

Government places burdensome regulations on State and local governments as well. Often times these regulations tie the hands of these governments in their attempt to address the needs of their citizens. That is why I introduced S. 88, the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act of 1995, on the first day of this Congress. The need to provide flexibility to local and State governments is enormous. While I intended to offer S. 88 as an amendment to the legislation on the floor, I did not want to delay passage of this bipartisan bill. However, I will continue to offer the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act as an amendment to legislation which comes before the Senate. I will also work with other Members to push this legislation forward as I believe it addresses regulations which are often overlooked and are as burdensome as those that this amendment addresses.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is about to pass legislation establishing an expedited procedure for congressional consideration and, where necessary, disapproval of regulations. I believe this is the right choice. The original legislation, which provided for a moratorium on regulations, was fraught with difficulty. It was legislation which could not pass this body and which, if it did, would probably have been vetoed. The approach we take today holds far greater promise for responsible review of regulations. And I applaud the efforts made by Senator NICKLES, Senator REID, and Senator GLENN who floor managed and perfected this legislation.

However, there was one provision inserted in the legislation yesterday that deserves further scrutiny. That provision would require the General Accounting Office to provide a report to Congress on each and every significant regulation promulgated by an agency informing Congress whether the agency has performed its job. Among other things, GAO's functions would include checking out whether the agency consulted with State, local, and tribal governments under the unfunded mandates legislation recently signed into law as well as checking on the agency's compliance with cost-benefit and risk analyses requirements under Executive Order 12866 and under legislation the Committee on Governmental Affairs last week ordered reported.

We are now in conference on the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. In neither body was a single vote cast against that legislation. We all agree the Government generates too much paperwork. While the central complaint concerns burdens on the public, there is also the recognition that Government imposes needless paperwork requirements on itself. In fact, Senators MCCAIN and LEVIN added important provisions to the paperwork legislation that would reduce unnecessary reports to Congress.

Now before those provisions even have a chance to get enacted, the Senate contradicts itself, mandating the

creation of about four GAO reports every working day of the year, the vast majority of which will be unnecessary and unread. These reports will cover functions already assigned to OIRA and in some cases duplicate the mission of independent peer review provisions in legislation ordered reported by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Moreover, we all need to be reminded that serious discussions are underway to cut the budget of GAO by 25 percent. By its own admission, GAO lacks expertise in the area of regulatory review. This would be a new mission for that agency coming at a time when we need to see how the present core mission of GAO can be preserved on a smaller budget.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let's do that little pop quiz again: How many million dollars are in \$1 trillion? When you arrive at an answer, bear in mind that it was Congress that ran up a debt now exceeding \$4.8 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business Tuesday, March 28, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,849,995,857,343.69—meaning that every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$18,410.67 computed on a per capita basis.

Mr. President, again to answer the pop quiz question, How many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion; and you can thank the U.S. Congress for the existing Federal debt exceeding \$4.8 trillion.

CIA LINKS TO GUATEMALAN MURDERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by new information reported in the New York Times and elsewhere linking the CIA to those responsible for the murders of United States citizen Michael DeVine and Efrain Bamaca Velasquez, the Guatemalan husband of United States citizen Jennifer Harbury. At this point, we do not have all the facts necessary to get a full picture of what occurred, but these preliminary reports raise serious questions.

For most of the last 30 years, systematic human rights violations have been committed with impunity against Guatemalan civilians. The political repression and deplorable practices of the Guatemalan military—extrajudicial killings, political kidnappings, and death threats—have taken the lives of at least 100,000 citizens since the early 1980's.

It is because of Guatemala's miserable human rights record that I have closely followed the cases involving U.S. citizens, including the case of Jennifer Harbury's husband and Michael DeVine. Over the last 2 years, I have taken several steps to find information

regarding the whereabouts and status of Mr. Bamaca, Mr. DeVine and others who have disappeared or been murdered in Guatemala. I have written letters or inquiry to the President, the National Security Council, and to the President of Guatemala, Ramiro De Leon Carpio, expressing my concern with these cases. Last year, I also introduced legislation urging the need for greater protection of human rights in Guatemala.

Throughout these efforts, and specifically on the case of Jennifer Harbury, I have been told that every attempt was being made to investigate her case, so that she could finally know the fate of her husband. Likewise, Congress has pressed time and again to resolve the questions surrounding the killing of Michael DeVine, an American innkeeper who was brutally murdered in Guatemala in 1990.

And now it is being reported that a Guatemalan Army colonel linked to the deaths of Michael DeVine and Jennifer Harbury's husband was, in fact, employed by the CIA and twice trained by the United States Army.

According to Thomas Stroock, who served as United States Ambassador to Guatemala from 1989 til 1992, our Embassy, having investigated Mr. DeVine's murder, came to the conclusion that Col. Julio Roberto Alpirez was behind it. Reportedly, Ambassador Stroock then told his staff at the Embassy that they were to have nothing more to do with the colonel. Nonetheless, reports indicate that the CIA station chief in Guatemala keep Col. Alpirez on the payroll for nearly 2 more years. The reports go on to indicate that much later the CIA, in 1992, paid Alpirez a lump sum of \$44,000 for intelligence work done for the Agency, nearly 46 times the average yearly income in Guatemala. If these reports are true, it is difficult to understand how and why the policy carried out by the CIA was so clearly at odds with the policy established years earlier by the U.S. Ambassador. How could the CIA justify providing U.S. taxpayer dollars to this criminal? And whom did the CIA station chief answer to, if not the U.S. Ambassador?

The Clinton administration must continue to push the Guatemalan Government to prosecute Alpirez and any others who were involved in these murders. And if the reports I have described here are true, the CIA must be held accountable for their deeply troubling involvement.

It is equally of concern to me that Col. Alpirez evidently oversaw the killing of Michael DeVine just 6 months after Alpirez had graduated from an elite course for senior officers at the School of the Americas, a U.S. Army School in Fort Benning, GA. It was the second time that U.S. taxpayers paid to train Col. Alpirez, who evidently then went on to thank this country by ordering the murder of one of our own citizens.

It remains unclear how long and for what reasons the CIA knew information related to the fate of Jennifer Harbury's husband, and withheld it from those within the administration who had explicitly sought it.

Serious questions have been raised about the CIA's involvement in both of these cases, and a full accounting is in order. Congressman TORRICELLI, in making information related to these cases public, has said, "This is the single worst example of the intelligence community being beyond civilian control and operating against our national interest."

A central United States objective in Guatemala is to contribute to an improved human rights environment in that troubled nation. If the reports of recent days are true, then clearly the CIA has failed to embrace this goal and may, in fact, be part of the problem in Guatemala. Mr. President, Congress and the taxpayers deserve answers to all of these questions.

THE AMERICAN CITIZENS HELD IN IRAQ

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise to share my strong concerns about the safe and prompt return of two American citizens currently being held in an Iraqi prison.

William Barloon, the brother of one of my constituents in Minnesota, and David Daliberti unintentionally strayed into Iraqi territory on March 13 while seeking to visit friends in the demilitarized zone between Kuwait and Iraq.

They were allowed to pass through two check points, one run by the United Nations and the other by Iraqis, before they were arrested for not possessing appropriate visas to enter Iraq. Thus, the very vulnerable position in which these men found themselves was not altogether of their own making.

Following their arrest, Mr. Barloon and Mr. Daliberti were given a rushed trial with no Americans present and without satisfactory legal counsel. An Iraqi court sentenced them to 8 years in prison, a very severe and disproportionate punishment for what was, at most, simple carelessness and neglect.

Mr. President, I also rise in strong support of the amendment offered yesterday by the gentlemen from Iowa to condemn the conviction and sentencing of Mr. Barloon and Mr. Daliberti. We must send a loud and clear message to the Iraqi Government: Under no circumstances should it even attempt to link its unjustified detention of the Americans to other international issues.

The Iraqi Government must be made to realize that the longer they hold these two men, the more they will heighten tensions and damage relations with the United States and the rest of the international community.

If Iraq hopes to use American citizens as bargaining chips in negotia-

tions on U.N. economic sanctions, it is sadly mistaken. Nothing less than the immediate release of Mr. Barloon and Mr. Daliberti will be satisfactory.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank those countries that are assisting the U.S. Government on this matter. Poland, in particular, deserves our gratitude for making sure that its diplomats have visited the Americans in prison and were present at their trial. I hope other countries will prove to be as cooperative as we work to resolve this situation.

Mr. President, as we all work to gain the quick release and safe exit from Iraq for Mr. Barloon and Mr. Daliberti, our prayers and thoughts are with them and their families.

COASTAL INSTITUTE IS WELL UNDERWAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to object to any amendment affecting Cooperative State Research Service funding that would rescind funds, already obligated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for building educational facilities at the University of Rhode Island.

USDA already had obligated \$6.2 million, appropriated in fiscal year 1993, fiscal year 1994, and fiscal year 1995 for the Federal matching share of funds to build the University of Rhode Island's Coastal Institute. I have been personally involved in this project since the 1980's, but it will be destroyed if these funds are rescinded.

Both the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee decided not to rescind this \$6.2 million. These funds represent the authorized, appropriated, and obligated Federal share of an ongoing agricultural education building project.

Rhode Island already has completed construction of one Coastal Institute building and I plan to attend a formal groundbreaking for the second building in about 3 weeks. These buildings constitute the State match—totaling \$12.56 million—for a third building to be built with anticipated Federal matching funds.

Mr. President, it strikes me as poor policy for the Federal Government to require Rhode Island to spend \$12.56 million to receive a like amount of Federal funds only to renege on the Federal share once the State had spent more than enough funds to meet its match.

I also want to emphasize that this is not a project that came in through a backdoor. The University of Rhode Island's Coastal Institute went through the most rigorous USDA feasibility review, including a peer review, and its funding has been approved step by step in the appropriations process for more than 5 years.

I would like to tell you just a bit about why the USDA approved matching funding for the Coastal Institute

and what the facilities can do for both Rhode Island and the Nation. First and foremost, I want to underscore why the coastal area is clearly an agricultural concern.

The coastal area includes the continental shelf, the shore area—including highly productive estuaries and wetlands, and the land areas which make up the first tier of inshore watersheds.

This encompasses rich agricultural lands, forest resources, and both urban and rural communities. Coastal lands are among the most productive and the most heavily populated on the earth.

The primary mission of the Coastal Institute is to carry out research and analyze policies to better enable society to manage its coastal resources wisely. This research and analysis includes such USDA priorities as agricultural production, aquaculture production, rural welfare, watershed management, and the maintenance of water quality.

USDA is concerned about nonpoint source pollution from agriculture and rural homes—pollution which hurts the productivity of our coastal estuaries. The Coastal Institute will investigate the origins, transport, and fate of these contaminants and will develop improved practices to reduce them.

It also will evaluate policy alternatives for implementation that recognize the legitimate interests of all groups involved, especially the rural and farm communities.

USDA also must address management of water resources in complex coastal areas. The Coastal Institute will investigate salt and other loadings of drainage water from irrigated agriculture and subsequent effects on soils, rivers, streams, and adjacent wetlands. It also will investigate salt water intrusion as a result of ground water withdrawals—a worldwide problem. The Coastal Institute will follow through by evaluating improved management practices and mitigating policies.

The Coastal Institute also will focus on fish and aquaculture as an area of intensive research.

The Coastal Institute will be working to develop aquaculture first, as a source of affordable fish for consumers; second, as a way to reduce our annual trade deficit of almost \$3 billion in fisheries products; third, as a potential market for feed products such as soymeal; and fourth, as a means to provide employment and increase the welfare of our rural communities.

Mr. President, I regret to say that, in general, the United States is lagging behind other nations in technological innovations that will allow the expansion of aquaculture systems.

Scientists of the Coastal Institute will continue: first, to develop environmentally sustainable aquaculture technologies for new species and for multiproduct aquaculture systems; second, analyze international trade and