public accommodation under Title II of the Civil Rights act—in other words, the cited case really stands only for the proposition that the Boy Scouts are not a restaurant.

In addition to covering a variety of children's organizations, the Act would also have applied to a large number of religious organizations. While the bill appeared to include an exception for them, it defined the term ''religious organization'' so narrowly as to exclude a wide array of religious organizations and activities. ''Religious Organization'' was defined to mean only:

A religious corporation, association or society; or

A religious school if the school is owned, controlled, managed, or supported by a religious corporation, association or society—or the school's curriculum is directed toward the propagation of a particular religion.''

Even then—the religious organization's for-profit activities would have been subject to the bill's prohibitions.

Under this definition, the hiring decisions of religious radio stations and bookstores—which are not religious corporations—religious pre-schools—which are not religious schools—and religiously affiliated colleges that are not divinity schools and are not controlled or supported by a religious corporation would have been covered. Even churches' and religious schools' decisions to hire individuals to sell books or church or school memorabilia would have been covered if those activities were conducted for profit. This, of course, on top of the fact that as I explained earlier, the hiring decisions of non-religious entities involving kindergarten teachers, camp counsellors, Little League coaches, Day Care Centers, or Boys Town counsellors would have been covered by the Act.

Given the novelty of any kind of prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, it seems to me that the bill's coverage surely should have been significantly narrower.

Finally, even if these problems could have been solved, there is a serious risk that covered entities would be subject to harassing lawsuits under this bill by any individual dissatisfied with an employment decision. Since sexual orientation isn't subject to easy proof, being a state of mind—unlike gender or race—ENDA would have allowed anyone with a job where 15 or more people are employed—or applying for such a job—to sue for perceived employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Even employers found innocent of either knowing or caring what an employee's sexual orientation is, would potentially be saddled with expensive and time-consuming lawsuits defending themselves. Thus—irrespective of its necessity—the specific legislation at issue was overly-broad in scope and virtually impossible to apply as intended.●

UNITED STATES POLICY TO EGYPT

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I have visited Egypt and other nations in the Middle East several times. Egypt is playing a key role in the peace process. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said, ''Without Egypt, there is no war, without Syria, there is no peace.'' A strong and healthy Egypt that has an open and peaceful relationship with Israel and its neighbors is a key to ensuring stability in the Middle East.

Former President Anwar Sadat and the current President, Hosni Mubarak, have helped develop a vibrant and growing Egypt and secure an enduring stable peace with Israel. Under President Sadat, Egypt became the first Arab nation to make peace with Israel. Making that peace allowed Egypt to concentrate on other domestic priorities and Israel's other neighbors to become accustomed to the notion of peace with Israel. And, even after his death, President Sadat's dream of an expanded peace in a more stable Middle East began to take greater shape.

President Mubarak continued Sadat's rapprochement with Israel and helped contribute to plans for establishing a Palestinian homeland. He also worked for greater dialog with Israel and other Arab nations that remained technically, at war with Israel. In light of Egypt's precarious position, though, President Mubarak has been under immense pressure from domestic as well as international forces.

Since 1992, the Government has been under attack from an Islamic guerrilla group that has committed several acts of terrorism. In response, the Egyptian Government has for the past 4 years resorted to military tribunals, whose methods and procedures are often unfair, to try Islamic militants, as well as moderate political opposition members. Egyptians have also been illegally detained and allegedly tortured while in police and military custody. While Egypt's human rights record is not as bad as most nations in the region, I am still concerned.

I am also concerned that too much of U.S. foreign aid to Egypt goes to the military. Egypt's unemployment rate is over 17 percent, almost 50 percent of its people live at or below the poverty line, and pollution remains an intractable problem. The United States can help Egypt more effectively by putting less emphasis on military aid, and more on economic aid so that Egypt can invest in its infrastructure, worker training, and education.

Egypt, as a leader in the Arab world, sets an example for other nations to follow. It cannot remain a stabilizing force if its military grows, while its economy suffers and its own citizens are mistreated and jailed without trial or thorough investigation. Fighting terrorism does not have to lead to abrogation of civil liberties. As I approach my return to academia, I will continue to encourage ways for the United States Egypt partnership to achieve greater peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. President, we must recognize that a stable and secure Egypt is good for peace in the Middle East. It is in the United States best interst to see a democratic Egypt with human rights observed.

SCOTT CORWIN

● Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to make a difficult statement. Scott Corwin will be leaving the Appropriations Committee staff at the end of this Congress to return to his home State of Oregon.

Since taking over the chairmanship of this subcommittee a year ago, I have come to rely on Scott's advice and counsel. He has worked long hours under difficult circumstances to meet what many would view as impossible deadlines—and he met them all. He handled controversial issues fairly and directly.

I appreciate Scott's hard work, and I admire his dedication to public service. Although we will miss Scott, I am sure that Senator HOLLINGS and Chairman HATFIELD will join me in wishing Scott and his new bride Kristen well in their future together.●

A CALL FOR JUSTICE: SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as I look back over my years of service here in the Senate, I am struck by how much international relations have changed and how much they have stayed the same. In just the last few years, we have witnessed the dramatic end of the cold war and a wave of democracy spreading around the globe from the Republic of China on Taiwan to the newly established countries in Eastern Europe. Advances in technology have opened new channels of communication between people of different cultures and languages. Economic development, investment and trade have become major factors in bilateral relationships. And in unprecedented fashion, the international community has reached consensus on the need to reduce nuclear weapons, to protect the environment, and to promote international peace and security.

Yes some things have not changed since my arrival in the U.S. Senate. The world is still plagued with civil wars. Children continue to lack access to basic health care and immunizations. And despite the lessons learned from the horrible atrocities that took place under the Nazi regime in World War II, we have failed to stop genocide and ethnic cleansing from occurring once again. In wars that have ravaged both the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, aggressors have flown in the face of international law and committed the gravest crimes against humanity. If we in the international community are determined to learn the lesson this time,

we must support the work of the International War Crimes Tribunals. The work of these tribunals is critical in the effort to establish genuine and long-lasting peace in war-torn areas around the globe.

Created by the United Nations Security Council, the current two war crimes tribunals seek to find justice for the victims of genocide and other war crimes that took place in the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda. After witnessing the brutality of the wars in these two regions, the international community seized the opportunity to once again publicly prosecute and punish the planners and executioners of the genocide. The tribunals at Nuremberg after World War II have served as an important precedence for the current tribunals. The trials at Nuremberg were the first time that the international community recognized some crimes as so heinous that all states have the right and responsibility to prosecute the offenders. I am proud to say that my father, the late Herbert C. Pell, a former congressman from New York City, was President Franklin Roosevelt's representative to the U.N. War Crimes Commission which established the Nuremberg Tribunals. It is a tragedy that today there is once again a need for these tribunals to punish those who commit atrocities and other crimes against humanity.

The task confronting the two war crimes tribunals is immense and complex. In both the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda, U.N. investigators are struggling to collect documentation and eyewitness accounts of the murder, rape, ethnic cleansing, and other horrible crimes that were committed during those violent conflicts. But despite the difficulties encountered in trying to amass evidence and to arrest the accused, the international community has recognized that the work of the tribunals is critical to finding a long-term solution to the conflicts in both Bosnia and Rwanda. Unless the perpetrators of the genocide are held accountable for their actions, the cycle of violence will not be broken and could start once again in either country. Equally alarming, unless the international community decisively condemns these crimes, others may be encouraged to commit similar acts without fear of retribution.

The significance of the war crimes tribunals has been emphasized most compellingly by the head prosecutor of the tribunals, Justice Richard Goldstone. In a recent statement to the Canadian Bar Association at the eleventh Commonwealth Law Conference, Justice Goldstone noted that:

> Without meaningful justice, there cannot be enduring peace in either the former Yugoslavia or Rwanda . . . it is surely unrealistic to expect the survivors to forget and forgive—to accept blanket amnesties and impunity for those most responsible . . . Accountability is essential if the hated is finally to come to an end.

Mr. President, I would like to submit a copy of Justice Goldstone's address for the RECORD.

As the head prosecutor for both tribunals, Justice Goldstone has placed an indelible mark on the course of international human rights law. Under his tenure, the Yugoslav tribunal has indicated 76 persons, and the Rwandan tribunal has indicted 19. Despite constant frustrations caused by insufficient resources and communications problems, the tribunals are setting important legal precedence for prosecuting those who commit appalling atrocities in the name of conventional warfare. It is truly a testament to the legal, diplomatic, and political skills of Justice Goldstone that so much progress has been made. With this in mind, I would like to note my own deep regret that Justice Goldstone will be leaving the tribunals at the end of this month to return to South Africa and a seat on its constitutional court. Over the last few years, I have had the privilege of meeting with Justice Goldstone on several occasions, and I found him to be an eloquent and influential spokesperson for the tribunals. He will be sorely missed, but I will join with many others in expressing my high expectations for his successor, Louise Arbour. We look forward to seeing the work of the tribunals continue with the same high caliber of leadership set by Justice Goldstone.

Clearly this is a critical time for the war crimes tribunals. Now more than ever, the international community must renew its commitment to the tribunals so that the progress accomplished thus far is not lost. The hard work of Justice Goldstone, and of the prosecutors, justices, and staff, certainly merits greater financial and political support from all U.N. member states. The victims who have survived the genocide and other horrible crimes are looking to the tribunal to see justice handed down. We must ensure that the tribunals are given the resources and political will to achieve their mandates. That is why I strongly supported the Clinton administration's efforts to establish the Yugoslav and Rwandan tribunals through the United Nations. And this year, I joined my colleagues in supporting a provision of the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill to provide $25 million of U.S. financial support to the tribunals. Of course, U.S. support alone is not enough. But through the contributions and cooperation of all states, the international war crimes tribunals will work to ensure that the human rights of all people are protected under international law.

Justice Goldstone's address follows:

PROSECUTING WAR CRIMINALS

Almost a year ago, in Ottowa I was invited to address the Conference of Commonwealth Chief Justices and International Appellate Judges on the work of the UN International War Crimes Tribunals. It was extremely encouraging that the subject of the prosecution of war crimes found a place on the agenda. It is no less encouraging that almost a year later, at this important Conference, the subject is again receiving attention.

Before the Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials, the prosecution of war criminals would universally have been considered to be of national and not international concern. Victims of war crimes had recourse only to national courts which had jurisdiction over the perpetrators. States whose forces were responsible for the crimes seldom, if ever, prosecuted their own combatants. That state of affairs was changed by the Nazi Holocaust. It was that affront to human dignity which led to the internationalisation of humanitarian law. The recognition by the international community of the concept of a crime against humanity was the essential key to international jurisdiction. There were crimes so evil and so over-reaching that it was the right and the duty of all of humankind to try, and if found guilty, punish the perpetrators. There was, in short, universal jurisdiction. It was that recognition that provided the moral and legal underpinning for the conferment of jurisdiction to punish perpetrators outside the country where the crimes were committed or where the accused happened to be found.

At the time of the establishment of the United Nations, it was widely assumed that an international criminal court would be set up. Indeed, there was an express reference to such a court in the 1948 Genocide Convention. But it was not to be. States were too jealous of their own sovereignty even to allow their citizens to be surrendered to an international jurisdiction even for the most serious war crimes. Alas, there was no court before which Pol Pot, Saddam Hussein and other post-World War II genocidal leaders could be prosecuted.

The establishment by the Security Council of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia came as a surprise. It was generally accepted by the experts that an international criminal court would have to be established by treaty. It had never been seriously contemplated that such a court would be established as a measure which could assist in the re-establishment of international peace and security. It was that determination, under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, that gave the Security Council the power to take that step. It was that act and the subsequent establishment of the Rwanda Tribunal that have drawn wide attention to the global dimensions of justice. In the case of both tribunals, the Security Council made a determination that the widespread and systematic atrocities perpetrated in both countries constituted a threat to international peace and security. That, in itself, was significant, because it was the first time that the linkage had ever been made by that body. Even more significant was the consequential decision that bringing to justice the individuals responsible for those violations was an appropriate response to that threat. The linkage between justice and peace in the international arena was born.

Notwithstanding that action by the Security Council, there have been serious challenges to the concept that peace and justice not be in opposition to each other. There were, and still are, those who argue that the establishment of the Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia would derail any nascent peace process. Just recently, an anonymous article appeared in the 1996 Human Rights Quarterly published by The Johns Hopkins University Press, in which the author wrote:

''Targeting violators of human rights and bringing them to justice is essential. Accusation, however, comes more easily than making peace. The quest for justice for yesterday's victims of atrocities should not be pursued in such a manner that it makes today's living the dead of tomorrow. That, for the human rights community, is one of the lessons of the former Yugoslavia. Thousands of people are dead who should have been alive—

because moralists were in quest of the perfect peace. Unfortunately, a perfect peace can rarely be attained in the aftermath of a bloody conflict. The pursuit of criminals is one thing. Making peace is another.''

This debate over the potential of the Tribunal to destabilise the peace process was particularly intense just before the negotiations at Dayton. More particularly, there were those who argued that it would be impossible to negotiate a peace agreement in circumstances where the leaders of a principal party were under indictment for war crimes. Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic were, of course, at the centre of that concern. The implication was that peace would require the sacrifice of the laudable but unrealistic objective of pursuing justice. Happily the cynics have been proven wrong. Notwithstanding the indictment twice over both Karadzic and Mladic, the peace agreement was signed in Paris and its military objectives have been successfully carried out by IFOR. I have no doubt that it those alleged war criminals had been present at Dayton no agreement would have been reached. And, if they had been allowed to stand for election next month that election would not take place. Certainly, the Muslim leaders would not consider participation.

The position with the Rwanda Tribunal is somewhat different. In the first place, it was established by the Security Council at the request of the Government of Rwanda—the Government whose forces brought an end to the genocide of mid-1994. The leaders who were responsible for the organisation of the atrocities leading to the murder of about one million people had fled the country. They are not amongst the estimated 70,000 people who are today being kept in atrocious prison conditions in Rwandese prisons. They have moved to other countries in Africa, Europe and North America. Some of them took much of wealth of Rwanda with them. For these reasons, in particular, it is appropriate that there is an international tribunal. Few countries are likely to be willing to extradite persons to Rwanda before that country's criminal justice system has been re-established and it has reasonably acceptable prison conditions.

The Rwanda Tribunal was established at the end of 1994. It took many months to staff an office in very difficult conditions in Kigali. It took the UN Headquarters eleven months to appoint a Registrar for the Tribunal at its seat in Arusha in Northern Tanzania. The first cells there were only completed two months ago. At the time of writing this address seven indictments have been issued. Three of those indicted have been transferred from Zambia to the Tribunal in Arusha. They have made their initial appearances and the first trial is about to begin. Apart from the persons already indicted, provisional charges have been brought against four persons held in The Cameroons. They are expected to be transferred to Arusha in the coming days. They include Colonel Theoneste Bagasora, against whom we have evidence that, as chief of the Cabinet of the Ministry of Defense at the time the genocide began, he was one of the central persons responsible for the atrocities which followed. Another was one of the senior directors of the radio station, Radio Milles Collines, that spewed out hateful propaganda which was so important a weapon in the hands of the perpetrators.

I have no doubt that without meaningful justice, there cannot be enduring peace in either the former Yugoslavia or Rwanda. Where peoples have witnessed and suffered mass systematic murder, rape, torture and other unspeakable atrocities, and where millions have been displaced, it is surely unrealistic to expect the survivors to forget and forgive-to accept blanket amnesties and impunity for those most responsible. Such a policy would inevitably perpetuate the cycles of violence which have marked the recent histories of both Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. Accountability is essential if the hatred is finally to come to an end-there is no substitute for avoiding collective guilt upon which genocide feeds. In short, without effective justice, there is little hope for an enduring peace in societies suffering the aftermath of gross human rights violations.

Unfortunately, notwithstanding the remarkable and praiseworthy efforts of the Security Council, we are still a long way from effective international criminal justice. The failure by the Implementation Force (IFOR) to go out and arrest those indicted by the Yugoslav Tribunal is a matter for deep regret. The 60,000 strong force undoubtedly has the capability to do so, Under the Dayton Agreement it has the legal right to do so. The fault lies not with the IFOR commanders but with their political bosses. Their policy is not to risk the lives of members of IFOR. But what are there for. As their name proclaims, they are there to implement the Dayton Agreement-but in this important respect they are being precluded for doing so. As is well known, the policy of the North Atlantic Council is that only those who literally fall into the hands of the IFOR soldiers will be arrested. It should come as no surprise that not one arrest has taken place since the IFOR troops first entered Bosnia Herzegovina at the end of last year. And, if the policy is not changed none is likely to be made. Far from endangering what may be a fragile peace in Bosnia, the arrest of some of the leading Serb and Croat indicated war criminals would have avoided many of the recent difficulties of Mr. Carl Bildt and the OSCE election organizers. It would have avoided the unfortunate spectacle of Mr. Karadzic making fools of some international leaders. That policy is also calculated to undermine the credibility not only of the international community but also of the Tribunal and international justice itself in the long term, this could create a disastrous precedent for the future exercise of international criminal jurisdiction.

The establishment of the two ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda has to be understood in a broader context. Even their most ardent supporters would not suggest that the response by the Security Council to two specific instances of humanitarian law violations is a satisfactory solution to the problem of world-wide massive war crimes. Many people question, with justification, why we are investigating and prosecuting violations in the former Yugolslavia and Rwanda and not similar shocking conduct in other parts of the world. It is disciminatory, and worse, the decision as to where such atrocities should be prosecuted is a political one taken by a political body-the Security Council. It is hardly fair or just that, by definition, war crimes committed by a permanent member of the Security Council, or by a country protected by such a member, would never be the subject of the exercise of that power. That notwithstanding, the establishment of the two tribunals is a significant step in the direction of having a permanent and independent international criminal court To the extent that they are successful, they will hasten that development. And, if we are unsuccessful in The Hague and Kigali, we will retard that process. It is for that reason that those of us involved in this process are so concerned when the international community fails adequately to support and protect a judicial body created by it.

On the more positive side, we have accomplished far more than many informed observers anticipated when the two tribunals were established. The Yugoslav Tribunal has issued 16 indictments in which some 76 defendants have been named. One of them, Erdemovic, a former member of the Bosnian Serb Army, recently pleaded guilty to crimes against humanity. He was involved in the murder of innocent Muslim civilians in the vicinity of Srebrenica in July 1995. He accepted responsibility for shooting at least seventy of the many hundreds who were killed. At this time he has not yet been sentenced by the trial chamber. Apart from Karadzic and Mladic, other leaders indicted Dario Kordic, the former vice-president of the self-proclaimed Croatian Republic of Herceg-Bosnia and Milan Martic, the ''President'' of another self-proclaimed Serb Administration in Knin prior to its destruction last year by the Croatian Army. The most recent indictment relates to the town of Foca in Bosnia Herzegovina. The charges arise out of the systematic rapes and sexual assaults perpetrated against the female population of that town by members of the Bosnian Serb Army. At present we have seven of the indictees in our custody, but alas, none of the leaders to whom I have just referred.

The trial of Dusko Tadic, which began many weeks ago, is likely to be followed by that of Tibotil Blaskic, a Croatian general, who voluntarily surrendered himself to the Tribunal to stand trial. He is the former regional commander of the Croatian Defense Council in the Lasva River Valley area of Bosnia Herzegovina, and was subsequently promoted to the Chief of Staff of the Mostar Headquarters of the HVO. He has been indicted on charges of crimes against humanity and grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions.

We have also brought a number of reconfirmation hearings where indicted persons have not been arrested and surrendered to the Tribunal. In these proceedings, the Prosecutor is able to present, in public, some of the evidence in support of the indictments. This is not a trial in absentia but a proceeding designed to enable a trial chamber to issue an international arrest warrant. The most recent proceeding of kind was that against Karadzic and Mladic and resulted in the issue of such warrants against both of them. Having regard to the evidence led it is even more difficult to accept the supine policy of the leading western nations with regard to their apprehension and surrender to the Tribunal.

This is an important time in the lives of both tribunals. The financial crisis of the United Nations has made our progress very difficult. We have constantly been under-resourced. Without the generosity of a number of governments, and particularly the United States and The Netherlands, we would not be at the trial stage in either The Hague or Arusha. I have already referred to some of the credibility problems facing the Yugoslav Tribunal. If the people we indict are not brought to trial then we will not be able to fulfil our mandate. In particular, we will be seen to have failed by the victims themselves. The Security Council undoubtedly raised their expectations in establishing the Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and endowing it with peremptory powers under the UN Charter. It sent a message to those victims that the international community had taken notice of what they had suffered and that message carried with it the promise that some justice would be afforded them. Their expectations were again raised when, from time to time, the Tribunal issued indictments. Imagine their frustration when they heard and read that IFOR would not be permitted to take the risk of seeking to arrest those indicted. Imagine their frustration

when Karadzic and Mladic continue to flaunt the terms of the Dayton Agreement. Whether the elections are able to take place in a reasonably free and fair atmosphere still remains to be seen.

In Rwanda the problems are different and no less serious. Two years after that country was destroyed by its then genocidal rulers, its criminal courts are still not functioning. The frustration of the members of its present government cannot be exaggerated. Not the least of their frustrations is what they understandably regard as an unacceptable delay in the International Tribunal becoming operational. Then, there is the unfortunate imbalance by reason of the Rwandan Law recognizing death sentence while the International Tribunal has no such power. Add to this the recent wish of the Rwandese Government wishing to try leading members of the former government in Kigali and the clash between that wish and the Tribunal legitimately exercising its right of primacy and insisting on the leaders being tried in Arusha. Finally, there is the disturbing fact that the Rwanda Tribunal has increasingly become forgotten by the Western media. This may change when the trials are under way.

I hope that I have said sufficient to bring to your attention some of the positive and some of the negative features which have emerged in consequence of the establishment of the two tribunals. Without strong public pressure in a number of countries they would certainly not have come into being. Without continued pressure they will not succeed. It is for that reason, in particular, that I am grateful for this opportunity to bring to your attention some of the important issues relating to the future of the tribunals. Not only are they important for the victims. If they succeed they can also provide a powerful deterrent for the future. Your support for the work of the tribunals and for a permanent international criminal court is of cardinal importance.●

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA SHEFFIELD

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Ms. Barbara Sheffield. It is a great pleasure to recognize Ms. Sheffield for her many years of loyal service to the General Services Administration [GSA], Heartland Region. Many Missourians have truly benefitted from her life-long dedication as a Federal employee.

Barbara Sheffield joined the GSA on January 23, 1963, as a GS–3 card punch operator with the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital in Kansas City. Distinguished by her cheerful and efficient demeanor, she was quickly promoted, and eventually moved into a GS–7 position as inventory management specialist for the Veterans' Administration.

In 1976, Ms. Sheffield took a short break from her career, and in December of the same year, she resumed her employment with GSA as a temporary GS–4 clerk typist. Starting over did not deter her, and Ms. Sheffield's commitment to serving others carried her through an ensuing 20 years with GSA. Since 1979, she has worked as a GS–12, Congressional Liaison Specialist, working with congressional clients, setting up disaster field offices and maintaining a host of other special projects.

Ms. Sheffield's inestimable contributions and respected professional experience will be sorely missed when she retires from GSA on January 3, 1997. I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors and continued good health and happiness.●

FRANK M. GRAZIOSO

● Mr LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Frank M. Grazioso, who has been selected by the Connecticut Grand Lodge Order Sons of Italy of America to be the recipient of the ''Good Citizen of the Year Award.'' Mr. Grazioso will be honored at a ceremony on Sunday, October 20, 1996, in North Haven, CT. I would like to take this time to briefly acknowledge a few of Mr. Grazioso's contributions to the community throughout his career.

Mr. Grazioso has served the community in a number of public offices. He has been a New Haven city alderman, a corporation counsel, and member of the Civil Service Commission, as well as a member of the original board of the Shubert Performing Arts Commission and a member of the Board of Harbor Commissioners. Mr. Grazioso has also chaired many activities in my home State of Connecticut including the Columbus Day celebration and the State of Connecticut Columbus 500th Anniversary. He currently serves as vice-president of the Italian-American Historical Society and has recently been elected general counsel and national officer of the national Italian American Foundation.

Through his work with the Order Sons of Italy in America, Mr. Grazioso has participated in national and international charitable donations and has helped in raising over $500,000 dollars for academic scholarships annually. Mr. Grazioso has worked closely with the Italian Government on wide range of educational and philanthropic activities. In 1991, Mr. Grazioso was honored by the Italian Government for his relief efforts on behalf of Italian earthquake victims. His work has been consistently outstanding and his commitment to helping his fellow citizens is much appreciated.

I salute Mr. Frank M. Grazioso for his continued dedication to serving his community and I congratulate him on his being named the ''Good Citizen of the Year.'' It is an award obviously well deserved. ●

REFORM OF THE FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would like to take one last opportunity in this Congress to discuss on the floor of the Senate a matter that is of high priority to me: reform of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. As I have stated many times, FDA reform is critical if the United States is going to continue to be the world leader in the field of medical technology, and I, for one, plan to pick up the mantle that was dropped in relation to this legislation this year.

And I believe the amendments that I offered that were adopted during consideration of Senator KASSEBAUM's bill by the Labor Committee represent some important principles on which we will need to build a new reform bill in the 105th Congress. One of these amendments dealt with the dissemination of new information relating to health discoveries uncovered by other authoritative Government agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health or the National Academy of Sciences. I believe the American public has the right to be as informed as possible about the nutritional value—or even the scientific potential value—of the food they eat.

Another amendment adopted would allow a system of national uniformity for the regulation, labeling, and marketing of nonprescription drugs. This is an important, pro-consumer provision. It would put an end to the confusing requirements that various States and localities choose to impose on these common products, ensure more efficient interstate commerce of these products, and will not force manufacturers to bear the cost of such mandates which are generally passed on to purchasers. This amendment also contributes to a higher standard of safety by exempting compelling State or local requirements, and creating a mechanism to make truly worthy requirements national.

Mr. President, I was especially pleased to see report language included by the committee acknowledging that other FDA-regulated products, ''may also lend themselves to such a comprehensive system.'' I would hope that the starting point of this provision next year will include cosmetics, prescription drugs, and biologics along with nonprescription products. The value of governing these products by a single, nationwide system is potentially vast. And, Mr. President, I think that discussion of such a comprehensive system for the regulation of food and food additives should be part of the debate.

This provision also dovetails nicely with another amendment that was accepted by the Labor Committee. For example, there is a global trend of international harmonization for products such as cosmetics: The countries in the European Union, Latin American, and various Asian countries are working toward regulatory cooperation. The Labor Committee, recognizing the significance of mutual recognition agreements [MRA] and the ongoing negotiations the U.S. Commerce Department and others are involved in, accepted my amendment urging the continuation and completion of such MRA's.

I am concerned by reports that many times, when the folks negotiating these agreements are very close, it is the FDA that throws a wrench into the works. I hope that the agency will take