

of the 89 regions and republics of the Russian Federation. Many of its Deputies are regional leaders. It does not meet on a continuous, full-time basis and is more like the French or German upper chamber than the U.S. Senate. Deputies in both chambers serve 4-year terms. The first Federal Assembly, however, was elected in December 1993 for only a 2-year term, with new elections due this December.

After the December 1993 election, it seemed that the Duma might be dominated by an anti-democratic coalition of hardline ultranationalists and communists. In its first year, however, the parliament avoided extreme confrontation with Yeltsin and, despite some missteps, supported some of the Government's key economic reform legislation. Surprisingly, the parliament approved Government budgets for 1994 and 1995 that imposed relatively strict fiscal discipline and sharply restrained defense spending despite intense pressure from the military-industrial complex. The parliament also enacted key parts of a new commercial code and laws protecting property rights.

There is strong parliamentary opposition to the Government's actions in Chechnya. Many Deputies were angered by Yeltsin's failure to consult them in advance or seek parliamentary approval of a state of emergency. Both chambers voted their disapproval of the assault several times by lopsided majorities, calling for the cessation of hostilities and a political resolution of the conflict. Parliamentary opposition, however, has had minimal impact on Russian policy in Chechnya, in part because the Constitution gives predominant power to the president on national security issues.

The Federal Assembly is a political training ground in which an important segment of the post-Yeltsin generation of politicians is learning democratic principles and skills that are not part of traditional Russian political culture, such as compromise and coalition-building, respect for the rule of law and representative government. Most Russian Deputies are overwhelmed by the enormity and urgency of their legislative responsibilities and the meagerness of their experience and resources. They know that they have a great deal to learn and the majority are not only willing but eager to benefit from foreign experience, including U.S. experience. Despite, or perhaps because of, the legacy of the cold war, many Russian Deputies view the U.S. Congress as an important and appropriate model. They are also stuck by similarities in the size and demographic diversity of our counties and our constitutional systems based on separation of powers, bicameralism, and federalism. Imperfect as our own institutions are, from a Russian perspective they are impressive examples of stability and continuity, functioning federalism, and peaceful resolution of competing political, economic, social, ethnic, and spiritual interests.

There is already a significant level of mostly informal travel between Washington and Moscow by Members of Congress and Russian Deputies. This is healthy and should be expanded as much as possible. There are already overtures from the Russian side for committee-to-committee consultations on issues of mutual interest. Staff consultations, exchanges, and training are another fruitful avenue. Frankly, on the American side the constraints are not so much financial but the commitment of time by busy Members. But I would urge my colleagues to think about the potential payoff on a modest investment of time in such endeavors. Russian Deputies are so eager to learn about U.S. legislative procedure and about the U.S. experience on a wide range of legislative issues. Here is an opportunity to influence positively and perhaps even help to shape the procedures, policies, and perspectives of the legislature of the world's other nuclear superpower. This should be done not in spite of the conflict in Chechnya, but all the more because of it. The Chechen crisis underlines the increased importance of the Russian parliament.

The Congressional Research Service is already embarked on an ambitious program of technical assistance to the Russian Federal Assembly. Funded by the Agency for International Development, \$3.5 million over 3 years, beginning in May 1994, with congressional approval, the CRS program aims to:

Help the Russian Federal Assembly create its own research and analysis capability independent of the executive branch.

Enhance the automation and interconnectivity of both chambers of the Federal Assembly and the Parliamentary Library.

Strengthen the collections and capabilities of the Russian Parliamentary Library.

Provide training in Moscow and Washington for Russian parliamentary staff specializing in automation, research and policy analysis, and legislative drafting.

Bring a leadership delegation from both chambers of the Federal Assembly to Washington to learn and observe first hand about development and oversight of legislative research and policy analysis.

CRS has considerable experience in such activity, having been directed by Congress to provide similar parliamentary assistance through the Gift of Democracy, to Poland, program, which was subsequently expanded under the House of Representative Special Task Force on the Development of Parliamentary Institutions in Eastern Europe, to include assistance to the parliaments of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, and Albania. There is a comparable AID-funded program in Ukraine.

These programs have made significant contributions to the development of democratic parliamentary institu-

tions in Central and Eastern Europe and now hope to do the same in Russia. At the same time, these programs provide CRS and the Congress with literally unique access to and insight into political developments in those countries. It is an activity from which all parties benefit in a variety of ways.

The Russian parliamentary leadership delegation that has been invited by CRS to visit Capitol Hill in the first week of April 1995 is led by Mikhail Mityukov, First Deputy Chairman of the Duma and Valerian Viktorov, Deputy Chairman of the Federation Council, and includes the chairmen of five important committees from both chambers.

On behalf of the Congress I would like to welcome these distinguished visitors in the spirit of interparliamentary cooperation and exchange.

I would also encourage my colleagues to meet with their Russian counterparts to help them gain a deeper appreciation of our legislative experience as well as our shortcomings so that they may benefit both from our example and from mistakes as they build the foundation of their own legislature. At the same time, this will give Members an unusual opportunity to discuss legislative issues of mutual interest with senior Russian Deputies and to learn firsthand about developments in Russia as it struggles to redefine itself politically, economically, socially, and spiritually.

This is not only a historic moment for Russia but also a historic opportunity for both our countries to redefine the relation between us. Cooperative interparliamentary relations can play a role in this redefinition.

#### HONORING THE 1995 KIMBALL HUMANITARIAN AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to three outstanding citizens of New Jersey who are being honored by the Kimball Medical Center Foundation of Lakewood, NJ on Wednesday, April 12, 1995.

At the Ninth Annual Awards Program, Edmund Bennett, Jr., Thomas F. Kelaher, Esq., and Robert H. Ogle will each receive the Kimball Humanitarian Award as a way to recognize "extraordinary leadership to the nonprofit sector of society, to acknowledge distinguished service towards the advancement of health care, and to honor individuals whose daily lives reflect the essence of humanitarianism."

Today, when the fragile ecology of our social environment is as threatened as that of our natural environment, I am delighted to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the efforts of these three individuals who recognize the importance of civil society. Civilizations cannot be constructed out of government and markets alone—we must also have a healthy and robust

civic sector—a place in which the bonds of community can flourish.

Edmund Bennett, Thomas Kelaher and Robert Ogle recognize that civil society is the place where Americans make their home, sustain their marriages and raise their kids. They know that civil society is in our schools, fraternities, community centers, churches, PTAs, libraries and local voluntary associations. They recognize that a sense of common purpose and consensus need to be forged to tackle our nations' problems. Civil society is the sphere of our most basic humanity—the personal, everyday realm that is governed by values such as responsibility, trust, fraternity, solidarity and love. With every meeting attended, board sat on, speech delivered and helping hand that is extended, these three men challenge the notion that life today is too fastpaced and global in scope for individuals to make a difference in their own communities. I salute Edmund Bennett, Thomas Kelaher and Robert Ogle for their spirit of volunteerism, leadership among local voluntary organizations and their continuing contributions to their community.

#### COMMEMORATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF McCARTER & ENGLISH OF NEWARK, NJ

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of McCarter & English, the oldest and largest law firm in New Jersey.

Originally a small firm with fewer than a dozen lawyers, McCarter & English has grown in both size and prominence in the century and a half since its founding. At its current size of 210 lawyers, with five offices and a sizable international legal services group, McCarter & English has established a reputation as one of the preeminent firms in New Jersey and the country.

If you were to ask a member of the New Jersey business community to describe McCarter & English, they might use the word prestigious or perhaps venerable; if you were to ask a New Jersey historian the same question they would undoubtedly use a much different word and it would be colorful. Since its founding by Thomas Nesbitt McCarter in 1845, McCarter & English's unique history of legal representation has included: handling legal matters for one of New Jersey's most famous historical figures, Thomas Alva Edison; defending one-time client Annie Oakley in a libel case and successfully contesting the New Jersey Senate election of 1893.

McCarter & English has contributed more than just color to New Jersey's legal history, it has also provided the State with many fine public and business leaders throughout the 15 decades since its founding. These leaders have included the founder's son Robert, who

became New Jersey attorney general, son Uzal, who founded First Fidelity Bank and a third son, Thomas Jr. who created Public Service. This history of leadership in both the public and private sector continues today. McCarter & English plays an on-going leadership role in support of charitable, educational, cultural and civic organizations in the State. Generous contributions to the New Jersey Center for Performing Arts and other projects have played a vital role in the revitalization of downtown Newark. This commitment to the city of Newark, where McCarter & English has been headquartered since it moved from Newton, Sussex County in 1865, has helped Newark weather difficult times over the past three decades.

McCarter & English has played an historic role in the development of New Jersey's business and legal communities and continues to play a vital role in these arenas. Once again, I congratulate McCarter & English on its 150th anniversary.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ACCOMPANYING S. 244, THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on the "Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995", S.244, a bill which I introduced on January 19, with strong bipartisan support. I anticipate that the conference report will be accepted by the Senate. The leadership of the House is eager to take action before the recess. Representatives of the administration have stated that the President is equally eager to sign into law this legislation to substantially strengthen the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, and reauthorize appropriations for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs [OIRA], which has been without an authorization since October of 1989.

Mr. President, before making some observations about the substance of the conference report upon which the Senate is about to act, I would like to briefly share with some of our newer colleagues some highlights of the very long march that had to be taken to get us to this point.

The effort has spanned more than 5 years, beginning in 1989. In the fall of 1989, the small business community sought the assistance of members of the Committee on Small Business to advance a package of amendments to S. 1742, legislation in the 101st Congress. They asserted that these amendments were desperately needed if the effectiveness of the Paperwork Reduction Act was to be preserved. These proposed amendments garnered bipartisan support within the Small Business Committee and were advanced during the Governmental Affairs Committee's consideration of the bill. S. 1742 was not passed by the Senate before the end of the 101st Congress.

With the beginning of the 102d Congress, I offered the "Paperwork Reduc-

tion Act of 1991", the first predecessor to the legislation being considered today. From the outset, this legislation has garnered strong bipartisan support, especially within the membership of the Committee on Small Business. Successive ranking Republican Members of the Committee on Small Business, including Senators Boschwitz, Kasten, and Pressler, have all been original cosponsors. My friend from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], then chairman of the committee, has each time consented to serve as the principal Democratic cosponsor.

With the introduction of S. 1139, the effort has had the strong support of a broad Paperwork Reduction Act Coalition, representing virtually every segment of the business community, but especially the small business community.

Mr. President, I will have more to say about the Paperwork Reduction Act Coalition later in my remarks.

The 102d Congress ended without seeing any action on S. 1139. Consideration of that bill became ensnared in the controversies regarding OIRA's regulatory review activities on behalf of the President, conducted pursuant to executive order, and the activities of the Council on Competitiveness, chaired by Vice President Quayle.

At the beginning of the 103d Congress, I introduced S. 560, again with strong bipartisan support. Our former colleague from Missouri, Senator Danforth, served as the principal Republican cosponsor. Senator Danforth had been the principal Republican cosponsor of the legislation sponsored by our former colleague from Florida, Lawton Chiles, that became the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980.

During the last Congress, real progress was finally made. S. 560 was skillfully blended with Senator GLENN's bill, S. 681. Both had the same basic objective—to reauthorize appropriations for OIRA and to strengthen the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. Each bill, however, reflected substantially different perspectives of how the Paperwork Reduction Act should be strengthened. A committee substitute for S. 560 was developed, reflecting the core of both bills. My friend from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], then chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee displaying skillful leadership and tenacity to break the logjam. Progress would not have been possible without the steadfast support of my friend from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], and many of my Republican friends on the Governmental Affairs Committee. Before the end of the last Congress, we were able to have the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1994, S. 244, as amended, approved by the Senate not once but twice in the closing days of the 103d Congress. S. 560 passed the Senate by unanimous voice vote on October 6, 1994. The following day, the text of S. 560 was attached to a House-passed measure, and returned to the House. Unfortunately, neither bill was cleared for action before adjournment of the 103d Congress.