

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

was receptive to addressing a number of my concerns in the revised version of S. 1795 he brought before the committee.

I am very hopeful that these improvements will be retained, and that additional improvements can be made on the Senate floor and in conference.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

TREATIES

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following treaties on today's executive calendar, No. 13 through No. 22.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the following treaties:

Treaty Document No. 103-35, treaty Between the United States of America and Jamaica Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol;

Treaty Document No. 103-36, treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Belarus Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment with Annex, Protocol, and Related Exchange of Letters;

Treaty Document No. 103-37, treaty Between the United States of America and Ukraine Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex, and Related Exchange of Letters;

Treaty Document No. 103-38 treaty Between and Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Estonia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment with Annex;

Treaty Document No. 104-10, treaty Between the United States of America and Mongolia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol;

Treaty Document No. 104-12, Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol;

Treaty Document No. 104-13, Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Georgia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex;

Treaty Document No. 104-14, Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol;

Treaty Document No. 104-19, Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Albania Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol; and

Treaty Document No. 104-24, Agreement for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to Fish Stocks.

STATEMENT ON THE AGREEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA OF 10 DECEMBER 1982 RELATING TO FISH STOCKS

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I am very pleased that the Senate is proceeding to consider Treaty Document

104-24, commonly known as the Straddling Fish Stocks Agreement. I strongly urge my colleagues to support Senate advice and consent to ratification.

The need for this Agreement—and indeed other appropriate measures to protect fisheries—has become increasingly evident in the past years. World fish production, both marine and aquaculture, peaked in 1989 at roughly 100 million tons. Since then, marine catches have declined significantly due to over-exploitation. By 1992, the world marine catch had declined to 86 million tons and by 1994 to 72.3 million tons. The Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that 70 percent of the world's marine fish stocks are fully to heavily exploited, over-exploited, depleted, or slowly recovering.

Against this backdrop, the Straddling Stocks Agreement will significantly advance U.S. interests. In effect, it confirms the U.S. approach to fisheries management and reflects the acceptance by other nations of that approach. The agreement does not require any changes to U.S. fishery laws or institutions. The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act as well as other acts, provide the necessary legislative authority for the United States to carry out its obligations under the agreement.

It is very important to note that the Straddling Stocks Agreement is tightly linked, both legally and practically, to the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, which has for nearly 2 years been pending before the Foreign Relations Committee. The United States ability to pursue its objectives under the agreement will be maximized only if we in the Senate move ahead to grant advice and consent to ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention.

Over the past 2 years I have repeatedly addressed the Senate to highlight the ways in which the Law of the Sea Convention has been improved, and now meets our fisheries interests, our national security interests, and our economic interests. I hope that all my colleagues who have shown such an interest in the Straddling Stocks Agreement will join me in my efforts to see the convention ratified promptly.

Mr. MCCAIN. I further ask unanimous consent that the treaties be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification, that all committee provisos, reservations, understandings, et cetera, be considered agreed to; that any statements be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if read; and that the Senate take one vote on the resolutions of ratification to be considered as separate votes;

Further, that when the resolutions of ratifications are voted upon, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that the President be notified of the Senate's action, that following disposition of the treaties the Senate return to legislative session.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for a division vote on the resolutions of ratification.

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

All those in favor of ratification please stand and be counted. (After a pause.) All those opposed to ratification be stand and be counted.

On a division, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification are agreed to.

The resolutions of ratification agreed to are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF RATIFICATION

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAMAICA CONCERNING THE RECIPROCAL ENCOURAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF INVESTMENT, WITH ANNEX AND PROTOCOL

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and Jamaica Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol, signed at Washington on February 4, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 103-35).

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS CONCERNING THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND RECIPROCAL PROTECTION OF INVESTMENT, WITH ANNEX, PROTOCOL, AND RELATED EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Belarus Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex, Protocol, and Related Exchange of Letters, signed at Minsk on January 15, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 103-36). The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which the President, using existing authority, shall communicate to the Republic of Belarus, in connection with the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the Treaty:

(1) It is the Sense of the Senate that the United States:

(a) supports the Belarusian Parliament and its essential role in the ratification process of this Treaty;

(b) recognizes the progress made by the Belarusian Parliament toward democracy during the past year;

(c) fully expects that the Republic of Belarus will remain an independent state committed to democratic and economic reform; and

(d) believes that, in the event that the Republic Belarus should unite with any other state, the rights and obligations established under this agreement will remain binding on that part of the Successor State that formed the Republic of Belarus prior to the union.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND UKRAINE CONCERNING THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND RECIPROCAL PROTECTION OF INVESTMENT, WITH ANNEX, AND RELATED EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and Ukraine Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Related Exchange of Letters, done at Washington on March 4, 1994 (Treaty Doc. 103-37).