

program because so much of one's educational and personal success is built on one's ability to read.

If we are to be a nation of learners and achievers, we have to first be a nation of readers. A recent National Educational Goals Panel report indicated that students in New Mexico and many other States are not achieving in reading comprehension as well as they need to do in order to succeed in school and work.

This initiative will help us improve, and I would urge other businesses in our communities in New Mexico and around the Nation to initiate the Read-Write-Now program at their partner schools.●

NATIONAL MARKET IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate passed the conference report to H.R. 3005, the National Market Improvement Act of 1996, on Tuesday, November 1, 1996. This bill is a critical piece of legislation that will streamline securities regulation and provide important investor and consumer protections—maintaining the preeminence of the U.S. capital markets.

Section 102 of the bill will enable issuers whose securities are listed or authorized for listing on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, the National Market System of the Nasdaq or a comparable exchange (or tier or segment thereof) to register those securities only with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Those issuers would not have to register their listed securities—or those securities that have been authorized for listing—with the 50 States.

The conferees intended for this provision to accord equal treatment to each of the exchanges explicitly listed in the statute (the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, the National Market System of the Nasdaq) as well as any other exchange (or segment or tier thereof) with comparable listing standards.

The conferees are concerned, however, that a strict reading of the statutory language may lead to the interpretation that the conferees intended the provision to accomplish something different than absolute parity of treatment among the eligible exchanges. Mr. President, this is unequivocally not the case.

In the future, I will seek to correct the drafting error to avoid any ambiguity in the statute. Pending that legislative fix, I take this opportunity to make the record clear—the conferees intended for issuers whose securities are listed or authorized for listing on the National Market System of the Nasdaq to be exempt from State registration requirements under section 102 of H.R. 3005.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. BILL WILEY

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I have been privileged in my career in the U.S. Senate, through my work on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to work with many of the great scientific minds of this country. I rise today to pay tribute to one of those scientists with whom I worked especially closely and who was a long-time close personal friend before his death last summer.

Dr. Bill Wiley of the Battelle Memorial Institute built a monumental career and left a huge legacy first and foremost because of his special gifts and training as a fine scientist. His achievements over his 30-year career with Battelle, beginning as a staff research scientist and ending with his position as vice president for Science and Technology, contributed significantly to this country's scientific understanding.

But I believe that the work for which Bill Wiley should and will be best remembered is the concrete result of his vision which is now nearing completion on the banks of the Columbia River in Richland, WA, the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory (EMSL), which will be the jewel of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and which may very well hold the key to this country's Herculean effort to the cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and other, similar sites around the country.

Armed only with this vision and his irrepressible charm and enthusiasm, Bill Wiley came to see me several years ago to lay out his plans for EMSL, undaunted by skeptics who had told him at every turn that it might be a good idea, but the Congress was unlikely to embrace such a costly project. I must say that had it been anyone other than Bill Wiley pushing the dream, the skeptics probably would have been right. But Bill not only convinced me that it was worth doing, he persuaded all the other relevant players that not only was it something we could do, but that it was something a great nation should not fail to do. I visited the EMSL facility in its late stages of construction shortly before Bill's death last summer. Anyone who ever harbored doubts about the wisdom of this research facility should go have a look when it opens its doors next month. It will be home to America's finest scientists employing the latest tools doing the best research in the world today. And it is a point of special pride to those of us who were his friends that they will be doing so in the building named in memory of William R. Wiley.

This African-American son of an Oxford, MS, cobbler served his Nation well professionally and as a humanitarian who was never too busy in his career to help the less fortunate who were trying to work their way up the ladder or merely to get to the first rung of the ladder. I know many col-

leagues join me in expressing our condolences to Bill's loving wife Gus and to his daughter Johari Wiley-Johnson and in expressing our deep gratitude for the paths that Bill Wiley charted and the mark he left behind.●

RECOGNITION OF KEVIN PRICE

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, before the 104th Congress adjourns, I want to take a moment of the Senate's time to thank someone who will be leaving my office in a few weeks.

Four years ago, Kevin Price joined my staff as a legislative assistant for agriculture from Senator KERREY's office, where he had served as a legislative correspondent. Kevin quickly established himself as one of the hardest working people on my staff. It seemed like he was almost always one of the first here in the morning and one of the last to leave at night. And that was before serious preparation for the 1995 farm bill had even begun.

Kevin also was very successful at reaching out to North Dakota farmers and farm groups. Although he initially had to overcome some skepticism because he was from the northwestern Minnesota town of Steven, and not a native of North Dakota, he soon earned their trust, respect, and friendship through his work for me on the 1993 budget, disaster assistance, grazing, and many, many other issues.

At the same time, Kevin developed a strong working relationship with other staff on agriculture issues that made him a persuasive actor in all of the staff work that goes on behind the scenes around here. His ties to both Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate staff, and key administration players made him very effective at protecting the interests of North Dakota farmers on myriad, small but often very important, issues that are effectively determined at the staff level.

For the past 3 years, Kevin immersed himself in the details of the 1995 farm bill to ensure that my priorities were addressed. For North Dakota, the farm bill is essential legislation. Its provisions, in large part, determine my State's economic future. During consideration of the farm bill, it is essential that I have accurate, timely information and thoughtfully prepared options. I ask a lot of my staff.

Kevin came through—for me, and for the people of North Dakota. He not only worked incredibly long hours himself, he did a terrific job of coordinating the many other members of my staff who also helped work on the farm bill, and, despite the enormous pressure that he must sometimes have felt, Kevin was always a pleasure to be around. Although I believe the overall approach to farm policy taken by the Republicans in the 1995 farm bill is misguided and I could not support it, it does contain numerous provisions that will make an important difference for North Dakota that would not be in the bill had Kevin not worked so hard on my behalf.

In a few weeks, Kevin will be going to work for the American Crystal Sugar cooperative in Moorhead, MN. He has very big shoes to fill, because he is taking over from former Gov. George Sinner. But I have no doubt that he will fill them well, because he also leaves behind big shoes for my next agriculture legislative assistant to fill.

On behalf of the people of North Dakota, I thank Kevin for a job well done and wish him well in his new endeavor.●

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about domestic violence. This subject has quite literally been brought more clearly into focus in recent days by photographs exhibited in the Russell Senate Building rotunda. As we begin the observance of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month, the photographs of three Connecticut women who have lived through—and perhaps still endure—the pain of domestic violence are on display in the Russell rotunda, along with the names of many individuals from every state who have died as a result of domestic violence.

Mr. President, the statistics on domestic violence are horrifying. While the victims are not only women, women are significantly more likely to be victims of domestic violence than are men. Once every 15 seconds, a woman is beaten by her husband or boyfriend, according to the FBI's crime statistics. Four women a day are killed at the hands of their attackers, according to the National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women. And last year's National Crime Victimization Survey, conducted by the Department of Justice, showed that 29 percent of all violence against women by a single offender is committed by an intimate—a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend.

In Connecticut in 1994, there were 18,768 incidents of family violence that resulted in at least one arrest, according to the Connecticut State Department of Public Safety. And 29 people were killed by family violence in Connecticut in 1994 according to the same source.

But in the photographs displayed in the Russell rotunda, photographer Annie Liebovitz captures more than just the grim statistics. She brings into focus both the physical pain and emotional anguish suffered by victims of domestic violence. One can see the hurt and the horror, the shame and the solitude, and the fighting and the fear.

And while this pain, hopefully, will diminish one day, it will never completely go away. The battered individuals, Mr. President, are not the only victims. Domestic violence leaves scars on all those who live with it—especially the children.

Domestic Violence Awareness Month is a time when we can step up the ef-

fort to prevent domestic violence. We must educate Americans about this terrible problem and reach out to victims to let them know that help is available and that, sadly, they are not alone.

Mr. President, I am proud to support Domestic Violence Awareness Month and other measures to combat domestic violence, including a provision in the omnibus bill recently passed by Congress and signed by the President to prevent anyone convicted of any kind of domestic violence from owning a gun. I look forward to the day when we will no longer need to designate a Domestic Violence Awareness Month, but until then, I remain committed to preventing and healing the wounds of domestic violence.●

MEDICARE 50/50 ENROLLMENT COMPOSITION RULE WAIVER

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the bill introduced by Senator ABRAHAM and myself, which provides for a Medicare 50/50 enrollment composition rule waiver for the Wellness Plan of Michigan, has not been cleared. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee to ensure that we enact such a waiver as early as possible in the 105th Congress. We cannot continue to deny Michigan Medicare beneficiaries the opportunity to enroll in this well-established quality plan.●

UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN BOSNIA

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on the plan to send an additional 5,000 troops to Bosnia over the next few days. The report, which first appeared in articles in the Wall Street Journal and Washington Post earlier this week, came as a surprise to me and I am sure to many of my colleagues. Apparently, members of the media learned about this new troop deployment before Congress itself had been notified. Now I learn that Secretary Perry will appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee—only after the chairman sent him a stinging letter of rebuke.

I have held strong reservations about United States troop deployment in Bosnia ever since it was initially announced last year. As many in this Chamber will recall, I was one of the few Members of Congress to vote against the deployment of U.S. troops to support the Dayton accord.

I said then, and I reiterate today, that I doubted the value of a heavy U.S. investment in this region. I felt then, and I still feel today, that administration promises to have U.S. troops out of the region within a year's time were unrealistic and would not be kept. And I questioned then, and still question today, whether or not the Dayton plan would truly level the playing field between Serbs and Muslims.

I recognize that the Dayton accord, and the deployment of the NATO Im-

plementation Force [IFOR] to enforce it, has not been without some real benefit. We can all be grateful that people are no longer dying en masse in Bosnia. U.S. troops, in conjunction with troops from other countries, should be applauded for having largely succeeded in enforcing the military aspects of the agreement.

In addition, many of the peacekeeping tasks delegated to IFOR troops also have been completed, including overseeing the transfer of territory, the demobilization of troops, and the storage of heavy weapons.

Furthermore, while they were not without problems, the September 14 elections have now created a new political structure in Bosnia, although its viability is yet to be tested.

In the past, I have raised concerns regarding compliance with the war powers resolution and the constitutional implications of troop deployment without prior congressional authorization. I will not revisit that larger issue now. In this case, I understood that there was an implicit—if not explicit—understanding between the administration and the Congress that the Congress would be consulted regarding any proposed changes in the mandate of United States troops in Bosnia. Certainly, this deployment of 5,000 more troops would fall within that understanding.

At a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 10, several administration witnesses noted that, even though IFOR's mandate will expire in December, it was unclear what the security needs on the ground would be in Bosnia at that time. But as Thomas Longstreth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of DOD's Bosnia task force, made clear during the hearing, further decisions would "have to be made in concert with our allies and, obviously, in consultation with the Congress between the [September 14] elections period and the end of IFOR's mandate [on December 20]."

I understood this to mean that the Defense Department would—at the very least—let the relevant congressional committees know about any troop enhancements before releasing such information to the press.

On Tuesday, October 1, at a followup hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee less than 24 hours before the Washington Post article appeared, no mention was made of this specific troop enhancement, but only passing references to the possibility that additional troops might be needed depending on the security situation on the ground in December.

Instead, at that second hearing, Assistant Secretary of State John Kornblum told the Committee that

"We fully understand and appreciate the need to work closely with Congress on questions that involve the deployment of U.S. troops. Clearly, the prospects for the success of any such effort, if it occurs, depend significantly on whether we have gained Congressional and public support.

Mr. President, I do not think releasing information to the press that has