

While agriculture was the predominant force in the Prince Georges County economy, the push for western expansion in Maryland led to the growth of thriving commercial and trading centers such as Upper Marlboro, Laurel and Bladensburg. Cotton mills, steamboats, and railroads resulted in increased commercial development, strengthening the county's ties with Europe and other American colonies and leading to increased economic development.

This early entrepreneurial spirit continues to flourish and thrive today. Prince Georges County is now home to over 13,600 businesses which employ over 223,700 workers. Major employers including Giant Food, United Parcel Service, and Dimensions Health Corporation serve to make Prince Georges County a prime example of a large and prospering business community, while the Prince Georges County Economic Development Corporation has been nationally recognized for its programs to assist individual entrepreneurs and small minority-owned businesses.

The county's close proximity to the District of Columbia has been another factor in its evolution and maturation. Over the years towns and cities have sprung up to meet the needs of a growing community of Federal employees who increasingly choose to live outside the Federal city in suburban Maryland. Towns such as Takoma Park, New Carrollton, Greenbelt, and District Heights are home to the over 87,000 Federal employees who work both in the District and at the many Federal installations which are located in modern Prince Georges County.

Prince Georges County is today one of the Nation's largest and most vibrant subdivisions, winning widespread acclaim and national recognition for its success in promoting diversity and opening up the doors of opportunity for all of its citizens. This well-deserved reputation as a national model is due to a strong sense of community and cooperation among its residents and to enlightened and visionary leadership. In the forefront of these efforts have been our respected Governor and former Prince Georges County Executive Parris Glendening, two of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress, Representatives STENY HOYER and ALBERT WYNN, and the present dynamic County Executive Wayne Curry.

Such citizens and leaders throughout history have guided Prince Georges County from a region of frontier wilderness and rural plantations to today's modern urban communities and advanced agricultural centers. Prince Georges County has adapted to meet the changes wrought by the centuries, while preserving the evidence of 300 years of growth and progress. This tricentennial celebration pays tribute to the rich legacy of our Maryland ancestors and bears testament to the limitless promise and potential of Prince Georges County.●

A FOND FAREWELL TO AN HISTORIC AIRCRAFT

(Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, on April 20, 1996, the last of the Idaho Air National Guard's F-4G "Wild Weasels" will be retired.

As we bid farewell to this reliable workhorse that has served this Nation well for nearly three decades, let me recognize the historic accomplishments of the Wild Weasel and the superb men and women of the 124th Fighter Group stationed at Gowen Field in Boise, ID, who have flown and maintained this remarkable aircraft.

Since June 1991, the 124th has flown the F-4G Wild Weasel. It is a two-seat, twin engine jet that can travel at more than twice the speed of sound. Armed with radar and heat seeking missiles as well as conventional bombs, the Wild Weasel is often the first aircraft to enter combat and the last to leave. Its mission is to find and attack enemy radar and missile sites—clearing the path in a hostile environment for friendly fighters and bombers to enter enemy airspace.

When the Wild Weasels first arrived at Gowen Field, the 124th converted to the new mission and was combat ready in record time.

Six months later, these men and women were called on to leave their homes, families and jobs to serve their Nation. Without a Presidential call-up, these troops volunteered for service and became the first Air National Guard unit activated for a combat mission during peace time when they were deployed to Saudi Arabia as part of Operation Southern Watch.

The Group was fully integrated into the Air Force Wing deployed to the region. They were given day to day mission responsibilities for patrolling southern Iraq and escorting coalition aircraft into enemy airspace that had proven over time to be a hostile environment.

As I visited the men and women of the Idaho Guard stationed in Saudi Arabia, I saw how effectively the active duty and National Guard forces were working together to defend our Nation's interest. I also heard British and French pilots state they would not fly over Iraq unless they knew the Wild Weasels were also in the sky to protect them against surface to air missiles.

Maj. Gen. Darrell V. Manning praised his men and women for their critical role in this international enforcement effort. He said, "They were the only trained organization in place that could perform this mission and we had the trained and motivated people required to succeed in this critical role."

But this success required the support of hundreds of personnel who performed their duties to near perfection. The mechanics, refuellers, weapons handlers, and every other member of this team—and I mean team—contributed to the effectiveness of the 124th Fighter Group.

The 124th was again called to service in Operation Provide Comfort—this

time to Turkey where they enforced the northern Iraq no-fly zone as part of combat-ready patrol along with other United States, British, French and Turkish coalition forces.

In the fall of 1995, the Idaho Air National Guard made Air Force history by flying the 50,000th aerial mission in support of Operation Provide Comfort II.

I had the privilege of visiting the 124th Fighter Group in Turkey in early October, 1995. Once again I saw a well trained and well disciplined group of men and women serving our Nation's interests. I also saw the pride that these men and women from Idaho had in their venerable aircraft, the Wild Weasel. And while there, I let them know their State and country were proud of the 124th's dedication and commitment to peace in that troubled region.

Mr. President, it is clear the men and women of the 124th Fighter Group have established themselves as one of the premier Guard units in the country. And while I have some parochial pride in making that statement, that distinction was hard-earned and well-deserved.

Based on the Wild Weasel's performance in Saudi Arabia, the Secretary of the Air Force came to Boise, ID in December 1993 to honor the 124th Fighter Group. Secretary Sheila Widnall and Maj. Gen. Philip G. Killey, Director of the Air National Guard, presented the men and women of the 124th Fighter Group with the Air Force's Outstanding Unit Award for their role as the leading edge of force projection during peacetime, and the first to assume this new and difficult role for Air Reserve forces.

Mr. President, we all knew the time would come for the Wild Weasel to be retired, and with the downsizing of active and reserve units that has taken place, there were concerns over future missions for Gowen Field.

As we looked for a new mission for Gowen Field, it was clear the men and women of the Idaho Air National Guard had already presented their case. The performance of the Wild Weasel was well-documented. The dependability of the Idaho Air Guard was second to none. Together, they had earned not one, but two new missions to replace the Wild Weasels—the A-10's and the C-130's.

And while we say goodbye to this trusted airframe, we know the tradition of the Wild Weasel will live on with the men and women of the Idaho Air National Guard where the motto is "First Class or Not At All."●

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Dole/Roth amendment adopted earlier today includes a provision designed to address the problem of renunciation of U.S. citizenship by Americans who move abroad in order to avoid U.S. taxation. On April 6, 1995, shortly after this issue first came to light, I introduced S. 700, a bill to close the loophole in the Tax Code that permits expatriates, as they have come to be called,

from evading U.S. taxation. I said here on the floor that the Senate would act expeditiously to end this abuse, and would act in a careful and judicious manner to do so. The amendment before us today, which includes a modification of S. 700, would do just that.

Although expatriation to avoid taxes occurs infrequently, it is a genuine abuse. The Tax Code currently contains provisions, dating back to 1966, intended to prevent tax-motivated relinquishment of citizenship, but these provisions have proven difficult to enforce and are easily evaded. One international tax expert described avoiding them as "child's play." Individuals with substantial wealth can, by renouncing U.S. citizenship, avoid paying taxes on gains that accrued during the period that they acquired their wealth—and while they were afforded the many benefits and advantages of U.S. citizenship. Moreover, even after renunciation, these individuals are permitted to keep residences and reside in the United States for up to 120 days per year without incurring U.S. tax obligations. Indeed, certain wealthy individuals have renounced their U.S. citizenship and avoided their tax obligations while still maintaining their families and homes in the United States. They need only take care to avoid being in the United States for more than 120 days each year.

Meanwhile, ordinary Americans who remain citizens continue to pay taxes on their gains when assets are sold or when estate taxes become due at death.

I regret to say that the expatriation issue has been the subject of more controversy than it probably deserves, so in the interest of setting the record straight, I will briefly review the history of its consideration in the Congress. On February 6, 1995, the President announced a proposal to address expatriation in his fiscal year 1996 budget submission. Three weeks later, on March 15, 1995, during Finance Committee consideration of legislation to restore the health insurance deduction for the self-employed, I offered a modified version of the administration's expatriation tax provision as an amendment to the bill. My amendment would have substituted the expatriation proposal for the repeal of minority broadcast tax preferences as a funding source for the bill. The amendment failed in the face of united opposition by members of the majority on the Committee. The vote against the amendment was 11-9.

Subsequently, Senator BRADLEY offered the expatriation provision as a free-standing amendment, with the revenues it raised to be dedicated to deficit reduction. Senator BRADLEY's amendment passed by voice vote. That is how the expatriation tax provision was added to the bill that came before the Senate.

After the Finance Committee reported the bill, but before full Senate action and before our conference with the House, the Finance Committee held

a hearing to review further the issues raised by expatriation. At our hearing, we heard criticisms of some technical aspects of the provision, as well as testimony raising the issue of whether the provision comported with Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the United States ratified in 1992. Section 2 of Article 12 states: "Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own."

Robert F. Turner, a professor of international law at the U.S. Naval War College, testified that the expatriation provision was problematic under the Covenant because it constituted a legal barrier to the right of citizens to leave the United States. The State Department's legal experts disagreed, as did two other outside experts who provided written opinions to the Committee: Professor Paul B. Stephan III, a specialist in both international law and tax law at the University of Virginia School of Law; and Mr. Stephen E. Shay, who served as International Tax Counsel at the Department of the Treasury in the Reagan administration.

Given this division in authority, it seemed clear that the Senate should not act improvidently on the matter. Genuine questions of human rights under international law, and the solemn obligations of the United States under treaties, had been raised. We therefore sought the views of other experts. Opinions concluding that the expatriation provision did not violate international law were received from Professor Detlev Vagts of Harvard Law School and Professor Andreas F. Lowenfeld of New York University School of Law. The State Department issued a lengthier analysis supporting the legality of the provision, and the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service reached a like conclusion. However, there were dissenting views, most notably the powerful opinion of Professor Hurst Hannum of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, who first wrote to me on March 24, 1995.

This is where things stood when the House-Senate conference met on March 28, 1995. Although the weight of authority appeared to support the validity of the provision under international law, very real questions remained. Yet the underlying bill had to move at great speed. As my colleagues well know, the legislation restoring the health insurance deduction for the self-employed for calendar year 1994 needed to be passed and signed into law well in advance of the April 17, 1995 tax filing deadline, so that self-employed persons would have time to prepare and file their 1994 tax returns. The conference committee had to decide immediately whether to retain the expatriation provision; there was no time for further inquiry into its validity under international law. We accordingly chose not to risk making the wrong decision with respect to international law and

human rights, and so the expatriation provision was not included in the conference report. The conferees instead adopted a provision directing the Joint Committee on Taxation to study the matter and report back.

This decision, which was the only prudent one at the time, met with some not very pleasant criticism in the Senate. This was surprising, since I believed it was axiomatic that government should proceed with great care when dealing with human rights—particularly the rights of persons who are despised. The persons affected by the expatriation proposal—millionaires who renounce their citizenship for money—certainly fall into that category.

Since that time, a general consensus has developed that the provision does not conflict with the obligations of the United States under international law. Professor Hannum, after receiving additional and more specific information about the expatriation tax, wrote a second letter of March 31, 1995 stating that he was now "convinced that neither its intention nor its effect would violate present U.S. obligations under international law."

In the interim, there has been time to consider other approaches to the problem. On June 1, 1995, the Joint Committee on Taxation published its report on the tax treatment of expatriation. Shortly thereafter, on June 9, 1995, Chairman ARCHER introduced an expatriation bill that adopted a different approach than S. 700, the bill introduced by the Senator from New York. The Archer bill, rather than impose a tax on accrued gains, would build on the current law approach of taxing only a portion of the income of an expatriate received during the 10-year period following expatriation. A version very similar to the Archer bill was included in House-passed version of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

We held a second Finance Committee hearing on expatriation on July 11, 1995 to consider the two competing approaches. Soon thereafter, the Senate in the Senate-passed version of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 adopted the accrued gains approach from my bill, rather than the House alternative, as the superior response to the problem.

During the conference on the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, the conferees opted for the House approach. This was, I believe, a serious error. Fortunately, that version did not become law because the President vetoed the conference agreement. The conferees on the pending bill will be faced with the same choice. The House version of the expatriation provision is included in the House-passed companion to the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill. We ought not repeat the mistake made in the Balanced Budget Act.

I am convinced that the House approach has serious defects and would fail to eliminate the very substantial tax advantages that currently accrue

to those willing to give up their citizenship. Under the House proposal, several categories of taxpayers would continue to owe no tax at all should the IRS be unable to prove a tax avoidance motive for expatriating. As under current law, taxpayers who are patient would avoid all tax on accrued gains by simply holding their assets for 10 years. A wealthy expatriate in need of funds during the 10-year period could simply borrow money using his or her assets as security. Since the income from foreign assets generally would remain exempt as under current law, clever tax practitioners would continue to find ways to convert U.S. assets into foreign assets in order to avoid tax on the income earned during the 10-year period.

The House approach also would be destined to fail because it relies on the voluntary payment of taxes by people who have moved beyond the reach of U.S. courts. In contrast, the Senate version would collect tax while the individual is still subject to the taxing power of the United States, which is surely a more administrable approach.

A separate objection to the House bill is that it would unilaterally override existing tax treaties. In its report on expatriation, the Joint Tax Committee staff stated that the House version may ultimately require that as many as 41 of our 45 existing tax treaties be renegotiated and that it might be necessary for the United States to forego benefits to accomplish renegotiation. This is a serious matter.

Article VI of our Constitution states:

... [A]ll Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land.

Further, our treaties come into being through a singular exacting sequence. Treaties are entered into by the United States with other nations either directly or through adherence to a common document. They are signed by a member of the executive branch. Thereafter, the Senate of the United States must by resolution, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, give its advice and consent to ratification. This advice and consent having been given—by an extraordinary majority—the President then ratifies and confirms the treaty in an instrument of ratification. Only at that point shall the said treaty become “the supreme Law of the Land.” Matters that survive this singularly exacting process should not be abrogated lightly.

One final point, of utmost importance. During the time we have taken to write this law carefully and well, billionaires have not been slipping through the loophole and escaping tax by renouncing their citizenship. The President announced the original proposal on February 6, 1995 and made it effective for taxpayers who initiate a renunciation of citizenship on or after that date. This was an entirely appropriate way to put an end to an abusive

practice under current law. Likewise all the proposals considered by the Senate, including my bill S. 700, used February 6, 1995 as their effective date. The House conferees on the self-employed bill had proposed moving the effective date forward to March 15, 1995, the date of Senate Finance Committee action on the provision. But the two chairmen of the tax-writing committees ultimately—and wisely—resisted that overture, and issued a joint statement giving notice that February 6, 1995 would be the effective date of any legislation affecting the tax treatment of those who relinquish citizenship.

Now that the Senate has had adequate opportunity to fully explore the best way to address the expatriation problem, it is time to act. As the first Senator to have introduced legislation to end tax avoidance by so-called expatriates, and as one who urged that it be acted upon by the Senate expeditiously, I am pleased that the Dole/Roth amendment incorporates the expatriation changes I have favored. I hope that the conferees will retain the superior Senate expatriation provision, and that it will be enacted as soon as possible.●

AMENDING THE INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION AND EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3034 just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3034) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend for two months the authority for promulgating regulations under the Act.

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

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3034) was deemed read the third time and passed.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 19, 1996

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m., on Friday, April 19; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the cal-

endar be dispensed with, the morning hour deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the first 75 minutes under the control of Senator COVERDELL, or his designee, and the last 45 minutes under the control of Senator DASCHLE, or his designee, with 10 minutes of that time reserved for Senator MURRAY; further, that at the hour of 12 noon the Senate begin consideration of Calendar No. 201, S.J. Res. 21, regarding a constitutional amendment to limit congressional terms.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. Shortly after convening, the Senate will consider a sense-of-the-Senate resolution regarding the anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing. The Senators are asked to be on the floor promptly at 10 a.m., as there will be a brief period of silence to remember the tragedy.

Following morning business, the Senate will then begin consideration of the term limits legislation. No rollcall votes will occur during Friday's session.

When the Senate completes debate Friday, it will resume consideration of the term limits legislation on Monday. No rollcall votes will occur during Monday's session. However, Senators are encouraged to debate the legislation and offer any amendments during Friday's and Monday's sessions of the Senate. The Senate may also be asked to turn to any other legislative items that can be cleared for action.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator LAUTENBERG.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

TOXIC WASTE CLEANUP

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, at this moment, though the hour is late, and I apologize to those who are inconvenienced while I make my remarks, this is a topic of great importance to me and my home State of New Jersey, and a number of communities across the country—that is, the cleanup of toxic waste.

Mr. President, 73 million Americans live near toxic waste sites. That is