

(2) A committee of conference to which is committed an authorization measure shall not file a conference report in either House unless such measure presents each direct spending or targeted tax benefit as a separate item and the statement of managers accompanying that report clearly identifies each such item.

(3) If a conference report is presented to the House or Senate that fails to comply with either paragraph (1) or (2), it shall not be in order in that House to consider such conference report. If a point of order under this paragraph is sustained in the House to first consider the conference report, the measure shall be deemed recommitted to the committee of conference.

### SEC. 3. WAIVERS AND APPEALS.

Any provision of section 2 may be waived or suspended in the House or Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of that House duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under that section.

### SEC. 4. SEPARATE ENROLLMENT.

(a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when any appropriation or authorization measure passes both Houses of Congress in the same form, the Secretary of the Senate (in the case of a measure originating in the Senate) or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of a measure originating in the House of Representatives), shall cause the enrolling clerk of such House to enroll each item of such appropriation or authorization measure separately.

(2) A measure that is required to be enrolled pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) shall be enrolled without substantive revision,

(B) shall conform in style and form to the applicable provisions of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code (as such provisions are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), and

(C) shall bear the designation of the measure of which it was an item prior to such enrollment, together with such other designations as may be necessary to distinguish such measure from other measures enrolled pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to the same measure.

(b) A measure enrolled pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) with respect to an item shall be deemed to be a bill under Clauses 2 and 3 of Section 7 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States and shall be signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, or their designees, and presented to the President for approval or disapproval (and otherwise treated for all purposes) in the manner provided for bills and joint resolutions generally.

### SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "appropriation measure" means any general or special appropriation bill or any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations.

(2) The term "authorization measure" means any measure other than an appropriations measure that contains a provision providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits.

(3) The term "direct spending" shall have the same meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) The term "item" means—

(A) with respect to an appropriations measure—

(i) any numbered section,

(ii) any unnumbered paragraph, or

(iii) any allocation or suballocation of an appropriation, made in compliance with section 2(a), contained in a numbered section or an unnumbered paragraph; and,

(B) with respect to an authorization measure—

(i) any numbered section, or,

(ii) any unnumbered paragraph,

that contains new direct spending or a new targeted tax benefit presented and identified in conformance with section 2(b).

(5) The term "targeted tax benefit" means any provision:

(A) estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation as losing revenue within the periods specified in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; and

(B) having the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers.

### SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall apply to measures passed by the Congress beginning with the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2000.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding a hearing on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, beginning at 2:30 p.m., in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building on S. 441, a bill to reauthorize Public Law 101-630, the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and S. 510, a bill to extend the reauthorization for certain programs under the Native American Programs Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Monday, March 20, 1995, beginning at 10 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on welfare to work programs.

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

### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Monday, March 20, 1995, beginning at 2 p.m., in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building on the impact in Indian country of proposed rescissions of fiscal year 1995 Indian program funds and of proposals to consolidate or block grant Federal programs funds to the several States.

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

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### REVISIONISM IN JAPAN

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I rise today to address a disturbing article in last Thursday's Washington Post. According to the Post, last Wednesday the mayor of Nagasaki, Motoshima Hitoshi, likened the two 1945 bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to the Holocaust. He said, and I quote, "I think that the atomic bombings were one of the two greatest crimes against humanity in the 20th century, along with the Holocaust." He was joined in these sentiments by Hiraoka Takashi, the mayor of Hiroshima.

Mr. President, I am incensed by this comparison, and by what appears to me to be a growing revisionist tendency among some circles in Japan aimed at sanitizing its role as the aggressor and transforming it into the innocent victim of the atomic bomb. History is replete with instances which provide ample justification for the course the United States took to end years of war. For the benefit of these two gentlemen, let me note some of those facts.

On December 7, 1941, without notice or declaration of war, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, HI. I do not need to describe for my colleagues the carnage and death that followed. From that point, Japan engaged us in a protracted and costly war that ranged over the Pacific rim for more than 4 years and cost thousands and thousands of lives.

Treatment of Allied prisoners of war was unconscionable. For Americans fighting in the Pacific theater, the likelihood of dying in combat was about 5 percent. For American POW's in German prison camps, it was 4 percent. But for those in Japanese prison camps the number ran to 33 percent. Executions, tortures, the Bataan Death March, the record is replete with atrocities for which the victims have yet—50 years later—to receive an apology. It is somewhat ironic that also in the same edition of the Post is a lengthy article entitled, "Still Waiting for an Apology: Historian Gavan Daws, Calling on Japan on War Crimes." I would commend it to Messrs. Hiraoka and Motoshima; they might learn a thing or two from it.

A special unit of the Imperial Army, called Unit 731, conducted research in germ warfare with an aim at introducing plague, anthrax, and other fatal diseases into the United States. As the theater of war moved closer to the home islands, the United States and its Allies were reduced to fighting their way toward Japan on an island-by-island basis. The battles were costly—both in lives, time, and materiel. Just this week we remembered the 50th anniversary of the taking of Iwo Jima. In that battle, some 20,000 Japanese fought to the death—many committing seppuku rather than surrender.

All the signs available to us at the time indicated that this would be the course of the remainder of the war. Several Allied surrender ultimatums were rejected offhand by the Japanese. Thus, as the war drew to a close in Europe, we were clearly faced with a choice in Asia; do something to bring a quick end to our losses and suffering, or continue a painfully long, drawn-out, costly conflict. President Truman chose the only alternative a nation's leader would, and the bombs fell.

Yet, some in Japan can overlook all that came before the bombs. Some can reduce Japan from the vigorous aggressor to the passive victim. Mr. Hiraoka seems to be of that ilk. For example, he emphasized that several early multinational conventions prohibited deliberate attacks on civilians, then proceeded to list those nations which did not live up to that ideal during the war era: German attacks on London, the United States firebombing of Tokyo, the British-led firebombing of Dresden.

Yet, conspicuously absent from his list is the country behind the first such indiscriminate bombing: Japan. On December 1, 1937, the Imperial Army Headquarters in Tokyo ordered an attack on Nanjing, China. The planes came and laid waste to the city and its population; estimates of the civilian losses range from 100,000 to 200,000. The attack lives on in the minds of many Chinese as one of the most infamous events of the 20th century.

Mr. President, the present strong relationship between the United States and Japan is of the utmost importance to us. I personally enjoy my nascent relationship with Kuriyama Takakazu, Japan's Ambassador here in Washington. But statements like those made by these two mayors cannot go unanswered; for to fail to rebut such revisionism is simply to lend credence to it. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO CAROLYN SQUIRES

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, during the welfare reform debate that we are bound to have in the months ahead of us, I would like the Senate to keep in mind the story of Carolyn Squires, representative of the State of Montana's House District 68. Her example should be a reminder to all of us that public assistance programs can work.

Although she is a successful member of the Montana House of Representatives, I would like to tell you about a time when Carolyn was not so lucky. She was once divorced, a single mother, and on welfare. But like a majority of welfare mothers, she never gave up a little over a year later she found a career.

For the past 27 years, Carolyn has worked at Missoula's community medical center as a licensed practical nurse. She is active in the Missoula labor movement. Still a member of the licensed practical nurses union, Carolyn is president of the Central Labor Council in Missoula.

Although she was initially appointed to the Montana State House, Carolyn has worked hard for her constituents. And they have rewarded her with their votes. It is because she has a way with people. I remember hearing of a time during her recent campaign when she decided to go door-to-door. After about three or four blocks, several people started following her. They liked what she had to say. And although Carolyn did not get far on her walk, she was always connected with her constituents.

Carolyn has exemplified this again and again. One of her constituents, a single mom receiving AFDC, called for Carolyn's help. The mother did not receive her check for 2 straight weeks. As many of you know, this can be a crisis. But Carolyn did not waste any time. She called the Montana Social Rehabilitation Service directly and demanded to talk to the cabinet director.

"The Director is in a meeting," she was told.

Then Carolyn got really mad. And, while Carolyn has a heart of gold, anybody who knows her also knows it is best to stay on her good side. Clearly, the folks in the department did not know Carolyn Squires very well. Yet they finally pulled the director out of the meeting. Carolyn demanded that the check arrive tomorrow morning, and that she herself would be there to receive it. Needless to say, the check arrived bright and early the next day.

Carolyn Squires has a lot to be proud of. She knows that politics is about people, and she makes a difference. She is a shining example, one of many, whose life was improved because of our welfare system. Her husband Harold, her sons Paul and Keith, her grandchildren and those Montanans in house district 68 are lucky to have someone so dedicated taking care of them. They should all be proud of her legacy of service to the city of Missoula and the State of Montana. I am proud to honor her today before the Senate. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. RICHARD G. KIRKLAND

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the dedication, public service, and patriotism of Rear Adm. Richard G. Kirkland, U.S. Navy, on the occasion of his retirement after 26 years of faithful service to our Nation. Admiral Kirkland's strong commitment to excellence will leave a lasting impact on the vitality of our modern warfighters, commanding admiration and respect from his military colleagues and Members of Congress.

Rear Admiral Kirkland was born August 17, 1947, in Coronado, CA. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1969 with a bachelor of science degree and earned a master of science in aeronautical systems engineering from the University of West Florida.

Rear Admiral Kirkland's first duty assignment was Patrol Squadron 56 (VP-56) from June 1971 through May 1974. He then was attached to Air Test

and Evaluation Squadron 1 (VX-1) as operations test director, Harpoon weapons system from June 1974 through May 1977. In August 1977, he reported to U.S.S. *Constellation* (CV-64) for duty as assistant navigator. During this tour, the ship deployed twice to the Western Pacific and was the first carrier to deploy into the Indian Ocean. While on board, he qualified and was designated as surface warfare officer. He then went to the Naval Military Personnel Command [NMPC] as VP sea duty detailer and sea duty coordinator from May 1979 to January 1981. His next assignment was with the Pelicans of Patrol Squadron 45 (VP-45) as operations officer from June 1981 until April 1983. He was then assigned to Patrol Wing 11 as operations officer between April 1983 and April 1984. He was selected to serve with the Mad Foxes of VP-5 as executive officer from May 1984 until June 1985. Subsequently, he took command of Patrol Squadron 5 (VP-5) from July 1985 through September 1986. He returned to serve a second tour at NMPC as the assistant aviation commander detailer from September 1986 until March 1988. He then was assigned command of Patrol Squadron 30 (VP-30) from April 1988 through July 1989. After completion of this command tour, he was selected as a CNO Fellow and served as a member of the Strategic Studies Group IX from August 1989 to July 1990 which marked his third tour outside the VP community. Upon completion of this tour, he was assigned as Commander, Patrol Wing 11 from July 1990 until April 1992. He served as director, Navy/Marine Corps Senate liaison office from April 1992 to December 1993 before assuming his present position.

Rear Admiral Kirkland's awards include the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal with three gold stars, and numerous other unit awards and personal decorations.

Our Nation, the U.S. Navy, his children Keith, Heather, and Ryan, can truly be proud of the Admiral's many accomplishments. A man of his extraordinary talent and integrity is rare indeed. While his honorable service will be genuinely missed in the Department of Defense, it gives me great pleasure to recognize Rear Admiral Kirkland before my colleagues and wish him all of our best wishes in his new and exciting career. ●

#### SALUTE TO ROSIE THE RIVETER

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, on March 15, 1995, Dundalk Community College in Dundalk, MD, in honor of Women's History Month, hosted "A Salute to Rosie the Riveter," honoring the women who worked in America's wartime factories to do their part in America's war effort.

Between 1942 and 1945, the ranks of American working women swelled from 12 to 18 million. Responding to the call that "We can do it," thousands of women entered the wartime work force