

from an Indian point of view. Our historic, cultural and spiritual attachment to Mount Hood has caused us to be involved in many public policy, administrative and legal proceedings involving use and development of the mountain. Currently, we are party to several legal proceedings involving land management decisions of the Mount Hood National Forest. We are concerned about these decisions because of the potential impacts of these developments on our treaty fishing rights, and other legally protected interests. We are, for example, the only tribes involved in the Mount Hood Meadows Ski Area expansion proceedings. We believe that Mount Hood National Forest should consult only with our tribe on issues relating to proposed developments on public lands in the vicinity of Mount Hood.

With regard to the area called "Enola Hill," our people are familiar with this place. Many of our elders camped with their families in this area, fished for salmon and picked huckleberries in the general vicinity of Enola Hill. Whether there is special cultural significance to Enola Hill as a whole, and whether there are special religious and spiritual places there, is not something we wish to speak about in a position paper or put down in writing. In the past, our tribal elders have provided such information to appropriate officials once they have been assured of confidentiality and convinced of the serious need for the information. However, we are concerned that culturally sensitive information our elders have disclosed concerning Enola Hill could be exploited and used for improper purposes. Unwarranted public access to such information through the courts or the media only makes our job of protecting our people's sacred sites more difficult. We hope that the cure does not become worse than the affliction.

We believe very strongly that only Warm Springs tribal elders and religious leaders should be questioned on this issue. Certain individuals who are not from our tribe, and indeed some of them are not even Indian, have spoken out frequently and loudly about what they believe is the desecration of sacred Indian religious places at Enola Hill. Mount Hood, including Enola Hill, is not theirs—it is ours. It is not for them to talk about the traditional Indian cultural and religious significance of any part of Mount Hood. It is the mountain of our people and we believe that we should be the only ones asked to give the true traditional Indian interpretation of the significance of any part of the Mount Hood region. For this reason, we oppose the voices of those individuals about the importance of Enola Hill. Furthermore, we ask that the Federal Government, the State of Oregon, the Federal Court, and the non-Indian public, look to our people for the answers to their questions about what Mount Hood, including Enola Hill, means to the traditional Indian people of this area. We are those people, and we should be the only ones to answer those questions.

Dated: January 20, 1993.

NATIONAL ORGAN DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week is National Organ Donor Awareness Week. It is a privilege to be part of this important effort to increase public awareness about the need for donors. Organ donation literally saves lives. It truly is the gift of life.

As Carl Lewis, the Olympic Gold medalist, told the Labor and Human Resources Committee in his testimony this week, "One thing about organ and

tissue donation: it is the absolute definition of altruism—giving solely for the sake of giving . . . It is an opportunity that is almost impossible to find anywhere else you might look. It is the opportunity to actually save the life of another human being."

Eleven years ago, a Massachusetts constituent, Charles Fiske, came to Congress and testified eloquently about the financial and emotional ordeal of his family's search for a liver transplant for their 9-month-old daughter. Out of that testimony came a long-overdue national effort to increase the number of organ donors, enhance the quality of organ transplantation, and allocate the available organs in a fair manner. In 1984, President Ronald Reagan signed the National Organ Transplant Act into law. Its primary goal was to assure patients and their families a fair opportunity to receive a transplant, regardless of where they live, who they know, or how much they could afford to pay. We have not yet achieved these goals, but we are closer to them today.

Additional legislation is now pending. The Organ and Bone Marrow Transplant Program Reauthorization Act was recently approved unanimously by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and is now awaiting action by the full Senate. That measure will improve the current organ procurement and allocation systems by earmarking funds for public education, training health professionals and others in appropriate ways to request donations, improving information for patient, and increasing the role of transplant recipients and family members in these efforts.

Legislation will help, but the shortage of organs for transplantation cannot be solved by legislation alone. Our goals can be achieved only through broad participation by people across the country.

Every day, eight Americans die who could have lived if they had received a transplant in time. Last year, 3,500 patients died because no donor was available, including 173 from Massachusetts. As technology for transplants continues to improve, the gap between demand and supply will continue to widen. The number of persons needing transplants has doubled since 1990. A new name is added to the list every 18 minutes.

Currently, 45,000 Americans are in need of an organ transplant, including 1,400 children. By the end of this year, the total is expected to exceed 50,000. Despite the need, fewer than 20,000 transplant operations will be performed in 1996—because of the shortage of donors.

In part, we are not obtaining enough donors because of the myths surrounding organ donation. Many citizens don't know that it is illegal in this country to buy and sell organs. There is no age limit for donors. Donations are consistent with the beliefs of all major religions.

Except in rare cases such as kidney transplants among close relations, virtually all donations actually take place after death, in accord with the wishes of the donors and their families. The removal of the organs does not interfere with customary burial arrangements or an open casket at the funeral, since the organ is obtained through a normal surgical procedure where the donor's body is treated with respect.

The decision to become a donor will not affect the level of the donor's medical care, or interfere in any way with all possible efforts to save patients where the patients are near death. We need to do all we can to dispel the myths that contradict these facts.

Most important, as members of Congress, we can lead by example, by signing our own organ donor card. I have done so and I have discussed organ donation with my family, so that they know my wishes. Senator FRIST and Senator SIMON have urged all of us in the Senate to sign organ donor cards, and over 50 Senators have now done so.

I encourage all of my colleagues to become organ donors. We must do more, and we can do more, to save the lives of those who need transplants. Each of us can save several lives by agreeing that we ourselves will be donors. And we can save many more lives as other Americans learn from our examples and become donors themselves.

JUNK GUN VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, along with my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY and my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE, I have introduced legislation to ban the production and sale of junk guns—or as they are sometimes called, Saturday night specials. My bill would take the standards for safety and reliability that are currently applied to imported handguns, and apply them to domestically produced firearms. It is a simple common sense proposal that deserves the support of all Senators.

I had a meeting with a very special physician today and I want to share with my colleagues some of the things that I learned. Dr. Andrew McGuire is Director of the Trauma Foundation, a nonprofit organization based out of San Francisco General Hospital. The Trauma Foundation has a simple goal: keep people out of the emergency room.

Several years ago, Dr. McGuire was asked to write a policy paper aimed at developing strategies to curtail violence in the San Francisco area. He concluded that something had to be done to curtail the proliferation of handguns. Specifically, he advised banning these cheap, poorly constructed junk guns.

Since then, Dr. McGuire has been on a crusade to educate the country about

the danger of junk guns. He has developed a national network of trauma surgeons to spread the word about gun violence. On this issue, we should listen to our doctors. They are the ones who see the destruction caused by these weapons first hand.

Some of the statistics Dr. McGuire shared with me were truly frightening. Since 1930—when statistics were first recorded—more than 1.3 million Americans have died of gunshots. That is more Americans than died in all of our wars since the Civil War.

Two weeks ago, the Children's Defense Fund released a study showing that nationwide gunshots were the second leading cause of death among children. In California, gunshots are No. 1.

Let me say that again. Among California children ages 0 to 19, gunshots are the single leading cause of death. More die of gunshots than automobile accidents or any disease. That is a crisis that I, as a Senator from California, cannot overlook.

We must do something to stop this epidemic of violence. Passing the Junk Gun Violence Protection Act, would be an excellent step.

A PRESCIENT MOMENT 25 YEARS PAST

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of the great benefits that accrues to those of us who have served in the U.S. Senate over a period of time—measured not in years but in decades—is that of perspective. Serving here since my election in 1960 has provided me with a gift of hindsight that only time and experience can produce.

It was 25 years ago this week that I participated in a historic Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. We scheduled that hearing to provide leaders of the anti-war movement with a legitimate forum to focus their collective anger and voice their passionate resistance to a heart-rending war that was dividing this country.

I remember this hearing clearly. It was held during the historic encampment of Vietnam veterans in our Capital City and the committee invited the veterans to testify. It was from the witness table in our hearing room, in what was then the New Senate Office Building, that the veterans sounded their call for an end to the war.

What stands out most in my mind, however, was the testimony, the eloquence and the authority of a tall, lanky young man who testified on behalf of his friends and peers. A decorated hero, he was speaking for those who were paying the ultimate price for a disastrous foreign policy.

The large hearing room was crowded and the tension was electric. As I sat behind the raised dais, with Senators William Fulbright, our chairman; Stuart Symington, George Aiken, Clifford Case, and Jacob Javits, I remember looking at the drama before us and saying that the young man who was testifying should be on my side of the dais.

He had just returned from the war and had been decorated for heroism, having been injured in combat (three Purple Hearts) and saved the lives of his Swift Boat crewmen (a Silver Star and two Bronze Stars). As an early and outspoken opponent of the war myself, I knew him and had worked to win support for him and his fellow anti-war veterans.

After his testimony, when it became my turn to address him, I welcomed him with these words: "As the witness knows, I have a very high personal regard for him and hope before his life ends he will be a colleague of ours in this body". That young man was JOHN KERRY.

Mr. President, since that historic time, one which truly marked a milestone in the shift of public opinion, I have come to know JOHN much better. I am happy to find that history has proven me right—both in my opposition to the war in Vietnam and in my glimpse of a young man's future.

When JOHN KERRY, as the Junior Senator from Massachusetts, joined us on the Foreign Relations Committee, I could not have been more delighted with my prescience.

During my service Chairman of the Committee, I asked him to handle the State Department authorization bill—one of the major annual bills that come before the committee—because I knew he had the knowledge, the mastery of the legislative process and the negotiating skills to do the job.

I was right. Senator KERRY has skillfully managed that bill several times now. And in the past year he negotiated with the Chairman JESSE HELMS, over an intensely difficult question, and acquitted himself superbly.

Perhaps his greatest contribution, however, has been his chairmanship of the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs. Thanks to JOHN KERRY's doggedness and leadership, we are finally on the path to healing the wounds and closing the last chapter on a painful time in American history—that of the Vietnam war.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN AT THE DOW JONES AND COMPANY DINNER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the remarks delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] to Dow Jones and Company on April 23, 1996.

In his remarks, Senator MCCAIN addresses a very important issue: what are the obligations of a candidate for the presidency in how he criticizes his opponent—a sitting President—when the President is abroad representing the United States? As he points out, the Clinton administration is insisting on a double standard. During the 1992 campaign, when then-Governor Bill Clinton was challenging President Bush, candidate Clinton had no hesi-

tation in taking President Bush to task even on foreign policy and national security topics while President Bush was outside of the United States meeting with world leaders. On the other hand, now, in 1996, when Bill Clinton is the incumbent, he is criticizing his challenger, the Republican leader, for his recent comments on the Clinton domestic record—specifically on the issue of Federal judges. As Senator MCCAIN details the matter, there is simply no precedent for the White House's distorted and self-serving assertions. I hope all of my colleagues will take a look at these remarks, as well as members of the media who are interested in setting the record straight.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

Thank you. I welcome this opportunity to have as a captive audience people whose attention I spend a fair amount of time trying to get. Al Hunt told me that I could speak on any subject I wished to, and never one to waste such opportunities, I want to spend some time this evening analyzing in detail the pathology of karnal bunt, the fungal disease afflicting wheat crops in Arizona. . . . Or perhaps I should save that analysis for a speech to the New York Times.

I will instead ask your indulgence while I talk a little bit about the press and the presidential race. As I will include a few constructive criticisms in my remarks, I want to assure everyone here that I exempt you all from any of the criticisms that follow. Each and everyone of you has my lasting love and respect.

I would like to begin by quoting a presidential candidate.

"What's the President going to Japan for? He's going to see the landlord."

Here's another quote:

"[The President] has slowed progress toward a healthier and more prosperous planet. . . . He has abdicated national and international leadership on the environment at the very moment the world was most amenable to following the lead of a decisive United States."

And one more:

"[The President should not give trade preferences] to China while they are locking their people up."

Now, let me offer a quote of more recent vintage by that same individual.

"I like the old-fashioned position that used to prevail that people didn't attack the president when he was on a foreign mission for the good of the country. It has been abandoned with regularity in the last three and a half years. But I don't think that makes it any worse a rule."

President Clinton is, of course, the author of all four quotations. The first three—those he made as a candidate for President—were delivered while former President Bush was on foreign missions "for the good of the country," in Japan and Brazil.

The last quote was taken from the President's Moscow press conference last Saturday when he responded to Senator Dole's criticism of his judicial appointments. As you can see, he used the occasion to denounce a practice he regularly employed as a candidate.

What made this particular example of presidential hypocrisy so galling, was that Senator Dole has scrupulously avoided criticizing the President's foreign policy while the