

In addition, many seniors have expressed the frustration with the seniors' earnings limit which unfairly penalizes senior citizens by reducing their Social Security benefits if they continue working beyond retirement age and earn over \$11,160.

Last year, as a member of the 103d Congress, I nominated John Pribyl as the delegate from Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. John has spent over 20 years helping to develop service opportunities for senior citizens.

As director of the Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota's Senior Companion Program and Foster Grandparent Program, John Pribyl has worked tirelessly to promote seniors as a valuable resource with talent and experiences to share with others.

I also nominated Joanne Demko of Minneapolis, who has worked in aging services for 15 years. She currently serves as director of the Volunteers of America Anoka/Hennepin Senior Dining and Home Delivered Meals Programs. In addition to these duties, Demko is an active member of the Minnesota Gerontological Society, Minnesota Minority Elders Coalition, and previously served as president of the Minnesota Nutrition Directors Association.

Mr. President, these two individuals have devoted a significant portion of their lives improving the opportunities for Minnesota senior citizens. Joanne Demko and John Pribyl stand out as leaders in their communities who have the vision, the compassion, and the determination to protect the great state of Minnesota. Mr. President, it is a distinct honor for me to have such qualified champions of seniors' issues advocating the needs of older Americans.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a complete list of Minnesota's delegates to the White House Conference on Aging and again, congratulate these individuals for their commitment to these important issues.

DELEGATES TO THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE  
ON AGING

The list follows:

David E. Meillier.  
Elva D. Walker.  
Gretchen Dee.  
Marvel Pratte.  
Helen Johnston.  
Madelyn Reiter.  
Roger Banks.  
Eli Hunt.  
Caralyn Radatz.  
Garritt Van Hunnik.  
Rosalie Tassoni.  
Frank R. Johnson.  
Virginia Smith.  
David Janovy.  
Annabel Greseth.  
Joanna Demko.  
Wayne Willman.  
Miriam B. Seltzer.  
Edith Brady.  
Eric G. Tangalos.  
Margaret Christenson.  
Pegeen Tillman.  
Jim Varpness.  
Dean Fenner.  
Wayne Takeshita.  
Carolyn Kelly Tasker.  
Donna Walberg.

Marjorie Jamieson.  
Bob Meiches, M.D.  
Meredith Hart.  
Maureen Acosta.  
Al Sollom.  
Corinne T. Ellingham.  
Joci Maher.  
Theresa Burns.  
Charlotte Fitzpatrick.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. BRUCE FLINT, VICE CHANCELLOR EMERITUS, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL CENTER

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 31, 1995, Dr. Bruce Flint, the vice chancellor emeritus and retired director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, will be honored by his peers and colleagues at LSU and throughout the State of Louisiana.

After achieving a degree in agricultural economics from LSU, Dr. Flint, who grew up on a farm in northeastern Louisiana, served 4 years in the U.S. Army before accepting his first extension position—as an assistant county agent in Union Parish—in 1956. Through the years, he served as an associate county agent, district program specialist, associate specialist for training and staff development, extension education specialist, division leader and State agent for personnel and programs. Along the way, he also obtained his masters degree in extension education from LSU and his doctoral degree in cooperative extension administration from the University of Wisconsin.

In 1980, Dr. Flint was named assistant director of the extension service with responsibilities for personnel, business, and fiscal affairs of the organization, and in 1984, he was promoted to associate director. In mid-1988, he assumed leadership for the agricultural center's administrative services as its director, and in mid-1989, he was appointed as vice chancellor for administration and director of administrative services. Finally, in 1993, Dr. Flint returned to extension as vice chancellor and director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service—the position he held until his retirement on April 30, 1995. On April 21, 1995, the LSU Board of Supervisors named him Vice Chancellor Emeritus Bruce Flint in recognition of his remarkable career with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service and the LSU Agricultural Center.

That recognition capped a 39-year career during which Dr. Flint received a variety of honors, served on countless boards and committees, and was a member of several honor societies. Among those, he was a member of Epsilon Sigma Phi, Gamma Sigma Delta, the Adult Education Association, the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, and the American Legion.

He also served as chairman of the LSU Continuing Education Council, the Midsouth Region Extension Workers Committee on Program Development and Management Information

Services and a Louisiana Board of Regents task force studying statewide programs in agricultural research and public service—extension—as well as academic programs in agriculture, human ecology, forestry, wildlife, and fisheries.

Mr. President, it is easy to ascertain that Bruce Flint not only possesses a remarkable mind and intellect, but has accomplished an unparalleled career. My hope is that others in Louisiana, and throughout America will model themselves after Dr. Flint's approach and commitment to both work and involvement within the community. Dr. Bruce Flint is a true asset to higher education, conservation programs, his family, and the community. He will be missed by his colleagues and peers and by all of Louisiana.

#### SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520 as amended by Public Law 103-283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriation for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the second quarter of fiscal year 1995 to be printed in the RECORD. The second quarter of fiscal year 1995 covers the period of January 1, 1995, through March 31, 1995. The official mail allocations are available for frank mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 103-283, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

The material follows:

#### SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/95

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Fiscal year 1995 official mail allocation
ABRAHAM .....	600	0.00006	\$218.90	\$0.00002	\$140.289
AKAKA .....	0	0	0.00	0	29.867
ASHCROFT .....	0	0	0.00	0	83.043
BAUCUS .....	0	0	0.00	0	34.694
BENNETT .....	0	0	0.00	0	30.689
BIDEN .....	0	0	0.00	0	28.591
BINGAMAN .....	0	0	0.00	0	30.834
BOND .....	0	0	0.00	0	108.312
BOXER .....	15,805	0.00051	5,856.86	0.00019	582.722
BRADLEY .....	0	0	0.00	0	151.392
BREAUX .....	0	0	0.00	0	82.088
BROWN .....	0	0	0.00	0	74.406
BRYAN .....	0	0	0.00	0	45.030
BUMPERS .....	0	0	0.00	0	48.743
BURNS .....	0	0	0.00	0	34.694
BYRD .....	0	0	0.00	0	34.593
CAMPBELL .....	0	0	0.00	0	74.406
CHAFEE .....	0	0	0.00	0	30.524
COATS .....	0	0	0.00	0	111.738
COCHRAN .....	0	0	0.00	0	48.596
COHEN .....	6,898	0.00059	2,722.62	0.00220	37.937
CONRAD .....	58,800	0.0245	10,837.38	0.01704	25.438
COVERDELL .....	0	0	0.00	0	137.674
CRAIG .....	0	0	0.00	0	31.846
D'AMATO .....	0	0	0.00	0	335.341
DASCHLE .....	0	0	0.00	0	27.650
DEWINE .....	0	0	0.00	0	168.128
DODD .....	0	0	0.00	0	66.615
DOLE .....	0	0	0.00	0	51.907
DOMENICI .....	1,000	0.00063	226.53	0.00014	30.834
DORGAN .....	62,500	0.09827	11,191.75	0.01760	25.438
EXON .....	0	0	0.00	0	32.516
FAIRCLOTH .....	0	0	0.00	0	140.612
FEINGOLD .....	0	0	0.00	0	97.556
FEINSTEIN .....	0	0	0.00	0	582.722
FORD .....	0	0	0.00	0	74.054
FRIST .....	0	0	0.00	0	78.686
GLENN .....	0	0	0.00	0	219.288
GORTON .....	0	0	0.00	0	106.532
GRAHAM .....	2,397	0.00018	1,940.83	0.00014	323.488
GRAMM .....	16,000	0.00091	3,992.34	0.00023	352.339
GRAMS .....	0	0	0.00	0	67.423

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS  
FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/95—Continued

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Fiscal year 1995 official mail allo- cation
GRASSLEY .....	0	0	0.00	0	56,381
GREGG .....	35,256	0.03173	28,252.50	0.02543	34,552
HARKIN .....	0	0	0.00	0	56,381
HATCH .....	0	0	0.00	0	30,689
HATFIELD .....	0	0	0.00	0	62,019
HEFLIN .....	6,800	0.00164	1,207.20	0.00029	81,113
HELMS .....	0	0	0.00	0	140,612
HOLLINGS .....	0	0	0.00	0	72,302
HUTCHISON .....	0	0	0.00	0	352,339
INHOFE .....	0	0	0.00	0	52,475
INOUE .....	0	0	0.00	0	29,867
JEFFORDS .....	0	0	0.00	0	23,830
JOHNSTON .....	0	0	0.00	0	82,088
KASSEBAUM .....	0	0	0.00	0	51,907
KEMPTHORNE .....	0	0	0.00	0	31,846
KENNEDY .....	0	0	0.00	0	121,391
KERRY .....	0	0	0.00	0	32,516
KOHL .....	0	0	0.00	0	121,391
KYL .....	0	0	0.00	0	97,556
LAUTENBERG .....	0	0	0.00	0	63,581
LEAHY .....	3,714	0.00652	1,082.36	0.00190	151,392
LEVIN .....	0	0	0.00	0	23,830
LIEBERMAN .....	0	0	0.00	0	182,978
LOTT .....	0	0	0.00	0	66,615
LUGAR .....	0	0	0.00	0	48,596
MACK .....	0	0	0.00	0	111,738
MCCAIN .....	0	0	0.00	0	323,488
MCCONNELL .....	0	0	0.00	0	82,928
MIKULSKI .....	3,800	0.00077	866.55	0.00018	74,054
MOSELEY-BRAUN .....	0	0	0.00	0	91,956
MOYNIHAN .....	0	0	0.00	0	216,454
MURKOWSKI .....	0	0	0.00	0	335,341
MURRAY .....	5,558	0.00108	1,298.40	0.00025	23,179
NICKLES .....	0	0	0.00	0	106,532
NUNN .....	0	0	0.00	0	68,442
PACKWOOD .....	6,300	0.00212	1,469.89	0.00049	137,674
PELL .....	0	0	0.00	0	62,019
PRESSLER .....	0	0	0.00	0	30,524
PRYOR .....	0	0	0.00	0	27,650
REID .....	12,139	0.00915	6,607.64	0.00498	48,743
ROBB .....	0	0	0.00	0	45,030
ROCKEFELLER .....	61,850	0.03413	10,705.35	0.00591	124,766
ROTH .....	0	0	0.00	0	34,593
SANTORUM .....	0	0	0.00	0	28,591
SARBANES .....	0	0	0.00	0	182,834
SHELBY .....	0	0	0.00	0	91,956
SIMON .....	0	0	0.00	0	81,113
SIMPSON .....	0	0	0.00	0	216,454
SMITH .....	0	0	0.00	0	19,826
SNOWE .....	0	0	0.00	0	34,552
SPECTER .....	0	0	0.00	0	29,086
STEVENS .....	0	0	0.00	0	238,468
THOMAS .....	0	0	0.00	0	23,179
THOMPSON .....	0	0	0.00	0	15,200
THURMOND .....	0	0	0.00	0	94,111
WARNER .....	0	0	0.00	0	72,302
WELLSTONE .....	0	0	0.00	0	124,766
					87,939•

## TRIBUTE TO LES ASPIN

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the passing of Les Aspin. He was a great public servant who worked all his life to make our country better and stronger.

Les Aspin understood the defense budget better than just about anyone. He chaired the House Armed Services Committee during the height of the cold war and during the even more challenging years of the post cold war. He led the Department of Defense as it began to adjust to America's new role in the world. And he began the difficult process of expanding opportunities for women in the military. Most recently, he took on the challenge of reviewing and reinvigorating our Nation's intelligence programs.

He didn't come to Washington for power and prestige—he came to serve. He came to represent the working families of Wisconsin's First Congressional District. He quickly became an expert on national defense. His goal was to strengthen our military while making sure that the U.S. taxpayer got the most out of every dollar spent on defense. He realized that national secu-

rity was too important to become politicized. He believed that a strong defense is not a Republican position or a Democratic position—it is a necessity for the world's only superpower.

Les Aspin served the people of Wisconsin and the people of this Nation with honor and distinction. He will be greatly missed.●

PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI TO  
VISIT ALMA MATER

• Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to inform my colleagues that, as predicted in the press over the weekend, the administration will announce this afternoon that it has agreed to issue a visa to President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan for a private visit to his alma mater.

I am very pleased that the administration has finally decided to take this step. The feeling in Congress on this issue has been very strong, as evidenced by the near unanimous votes in the last 2 weeks on the resolution calling on the State Department to allow the visit. I'm equally pleased that we have avoided an escalating squabble with the State Department over the visit. If this action had been taken earlier, when it should have been, we could have avoided a great deal of acrimony and conflicting signals. I believe that the decision to admit President Lee brings our policies on admission of, let us say, controversial public figures more into uniformity, and it removes a gross and unnecessary slight to one of our close friends in Asia.

Mr. President, in closing I would like to make something clear to our friends in the People's Republic of China. Although I understand the depth of their feelings on this issue, I do not believe that this simple move has to adversely affect our important relationship. Admitting President Lee Teng-hui for a private, I repeat, private visit should not be seen for more than it is—an internal decision to admit a private citizen for a limited private purpose—and I am sure that President Lee will closely adhere to the parameters of the visit in order to avoid any unnecessary complications. There are no hidden signals here, no nebulous meanings, no new policy currents. This is not, nor should the People's Republic of China interpret it to be, our repudiation of their one-China policy.●

## SUPPORT OF S. 747

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 747. The intent of this bill is to modify section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export and Control Act to require congressional oversight and scrutiny of all arms sales to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia until such time as the Secretary of the State certifies and reports to Congress that the unpaid claims of American

companies described in the June 30, 1993, report by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 9140(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-396; 106 Stat 1939), including the additional claims noticed by the Department of Commerce on page 2 of the report, have been resolved satisfactorily.

My interest in S. 747 relates in part to a New York company, Gibbs & Hill, Inc. Gibbs & Hill was founded in 1911, and has the privilege of being the oldest power and transportation engineering firm in the United States. One of its most notable projects was the electrification of the Northeast corridor rail line between New York and Washington, DC. The first electric locomotive to run on these tracks was the George Gibbs I.

In 1978, Gibbs & Hill went to Saudi Arabia to provide its engineering expertise to the Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu in connection with the design and construction of the Yanbu Industrial City. Gibbs & Hill was hired by the Royal Commission to design the desalination and related facilities, which are a major component of this industrial complex. The Royal Commission required significant additional services of Gibbs & Hill, equaling more than 200 man-years of effort. After requiring Gibbs & Hill to perform the work, committing to compensate Gibbs & Hill for the added services, and benefiting from the work performed, the Royal Commission refused to pay. Gibbs & Hill's attempts to seek redress through the kingdom's court system was useless, as the court merely upheld the wrongful acts of another agency of the kingdom.

The default landed Gibbs & Hill in the special claims process established following congressional hearings in May 1992, and furthered by section 9140(c) of the fiscal year 1993 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The \$43.4 million claim of Gibbs & Hill is the last remaining unpaid claim awaiting resolution by the Saudi Government through the special claims process. Despite repeated commitments to our Government by the Saudi Government to resolve the claim favorably for the company, Gibbs & Hill has not been paid. Gibbs & Hill has waited more than 14 years to have this debt paid, including 2 years since receiving explicit commitments from the Saudi Embassy that it would spare no efforts in resolving the claim fairly and promptly.

Today, the Yanbu Industrial City is pointed to as an example of the kingdom's technological advancement. Yet this advancement was obtained at the expense of Gibbs & Hill. The kingdom had an obligation to honor its commitments to Gibbs & Hill, as it still does today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 747.●