

can set up pension programs for their employees. The proposed information includes a plain English description of the common types of retirement savings arrangements available to individuals and employers; a way to calculate estimated retirement savings; and an explanation of how to establish different savings arrangements for workers.

Finally, SAVER calls for a national summit on retirement savings to bring the urgency of our Nation's extremely low saving rate to the top of the public agenda. The event would serve as a catalyst for future policy discussion on how to best increase personal retirement savings as well as accessibility and participation in pension plans. The summit will represent the kind of public-private cooperation that is so crucial to preserving successful retirement programs for future generations of Americans. The Department of Labor will work closely with the American Savings Education Council [ASEC] to bring together delegates from all over the country to develop a broad-based public education program on retirement savings. As Senator GRASSLEY correctly pointed out, ASEC is an organization uniquely equipped to assist us in our efforts. Their input in both the logistical and conceptual organization of this event will help us create a top-notch program. At the summit, participants will identify barriers that prevent many Americans from setting aside enough money for their retirement and barriers that discourage employers—especially small business—from helping their employees accumulate more savings for their retirement.

Mr. President, as we move forward with reforming Social Security and Medicare, we must also provide more Americans with the incentives they need to better prepare for their retirement. Our SAVER bill not only gives Americans the tools they need to determine how much personal savings they need to supplement their Social Security benefits, it also raises awareness of the responsibility individuals have for planning for their future.

Mr. President, I believe that the SAVER bill is the first step that this Congress must take in assisting all Americans in their quest for a comfortable, happy retirement. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this measure.

ONGOING TRADE CASES AND FAST TRACK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the senior Senator from Texas. I would like to clarify a statement regarding salmon imports that the Senator made during yesterday's debate on the motion to proceed to the fast track negotiating authority. Would the Senator agree that his comments yesterday were not intended to suggest any connection between the fast track legislation that is

before the Senate and any pending trade cases regarding salmon imports from Chile?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to the inquiry from my colleague from Maine. I would fully agree that there is nothing in the fast track legislation that would affect any ongoing trade cases involving salmon, or indeed any other product. My comments were intended to underscore the impact of trade on consumers and in no way should be interpreted as affecting any of the formal processes involved with reviewing the pending salmon cases or suggesting that the fast track legislation would affect any pending salmon trade cases.

Ms. COLLINS. Would the Senator also agree that the passage of fast track authority would in no way countenance the continuation of any practices by the Chilean salmon industry that are in violation of United States trade laws?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, that is also correct. This is a procedural bill regarding negotiations. It does not change any of our existing laws regarding unfair trade practices.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Senator for this clarification.

Mr. GRAMM. I am happy to do so and appreciate the inquiry.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, November 5, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,433,411,941,085.78 (Five trillion, four hundred thirty-three billion, four hundred eleven million, nine hundred forty-one thousand, eighty-five dollars and seventy-eight cents).

One year ago, November 5, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,247,476,000,000 (Five trillion, two hundred forty-seven billion, four hundred seventy-six million).

Five years ago, November 5, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,071,603,000,000 (Four trillion, seventy-one billion, six hundred three million).

Ten years ago, November 5, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,394,640,000,000 (Two trillion, three hundred ninety-four billion, six hundred forty million).

Fifteen years ago, November 5, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,137,627,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred thirty-seven billion, six hundred twenty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,295,784,941,085.78 (Four trillion, two hundred ninety-five billion, seven hundred eighty-four million, nine hundred forty-one thousand, eighty-five dollars and seventy-eight cents) during the past 15 years.

GLOBAL LEGAL INFORMATION NETWORK

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to briefly discuss a program presently being developed by the Library of Congress.

The law librarian of Congress, Dr. Rubens Medina, briefed me this morning on the efforts the law library has undertaken in recent years to put together an international legal database containing the texts of laws of some 35 foreign countries. The data base comprises abstracts of legal material, the full authentic texts of laws and regulations, and a legal thesaurus. It is structured so that the full range of legal material including constitutions, laws and regulations, judicial decisions, parliamentary debates, and legal miscellanea can be added over time as participating countries are able to contribute the material. The material is available over the Internet in its entirety to officials of those countries who agree to participate in making their laws available on the system; in addition, a summary in both English and the language of the country of origin will be available to the general public.

This network, called the Global Legal Information Network or GLIN, will enable Members of Congress and their staffs and the Library staff—as well as our counterparts in participating countries—to access the most current and authentic versions of other countries' laws, something that is increasingly important in this day and age when we deal so frequently with international trade and security issues. Congress should acknowledge and salute this effort by its Library, and be proud that it was created in and enhanced by the legislative branch and that the library is taking the international leadership role on the project.

As additional recognition of the viability and importance of this project, and one that interests me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Dr. Medina informed me that the Secretary of State will be proposing at the forthcoming ministerial meeting of the 18 APEC nations in Vancouver, BC, next month that each APEC country seriously consider joining GLIN and suggesting that an informational meeting on GLIN be held early in 1998.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be involved in some way in this monumental project, one in which the joint efforts of the executive and legislative branches can capitalize on technological achievements to advance international cooperation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, a Vermonter who is on active duty in the U.S. Army contacted me recently to let me know of his support for a ban on antipersonnel landmines. He wrote from personal experience, and his comments mirrored those I have received from so many other servicemen and women who have seen first-hand the danger these weapons pose to our own troops.

Here is what he wrote:

In the many training exercises in which I have participated, landmines were relatively ineffective in disrupting enemy attacks. Landmines often caused fratricide casualties

among one's own troops. The locations of the training landmines were almost never properly recorded. The modern battlefield is simply too fluid and complex to accurately keep track of all the landmines that are emplaced. Under actual combat conditions, these landmines will represent a certain threat to the lives of U.S. personnel.

Mr. President, compare that to a recent U.S. Army report which concluded that landmines contributed to the high rate of fratricide during recent exercises at Fort Irwin, CA. Air-dropped landmines, the so-called smart mines that the Pentagon claims pose no danger to U.S. troops or civilians, were the biggest single cause of friendly-fire deaths during mock battles. Of the 82 soldiers that were "killed" by friendly fire, 45 of them were victims of their own landmines. In one incident, an Army unit drove into its own mines dropped by aircraft, resulting in what would have been 23 deaths in a real war.

Now compare that to our experience in Vietnam, where over 64,000 Americans were killed or injured by landmines. The vast majority of those casualties resulted from U.S. mines, or mines containing U.S. components. In other words, we made the mines and took them over there, and they ended up killing our own people. I wonder how many times history has to repeat itself before we get the message.

A veteran of the Persian Gulf war described the same danger of fratricide. He said:

I spoke to numerous military officers who agreed * * * that they would never employ scatterables (the air-dropped mines) in their area of operations, even if those scatterables were designed to self-destruct after a short period of time. Why? They were simply not prepared to risk the lives of their soldiers on the promise that the technology would work as designed. The fact is that U.S. ground warfare doctrine is 'maneuver' warfare doctrine—highly mobile, able to take advantage of the terrain, exploit the weakness of the enemy on the battlefield. A commander who uses anti-personnel mines—except in the most exigent, Alamo-like situation—is deliberately reducing his or her battlefield advantage of speed and flexibility.

Mr. President, despite this, the Pentagon insists that landmines protect our troops. It is the same old story. Years ago, they said we could not do without biological weapons. They said the same about chemical weapons, which they called the most effective weapon history has ever known. They said if we gave up Okinawa that we would irreparably undermine our security in the Pacific. They fought the nuclear test ban. And now they say that landmines, which have consistently plagued our own forces in battle, protect American lives.

I respect our military leaders and I support a defense second to none. But I am losing patience with the Pentagon's arguments. They simply fly in the face of the evidence. Their latest arguments about the need for antipersonnel mines to defend antitank mines wither under close scrutiny. Unfortunately, too many people, including some in the

White House, accept the Pentagon's arguments as gospel, and don't ask the hard questions.

From my off-the-record conversations with Pentagon officials it is obvious to me that the real problem is that they do not want to give up a weapon, regardless of how marginal its utility or how dangerous it is to our own troops, because they are loath to encourage so-called arms control activists from trying to ban other weapons that endanger civilians. I understand their fear, because unlike a century ago when the overwhelming majority of war casualties were soldiers, being a soldier in a war today is far safer than being a civilian. The overwhelming majority of war casualties today are civilians.

That is hardly a reason to stay outside of a treaty that offers the best hope for riding the world of a weapon that is both inhumane and militarily unnecessary. When the Pentagon argues that our "smart" mines do not cause the humanitarian problem, I ask them to consider that as long as we stay outside the treaty we are part of the humanitarian problem because there will never be an international ban without the United States. And I ask them to consider the evidence. Given the danger our own mines pose to our troops, we should shop using them for that reason alone.

SOUTH DAKOTA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to a key institution in my State, the South Dakota Community Foundation [SDCF], which celebrates its 10th anniversary on November 11, 1997. This statewide community foundation is a model of how private funds are raised within communities to support projects that enable those communities to enter the 21st century in a competitive position—people helping themselves.

As with many success stories, the SDCF was launched by a group of people with the vision of raising and investing funds with the goal of creating an environment in which South Dakota communities can revitalize themselves. This vision was embraced by the critical early stage investors providing seed funding, yielding, as we do in our farmland, a rich harvest 10 years later.

I must take my hat off to the vision and drive of then-South Dakota State senator and now SDCF executive director, Bernie Christenson, and the active support by our late Governor, George Mickelson. I regret George is not alive to see the legacy of his actions in 1987, but his spirit lives with us through this foundation and in every one of the communities it helps.

That seed funding for the SDCF came from the 3M Foundation, McKnight Foundation and the South Dakota Legislature. I congratulate the leaders of those 3 institutions. The success of the

SDCF is also a testament to former South Dakota native, former 3M CEO, and McKnight Foundation founder, William McKnight. We can all learn from William McKnight about the value of giving back to the community and institutions that helped shape our lives. The State of South Dakota and the 3M Foundation each contributed \$2 million, and the McKnight Foundation committed up to \$3 million in a challenge grant. Less than 13 months later, Bernie and George had raised \$3 million to meet that first challenge; the foundation was off and running with a \$10 million fund.

Ten years after its creation, the South Dakota Community Foundation has reached the \$20 million mark and administers these funds through a wide range of unrestricted, designated and donor-advised funds. This has been accomplished over the years through the leadership, commitment, and hard work of Bernie Christenson, an administrative assistant, and countless board members, including the current board president, Paul Christen.

I am pleased that the Northwest Area Foundation has joined its neighboring twin cities-based foundations, 3M and McKnight, in providing funds to the South Dakota Community Foundation. In a letter sent last year to northwest area president, Karl Stauber, I strongly urged support for the SDCF plan to challenge communities to join SDCF in raising capital to endow small community loan funds that would be used to help existing businesses expand and to assist entrepreneurs in starting new businesses, with the goal of long-term community revitalization. Bernie and my staff coordinated a short tour of South Dakota communities and projects for Karl late last year. It is important for foundations as well as federal agencies to get out from behind the desk and see close up the commitment and innovation flourishing in our communities. Just before closing down the foundation grantmaking for a year of strategic planning, Northwest Area Foundation committed its support to this project and 10 communities have now stepped up to the challenge and matched the foundation funds with their own.

I am reminded of a letter President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent to South Dakota Governor Harlan Bushfield in 1939 on the occasion of South Dakota's 50th anniversary of its entry into the Union.

President Roosevelt said, "The 50 years that have elapsed since South Dakota became a State have witnessed the end of one period of pioneering and the ushering in of another."

Mr. President, nearly 60 years after Franklin Roosevelt wrote that letter, we in the Northern Great Plains are in a transition toward yet another era, confronted now by tremendous global economic forces and declining Federal support for key economic development activities and institutions.