

northern spotted owl, the marbled murrelet, and the gray wolf, and may be a recovery area for other species. Despite the area's biological importance, the checkboard pattern of ownership is not conducive to coordinated environmental protection.

Forrest and timber management of these lands has also been difficult. Public and private landowners are often in conflict because of their differing roles and objectives. A large-scale land exchange would reduce, if not eliminate, these conflicts. It would place valuable wildlife habitat under public management and block-up lands identified by President Clinton as essential to the recovery of spotted owls.

The PlumCreek lands to be traded also provide outstanding recreational opportunities for the growing Puget Sound metropolitan community. The lands poised for exchange are located just south of the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. The space these lands provide will relieve pressure on Alpine Lakes where overuse might limit future access. And buffers obtained in the exchange will protect the wilderness and pressure scenic vistas.

I pledge to work with PlumCreek and the Forest Service as they try to find lands to exchange. This will be a difficult and controversial process. And I must admit to having concerns about one part of the State gaining superb lands, while others are asked to sacrifice their nearby public lands. I am also sensitive to the concerns of National Forest dependent timber producers who fear that they will lose their dwindling land base to PlumCreek, while not receiving lands suitable for timber harvest. Finally, I acknowledge the fear that Kittitas County officials have about losing private, taxable lands in exchange for more Federal lands.

Nevertheless, I strongly support this joint Federal-private effort. I look forward to working both with PlumCreek and the Forest Service to facilitate this exchange based on a principal of equity of all interested parties.

Again, Mr. President, I offer my heartfelt congratulations to PlumCreek Timber Co. and the Clinton administration for the great strides they have made for environmental protection and economic stability.

I ask to include this June 25 editorial from the Seattle Times in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Seattle Times, June 25, 1996]

A SENSIBLE FOREST PLAN FOR SNOQUALMIE PASS

For most of a century, Snoqualmie Pass has been both a spectacular gateway to Puget Sound and an environmental battleground. Its proud stands of Douglas fir, cedar and pine have been scattered in a checkerboard pattern of ownership, crisscrossed by railroads and highways, battered by ski areas and some of the ugliest clear-cuts the region has seen.

Now, Plum Creek Timber and the federal government, who own most of the land in the pass, have crafted a landmark land-use plan that promises to integrate environmental and economic common sense.

The "habitat conservation plan," which will be formally endorsed by the Clinton administration this week, is the result of two years of work by scientists and land managers who studied 418,000 acres of public and private forest and 285 species of wildlife ranging from salamanders to grizzly bear.

Their long-term plan moves beyond species-by-species devices such as "owl circles," which obstruct private landowners while producing dubious public benefits. Instead, scientists have crafted a plan that would protect wildlife habitat in some areas while allowing sensible timber harvests in others.

Already, that plan has been a target for criticism from environmentalists, who point out that logging will be allowed in certain spotted owl habitat. Critics prefer major land exchanges, assembling large parcels of critical forest under public ownership, then shutting them down.

Plum Creek and the government may negotiate such exchanges, but that could take years. Snoqualmie Pass is home to some of the most valuable timber in the nation, making exchanges difficult and costly.

The status quo hasn't worked. Since the turn of the century, timber managers have followed the same strategy—sustained yield, which calls for cutting trees at the same pace that they grow back. That strategy ignored wildlife habitat and led to overcutting of both private and public forest lands.

Nobody knows for sure what will work better. Forest Service Chief Jack Ward Thomas wants to experiment with a variety of strategies, monitoring the effects over decades to come.

The opportunity to try something new explains why the Snoqualmie Pass plan has earned support from key forestry experts and selected environmentalists as well as Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt and the timber industry itself. They see a potential model for resolving resource conflicts without turning biological questions over to federal judges. The breadth of their coalition does not prove the habitat strategy will work, only that it's well worth a try.●

IN APPRECIATION OF KITTY ST. GEORGE

● Mr. COATS. Mr. President, ours is too often a cynical age. When we hear the phrase "public servant" we have come to think of cartoon characters, much like those depicted 100 years ago: Overblown figures in dark suits wearing top hats, spats, and smoking cigars. These were people on the take and on the make; serving the public was far from their minds.

While the scourge of widespread cynicism is unfortunately alive and well in our Nation, so too is countervailing spirit of truly tireless public service. That is good news, very good news, indeed.

As U.S. Senators, our first duty is to the people: To represent their interests, to listen to their opinions, to do what is in the best interest of our country and our States by taking into consideration what our constituents believe. Service, truly dedicated public service, is our mission and our call.

To meet that goal, we must have around us people of like mind, people who are unapologetically committed to high ideals, people who are principled, and who have a sense of moral imagination.

For more than half my time in public life, and from my first day as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have been privileged and deeply honored to have work for me in my Fort Wayne regional office a woman named Kitty St. George.

Kitty is the beau ideal of public service. She is committed. She is dedicated. She has worked many 7-day weeks. She is cheerful. She is unfailingly kind.

We have shared many laughs. We have shared a few tears. And through it all, Kitty has been the Webster's Dictionary definition of a gentelady. Would it were there were more public servants of Kitty's caliber.

As Senators, we are often placed on a pedestal as opinion-makers and opinion-leaders. It can be a heady place to spend part of your life.

But what makes it so meaningful, at least in large measure, is to be able to take away from your constituents, your colleagues, and your staff some glimpse of joy and contentment.

From Kitty, I take away a deeper sense of dedication, a renewed sense of hope, and perhaps most importantly, the ability to find the winsome in everyday life.

As Kitty prepares to move from Indiana to the warmer climes of the South, I wish her much love and Godspeed.●

RETIREMENT OF VIVIAN E. CHURCH

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Ms. Vivian E. Church upon her retirement as director of the Joyner Child Parent Center. In her 38 years working in the public school system she taught generations of children about learning and life. For 1 of those 38 years, she taught me. I am here today to thank and honor her for that and for all she has done.

Ms. Church is a native Chicagoan. She attended Chicago public schools, received her bachelors degree in Elementary Education at Roosevelt College, and her masters in education degree in inner-city studies from Northwestern Illinois University.

Her work in the public school system spanned many years and many positions. She has been a teacher, master teacher, assistant principal, title I consultant, parent resource teacher, and since 1988 the head teacher and director at the Joyner Child Parent Center.

Vivian Church touched the lives of the children that she has taught and guided in her schools. She touched the lives of many other children through her book, "Colors Around Me," which she wrote for kindergarten and first-grade children. This book helps minority children to develop a positive self-image, to develop reading as a personal experience.

She is clearly an impressive woman and she should be honored for taking on the most important and, in many ways, the hardest job there is, being a

teacher. For me personally, I will always remember her not just as a teacher, but as a wonderful, warm hero.

I started school a year early. When I was in the first grade I was smaller than the rest of the children. One day, when we were playing out on the playground the other children wouldn't throw the ball to me or would throw it over my head.

Ms. Church looked out the window and saw me crying. She came outside, brought me inside, and sat me on her lap until my tears dried. She then thought up things for me to do with her for the rest of recess. Throughout the year I spent a lot of time working with Ms. Church at recess and I enjoyed myself immensely. Vivian Church went out of her way for me. She not only taught me, she made school fun for me.

After I left first grade I didn't see Ms. Church again for many years. Then one day, when I was running for the State legislature for the first time, I went to a fundraising tea. Now, Ms. Church wasn't a political activist and I never expect to see her at a campaign event. Not only was she at the fundraising tea, she held the tea in her house. She remembered that I was her first grade pupil and she was still trying to smooth the way for me all these years later.

I am honoring Ms. Church on the floor of the U.S. Senate today as my way of thanking her for all she has done for me and for the generations of children that followed. She is a hero, an inspiration, and role model. Thank you, Ms. Church.●

WELFARE-MEDICAID REFORM LEGISLATION

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, in discharging its responsibilities under the 1997 budget resolution, yesterday the Finance Committee reported S. 1795, as amended. This legislation proposes major reforms to Medicaid and welfare-related programs to give States additional flexibility, and to reduce associated Federal expenditures by \$98 billion through 2002.

Under the terms of the budget resolution, this is the first of three legislative packages the Finance Committee will consider. Next month, the committee will act on legislation to shore up the troubled Medicare program. Following that, a third bill will be considered in September that will deal with other Federal entitlement programs.

I would like to make a general comment about the budget process this year, and then proceed with specified points about the Finance Committee-reported bill.

Last month the Senate rejected by only four votes an alternative budget resolution authored by myself and Senator BREAUX. That bipartisan plan would have put us on a constructive, achievable path to a balanced budget.

At the end of the day, I think the Chafee-Breaux plan would have been

acceptable to President Clinton. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the budget resolution which was ultimately approved by the Congress. Instead, this is like *deja vu* all over again. We will go through the motions, as we did last year, of sending the President much needed deficit reduction legislation he is all but certain to veto.

Frankly, our time could have been better spend working on a bipartisan basis to develop a consensus package which could have become law, and actually helped to reduce the deficit. In my opinion, we can only enact meaningful entitlement reforms—which are the root cause of our deficit problem—through bipartisan cooperation. That was what the Chafee-Breaux alternative was all about.

Given the critical need to get this intolerable Federal deficit under control, I find the present situation frustrating and disappointing.

On a related matter, I want to commend our Republican leaders for their decision not to include cuts in this Medicaid-welfare package. To do so would have been counterproductive. I would prefer to see us concentrate our firepower on deficit reduction before we start cutting taxes.

With respect to the Finance Committee's action yesterday, I want to offer several observations. Though I voted to report S. 1795, it is widely acknowledged that this legislation is headed for a Presidential veto.

However, I want to commend our distinguished chairman, BILL ROTH, for accommodating a number of the improvements I recommended with respect to the Medicaid and welfare sections of the legislations.

On Medicaid, the initial version of S. 1795 would have allowed States to cut off children 13 or older—a significant departure from current law. Under current law States must cover children at or below 100 percent of poverty through the age of twelve, with an additional year's coverage added each year until such children reach the age of 19. At my urging the chairman agreed to maintain current law in this area.

I was also pleased the chairman retained current law coverage of benefits for children under the early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment requirements. This will assure that severely disabled children continue to get medically necessary treatment.

Another concern of mine which the chairman addressed was the lack of health and quality standards for individuals with developmental disabilities who reside in intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded [ICF's/MR], as well as those who reside in community-based settings. The chairman agreed to include standards in his proposal to ensure the safety and quality of care provided to these individuals.

My biggest remaining concern in the Medicaid area is that S. 1795 does not guarantee coverage for individuals

with disabilities under the age of 65, as defined under current law. Under this bill, States would have the option of setting their own standards, which I fear would result in the loss of basic health care services for this vulnerable population. I intend to offer an amendment to correct this deficiency when S. 1795 comes before the Senate.

With respect to the welfare provisions, I was pleased several of my proposed improvements were incorporated into the revised version of S. 1795 which the chairman brought before the committee.

I have long been a proponent of a strong Federal-State partnership with respect to welfare. For this reason, I pressed to have the maintenance of effort requirement in S. 1795 strengthened from 75 to 80 percent, and to prevent States from counting expenditures they make which are not directly related to supporting poor families and their children. The States must maintain their investment in these programs if we are to achieve genuine welfare reform.

On a related matter, I proposed, and the chairman accepted, a provision to ensure that the block grant funds are used only to meet the objectives of this legislation, and not for general social services.

Last, I was very pleased that the chairman agreed with my request to retain current law with regard to child welfare and foster care, and to drop his proposal to block grant these programs. These are not welfare programs, and have no place in welfare reform.

With respect to the issue of abortion services, I was disappointed the committee rejected my amendment to continue current law, which requires States to cover abortions for poor pregnant women in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is at stake.

S. 1795 would leave this decision to the States. Regrettably, this means, for example, that a poor 13-year-old girl who is pregnant as a result of being raped by her father, may not be able to obtain an abortion. I intend to pursue this matter further when S. 1795 comes before the Senate.

I remain deeply troubled about the immigrant provisions of the committee-reported bill. The restrictions on benefits for legal immigrants in this measure are harsher than those that were included in the welfare reform bill overwhelmingly approved this past September by the Senate.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment in committee to soften the impact of these proposed restrictions. However, once it became clear that no extra funds were available to defray the cost of my amendment, I was unable to proceed. I remain hopeful that we can work to modify these very tough restrictions as the process moves forward.

In closing, while I continue to have significant concerns about this legislation, I am pleased that Chairman ROTH