

earthquake damage prevention, advanced automotive technologies, renewable energy, wireless communications, and Arctic impacts of Soviet nuclear contamination.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that we don't need an OTA—that is, our own group of experts in the legislative branch capable of providing us with these highly technical analyses needed for developing legislation. How many of us are able to fully grasp and synthesize highly scientific information and identify the relevant questions that need to be addressed?

The OTA was created to provide the Congress with its own source of information on highly technical matters. Who else but a scientifically oriented agency, composed of technical experts, governed by a bipartisan board of congressional overseers, and seeking information directly under congressional auspices, and given the Congress and the country accurate and essential information on new technologies?

Can other congressional support agencies and staff provide the information we need? I am second to none in my high regard for these agencies, but each has its own distinct role. The U.S. General Accounting Office is in effective organization of auditors and accountants, not scientists. The Congressional Research Service is busy responding to the requests of members for information and research. The Congressional Budget Office provides the Congress with budget data and with analyses of alternative fiscal and budgetary impacts of legislation. Furthermore, each of these agencies is likely to have its budget reduced, or to be asked to take on more responsibilities, or both, and would find it extremely difficult to take on the kinds of specialized work that OTA has contributed.

I hope that the Congress does not become a body that ignores common sense. If it is to remain the world's greatest deliberative body—possible only because of access to the best and most accurate and impartial information and analysis—the Congress must retain the OTA.●

ERRATA IN CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, due to a printing error, the table in the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67 setting forth the budget authority and outlay allocations for Senate committees incorrectly shows a budget authority allocation of \$1,400 million to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee for 1996.

The 1996 budget authority allocation to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is actually \$1,440 million. Therefore, the Veterans' Affairs allocation for fiscal year 1996 is as follows:

Committee	[In millions of dollars]			
	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Veterans' Affairs	1,440	1,423	19,235	17,686

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENT OF THE GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, each year an elite group of young women rise above the ranks of their peers and confront the challenge of attaining the Girl Scouts of the United States of America's highest rank in scouting, the Girl Scout Gold Award.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize and applaud Kerri Marsteller of Monkton, MD, who is one of this year's recipients of this most prestigious and time honored award.

Kerri is to be commended on her extraordinary commitment and dedication to her family, friends, community, and to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

The qualities of character, perseverance, and leadership which enabled her to reach this goal will also help her to meet the challenges of the future. She is our inspiration for today and our promise for tomorrow.

I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kerri Marsteller. She is one of the best and the brightest and serves as an example of character and moral strength for us all to imitate and follow.

Finally, I wish to salute the families and Scout leaders who have provided Kerri and other young women with continued support and encouragement.

It is with great pride that I congratulate Kerri Marsteller on this achievement.●

RESTORATION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support the President's decision today to restore full diplomatic relations with Vietnam. This would not be an easy decision for any President to make. President Clinton has shown courage and honor in his resolve to do so.

President Clinton, like Presidents Bush and Reagan before him, took very seriously his pledge to the American people that the first priority in our relationship with Vietnam would be the accounting for Americans missing in action in Vietnam.

Given the importance of that commitment, President Clinton insisted that Vietnam cooperate with our accounting efforts to such an extent that normalization was clearly justified and that tangible progress toward the fullest possible accounting be clear enough to assure us that the prospects for continued cooperation were excellent.

Vietnam has shown that level of cooperation. The President has kept his commitment. Normalizing relations with our former enemy is the right thing to do.

In 1991, President Bush proposed a roadmap for improving our relations with Vietnam. Under its provisions, Vietnam was required to take unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral steps to help us account for our missing. Vietnam's cooperation has been excellent for some time now, and has increased since the President lifted our trade embargo against Vietnam in 1994.

That view is shared by virtually every American official, military and civilian, involved in the accounting process, from the commander in chief of U.S. Forces in the Pacific to the enlisted man excavating crash sites in remote Vietnamese jungles. It is also shared by Gen. John Vessey who served three Presidents as Special Emissary to Vietnam for POW/MIA Affairs, as capable and honorable a man as has ever worn the uniform of the United States.

It is mostly my faith in the service of these good men and women that has convinced me that Vietnam's cooperation warrants the normalization of our relations under the terms of the roadmap. It would be injurious to the credibility of the United States and beneath the dignity of a great nation to evade commitments which we freely undertook.

I should also note that Adm. Jeremiah Denton, my acting senior ranking officer at the Hanoi Hilton and a courageous resister, as well as my dear friend Ev Alvarez, the longest held POW in Vietnam, join me and many other former POW's in supporting the restoration of diplomatic relations.

Other factors make the case for full diplomatic relations even stronger. Increasingly, the United States and Vietnam have a shared strategic concern that can be better addressed by an improvement in our relations.

I am not advocating the containment of China. Nor do I think such an ambitious and complex strategic goal could be achieved simply by normalizing relations with Vietnam. But Vietnam, which will become a full member of ASEAN later this month, is an increasingly responsible player in Southeast Asian affairs. An economically viable Vietnam, acting in concert with its neighbors, will help the region resist dominance by any one power. That is a development which is clearly in the best interests of the United States.

Human rights progress in Vietnam should also be better served by restoring relations with that country. The Vietnamese have already developed complex relations with the rest of the free world. Instead of vainly trying to isolate Vietnam, the United States should test the proposition that greater exposure to Americans will render Vietnam more susceptible to the influence of our values.

Vietnam's human rights record needs substantial improvement. We should

make good use of better relations with the Vietnamese to help advance in that country a decent respect for the rights of man.

Finally, the people of Arizona expect me to act in the best interests of the Nation. We have looked back in anger at Vietnam for too long. I cannot allow whatever resentments I incurred during my time in Vietnam to hold me from doing what is so clearly my duty. I believe it is my duty to encourage this country to build from the losses and the hopes of our tragic war in Vietnam a better peace for both the American and the Vietnamese people. By his action today, the President has helped bring us closer to that worthy goal. I strongly commend him for having done so.●

THE HIGHWAY BILL

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to take a few months to explain several of my votes concerning S. 440, the highway bill. I voted in favor of final passage of the bill because it would meet Federal transportation responsibilities while returning to the States much of their rightful authority to manage their own roadways.

Many of the amendments offered to the bill concerned the question of whether the States should be required to enact various highway safety laws. Although the debate on these amendments focused to a large extent on the wisdom of the safety laws at issue, my votes on the amendments turned more on the threshold question of whether the States should retain the power to decide for themselves whether to enact those laws. As a general matter, I think the Federal Government should decide only those issues that, by their very nature, demand a uniform resolution throughout the Nation. On issues like these, a resolution of the issue at the State level would itself be harmful, no matter how wisely the State legislatures exercise their power. National defense is one such example; the need for central direction and economies of scale preclude a satisfactory resolution of the issue at the State level. But our laws in other areas should in the main be left to the discretion of the States, so that they can be tailored to the respective circumstances and values prevalent in each State.

These principles led me to oppose the Reid amendment to set a national speed limit for trucks, the Lautenberg amendment to set a national speed limit for all motor vehicles, and the Dorgan amendment to prohibit open containers of alcohol in motor vehicles. They likewise explain my support for the Smith amendment to repeal Federal seatbelt and motorcycle helmet law mandates, and the Snowe amendment to repeal the Federal motorcycle-helmet law mandate. None of these issues demands a single resolution across the Nation. I further note that my home State of Michigan already has a seatbelt law, which only

underscores the fact that my votes on these amendments turned not on my views as to whether States should have seatbelt and helmet laws, but rather on my belief that States ought to be able to decide these issues for themselves.

Similarly, I opposed the Hutchinson amendment to retain the Federal motorcycle-helmet law mandate with respect to States that do not assume the cost of treating injuries attributable to a person's failure to wear a helmet while riding a motorcycle. This amendment was presented as an attempt to marry States' responsibility with States' rights. And it is true that the Federal Government assumes certain medical costs through its Medicaid and Medicare programs. But that does not mean the Federal Government should be able to mandate motorcycle-helmet laws. For if it did, the Federal Government could likewise mandate laws prohibiting other activities—say, smoking or mountain climbing—that involve an appreciable risk of physical harm. The Hutchinson amendment in fact would have been a Trojan Horse for increasing the power of the Federal Government at the expense of not only the prerogatives of the States, but also of the liberties of the people.

My support of the Byrd amendment to encourage a national blood-alcohol standard for minor drivers was bottomed on these same principles. No one argues that kids should be able to drink and drive. To the contrary, everyone agrees that teenage drinking and driving is a danger that must be addressed. When there is this kind of overwhelming national consensus with respect to an issue, the question of whether the issue should be decided at the State level in fact becomes merely theoretical. Under these circumstances, the existence of a Federal rule is not likely to frustrate the desire of a State to enact a contrary rule. Such is the case with teenage drinking and driving. In cases like these, the practical, administrative benefits of a uniform Federal rule outweigh theoretical concerns related to federalism.●

THE 125th ANNIVERSARY OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS COPYRIGHT SERVICE

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, it is my pleasure to acknowledge the 125th anniversary of the statute which centralized our Nation's copyright registration and deposit system in the Library. This law, signed by President Ulysses S. Grant on July 8, 1870, was the single most important factor in ensuring that Congress' library would eventually become the Nation's library and, in fact, the greatest repository of knowledge in the world.

Today, Dr. James Billington, our Librarian of Congress, will recognize the role of the copyright in building the Library's unsurpassed collection over the past 125 years in a program being held

in the Jefferson Building's Great Hall. I join with Dr. Billington in celebrating the anniversary of this important statute.

The act required both that all works be registered in the Library and that the Library be the repository of these copies. The Library could hold the copy of the work as a record of the copyright registration, but it also had the opportunity to make the work available as a resource for others. The joining of copyright and the Library was, and continues to be, a mutually beneficial arrangement. Then-Librarian of Congress Ainsworth Spofford believed that bringing copyright to the Library could help it become a great library, and he strongly urged passage of the 1870 legislation. However, I think even he could not have foreseen that the Library of Congress would become the great institution it is today.

It is hard to overemphasize the importance of copyright deposits to the collections of the Library and the resulting growth of the institution. Within a decade after the 1870 statute, the Library's collections tripled. When foreign works were granted U.S. copyright protection in 1891, many works from other countries were brought into the Library through copyright deposit.

Among the works the Library has received through copyright deposit are: the first edition of a Dvorak opera; an unpublished composition by the 14 year-old Aaron Copland; all the network news programs since the 1960's; rare performances by artists such as Martha Graham captured on videotape; and important Civil War and Spanish-American War photographs.

The importance of the copyright deposits to the Library continues today. Some of the Library's most heavily used collections, such as the local history and genealogy collection, would hardly exist were it not for copyright deposit. In fiscal year 1994, the value of works received through copyright deposit was estimated at more than \$15 million. The acquisition of these works could not have been accomplished through purchasing and gifts.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress provides valuable and unique services to the Congress and the Nation. Copyright continues to play an important role in the Library's work and I once again join in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the act which brought our national copyright system to the Library of Congress.●

RESTORING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I feel that it is important that the Members of this Chamber move history forward and support the President's decision to normalize diplomatic relations with Vietnam.

Over the last 17 months, the Vietnamese Government has helped to resolve many cases of Americans who