appropriations bills are lined up together, excessive spending on things like sending Russian monkeys into space and massive out-dated water projects out West continues to drain the Treasury. I voted against this bill because I think we could have done a much better job at curbing unnecessary spending, government waste, and reducing the Federal deficit.

SENATOR BILL BRADLEY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, nothing is typical about BILL BRADLEY, but some things are characteristic. As, for example, his article on the front page of the Washington Post's Outlook section this past Sunday. Just before the scheduled adjournment of the 104th Congress, bringing to an end for now his brilliant 18-year career as a U.S. Senator. The article is characteristically bipartisan: ''It's Government by Tax Break Again: Clinton and Dole Should Be Talking About Fairness and Loopholes, Not Cuts and Credits.'' It is our pleasant custom to ask that such articles be reprinted in the RECORD, and I make that request, with the text to be placed at the conclusion of my remarks. But the Senate will take the meaning from the title. BILL BRADLEY harkens back to the great 1986 tax reform bill, of which he, above all his colleagues, conceived, inspired, and helped to enactment. The principles were simple. First of all, above all, simplify. Two low rates. In that sense, cutting taxes. But paying for the lower rates by closing loopholes in the existing code which had acreted like a coral reef as Congress after Congress responded to the tiny this and the tiny that special interest, until a vast barrier separated the privileged from the people. I happened to be one of the core group that put together this legislation. We would meet early each morning in the office of Senator Bob Packwood, who was then chairman of the Finance Committee. My informal task was to provide a brief inspirational reading as the meeting commenced. It was then a simple task. I would simply glance through the previous day's Wall Street Journal looking for the best advertisement.

Typically, it would have a headline: ''Guaranteed Losses'' In finer print one would learn that a sheep ranch in Idaho, an alligator ranch in Florida, an ostrich ranch in Kansas would assure investors immediate losses that could be offset against other income, which losses would be recouped at some future date. And that was where entrepreneurial energy was flowing. To guaranteed losses that the Internal Revenue Code would turn into profits. BILL BRADLEY changed that. But the work is never done, and so he leaves us still talking the responsibilities of citizenship and legislation.

I will miss him as perhaps few others. We have served 18 years together on the Finance Committee. He has taught me; I have learned from him and followed him. And will continue to do so. Just last week, the Finance Committee convened for its last meeting of this Congress. BILL was asked to say a few words; which was all he ever will do. He recalled that in 1978 I came down to Princeton, NJ to campaign with him in that first campaign for the Senate. In the course of our stumping about, I urged him to try to get onto the Finance Committee, where so very much of the critical issues of American life are decided. He did and he showed why. I then recalled a passage from Woodrow Wilson at the time he was president of Princeton University. A student of the Presidency, Wilson was watching the growing intensity of presidential campaigns. Candidates did not, of course, did not then go to the conventions that nominated them, but after nomination were getting into the business of making speeches from the rear of railroad trains and all manner of stressful campaigning. Wilson wrote that if this should continue, we would be reduced to choosing our Chief Executives from ''among wise and prudent athletes: a small class.'' I thought that then; I think it now, as we say farewell to BILL BRADLEY—for now.

TRIBUTE TO DIANE BALAMOTI AND TERESA BRELAND

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on several occasions over the past few days, I have taken the floor to express my appreciation to my fine staff for their loyal service to me and the committee over the years. Today, I want to say thank you to two staff members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Diane Balamoti has been with the committee since 1987. During this period she has served as the staff assistant to the Park and Public Lands Subcommittee. As many of my colleagues know, this subcommittee has always been one of the most active and prolific subcommittees in the Senate. During her 10 years with the committee, Diane has staffed countless hearings and business meetings and assisted in the preparation of bills, statements, and the drafting of committee reports. She has kept the subcommittee's voluminous bills files and tracked the work of the subcommittee through the Senate and House. Diane possesses truly outstanding clerical skills which are often tested, especially at the end of a Congress when the pace of the committee's business always quickens. Ms. Balamoti has been a dependable, productive, and important member of our committee staff for many years and I want her to know how much I appreciate her service to me and the country.

In addition, Mr. President, I want to thank Teresa Breland, the newest full time staff member on the Energy Committee minority staff. Terri, who has been with us slightly over a year, has served as our receptionist in the minority office and has more recently been the assistant to our staff director for the minority, Ben Cooper. Mr. President, Terri is one of those dedicated public servants who puts in a full day's work on the Hill and then goes to school at night. She is just about to finish her master's degree in psychology and I commend her for a job well done.

BIF/SAIF

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, would the Chairman yield for the purposes of a brief colloquy to clarify a provision of the banking title to H.R. 3610, the omnibus appropriations bill, addressing the Bank Insurance Fund and the Savings Association Insurance Fund?

Mr. D'AMATO. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Am I correct that the new prohibition on deposit shifting set forth in section 2703(d) of the bill, if not carefully applied by the federal bank regulators, could raise serious issues of interference with first amendment rights of free speech?

Mr. D'AMATO. We share the Senator's concern. In response, let me say that it is not our intent that the regulators implement the deposit shifting provision in a way that would raise constitutional free speech issues. The Supreme Court has made it clear that the first amendment protections do indeed extend to lawful and accurate business communications and we expect the regulators to abide by these decisions.

PARKS OMNIBUS LEGISLATION UPDATE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I want to assure my colleagues that we are continuing to have discussions with the administration relative to the disposition of the parks omnibus bill, and I hope that those bear some meaningful resolve before the day is out. Those discussions are going on now, and, I might say, Mr. President, I am somewhat encouraged, but I have been at that stage before, as well.

I know there is a lot of interest in it, and I want to at least advise my colleagues of the current status. It has been somewhat like how I would envision a Chinese torture chamber might be, had I ever been exposed to one—and perhaps I have been exposed to one and just do not know it.

In any event, the ultimate outcome of this still depends on the administration recognizing that we need some assurance on timber supply to supply our three existing operating sawmills in our State, and hopefully provide enough for the fourth one that has been shut down for 2 years. That is where we are on the issue of resolving our differences.

There are other differences. In fact, the State of Colorado, particularly, and the State of Virginia, we appear to be working some of those issues out, as well. Of course, it would require a process of amending the House bill which is pending but subject to an objection under a unanimous-consent request. But that would be the vehicle. Then we would send it back to the House, and the House would either accept or reject it. So that is where we are, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2183 introduced earlier today by Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislation clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2183) to make technical corrections to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

WELFARE AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this bill would clarify congressional intent and allow all States, regardless of when the State opts to start the new block grant program, access to contingency funds if they qualify. The welfare bill limits funds available to a State in 1997 to the State's block grant amount, but requires a State of have an approved welfare reform plan before being eligible for a contingency fund payment.

Prior to opting into the new Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF] Program, the State must operate under the current law Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] entitlement program. There are a handful of States that have rising caseloads and rising unemployment that normally would be eligible for the contingency fund. The authorizing committees, in a letter to HHS Secretary Shalala, indicated that congressional intent was that all States should be eligible for the contingency fund regardless of when they opt into the new TANF program. HHS has stated that legally they cannot give payments out of the contingency fund without a legislative change.

Many States will not be able to opt into the block grant until the legislation's effective date of July 1, 1997. For example, New Mexico's State Legislature will not convene until January 1997 and the legislative process will take time to develop a welfare reform plan.

Since CBO had assumed States would receive payments from the fund, the welfare bill was scored with costs (outlays from the fund.) Since this legislation clarifies intent, CBO scored no cost.

CBO identified a number of States that may have a problem because of rising unemployment or rising caseloads. These States include Nevada, New Mexico, Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, and Minnesota. So far it is unclear which States will actually have a problem.

AMENDMENT NO. 5424

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk by Senator DASCHLE. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 5424.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.

Section 11 of the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Act (Public Law 103–318; 7 U.S.C. 2661 note) is amended by striking ''the earlier'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''September 30, 1997.''.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. The amendment clarifies congressional intent and allows all States, regardless of when they opt into the block grant, access to the contingency fund.

The welfare bill restricts States funds in fiscal year 1997 to the block grant amount, even though the effective date for the new program is July 1, 1997. States may operate under current AFDC rules until then.

Congress never intended that States have financial difficulties prior to starting the new program.

In fact, most States make money under the block grant because caseloads have dropped, so the funding limitation never comes into question.

There are handful of States, including my home State, that have had caseload increases since the establishment of the block grant. These States could experience a funding shortfall during the transition period—a situation not foreseen in the original legislation.

Congress created the contingency fund for just this problem.

However, the contingency fund is available only to eligible States and HHS' interpretation is that an ''eligible State'' is a State that has opted into the block grant.

Most States do not have full-time legislatures that can convene and develop a new welfare plan. For example, New Mexico's Legislature does not convene until January 1997. Therefore, it will take time for New Mexico's welfare plan to be implemented.

Both the Finance Committee and Ways and Means wrote a letter to HHS advising the agency of congressional intent, but HHS responded by saying there must be a legislative change.

This amendment has no cost attached to it. CBO assumed that all States could have access to the funds and as such scored outlays in the welfare bill.

This amendment does not change the way States qualify for the fund—it is not limited to any particular State—any State that qualifies can access the funds as well.

This amendment has the support of the authorizing committees and the administration.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be advanced to third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without further action, or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 5424) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2183), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR 1997.—Section 116(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 is amended—

(1) in item (aa), by striking ''the State family assistance grant'' and inserting ''the sum of the State family assistance grant and the amount, if any, that the State would have been eligible to be paid under the Contigency Fund for State Welfare Programs established under section 403(b) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 103(a)(1) of this Act), during the period beginning on October 1, 1996, and ending on the date the Secretary of Health and Human Services first receives from the State a plan described in section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (as so amended) if, with respect to such State, the effective date of this Act under subsection (a)(1) were August 22, 1996,''; and

(2) in item (bb)—

(A) by inserting ''sum of the'' before ''State family assistance grant''; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting '', and the amount, if any, that the State would have been eligible to be paid under the Contingency Fund for State Welfare Programs established under section 403(b) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 103(a)(1) of this Act), during the period beginning on October 1, 1996, and ending on the date the Secretary of Health and Human Services first receives from the State a plan described in section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (as so amended) if, with respect to such State, the effective date of this Act under subsection (a)(1) were August 22, 1996.''.

(b) CORRECTIONS RELATED TO THE CONTINGENCY FUND FOR STATE WELFARE PROGRAMS.—Section 403(b)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act, as amended by section 103(a)(1) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(II), by striking ''minus any Federal payment with respect to such child care expenditures''; and