

What the people running for President should be talking about, for example, is health care. Thousands and thousands of new people each month are saying, "I have no health insurance." Businesses more and more each day are saying, "We do not supply our employees health insurance." Health care costs are still skyrocketing. Health care costs this year alone will go up \$1 billion. We need to have candidates talking about health care reform.

Minimum wage. We need to talk about raising the minimum wage. It is not a bunch of people, the stereotypical teenagers flipping hamburgers at McDonald's. The fact is that 60 percent of the people who receive the minimum wage are women. For 40 percent of those people, that is the only money they get for them and their family. The minimum wage needs to be increased. If it was good when we adopted it in the Depression years, it is good today and we should do what we can as a Congress to make sure it maintains its rate in keeping with inflation.

The environment. I have not heard a single candidate on the Republican ticket running for President talk about the environment. They are in that beautiful area of New Hampshire. I have never been to New Hampshire but the pictures are beautiful. I would love to go there and see that State. On television, you think of the pristine environment. We need to be talking about the environment. The only thing we have seen especially from the other body this past year is to roll back the environmental laws—22 riders on 1 appropriations bill to roll back environmental regulations. People in that body want to wipe out the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, wipe out the endangered species law. They should be talking in a positive sense about what we can do to improve the environment.

I repeat. What I have talked about has been good. It does not mean it is good enough, but it means it is good. Let us give our constituents, let us give the people of America the positive spin. We are doing fine. Let us have these candidates talk about senior citizens and Medicare and not hear the nonsense that we are not cutting Medicare; we are only cutting the rate of increase, without leveling with the American people and saying, of course, we have to maintain an increase in funding for Medicare because thousands of new people are coming on the rolls every day. Medical costs are rising out of the roof. Of course, we have to increase spending for Medicare. It does not mean we do not need to do some work to make it a better system, but we need not decimate it. We do not need to have it wither on the vine as the leader in the other body says that it should.

Education, let us talk about education in a positive sense instead of what we are seeing happen this past year. We are seeing programs that I believe are good programs like School-to-

Work—only 25 percent of the kids who graduate from high school graduate from college. What do we do about the other 75 percent? We have one way of helping. That is our School-To-Work Program which is a fine program that deals with that 75 percent and involves local businesses. In the State of Nevada, we have a wonderful School-to-Work Program. But what are they doing in the other body? They want to wipe it out, and in fact that is what we have. It has been wiped out.

What about our Goals 2000? In Nevada, we have set our Goals 2000. They are led by the First Lady of Nevada, Sandy Miller. About a month ago in Nevada they published their goals for the year 2000, good goals dealing with literacy, math education, reading, but it is being wiped out by this Congress. That is unfortunate. It is unfair to kids.

Crime. Crime is staggeringly bad in this country, but let us talk even there about the fact that the crime rate is declining with the number of murders reported dropping by 12 percent, robberies down 10 percent, car theft down 5 percent. As a result of the Brady bill, more than 45,000 fugitives and felons have been blocked from buying handguns. We have more cops on the street, about 30,000 across the country, over 150 in the State of Nevada. It has helped. Now, where we are failing—I have no problem discussing this—is with juvenile crime. It is becoming more violent, more vicious, and more random. We need to do something about that. But let us even talk on a positive note there about the President's State of the Union message where he said he was going to ask the head of the FBI to focus on juvenile crime, on gangs. That is important.

There is where the discussions should come. Let us talk positively. Let us talk about how well we are doing and how much better we can do.

Mr. President, there was an article recently by Daniel Gross that I assume ran in a number of different newspapers around the country. One of the things he said, and I quote, was:

The wealthy would be well served to also recall that the three most dramatic investment events of this century—the panic of 1907 and the crashes of 1929 and 1987—all took place in the watch of Republican Chief Executives.

The two worst Presidencies for stocks were those of Republicans Herbert Hoover, under whom the Dow fell an appalling 75 percent, and Richard Nixon. Between November 1968 and August 1974 the market fell 18 percent. Factor in the high inflation of the early 1970s, and the loss becomes a 6.9 percent annual rout.

Mr. President, I close by saying I think it is extremely important that the primaries, as they develop, be ones that the candidates focus more on the positive, talk about what is good that is happening in the country; and then on a positive note talk about how much better we can be, rather than the continual harangue we hear about how bad things are and how, in effect, the

future looks bleak. I do not believe that. I think we are as good as our past. And our past has been good.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Thursday, February 22, the Federal debt stood at \$4,987,959,914,205.44, about \$13 billion shy of the \$5 trillion mark, which the Federal debt will exceed in a few months.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,932.73 as his or her share of that debt.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore of the House (Mrs. MORELLA), was signed on today, February 23, 1996, by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND):

H.R. 1718. An act to designate the United States Courthouse located at 197 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, as the "Max Rosen United States Courthouse."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 1571. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1572. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide funds and incentives for closures of rail-highway crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 1571. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the

State or Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE LOST CREEK EXCHANGE ACT OF 1996

• Mr. BURNS. Madam President, today I am introducing the Lost Creek Land Exchange Act of 1996.

This bill would accomplish two important things. It authorizes the acquisition of the Lost Creek area for the public, and it may help prevent the closure of the Brand-S mill in Livingston MT.

I want to emphasize that this bill is a starting point. I fully anticipate major changes will need to be made. Yet, the process needs to move forward.

Under this bill, 14,500 acres of blue-ribbon bighorn sheep habitat known as Lost Creek would become a part of the Deerlodge National Forest. For the past few years, local sportsman and conservation groups, the Forest Service, and many others have been interested in the public acquiring this prime habitat. I, too, believe this is a worthwhile endeavor.

The bill I am introducing today would transfer the Lost Creek area, and 3,000 additional acres currently owned by R-Y Timber, to the Forest Service. In return R-Y Timber will acquire the deed to 3,600 acres and 46 million board feet of timber.

As most people in Park County know, R-Y Timber has an option to purchase the Brand-S mill in Livingston. If R-Y Timber decides to not purchase this mill by the middle of March, it is my understanding that the chances for the mill to remain open will be very slim. While R-Y Timber already has a mill in Townsend, this land exchange could allow R-Y Timber to keep both mills operating, and therefore, prevent the loss of 130 much-needed jobs in the Livingston area.

As I stated earlier, R-Y Timber will receive the deed to 46 million board feet of timber in the Deerlodge, Helena, and Lewis and Clark National Forests. However, the areas for harvesting have not been identified.

In addition, this timber will be harvested according to the Montana Forestry best management practice, Montana streamside zone management law, and other State laws. Between 20 and 30 percent of the timber will be available each year, and R-Y Timber will have 5 years to complete the harvest.

Language has also been included to assure that designation of the timber will not slow down the present limitations on the numbers of trained Forest Service personnel. Under this bill, the Forest Service would be required to use outside contractors to perform whatever field work is necessary for the designation.

The Lost Creek area has been valued at about \$8 million. And the days of the Federal Government simply paying the price tag are over. This bill provides a way for the public to purchase this prime bighorn sheep habitat while providing some timber jobs in our communities.

Madame President, as I stated earlier the bill I am introducing today is a starting point. We have much work ahead of us. Over the next couple months, I hope that the parties involved will continue to work together so this win-win bill can make it to the President's desk. •

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1572. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide funds and incentives for closures of rail-highway crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE RAILROAD CROSSING SAFETY ACT OF 1996

• Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation that would make America's railroad crossings a lot safer.

According to the National Safety Council, over the past 4 years an average of 522 people have been killed each year in train-vehicle collisions. Last year, 37 of these deaths occurred in my own State of Ohio.

Almost 50 percent of these accidents occur at crossings that are already equipped with active warning devices. Simply adding more warning devices, therefore, is not a complete solution to this problem.

Some of these railroad crossings are just too dangerous. They are life threatening. They are not needed, and they ought to be closed.

We all know, however, that people get accustomed to taking certain routes. And communities get used to certain traffic patterns. That's why it's sometimes difficult for localities to close these crossings, even when it's clear on safety grounds that a particular crossing must be closed.

Clearly, the local communities need some help. That's the purpose of my legislation.

Currently, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of closing a rail-highway grade crossing. But other grade crossing safety projects—such as traffic signs, guardrails, and traffic lights—are eligible for 100 percent Federal funding.

The bill I am introducing today will make grade crossing closure projects eligible for that same 100-percent Federal funding. This will remove the current incentive against closure projects.

If the safest thing to do is close a crossing, localities should have an incentive to do that.

This bill does not involve new Federal money. The money for this bill is already allocated for crossing safety purposes—and all we are trying to do is deploy that money in the most rational and effective way.

My bill will also provide up to \$7,500 to a local highway authority for each crossing closed. Furthermore, the railroad that is operating the crossing will match this money.

That means up to \$15,000 for a local community—just to close a crossing.

Obviously, this is just the beginning of a many-pronged assault on a major

safety problem. We can't close every single crossing that might be dangerous. So we want to make certain that the remaining railroad crossings are as safe as possible.

Last summer, I brought together Federal and State officials to see whether changes could be made to speed the process for dealing with unsafe railroad crossings.

Previously, the installation of safety lights and gates followed a linear process—one step had to be completed before another was allowed to begin. We created a new, streamlined process that allows officials to identify hazardous crossings and to implement expedited safety measures.

We eliminated the waiting periods between design, funding, and construction. The safety installation process used to take up to 2 years—but with this new, streamlined process, we are hoping it will only take about 12 months. This new process is being tried on 31 different sites throughout the State of Ohio.

It is a very promising approach, and if it works in Ohio, it deserves to be extended all over America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1572

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Railroad Crossing Safety Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. FUNDS AND INCENTIVES FOR CLOSURES OF RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.

(a) INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF CROSSING CLOSURES.—Section 120(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "rail-highway crossing closure," after "carpooling and vanpooling,".

(b) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR AT-GRADE CROSSING CLOSURES.—Section 130 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR AT-GRADE CROSSING CLOSURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), a State may, from sums available to the State under this section, make incentive payments to local governments in the State upon the permanent closure by such governments of public at-grade railway-highway crossings under the jurisdiction of such governments.

"(2) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS BY RAILROADS.—A State may not make an incentive payment under paragraph (1) to a local government with respect to the closure of a crossing unless the railroad owning the tracks on which the crossing is located makes an incentive payment to the government with respect to the closure.

"(3) AMOUNT OF STATE PAYMENT.—The amount of the incentive payment payable to a local government by a State under paragraph (1) with respect to a crossing may not exceed the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the incentive payment paid to the government with respect to the crossing by the railroad concerned under paragraph (2); or

“(B) \$7,500.

“(4) USE OF STATE PAYMENTS.—A local government receiving an incentive payment from a State under paragraph (1) shall use the amount of the incentive payment for transportation safety improvements.”.

SEC. 3. GUIDELINES FOR ANALYSIS OF COSTS AND BENEFITS OF NEW RAILWAY-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe guidelines to assist the States in analyzing the costs and benefits to the public of new railway-highway grade crossings. The purpose of the guidelines is to encourage uniformity in the analysis of such costs and benefits by the States.●

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE TAXPAYERS' CANCER RESEARCH FUNDING ACT OF 1996

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, breast and prostate cancer have taken a horrible toll on women and men throughout the world and we must make every effort to eradicate these pervasive diseases. Breast cancer is a deadly epidemic that strikes over 180,000 women each year. It will kill more than 44,000 women this year alone. Similarly, prostate cancer will strike an estimated 317,000 men, and will kill roughly 41,000 men this year. We cannot allow these appalling rates to continue unabated. We need to do something now. We need a cure and finding a cure takes money—a tremendous amount of money.

I rise today to introduce legislation to add another weapon to our arsenal in the fight against breast and prostate cancer. My bill will provide vital resources for the fight to eradicate this dire threat to the lives of women and men across our Nation. In addition, my bill will support our efforts to combat one of the leading cancer killers of men: prostate cancer. This is a very straightforward bill. This bill will augment existing Federal research funding by easily allowing taxpayers to get directly involved by contributing to a newly established fund expressly earmarked for breast and prostate cancer research.

On the Federal income tax return there currently exists a box that can be selected for Federal campaign contributions. My bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by establishing a similar box for a Federal breast and prostate cancer research fund. This will allow our citizens to cross swords with this dual scourge by simply placing a check in a box on their income tax return, as with the campaign contribution fund. One point needs to be made very clear—this is not an additional tax. This is a purely voluntary means by which concerned citizens may earmark a minor but vital portion of their Federal income tax

payments expressly for breast and prostate cancer research.

Breast cancer is a truly horrible disease. Its incidence is rising at an alarming rate. In 1960, 1 out of every 14 women developed breast cancer in her lifetime. A few years ago it was 1 in 10. Now the figure is one in eight. We cannot allow this trend to continue. According to the National Cancer Institute's calculations, breast cancer comprises about 30 percent of all female cancers and it is estimated that the cost to the nation in the form of direct and indirect health care costs will exceed \$16 billion annually. The NCI also says that reductions in breast cancer mortality will have a significant influence on these costs to the Nation.

Like breast cancer among women, prostate cancer is a leading killer of American men. According to the American Cancer Society, this dreaded disease is the second leading cause of cancer death in men. It is projected to take the lives of approximately 41,000 men in 1996 alone.

Congress has just begun to pay more attention to these terrible diseases by devoting increased funding for breast and prostate cancer research at the Federal level. We have made tremendous progress, but much more remains to be done. Given current budget constraints we need a mechanism to increase breast and prostate cancer funding every year from here on out.

Our current method of breast cancer treatment is not a cure. Today's treatments for breast cancer are very crude. We treat women with poison, radiation, and radical surgery with the hope that we will kill the cancer and not the woman. This is similar to dropping a tiny atom bomb. What we need is a smart bomb for breast cancer. Something which will specifically kill the breast cancer cells without causing destruction to the rest of the women's body and immune system. This can only be accomplished with an additional infusion of breast cancer research dollars. We also need to recruit more scientists and new ideas and innovations into this field. More money will jumpstart research but it must also cover the funding needs of research scientist and their programs.

I am personally determined to do everything I can to fight for the eradication of breast and prostate cancer. I hope to enlist the aid of my colleagues in the establishment of this Federal breast and prostate cancer research fund. Breast and prostate cancer can only be understood, and eventually conquered, through increased research. We need a cure and we need one now. It is therefore critical that we all join together in this effort to help speed the discovery of a cure for these dreaded diseases.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this critical bill.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 529

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 529, a bill to provide, temporarily, tariff and quota treatment equivalent to that accorded to members of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] to Caribbean Basin beneficiary countries.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension benefit plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] were added as cosponsors of S. 1039, a bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1108

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1108, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated.

S. 1129

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1129, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to permit employers to provide for flexible and compressed schedules, to permit employers to give priority treatment in hiring decisions to former employees after periods of family care responsibility, to maintain the minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees subject to certain leave policies, and for other purposes.