

what we can do to put more police officers on the street, and to put more police officers into our highest crime areas. Make no mistake, the evidence is clear, putting a police officer on a street corner in a dangerous neighborhood will reduce crime. We are looking for what really works, and putting police officers on the streets is a proven strategy that works. It is a plain fact, if you put a police officer on the street, crime will go down.

The President is right in this respect, and he is to be commended for understanding that there is, in fact, a direct or actually inverse relationship between the number of law enforcement officers who are deployed correctly in the neighborhood and the amount of crime that exists in that neighborhood.

That is why the President last year asked for \$8.8 billion in Federal funding for police officers. We do need more police; he is correct. Police officers deployed correctly matter. They do make a difference.

But, Mr. President, I believe that we can improve on President Clinton's plan, and there are three major shortcomings I believe that exist in the President's plan that we ought to address in the Senate. Let me list them:

First, the administration's plan spreads the \$8.8 billion far too thin. It does not target the funding for police officers to the most crime-ridden areas where the funding is most needed. Instead, it spends money on extra police officers even—even in extremely low-crime areas. That just does not make sense.

Second, the administration is not paying for the full cost of the extra police officers. The Clinton proposal pays for only 75 percent of the police officers and asks local communities to come up with the remaining 25 percent.

Third, the Clinton plan provides the money for only—only, Mr. President—3 years.

I think that these problems I have just listed with the Clinton administration proposal can be fixed fairly easily. As part of the comprehensive crime legislation I intend to introduce on Wednesday, I will be including my proposals on how we should fix these problems, and here is what I propose:

First, I propose to pay for the police officers and to pay for them in full, 100 percent. Under my proposal, we will send \$5 billion over a period of time to the local communities for new police officers. Those police officers will be fully funded 100 percent, not just 75 percent, as envisioned in the Clinton plan.

Second, we will fund these police officers for 5 years; 5 years, not 3 years, as envisioned by the Clinton proposal.

Third, and probably most significant, my proposal will target these funds where they are needed the most. Under the Clinton plan, really crime-threatened communities are deprived of the full contingent of police officers they really need. For example, under the administration proposal, a high-crime

community, such as Chicago, has received 300 police officers so far, and those 300 are not even fully funded. They are funded at 75 percent. My legislation would put 2,100 new police officers on the streets of Chicago and would pay for them in full.

I can cite example after example. Let me just give one from my home State. Youngstown, OH, is another city with a very serious crime problem. Under the Clinton plan, it has received a total of 10 new police officers. I think, however, to make a real difference in a crime area, we need to do better than that. Under the formula that is contained in the bill that I will introduce on Wednesday, there would be a total of 58 new police officers on the streets of Youngstown. We would go from 10 under the Clinton plan to 58 under my plan, and the way we are able to do that is because we are targeting the money to go to the areas where the crime is the worst. It only makes sense that when we are dealing with scarce Federal dollars, those Federal dollars should be targeted specifically to the areas where our citizens are most in danger.

My proposal would put the dollars for police officers where police officers are needed the most. We are targeting the 250 most crime-infested cities in America. We will succeed in getting those police officers on the street. In a community brutalized by rampant crime, the police officer is truly an ambassador of law and order. The police officer is a living, breathing confirmation of America's resolve to defend civilization from those who want to turn our country into a wasteland of stealing, raping, and killing.

The police officer is a soldier of justice, and like any other soldier, the police officer, to be most effective, needs to be sent where the enemy is. The enemy is anyone who does a drive-by shooting or rapes someone or commits any other kind of brutal act.

Mr. President, anyone who watches TV or reads the papers knows where the enemy really is. My bill would make sure that the police officers are deployed where they are needed the most. My bill would pay for them in full.

This is what it will take. This is what it will take if we are serious about taking back our streets.

The American people are, quite frankly, losing patience with violent crime. They are losing patience with the syndrome that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, calls defining deviancy down.

There is a consensus out here, Mr. President, that we will not allow our country to become a place where violent crime is considered normal. I think that putting these police officers on the street—and paying for them in full—will be a major symbol of our national resolve.

My legislation, Mr. President, would spend \$5 billion on these police officers, target them where they are needed the

most, and pay for these police officers in full.

The Clinton administration plan included \$8.8 billion as partial payment for police officers, with their deployment of police officers being spread throughout the country and spread among many, many areas where crime is not that serious.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I will discuss what we can do with this extra \$3.8 billion, and specifically how we can use block grants to give local communities the flexibility they need to use that \$3.8 billion as effectively as possible. And then on Wednesday of this week, Mr. President, I will be introducing my comprehensive crime bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

TERMINATION OF THE HELIUM AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to praise both the House and Senate Budget Committees for including in their budget assumptions termination of a relatively small program, the helium reserve program. The Budget Committee materials assume a \$27 million savings over 5 years from termination of the helium reserve program.

As the budget debate unfolds in the House and Senate in the coming week, there will certainly be considerable debate over programs of enormous magnitude—programs with budget outlays in the billions, not millions. Although the Budget Committee materials assume a \$27 million savings from termination of the helium reserve program, the actual savings will be significantly higher as the Federal Government sells off the existing helium reserve over a period of time that will not disrupt the private helium market, as well as terminates the program itself. The Federal Government is currently stockpiling enough helium to meet its needs for the next 80 to 100 years. In order to make sure that the taxpayers get a fair price for this helium, the reserve needs to be sold over a period of time to make sure that we do not inadvertently cause the entire market price for helium to fall needlessly. CBO has estimated that we can, at current market prices, eventually recover between \$1 and \$1.6 billion by this sale.

It is not just the current \$27 million in savings but a long-term savings by in effect privatizing this area of our Government.

I introduced legislation, S. 45, to terminate this program on the first day of the 104th Congress. I am pleased to report that this legislation has gained bipartisan support and that it has been cosponsored by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the

Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE]. On May 1, 1995, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], introduced similar legislation to terminate the program, joined by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI]. Thus, 15 Members of the Senate, 8 Republicans and 7 Democrats have sponsored legislation to terminate the program. Moreover, President Clinton on January 24, highlighted termination of the helium program in his State of the Union Address as an example of the kind of Federal spending that could no longer be justified.

Mr. President, I have previously spoken on the Senate floor about why termination of the helium reserve program is particularly appropriate today in light of the growth of a private helium industry which can more than adequately supply the needs of the Federal Government for this product.

The helium reserve program, like many programs which are the target of today's deficit reduction efforts, began decades ago when there was a reason for the Federal Government to become involved in this area. In the case of helium, the program dates back to the time of President Woodrow Wilson. The Helium Act of 1925 was enacted at a time when observation balloons were thought to have strategic merit. It was expanded under the Eisenhower administration when blimps were being used to spot enemy submarines in the Atlantic and to meet the needs of the fledgling space program. Since that time, however, a private domestic helium industry has developed and as of 1995, 90 percent of the helium produced in this country does come from private operations.

Now, Mr. President, it is time to terminate the Federal helium program. With the kind of bipartisan support that is now behind this effort, this would seem like a relatively easy task to accomplish during this budget cycle.

I hope it will be, but I am not overly confident, given the history of this program and similar programs. Even with the endorsement of both Budget Committees, bipartisan support in Congress, and the backing of the administration, terminating any Federal program, large or small, is never easy.

The helium reserve program was targeted for termination by the Reagan administration, by the Bush administration, and now the Clinton administration. Nonetheless, it survived. The Washington Post, in an article published February 7, 1995, entitled "Odorless, Colorless—and Hard To Kill" outlined the history of efforts to terminate the helium program and describe it as a "tale of yet another federal government program that has had more than nine lives." Perhaps 1995 will be the year that these efforts succeed. I

certainly intend to work to see that happens.

But I think we need to look at the survival of these kinds of programs in a broader context.

In the last Congress, we terminated another program, the wool and mohair subsidy program, that was started in 1954 when wool was considered to be a strategic material. The program lived on and on long after the original purpose had ended.

Unfortunately, even though this was a relatively small but important piece in the President's overall \$500 billion deficit reduction plan, I have just learned that there may be yet another attempt to try and revive this program now that we finally finished it off. I certainly hope that does not happen.

I have 2,000-3,000 sheep growers in Wisconsin who did not like it when I introduced legislation in the last Congress to terminate this program, but I also know that many of them recognized that it was difficult to continue that subsidy in light of our deficit problems. I also worked with this industry to get legislation enacted during the 103d Congress to enable them, working together, to set up a producer-funded promotion board to help increase sales in the marketplace for their product. I believe that it is very important as we terminate Federal spending programs that we do it in a way that is sensitive to the needs of the communities and individuals who have been dependent to some degree on continuation of these programs.

So that process appeared to have worked. We cut the subsidy, but we worked together to find a way to, through producer supported programs, promote the product. They made them less dependent on the Federal Government and yet we were able to move forward for their product. But we have to end many of these programs if we are going to make meaningful progress in reducing the deficit and achieving a balanced budget.

Mr. President, as one former President once said, "Not all spending initiatives were designed to be immortal." At least I hope they were not. Yet, we have all learned in one way or another how difficult it is to terminate a Federal spending program.

I recall during the last Congress a debate over whether a NASA program originally entitled SETI—Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence—which had been terminated had been revived under a new name. That is another demonstration of how difficult it is to actually end any Federal program. I recently had an interesting experience in attempting to terminate a program in my own State—Project ELF, a cold war relic that I believe no longer serves any significant strategic purpose.

The Senate recently voted unanimously to terminate Project ELF as part of the DOD rescission bill. The program survived, somehow, in conference, however, on the grounds that some new purpose justified its continu-

ation. I am not satisfied that there is a meaningful reason for continuing to spend millions of dollars each year—in this case, about \$16 million each year—on this program.

I am just going to have to continue my efforts to try to eliminate that, although I thought we finally had it in the Senate.

During the debate over the balanced budget amendment, I discovered that another program that is high on many deficit-reduction lists, the Tennessee Valley Authority, was going to receive special protection.

The Senate committee report on the balanced budget amendment created what could be called constitutional pork by singling out TVA as a program that would somehow not be affected by the proposed amendment, while everything else would be. I add that the House Budget Committee has assumed termination of TVA as part of its budget resolution.

I believe this is the direction we should be headed with regard to the program which has a long and significant history, going back to 1933 when it was first created. Mr. President, 60 years later we have to question whether the Federal Government should continue to operate and fund this particular program.

In this regard, I have introduced legislation, S. 43, to phase out funding for TVA and thereby reduce the deficit by about \$600 million over 5 years. I know that this legislation and termination of Federal funding for TVA will again be strongly opposed by those who benefit from the program, and this, too, will be a hard fight.

Mr. President, I mention these various programs that in total amount come to millions—not billions—each year because I think they illustrate one of the problems that confronts Congress as we attempt to reduce the Federal deficit. The cumulative total spending on so many of these smaller programs does add up to significant budget cost. Each one standing alone may not be an overwhelming burden on the taxpayers, but taken together, they are a major part of the problem.

Yet, Mr. President, my experience in the past 2 years has indicated that it takes almost as much effort to rein in spending on these relatively small programs as it does to tackle the big-ticket programs. The advocates for the smaller programs work just as hard to preserve them, and they are often quite effective in those efforts.

Mr. President, I think we all know that reducing the Federal deficit and achieving a balanced budget will take a great deal of discipline and hard work. I am delighted that both of the Budget Committees have identified the Helium Reserve Program as being appropriate for termination in this budget cycle, and I am prepared to work with other Members of the Senate again on a bipartisan basis to enact legislation that closes down this outdated program in a manner that will help reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. President, I realize there is a lot of partisan rhetoric that goes with any budget resolution. This one is no exception. I want to again take this opportunity, as I did Friday with regard to appropriate Medicare cuts, to signal my desire to work with the majority party to find the cuts that will actually lead to that balanced budget by the year 2002 and to make sure as we do it that we look at both the small and the big programs so we balance the budget not only for the year 2002, but that we can achieve a virtually permanent practice that is not existent here, which is to have a permanent commitment to have a balanced Federal budget into the future. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 101, S. 395, Alaska Power Administration bill.

Frank H. Murkowski, Hank Brown, Jon Kyl, Conrad Burns, Thad Cochran, Larry Pressler, Pete V. Domenici, Strom Thurmond, Ted Stevens, Trent Lott, Rod Grams, Dirk Kempthorne, Craig Thomas, Bill Frist, Dan Coats, Orrin Hatch.

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIAL, 1995

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the men and women who gave their lives so that we may be protected.

Aware of the dangers that face them everyday, law enforcement officers carry out their duties to protect the lives of others. Too often, their own lives are lost. Unfortunately, this year, 298 additional names will be carved into the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, here in Washington, DC. It is only fitting that on this day I pay tribute to several New York law

enforcement officers who died in the line of duty.

On March 15, 1994, Officer Sean McDonald was brutally slain while on duty in the 44th Precinct in New York. His murder occurred as he attempted to save two people from a robbery attempt. In a few short moments, while a series of gunshots, these ruthless cowards stole the life of a dedicated police officer, husband and father.

In a similar incident on May 20 of 1994, a perpetrator fatally shot Investigator Ricky J. Parisian, a devoted officer in Oneonta, NY. Investigator Parisian's life was abruptly ended when the robber he was struggling with shot him. He was 34 years old.

Several other names will also be added to the memorial. The names to be added include law enforcement officers who were also killed in the line of duty in 1994. These officers include: Police Officer Nicholas DeMutis of the New York City Police Department who was killed on January 25th, Police Officer Jose Perez of the New York City Police Department who was killed on April 27, Police Officer John J. Venus of the Suffolk County Police Department who was killed on November 20, and Police Officer Raymond R. Cannon, Jr., of the New York City Police Department who was killed in December 1994.

The memorial will also hold the names of officers who died in the line of duty before 1994 but were not listed until this year, including: Police Officer John Cahill of the Haverstraw Village Police Department, Police Officer Francis J. Donato, Jr., of the New York State Park Police, Police Officer John Bauer of the Cheektowaga Police Department, and Sgt. David C. Pettigrew of the Freeport Police Department.

On this day of remembrance, I would like to recognize the heroic service of officers across the United States who risk their lives each and every day, in every city, county, and State in this country, so that we may live in safety.

The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial was dedicated in 1991 and presently holds 1,293 names. This memorial is a way to express our Nation's appreciation of law enforcement officers and their efforts to fight crime and protect our families.

This year's memorial observation is also an opportunity for this Congress to renew our pledge to make our communities safer. By passing legislation that will require tougher sentences for convicted criminals, this Congress can do its part. If law enforcement officers can patrol our streets, risking their lives, then the least we can do is make sure that these criminals are not back on the streets before they have fully served their time.

HONORING DANIEL S. MOHAN, HERO OF THE YEAR

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I rise to honor a Missourian who has distinguished himself through his

bravery beyond the call of duty and earned the National Association of Letter Carriers' Central Region Hero of the Year Award. Daniel S. Mohan is a letter carrier from St. Claire, MO, who took actions well beyond trudging through rain, sleet, snow, and dark of night to complete his appointed rounds.

Daniel Mohan was driving on his postal route in St. Claire when he heard shots. Soon after, a woman ran screaming from her house and fell wounded on her driveway, the victim of three gunshot wounds, including one to the face. Mr. Mohan raced from his truck and pulled the victim to safety behind his postal vehicle located across the street as her assailant was coming out of the house in pursuit. Daniel's presence at the scene discouraged the gunman who returned to the house and surrendered to authorities soon after. The victim of the shooting was later treated at a local hospital's intensive care unit, and continues to undergo reconstructive surgery. But as Tom Yoder, Police Chief of Saint Claire acknowledged, this woman would not be alive if not for the valiant efforts of Daniel Mohan.

For his efforts, Daniel Mohan has been honored by the National Association of Letter Carriers as its Central Region Hero of the Year. In a time when we hear of events of violence going on in public view without a single person acting to stop egregious actions, Daniel Mohan's bravery and self-sacrifice is truly a model to be followed.

Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Mr. President, it is my hope that the heroic actions of this Missourian would become the norm, not the exception when we speak of how we as Americans should act toward our neighbors.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago I began making daily reports to the Senate making a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day. In the instances of my Monday reports, the information related to the close of business the previous Friday.

As of the close of business Friday, May 12, the exact Federal debt stood at \$4,859,130,274.89, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,445.34 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that the United States had an opportunity to begin controlling the Federal debt by implementing a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, the Senate did not succeed in its first opportunity to control this debt—but there will be another chance during the 104th Congress.