

among teens, are wrong; they are a prescription for disastrous outcomes for both the mother and the child—both will undoubtedly be seriously disadvantaged for the remainder of their lives. We must preach—and I do mean preach—that marriage is the proper social unit in which to have and raise a child. We must, each of us, discourage illegitimacy as harmful to the parents, the child and society at large. And we must do it now. This is not an issue we can push to the back burner. We are in a serious crisis now, and every single indicator points to it getting worse each and every year into the foreseeable future.

These are some of the threshold issues that I believe must be addressed in whatever reform package reaches the Senate floor. When the debate begins, I hope it will not become another missed opportunity. I hope we will work on the reform together. I hope we will do it right, with firmness but fairness. And I hope it will produce the desired results. Our efforts will impact all of our lives in one way or another. But it will affect more directly the lives of our children and their children.

WELCOMING HER MAJESTY QUEEN SIRIKIT OF THAILAND

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, this month the United States is privileged to welcome Her Majesty Queen Sirikit of Thailand. She is here as an honored guest. On May 25 Queen Sirikit will be awarded the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters by the Johns Hopkins University. On Tuesday, May 16, Queen Sirikit became the first woman ever to receive the prestigious Lindbergh Award. In the words of the Charles A. and Anne Morrow Lindbergh Foundation, Her Majesty was honored for her "educational and humanitarian efforts, her conservation and wildlife preservation work, and programs which are maintaining the Thai heritage and culture."

The description does not begin to do justice to Queen Sirikit's 45-year effort to care for the people of her country, to improve their health and living standards, and to preserve their environmental and cultural heritage. She has given generously of her time and energy to traditional humanitarian causes. She has served as honorary president of the Council of Social Welfare of Thailand, an organization of 150 public and private social work agencies. In her capacity as president of the Thai Red Cross, a position she has held since 1956, she established shelters for refugees from the war in Cambodia. But her particular genius, and I do not use that word lightly, the accomplishment for which the queen has been honored by the United Nations and for which she was awarded the first International Humanitarian Award by the Friends of the Capital Children's Museum in 1992, has been in finding ways to preserve traditional Thai culture and ecology while simultaneously

making life easier for impoverished farmers and hill tribes.

Her deep concern for the welfare of the Thai people is matched by her knowledge of their needs. Her husband, His Majesty King Shumibol Adulyadej, has made it his admirable policy to "visit the people", spending more than half of each year traveling around Thailand, often to remote areas accessible only by helicopter or jeep. Accompanying him on his trips, the queen witnessed at first hand the hardships of rural life, the damage to forests, wildlife and water supplies caused by primitive farming practices and the threat posed by modernization to traditional Thai arts and crafts. It was her inspiration to, in effect, capitalize culture, to train farm families in producing handicrafts which could be sold to bring in regular income. Since 1978, Queen Sirikit's SUPPORT Foundation has trained 30,000 such families in crafts ranging from ceramics to silk-weaving to bamboo basketry.

In 1982, the Queen initiated the Forest-Loves-Water project, to demonstrate that SUPPORT handicrafts projects could encourage reforestation. At Ban Mae Tam village, the rich teak forests once threatened by illegal logging are being replaced. Villagers able to earn a living from cottage industries do not need to rely on tree-cutting or slash-and-burn farming for subsistence. Under her gentle leadership, through encouragement and practical training, solutions are being found to pressing environmental problems.

Queen Sirikit's likeness is on the Cares Medal awarded by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This is an honor reserved for women who by their lives and their work have helped to lift the status of women. It is a beautiful medal, reflecting the beauty of spirit of its model, a woman whose motto has always been "To give without discrimination." It is always a pleasure to welcome Her Majesty to the United States, and to tell her how much we admire her efforts on behalf of the Thai people.

GEORGIA AND LARRY TALSMAS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, this week I have been fortunate to visit with two citizens from Springfield, SD—Georgia and Larry Talsma. Georgia and Larry made their first trip ever to Washington, DC, by car. The Talsmas are the quintessential hard-working South Dakota ranch family. They and their ancestors have worked the land for five generations. They know the importance of proper stewardship of the land, because without this respect there would be nothing for the next generation.

The Talsmas came to Washington to tell their story of how the Federal Government is intruding on their land and threatening to take over their private property. Amazing as this may sound, Mr. President, it is true.

In 1991, Congress passed legislation to designate the 39-mile segment of the Missouri River from the headwaters of Lewis and Clark Lake to the Ft. Randall Dam as a recreational river to be administered by the National Park Service. Today, however, the process to achieve this designation has raised great controversy. In fact, the local citizens along this segment of the Missouri River now question the need for the designation. I agree with those South Dakotans, including the Talsmas.

During the first public meeting on the designation, pamphlets were handed out describing how the Park Service acquires private property. Mr. President, most, if not all, of the South Dakotans in attendance were not even aware of the river designation, let alone the possibility of the Federal Government condemning their land and buying it out from under them.

Their concerns and fears were fed by representatives of the National Park Service who stated that if they, the Park Service, cannot own this land, then they will control it.

This morning I asked the Director of the National Park Service to come to my office and listen to the Talsmas. At that meeting I told the Director that I intended to introduce legislation to undo the designation in South Dakota. This is an effort the Talsmas and other South Dakotans strongly support.

I also asked the Director to listen to the Talsmas and see what steps could be taken by the Park Service to address the needs of South Dakotans. While Director Kennedy informed the Talsmas that the Park Service did not want to buy or control their land or claim eminent domain, the Talsmas correctly pointed out that the "Devil is in the details."

The Talsmas informed the Director they were being told just the opposite at the public meetings and that is why they felt they had to come to Washington to get their message across. Their primary concern is not for themselves, but for their children and future generations of South Dakotans who depend on the land for their survival.

I am pleased to report that due to the efforts of the Talsmas, something good came out of the meeting. First, the Park Service agreed to push back the deadline for a preferred alternative to no earlier than August 1, 1995. Just a few days ago the Talsmas were told they had only 5 days to review and comment on the preferred alternatives. This extreme time limit simply is not fair. I told the Director that South Dakotans needed the time to tell their story and have input into the decision-making process. Director Kennedy agreed.

Director Kennedy also assured the Talsmas there would be at least a 60-day comment period on any preferred alternative. If more time is needed, Director Kennedy said he would be willing to provide such time.

Director Kennedy also told me his office would provide legislative language

to me that would assure local control over the river. I look forward to reviewing the language and if appropriate will push for its immediate approval by the Congress.

Mr. President, I will continue to work with Georgia and Larry Talsma and other South Dakota landowners to see that their property and their rights are fully protected, and are not over-run by the Federal Government.

Federal policy is moving ever closer toward infringement of individual private property rights. One of America's founding principles is the right of citizens to own private property. These rights must be closely guarded.

Mr. President, I am proud South Dakota has citizens such as Georgia and Larry Talsma. Their determination, and hard work actually moved Washington to action. They had to take time off their ranching chores and drive all the way to Washington to move a bureaucratic mountain. I am please they achieved progress.

I am proud of the Talsmas and what they have accomplished. They are to be commended. Their battle is not over yet, but Mr. President, their action is proof that this is a government of and for the people.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what is the status at the present time? Are we under a time limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We remain in morning business until 12 o'clock. Statements, unless under a previous order, are limited to 5 minutes each.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

A HISTORIC DEBATE ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in less than an hour, the Senate will begin a truly historic debate on a budget resolution reported by the Senate Budget Committee. It is a budget resolution which, for the first time, perhaps, since the Budget Act was passed a quarter of a century ago, seriously proposes to put this Nation on the road to a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. President, lip service has been promised to that goal by many of those who voted against a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget, as well as by those who voted for that budget. Most of the former group, however, now find something wrong with this proposal, just as they have with any preceding attempts to balance the budget. In theory, they are in favor of reaching that goal, but in practice they have never actually seen the way in which it ought to be reached.

Perhaps the best evidence of this proposition, Mr. President, is that

while the minority party in this body is almost—I say almost, not quite—without exception opposed to the budget resolution that is before us, that same minority party in the House of Representatives is putting up as an alternative essentially the Senate budget resolution and praising it as much superior to the one that will actually pass the House of Representatives. I think they do that with full confidence that the proposal will not pass, that the alternative will not pass in the House, and it is therefore safe for them to praise it and, in some cases, to vote in favor of it.

This balanced budget here in the Senate, together with the one in the House, will have tremendous positive impacts on the American people. It will result in a significantly greater increase in family income all across this country because of lower interest rates and greater job opportunities. And those positive impacts will vastly overshadow any temporary negative impacts of the loss of various Federal subsidies.

Before we begin that formal debate, I want to make a few remarks about the downpayment on a balanced budget, the rescissions bill, which is about to go to the President of the United States and which the President announced yesterday that he intended to veto.

This rescissions bill—this cancellation of some of the spending proposed by the last Congress—amounts to about 1 percent of the current year's budget. Yet, to reduce spending this year by 1 percent seems much too drastic a step for this administration to be willing to take. This bill started as a request by the President to spend more money, some for the Department of Defense, essentially to cover the costs of various, dubious peacekeeping missions around the world which was passed as part of a separate bill, and others to spend money on various natural disasters which the President improvidently had refused to include in the budget passed less than a year ago, in spite of the fact that these disasters are always with us, together with a few modest reductions in a handful of programs.

The House of Representatives took the bit in its teeth and came up with a cancellation of something more than \$17 billion in current spending, about 1 percent of the total budget, as I have already said. The President protested that as being too much and in the wrong places. This body, as the Presiding Officer knows, passed a somewhat more modest rescissions bill, still close to \$15 billion or so, with a different mix of canceled or reduced programs. And about that Senate rescissions bill the President said:

The bill passed 99 to 0 in the Senate and I will sign the Senate bill if the House and Senate will send it to me. That is how we should be doing the business of America.

In the 4 weeks since then, Mr. President, the House and the Senate have met together in a conference commit-

tee to settle the differences between these two proposals, in the time-honored fashion under our rules. What was unprecedented during the course of this attempt to work out differences was the almost total absence of people representing the White House or the administration.

Unlike the situation during the Bush administration, the Reagan administration, and previous administrations when I was not here, there was no guidance from the White House at all. No statement that, "Here is our bottom line." No attempt to work out differences the way previous administrations did. Silence, except around the margins, until the day after the conference committee finished its work and submitted it to the two bodies.

Then the President decided that it ended up reducing a handful of programs and job training and education by so great an amount of money that he had to veto it.

I totaled up all of the items that I think could come under that veto threat and they amount to less than \$1 billion of the \$17 billions.

Mr. President, I repeat, no statements of this sort, no bottom lines, were sent to the members of the conference committee while it was working out this situation.

Yesterday, the President threatened to veto the bill. He also said that he still wanted to save money but too much money was being spent in this bill on courthouses and on highway projects. Curiously enough, Mr. President, all of these projects which the President now describes as pork were included in last year's appropriations bill that he signed and praised last year.

Of course, if his veto stands and no other rescissions bill is passed, all will be built. His veto does not cancel a single one of them. Not a single one of them was criticized at the time which they were originally appropriated for and passed last year.

One other curiosity, Mr. President, included in the Senate bill which the White House said would be approved, was certain timber language drafted by this Senator for the relief of timber communities not just in the Pacific Northwest but all across the country. That proposal simply authorized the administration to do what it said it wanted to do, to carry out the provisions of what is known as option 9, its own option in the Pacific Northwest, and to salvage burned and dead and dying timber in national forests all across the country, destroyed either by insects or by forest fires and rapidly becoming kindling for new forest fires.

Nothing in the Senate provisions required the administration to do more than it wished to do, but it did enable them to do what they claimed they wanted to do without the interference of outside lawsuits.

Not only was that apparently all right, as a result of the Presidential speech that I just read, it was expressly