

# WOUND, OSTOMY, AND CONTINENCE NURSES SOCIETY CONFERENCE

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to welcome the 28th annual Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society [WOCN] conference to Seattle, WA, June 15-19, 1996. The theme of the conference, "The Future is Ours to Create," will focus on future opportunities and challenges relating to the changing and expanding role of enterostomal therapist nurses, and other nurses specializing in wound, ostomy, and continence care.

Founded in 1968, WOCN is the only national organization for nurses which specializes in the prevention of pressure ulcers and the management and rehabilitation of persons with ostomies, wounds, and incontinence. In addition, WOCN is a professional nursing society which supports its members by promoting educational, clinical, and research opportunities, to advance the practice and guide the delivery of expert health care to individuals with wounds, ostomies, and incontinence. I applaud them for their commitment and dedication to their work.

In this age of changing health care services and increasing costs, the WOCN nurse plays an integral role in providing cost-effective care for their patients. This year's Seattle conference will provide a unique opportunity for WOCN participants to learn about the most current issues and trends related to their practice. I am honored that WOCN has chosen Seattle to host its conference and wish them every success.●

## PRUDENTIAL SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY AWARDS

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this morning I was privileged to honor North Dakota's recipients of the 1996 Prudential Spirit of Community Award, Kendal Alexander, a student attending the Erik Ramstad Middle School in Minot, and Jessica Schmidt, from Minot High School Magic City Campus. Kendall and Jessica are among 104 honorees representing each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that were selected to receive the Prudential Spirit of Community Award in recognition of their exemplary contributions to community service.

The Spirit of Community Initiative was organized last year by the Prudential Insurance Company of America, in partnership with the National Association of School Principals to encourage community involvement by young people, and to recognize community service contributions of America's youth. In the first year of the program, more than 7,000 young people working in various community service programs across the country were considered for the Prudential honors. One hundred four finalists were selected to receive the Prudential Spirit of Community

recognition, an award including a silver medallion and a \$1,000 cash award.

Mr. President, at a time when so much attention in the press is focused on the problems of youth, I think it important to highlight the contributions of young people like Kendal and Jessica who are working to improve their communities, and to provide services to individuals in need.

Kendal was honored for his work with a local food bank, highway improvement, to develop safe activities for children during Halloween and to assist senior citizens in nursing homes. Jessica, as president of the Minot High School Key Club, organized programs for nursing home residents, and a senior's prom for senior citizens in the Minot community. Kendal and Jessica deserve our sincere appreciation for their efforts to improve our communities. We can be proud that they are so committed to helping others, and that they represent our future. I also want to commend the Prudential Insurance Co. and the National Association of School Principals for establishing this outstanding program, and particularly, for encouraging young people to become involved in their communities.●

## THE FORT PECK RURAL COUNTY WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM ACT OF 1996

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 348, S. 1467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1467) to authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System, to authorize assistance to the Fort Peck Rural County Water District, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes.

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

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

The bill (S. 1467) was deemed read a third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1467

*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 "Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System Act of 1995".

### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) CONSTRUCTION.—The term "construction" means such activities associated with

the actual development or construction of facilities as are initiated on execution of contracts for construction.

(2) DISTRICT.—The term "District" means the Fort Peck Rural County Water District, Inc., a non-profit corporation in Montana.

(3) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The term "feasibility study" means the study entitled "Final Engineering Report and Alternative Evaluation for the Fort Peck Rural County Water District", dated September 1994.

(4) PLANNING.—The term "planning" means activities such as data collection, evaluation, design, and other associated preconstruction activities required prior to the execution of contracts for construction.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.—The term "water supply system" means the Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System, to be established and operated substantially in accordance with the feasibility study.

### SEC. 3. FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of the District, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the District for the planning, design, and construction by the District of the water supply system.

(b) SERVICE AREA.—The water supply system shall provide for safe and adequate rural water supplies under the jurisdiction of the District in Valley County, northeastern Montana (as described in the feasibility study).

(c) AMOUNT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), under the cooperative agreement, the Secretary shall pay the Federal share of—

(A) costs associated with the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system (as identified in the feasibility study); and

(B) such sums as are necessary to defray increases in the budget.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share referred to in paragraph (1) shall be 80 percent and shall not be reimbursable.

(3) TOTAL.—The amount of Federal funds made available under the cooperative agreement shall not exceed the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 4.

(4) LIMITATIONS.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount of Federal funds made available to the Secretary under section 4 may be used by the Secretary for activities associated with—

(A) compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) oversight of the planning, design, and construction by the District of the water supply system.

### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$5,800,000, to remain available until expended. The funds authorized to be appropriated may be increased or decreased by such amounts as are justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in development costs incurred after October 1, 1994, as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction project authorized under this Act.

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 8, 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 calendar be dispensed with, and the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and there then be 30 minutes equally divided for closing remarks prior to the 10 a.m., cloture vote relative to the White House travel bill.

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

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, there will be a 10 a.m., cloture vote on the White House travel bill. I ask unanimous consent that Senators have until 10 a.m., to file second-degree amendments under the provisions of Rule XXII.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, following the cloture vote, if not invoked, it may be the majority leader's intention to turn to any of the other following items, so we could expect votes tomorrow. We have the repeal of the gas tax, the taxpayer bill of rights, the minimum wage legislation, and the TEAM Act.

I guess we were unable to reach an agreement today, but it seems to me we should repeal the gas tax, settle the minimum wage dispute, all in one fell swoop. Hopefully that can be resolved.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that after the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS, the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

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

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the majority leader for allowing me to just make a few remarks before we go out.

#### THE GAS TAX CUT

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I want to again reiterate my strong opposition to the so-called gas tax cut. I have labored on the Energy Committee for 21 years and 4 months. An awful lot of that time has been spent preaching about conservation and how we must achieve some degree of energy independence.

It has not been too long since cars were lined up at the service stations. Getting their gas tanks filled was a 1 to 2 hour proposition. How soon we forget. There were cries then that we ought to raise the gasoline tax by as much as \$1 per gallon. I was never for that. The reason I was never for it is because people in my State, which is mainly rural, have to drive many miles

to go to work and do errands. In a rural State people drive from their homes to work in communities 25 miles away. That is a 50-mile-a-day commute. A 50-mile commute a day with a \$1 per gallon gasoline tax adds up to a staggering burden on middle- and low-income workers.

I have, however, always been a strong champion of fuel efficiency. The first year I was in the Senate under the leadership of Scoop Jackson, who was chairman of the Energy Committee, we forced the American automobile industry to achieve fuel efficiency standards, which they did not want to do. At that point, it was already apparent to anybody who watched that the American people had become rather captivated by small Japanese-made automobiles that were getting 35 to 50 miles a gallon. The automobile industry assured Senator Jackson and other Members of the Senate that requiring them to achieve some kind of a national fuel miles-per-gallon fuel standard would be disastrous for them.

In truth the car companies were wrong. We imposed Corporate Average Fuel Economy [CAFE] standards on the automobile industry. We told them that by 1985 they had to achieve an average national fuel efficiency standard of 27.5 miles per gallon per fleet. At that time in this country, the national average of all vehicles on the road, and that was roughly 30 million fewer cars than we have now, was a little over 13 miles per gallon.

You did not have to be a rocket scientist to know if we were using 6½ million barrels of gasoline a day that if you could improve fuel efficiency like that, with a snap of a finger, by one-third, you could have cut the import of oil into this country by 2 million barrels a day. At that time, the United States was producing between 60 percent and 65 percent of its own needs. Just parenthetically, today we produce about 50 percent and we import the rest. It is easily the single biggest contributor to our trade deficit.

In the 1980's we also raised the gas tax. The Federal gas tax had been 4 cents for a very long time. The tax was raised twice in the 1980's and twice again in the 1990's. Today it is 18.3 cents a gallon. In the past, we have always put gasoline taxes into the transportation trust funds to be used for building highways and for mass transit.

In the summer of 1993, as we labored in this body to honor a commitment that the President had made during his campaign that he would cut the deficit in half during his 4-year term, he sent a proposal to the U.S. Congress. He said if you adopt this proposal it will reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over the next 5 years. We have done this precisely the way the people around the coffee shops say they want it done—\$250 billion in new taxes, \$250 billion in spending cuts.

How often have you heard people say, "I would not mind paying more taxes

but they will just spend the money." Believe you me, there has always been enough action taken around here to give credence to that idea. Every poll shows the American people would opt for a plan if it cuts spending dollar for dollar against tax increases. So we raised income taxes on the wealthiest of Americans and we raised the gasoline tax by 4.3 cents a gallon.

What was that 4.3 cents per gallon tax worth? Over a 5-year-period it was worth \$24.5 billion. That total package was worth \$500 billion over a 5-year period, so we said.

In fact, Madam President, as of this moment, it is headed toward being \$700 billion in deficit reduction. How did we pass it? At that time what some of us like to refer to as the "good old days," we had 56 Democratic Senators, 6 voted no, 50 voted aye, and Vice President ALBERT GORE sat in that chair and voted to break the tie of 50-50, and we passed that deficit reduction package, which included this 4.3-cent a gallon gas tax.

Now we are back, and everyone wants to balance the budget. The American people have issued a nonnegotiable demand that they want the budget balanced. I happen to believe that any time the American people speak almost with one voice, they are heard here. So this body for the first time since I have been in the Senate has gotten serious about the business of balancing the budget.

Let me digress to say this, Madam President. The Presiding Officer is a member of the Republican Party. I am a Democrat. There are 53 Republicans sitting on the other side and there are 47 Democrats sitting on this side. In truth, this ought to be pleasing to the ears of the American people. We would all agree on about 90 percent of what we believe to be the core values of this country. Madam President, 90 percent of the core values that have made us a great Nation. And we are, make no mistake about it.

One of the values that every Democrat and every Republican and virtually everybody in the country would agree on is we should balance our budget. Where did we diverge? A couple of my very good friends on this side of the aisle are no longer here, and they are no longer here because they had the courage to be one of the 50 to vote for honest-to-God deficit reduction. If we had not done that, we would be looking at a \$290 to \$300 billion deficit today. One of the reasons the American people are feeling slightly better is that this year the deficit is going to be \$144 billion—less than half what it was projected to be and less than half what it would have been if a few people had not screwed up their nerve and been courageous enough to vote for something that was obviously unpopular. Nobody wants to vote for a tax increase of any kind. I wish I could just wave a wand and vote to repeal the 4.3-cent gas tax and say, "Well, we will take care of the deficit some other way."