

this historic day, and as long as our freedom endures.

On this 50th anniversary of the battle on Iwo Jima, we remember flags raised by marines all over the world. And we remember flags draped over marines, airmen, sailors, and soldiers, in honored glory, from Iwo Jima to Omaha Beach to Da Nang. Today and every day, we remember all our brave heroes.

Do I have any remaining time, Mr. President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska has 1 minute and 40 seconds.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I see my friend from Colorado is in the Chamber. The Senator from Texas had asked me to yield if I had any remaining time, but I do not see the Senator from Texas, so I obviously will yield to my good friend from Colorado.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

#### AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am here today to speak about another bill, but I listened with interest to the comments of my colleague from Alaska on our energy crisis and would like to associate myself with his comments.

I know, as does he, that we are more dependent now, I guess, than at any time in our history on foreign oil. And anyone who thinks that the war in the gulf was anything other than a war over oil is being naive. I think, as my friend from Alaska, that trading the blood of American soldiers is a pretty darned poor trade for oil. But clearly, if we do not have some kind of coherent energy policy and if we do not move to develop our resources, we are destined to do more battle on foreign lands.

It also is interesting to me to note that when we do have public hearings about developing America's natural resources, some of the people who protest the development show up in automobiles getting about 4 miles to the gallon.

At any rate, I look forward to working with the chairman on trying to enhance production of American resources.

#### THE NATIVE AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to speak on legislation I introduced last week entitled the "Native American Financial Services Organization Act," S. 436. This legislative initiative is the culmination of extensive deliberations between officials from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Treasury, the USDA, members of my staff, and staff

of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

The primary purpose of the Native American Financial Services Organization Act is to begin to look at innovative funding mechanisms to address the critical housing needs prevalent in most native American communities.

The cornerstone of this legislation is the establishment of a native American Financial Services Organization as a limited-government chartered corporation that would have the authority to:

Assist native American communities to create local financial institutions that will attract capital investment in housing and economic development in Indian communities.

And, to develop and provide specialized technical assistance on how to overcome barriers to primary mortgage lending on native American lands, such as issues relating to trust lands, discrimination, and inapplicability of standard underwriting criteria.

As a matter of consistency this legislation is intended to supplement, not duplicate, the efforts of any other government-sponsored enterprise or organization.

Through a cooperative agreement with the Community Development Financial Institutions [CDFI] fund established in the Riegle Community Development Banking and Regulatory Improvement Act, the Native American Financial Services Organization will provide technical assistance to native American financial institutions pursuant to the provisions of the CDFI fund.

Mr. President, last week Secretary Cisneros testified before the Committee on Indian Affairs. In his remarks, he discussed HUD's reinvention blueprint for native American programs in the context of overall HUD reorganization.

I was particularly impressed with his commitment to revitalize and reorganize the Department of Housing and Urban Development so that local communities, and in this instance Indian communities, are further empowered to administer housing programs with greater flexibility.

In addition to consolidating many existing programs into funds, which will be administered as block grants, the Secretary reiterated his commitment to seek out alternative, innovative funding mechanisms that could be a catalyst for supplementing existing Federal dollars with greater private investment.

Mr. President, as the Chair is probably aware, housing on Indian reservations is terrible. The existing housing conditions prevalent in many Indian reservation communities are so bad an estimated 50,000 families are in need of new homes. And further, according to a study completed by the Commission on American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing, the total backlog of needed homes approaches 5,500 or an estimated cost of \$460 million.

I think it is realistic to say that under our current fiscal constraints,

Congress will probably not be able to appropriate the necessary funding to meet such a large backlog of basic housing needs.

It is for this very reason that I believe the Native American Financial Services Organization Act is a viable solution to existing housing crisis in our Indian reservation communities. I want to thank my colleagues Senator MCCAIN, Senator INOUE, and Senator DASCHLE for cosponsoring this important legislative initiative and look forward to its speedy passage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

#### THE NO DUCK SEASON CANARD

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, it is about time to lay to rest the fears of duck hunters across America about the effects of S. 219, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, on this year's duck hunting season.

This bill, which would impose a moratorium on all new Federal regulations, is an integral part of our regulatory reform agenda. It is designed to protect the public from regulatory overzealousness, but certainly not at the expense of one of our country's most enjoyable pastimes.

The legislation introduced by Senator DON NICKLES, Senator BOND, and myself, cosponsored by 36 Members of the Senate, clearly exempts regulatory activity if the President finds the action is a routine administrative action or principally related to public property benefits or contracts.

No activity of the Federal Government can be considered more routine than setting limits on duck bags.

But, fueled by faulty information and media hype, millions of our country's sportsmen are crying foul. We call these tactics the close-the-Washington-Monument syndrome. The bureaucrats say if you are going to do something we do not like we will make the most ridiculous decision possible and try to blame you for it.

The proponents of this legislation have no intention of shooting themselves in the foot by losing the support of duck hunters for new regulatory common sense in our Federal Government. I have cosponsored the Federal regulatory moratorium and am a lead sponsor of the moratorium on the Endangered Species Act because they are important tools in our fight to protect private property rights and to safeguard small businesses and communities throughout the country from excessive Government regulation. Ill-conceived regulation curbs economic growth and curtails productivity at a significant cost to our taxpayers and it costs jobs in America.

While the moratorium would achieve the desired effect of slowing down this

administration's appetite for Government control of our businesses, it certainly is not intended to prevent routine Government procedures, or to deprive our citizens of their favorite leisure sports. And we have gone out of our way to take care of these concerns.

While the opponents of these bills are likely to continue to try to ruffle the feathers by trying to scare the public, the public's interest would be far better served by imposing moratoriums. It will prevent further regulatory burdens from being added before this Congress can revise current laws, and add common sense to overzealous regulations. That is our goal, common sense.

I think the close-the-Washington-Monument tactics show how little common sense there has been in the regulatory climate. The public understands one point all too clearly: Regulatory reform is an issue we cannot afford to duck.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

#### HUNGER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the other evening in a meeting in North Dakota with a couple hundred North Dakotans, mostly farmers, I asked to do something different. I asked if those who came to the meeting to participate would spend a little time talking about what is right, what works, which Government programs are good and address real needs in the right way?

It was an interesting exercise. The sport in America, the pastime in our country that consumes the minutes of virtually every town meeting of every Member of Congress, is talking about what is wrong. I understand that. We should figure out what is wrong and make it right. But it is also important to understand that there are a lot of things done in this country that are good, that are worthwhile, that make this country better.

There is, it seems to me, a requirement from time to time for us to stop and think about that. What is it that works? What is worthwhile?

We have in this country today something called a Contract With America, which was offered by the majority party in the House of Representatives. In the last election, when the American people decided who would govern, 20 percent of those who were eligible to vote cast their vote for Republicans, 19 percent of those eligible to vote cast their vote for Democrats. In other words, the Republicans won 20 percent to 19 percent, and 61 percent decided they would not bother to vote at all. That was the score. The 20-to-19 victory produced was called a mandate by some. This 1 percent mandate in the House of Representatives then provided us with something called a Contract With America. The Contract With America has some things in it that I support and some things that we on the

Democratic side of the aisle have brought to the floor of the Senate previously. There are things in it that I think are bipartisan and that will enjoy bipartisan support. There are other things that cause me great concern, which is where I think we are going to be in some public policy aggressive discussions later this year.

We are now discussing the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget on the floor of the Senate. Consuming a substantial amount of time in that debate is the notion that there are some people in this Congress who want to spend a lot of money and there are others who are conservative that do not.

Something happened last week that once again belies that general notion. In the House of Representatives, the majority party, the conservatives, the ones who push the Contract With America, said they wanted to add \$600 million in defense spending to a bill. The Secretary of Defense said, "No, we do not want that. We do not need that. We do not support that." The conservatives said, "No, no, no, we insist. We want \$600 million more for you to spend."

The question is, Who is conservative and who is liberal? We have conservatives saying the Defense Department should be given more money than they want or need because that is where they want to spend money. Where did they get it? They said, "We will not increase the deficit. We will take the money that's in an account for improvements for schools in low-income neighborhoods and we will use that to give the Defense Department money it says it does not need. We will cut job training for disadvantaged youth in order to give the Defense Department money the Defense Department says it does not want." This coming from conservatives.

So, who is a liberal and who is a conservative? Who are the big spenders? Are the big spenders people who want to stuff another \$600 million over to the Pentagon when the people who run the Pentagon say, "We do not want it, we do not need it, we did not ask for it, do not give it to us?"

I take from this lesson the general notion that is there is really not a plugged nickel's worth of difference between Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, in their appetite for spending money. Everyone wants to spend resources. The question is, on what? One wants to build star wars, another wants a feeding program for children. But both want to spend money.

I think a century from now one will be able to look back at this society, at this country, at this group of people and make a reasonably good judgment about who we were and what we were about and what kind of people we were by how we decided to spend public resources.

One will be able to look at the Federal budget 100 years from now and de-

cide: Here is what the American people felt. Here is what they thought was important in the year 1995, because the Federal priorities on spending, the priorities of the Federal and State governments and the other uses of public funds establishes what our country and its people thought was important.

There are some things in this country that are of national importance, that we have decided were important over 20 and 50 years. I have worked on one of these issues a great deal for many, many years. It is that issue—hunger—which persuaded me to come to the floor for just a couple of minutes today. I have traveled to refugee camps around the world. I chaired a task force on hunger with the chair of the Hunger Committee, the late Mickey Leland, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. We have the winds of hunger blowing every day in every way in every country around the world—killing 40,000 to 45,000 people a day, most of them children. And yet it is not a headline anywhere. It is just a persistent, chronic problem that imposes massive suffering on millions and millions of people. Hunger is not some mysterious disease for which we do not have a cure. We know what causes it. We know what cures it. Hunger is a very serious problem, and there is a national responsibility and a national requirement to respond to it.

The national priority to respond to hunger has been manifested in things like the school hot lunch program, the WIC program, the Food Stamp Program, a whole range of programs that invest in those who find themselves with the misfortune of being poor and hungry, particularly in young people.

We are told now in the Contract With America that the new way to respond to these issues is through block grants. Substantially cut the total amount of money for a number of programs, especially programs that affect the poor, the vulnerable, and the hungry. Substantially cut the money in the aggregate, roll it into one block grant, move it back to the States, and say to the States, "Use it as you wish. Address these problems as you will. It is your choice." Presumably, the State governments are more efficient and more effective than the Federal Government.

I will admit that there are many areas where the delivery of services by State governments can be more efficient and more effective. I also would say that, just because people talk about wanting to create block grants and use them as the device to save money, this does not in any way obliterate urgent national needs. Hunger and poverty are among those urgent national needs.

Block grants will create a system, to ask the poor and the most vulnerable—and, unfortunately, especially the hungry and the children—to compete against a range of other urgent needs because, if we say we are going to roll all of these programs into a block