

affecting the costs and financing of environmental activities at the Federal, State, and local levels. The Board shall report to the Administrator, and shall make the services and expertise of the Board available to Congress.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 35 members appointed by the Administrator.

(2) TERMS.—A member of the Board shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that 20 of the members initially appointed to the Board shall serve for a term of 1 year.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The members of the Board shall be individuals with expertise in financial matters and shall be chosen from among elected officials and representatives of national trade and environmental organizations, the financial, banking, and legal communities, business and industry, and academia.

(4) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Board shall elect a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, who shall each serve a term of 2 years.

(c) DUTIES.—After establishing appropriate rules and procedures for the operations of the Board, the Board shall—

(1) work with the Science Advisory Board, established by section 8 of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365), to identify and develop methods to integrate risk and finance considerations into environmental decisionmaking;

(2) identify and examine strategies to enhance environmental protection in urban areas, reduce disproportionate risks facing urban communities, and promote economic revitalization and environmentally sustainable development;

(3) develop and recommend initiatives to expand opportunities for the export of United States financial services and environmental technologies;

(4) develop alternative financing mechanisms to assist State and local governments in paying for environmental programs;

(5) develop alternative financing mechanisms and strategies to meet the unique needs of small and economically disadvantaged communities; and

(6) undertake such other activities as the Board determines will further the purpose of this Act.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Board may recommend to Congress and the Administrator legislative and policy initiatives to make financing for environmental protection more available and less costly.

(e) OPEN MEETINGS.—The Board shall hold open meetings and seek input from the public and other interested parties in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and shall otherwise be subject to the Act.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000.

#### SEC. 5. ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish and support an Environmental Finance Center in an institution of higher education in each of the regions of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) DUTIES AND POWERS.—A Center shall coordinate the activities of the Center with the Board and may—

(1) provide on-site and off-site training of State and local officials;

(2) publish newsletters, course materials, proceedings, and other publications relating to financing of environmental infrastructure;

(3) initiate and conduct conferences, seminars, and advisory panels on specific finan-

cial issues relating to environmental programs and projects;

(4) establish electronic database and contact services to disseminate information to public entities on financing alternatives for State and local environmental programs;

(5) generate case studies and special reports;

(6) develop inventories and surveys of financial issues and needs of State and local governments;

(7) identify financial programs, initiatives, and alternative financing mechanisms for training purposes;

(8) hold public meetings on finance issues; and

(9) collaborate with another Center on projects and exchange information.

(c) GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants to institutions of higher education to carry out this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000. •

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 277

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to impose comprehensive economic sanctions against Iran.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 277, supra.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles traveled in ozone non-attainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to require a report on United States support for Mexico during its debt crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to clarify the liability of banking and lending agencies, lenders, and fiduciaries, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to update references in the classification of children for purposes of United States immigration laws.

S. 508

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 508, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to the treatment of forestry activities.

S. 584

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 584, a bill to authorize the award of the Purple Heart to persons who were prisoners of war on or before April 25, 1962.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to establish the Gambling Impact Study Commission.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a joint resolution designating April 9, 1995, and April 9, 1996, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution expressing the concern of the Congress regarding certain recent remarks that unfairly and inaccurately maligned the integrity of the Nation's law enforcement officers.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 109—EXTENDING THE APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE OF THE U.S. SENATE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 109

Whereas Senator Robert C. Byrd on Friday, March 21, 1980, delivered on the floor of the Senate, an extemporaneous address on the history, customs, and traditions of the Senate;

Whereas on the following Friday, March 28, 1980, the Senator delivered a second, and once more spontaneous, installment of his chronicle on the Senate;

Whereas the first 2 speeches generated such intense interest that several Senators and others asked Senator Byrd to continue the speeches, particularly in anticipation of the forthcoming bicentennial of the Senate in 1989;

Whereas over the following decade Senator Byrd delivered 100 additional addresses on various aspects of the political and institutional history of the Senate;

Whereas in anticipation of commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Senate, Congress in 1987 authorized publication of the

addresses in suitable illustrated book-length editions;

Whereas between 1988 and 1994, Senator Byrd meticulously supervised preparation of 4 volumes, including a 39 chapter chronological history, a 28 chapter topical history, a compilation of 46 classic Senate speeches, and a 700 page volume of historical statistics;

Whereas volumes in the series have received national awards for distinction from organizations such as the American Library Association and the Society for History in the Federal Government;

Whereas the 4 volume work, entitled "The History of the United States Senate", is the most comprehensive history of the Senate that has been written and published;

Whereas Senator Byrd has devoted tireless energy and tremendous effort to the preparation and publication of the historical books, enabling citizens of the United States to better understand the history, traditions, and uniqueness of the Senate; and

Whereas a better understanding by people of the Senate and the role of the Senate in our constitutional system of government will foster respect and appreciation for the democratic traditions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the United States Senate extends congratulations and appreciation to Senator Robert C. Byrd for completing "The History of the United States Senate", a monumental achievement that will educate and inspire citizens of the United States about the Senate for generations to come.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND FAMILY POLICY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Finance Committee be permitted to meet on Friday, April 7, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on 1995 Board of Trustees annual report of the Social Security and disability trust funds.

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

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

• Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues who have expressed their congratulations to our counterparts in the House who this week completed work on the "Contract With America."

In the past few days, Mr. President, I have heard some powerful and stirring remarks from the other side about the nature of the "Contract With America." I have heard allegations that Republicans are plotting to break ketchup bottles over children's heads, to snatch their school lunches from their grasping mouths, and to send the seniors of America into the streets to forage from garbage cans.

Of course, this is an attempt to cast a judgment on the substance of the legislation that was brought forth under the contract. I would instead prefer to

focus my remarks on what I consider to be the real point of the contract, which was a commitment by newly elected leaders to—hold on to your hats—to keep their campaign promises.

Small wonder that this effort has produced so much discomfiture and fury on the other side. I remember a Presidential election in 1992, in which a Democratic Presidential candidate campaigned against the Bush policy in China, against the Bush policy in Bosnia, promised massive tax cuts—then delivered unprecedented tax increases—and on and on and on. And this is, to the mindset of the other side, what "responsibility" is all about. You don't keep your campaign promises, because it would be "irresponsible" to do so.

My view is rather quite different. My view of responsibility is that, while campaigning, one only makes promises that one intends to keep. But apparently it is a novel idea in Washington, and is described by phrases such as "pandering" and "irresponsibility."

Now also, before discussing the substance of the contract itself, let me also commend by House colleagues for adhering to the principle that, whether or not the votes were there to pass these items, these matters should be brought forth for a vote. That was the real point of the contract—to bring matters up for a vote.

I need not tell American citizens why that is so important, but I would like to refresh my colleagues' understanding of that point. The point is simply that the American public has a right to know where its representatives truly stand on these issues. That is a fundamental responsibility of representative democracy.

This principle should be supported by all legislators, whether or not they agreed with all of the substantive content of the "contract." Clearly, these were matters of importance to the American people. Many legislators—on both sides of the aisle—have run for office claiming that they supported such measures. They would say that they favored balanced budgets, favored the line-item veto, favored term limits, favored holding Congress accountable to the laws that it passed—and yet these measures were never passed. Those who voted for these legislators had a right to know who really favored these measures and who did not.

I think it is a measure of how truly "out of touch" Washington has become if the definition of "responsibility" has become—"refusing to vote on matters of importance to the American people." What House Republicans have accomplished, essentially, is to demonstrate that they believed that Americans did have a right to know where their legislators really stood, instead of Congress' engaging in the age-old practice of refusing to bring matters to a vote simply because it was feared they would pass. That is not my idea of representative democracy—gimmicking the system to avoid having to cast

a politically unpopular vote. And we saw a terrible lot of that in the House for 40 years.

Finally, I would like to address the rather silly charge that the "Contract With America" was a special boon for rich Americans only.

If we run down the various items of the contract—and I do not support every single one of them—we see several measures that have nothing to do with being "rich" or "poor." We simply see measures designed to give Washington some long-overdue accountability to the people we represent.

For instance—the Congressional Accountability Act. I do not understand why it would be catering to the "rich" to make Congress accountable to the laws that it passes.

Nor do I understand why a halt to unfunded Federal mandates is a special benefit for "the rich." It is an irrelevant, nonsensical argument to say that somehow it is the height of egalitarianism for Washington to send endless unfunded mandates on to the States.

The balanced budget amendment; there's another one. Simply the proposition that Government should live within its means. I would be very curious to know what tenet of economic theory holds that it is necessary for Government to go into hundreds of billions in debt every year in order to treat "rich" and "poor" appropriately.

Even many of the attacks on the proposed tax cuts struck me as disingenuous, at times even hypocritical. Many Congressmen and Senators waxed eloquent about how unfair it was to give any sort of tax break to the "rich," but when it comes to shelling out billions in Federal entitlement benefits to the "rich," they are strangely silent. If it is unjust to have any sort of tax relief affecting anyone of means, please explain to me why a billionaire should get a full Social Security COLA, or to have 75 percent of his Medicare part B premium paid by the taxpayer. If you want to know where we have really indulged the "rich," it's not through the Tax Code. It's through Government spending.

So this was never about "rich" versus "poor." It was about big Government versus small Government.

In the end, Mr. President, many of the attacks on the Republican legislative effort are nothing more than the same shopworn, trite, ridiculous rhetoric of class warfare that got us into this spending nightmare, and most assuredly will not get us out.

We will hear much more of it in the weeks to come.

When we attempt to hold the growth of Government spending to a reasonable level—not to cut it, but just to restrain its growth—we will hear how we are "cutting" and "slashing" and so forth.

I just cannot believe—and I say this in all earnestness to my Democratic colleagues and their pollsters—that the American people will swallow that one. I remember those charges during the