

offer this resolution, but I am forced to because discrimination still persists here. Ms. Shea is being treated differently simply because she is visually impaired and needs to use a guide dog.

Now, some may believe that the Senate fulfills its obligations under the Americans With Disabilities Act—

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WYDEN. Yes.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be made a cosponsor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that I also be added as a cosponsor to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senators will be added as cosponsors.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. President, some believe that the Senate is fulfilling its obligations under the Americans With Disabilities Act if they provide someone to accompany Ms. Shea to the Senate floor. But let me say that an unknown staff person is no substitute for a working guide dog.

The relevant language from the Americans With Disabilities Act says that an employer must provide reasonable accommodation for an individual with a disability. The Equal Employment Opportunity Office has said, "reasonable accommodation [is] when an employer permits a person who is blind to use a guide dog at work."

Let us put ourselves in Ms. Shea's situation. Imagine that you need to go on the Senate floor to carry out your official duties, but, wait, you must first check your ability to see with the doorkeeper, or go to the Rules Committee to get a resolution. I fail to see the logic of this, and I fail to see the justice behind it. Miss Shea's situation doesn't require extra financial resources nor special treatment. She just wants to do her job as a professional.

A large part of the problem seems to be a lack of understanding. So let me tell the Senate a little bit about what guide dogs do. They are working dogs, not pets. A guide dog is that person's vision, an integral part of that person's essential activities and professional responsibilities. A blind person or a visually impaired person, such as Ms. Shea, has learned to turn over her diminishing sight to her dog and trusts that dog with her safety. This guide dog has blocked Ms. Shea from oncoming traffic. He knows his left from his right. He is a marker to others that Ms. Shea is visually impaired. She has gone to the Senate Energy Committee hearings and nuclear weapons facilities. This dog has even met more just access with respect to the Soviet Union.

Yet, here in the United States, on the Senate floor, where we passed the ADA and the Congressional Accountability Act, we are refusing access to someone

who needs to use a guide dog. This guide dog has a serious job, and, I might add, the dog performs it very well. This is the tool that Ms. Shea uses to be a productive member of the work force, and today we are denying her the ability to do her job to the best of her ability. Ms. Shea is part of a growing work force of persons who want to be independent, who want to be productive, and who have been raised with a can-do attitude.

Let me conclude by describing how the guide dog would work on the floor. Ms. Shea would most likely tell him to "follow me," and as they walked down the aisle, the dog would alert Ms. Shea to each step by stopping. Then Ms. Shea would say to him "find the chair," and then Ms. Shea would sit down and the dog would lay right beside her. We would all forget that the dog was even here. In leaving, Ms. Shea would tell the dog to "find the door" once again, and the dog would alert her to where all the steps are and take her right to the door.

Mr. President, that is all there is to it. It seems to me that the Senate should change its rules to ensure that there is justice for people like Ms. Shea. To tell someone like Ms. Shea that she cannot come to the Senate floor with either a white cane or a guide dog and only with an escort is demeaning. You take away her right to decide what is the best method for her to carry out her job as a professional. You take away her sense of independence. You take away her dignity. You make her dependent on others. That is not what the Americans With Disabilities Act is all about.

Ms. Shea has Usher's Syndrome. That is the leading cause of deaf-blindness in the United States. She has struggled and worked hard to get where she is today as a professional. She is independent and self-sufficient, and she told me that she can cope with losing her eyesight, but she should not be forced to face blatant discrimination.

It is time for the Senate to change its rules. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Rules Committee to do this. It is time to ensure that the visually impaired in our country have justice, and have justice in the way that Congress envisioned with the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Congress Accountability Act. I thank my friends from Minnesota, Nevada, and Alaska for joining me as cosponsors this morning on this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 44

Mr. MURKOWSKI (for Mr. LOTT, for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 30

proposed by Mr. WELLSTONE to the bill (S. 104) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; as follows:

In the pending amendment, strike all after "SEC. ." and insert the following:

"SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED LEGAL IMMIGRANTS."

"It is the sense of the Senate that elderly and disabled legal immigrants who are unable to work should receive assistance essential to their well-being, and that the President, Congress, and States, and faith-based and other organizations should continue to work together toward that end."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there will be a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Immigration, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on Tuesday, April 15, 1997, at 10:30 a.m., in room 226, Senate Dirksen Building, on "Immigrant Entrepreneurs, Job Creation, and the American Dream."

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a full committee hearing on Thursday, April 24, 1997, at 9 a.m. in SR-328A to receive testimony regarding U.S. agricultural exports.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Monday, April 14, 1997, beginning at 1:30 p.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF HOME EDUCATION IN MISSOURI

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to recognize homeschoolers in the State of Missouri. They are a part of the ongoing commitment to quality education for Missouri's youth.

Home educators make an effort to give their children a chance for success in today's ever-changing society by personally guiding the education of their children and ensuring that all facets of their children's development are included in scholastic endeavors.

Homeschoolers establish one-on-one relationships with their adult mentors and develop interpersonal skills with all age groups through apprenticeship opportunities and involvement in civic and community organizations.

Home education in Missouri has enjoyed considerable success in recent years because of the tremendous support received for countless citizens who realize the significance of family participation in the educational process.

The State of Missouri has resolved to commend the efforts of home educators by designating May 4-10, 1997, Home Education Week. I applaud the home educators for their commitment to quality education and taking the time to be directly involved in their children's education. ●

B-2 BOMBER

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, today I want to address a very serious issue, which is at the heart of the defense of our Nation's interests. I want to address the need to acquire a meaningful long-range-strike weapons system. I want to address the procurement of nine more B-2 bombers, which are needed to complete a three-squadron fleet that will have the means to deter, the capabilities to defend against, and the power to defeat threats to our national interest.

I speak today in support of America's most capable long-range-strike aircraft, the B-2 bomber. The B-2 is not just a bomber. When most people think of bombers, they think of World War II airpower films, with scores of bombers flying in tight formation, dropping strings of iron bombs on rail lines and oil refineries. The B-2 is more than a bomber. It is a long-range-strike aircraft, capable of reaching anywhere in the world and releasing highly sophisticated, explosive weapons with uncommon precision on specific targets. Unlike the bombers of old, which often missed their targets by miles, the B-2 strike aircraft can hit as many as 16 separate aim points, with deadly accuracy, in a single pass.

Mr. President, it defies convention to think of the B-2, with its high sticker cost, as a cost-effective weapon. Only when we stop thinking of the B-2 as a bomber, and instead think of it as a long-range-strike weapons system, do we realize that it is, indeed, the most cost-effective weapons system in our Nation's arsenal which can realistically be used to protect our citizens, our interests, and our allies around the world. It is the only weapons system that combines long-range, large payload, modern precision weapons, and stealth—a revolutionary and powerful combination.

Since the end of the cold war, we have come to recognize that we no longer live in a bipolar world. Threats to our national security have taken on both familiar and unfamiliar forms: renewed territorial aggression, simmering regional and ethnic conflicts, state-sponsored terrorism, and now, for the first time since the Middle Ages, stateless terrorism. We send our forces abroad to protect air bases and oil fields and our sons and daughters are attacked by religious zealots. We all vividly recall the loss of life at our military barracks in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. It was attacked, not by the Iraqi forces we seek to deter, but by nameless terrorists from Iran, or from Lebanon, or from internal Saudi oppo-

sition groups, or from God knows where. With the B-2, the forward air bases would not be needed; the oil fields could be protected from afar.

What happened when Saddam Hussein attacked the U.N.-protected Kurdish safe zone in northern Iraq? We attacked Baghdad and southern Iraq. Because the leadership in Jordan, in Saudi Arabia, in Turkey, and in other countries, where we have shorter range aircraft, was concerned with stirring up public opinion, United States forces were denied the freedom to launch counter strikes from air bases on their territory. With the B-2, we could have struck Saddam Hussein's forces in the North, from bases in the United States.

The Secretary of Defense stated in his annual report for fiscal year 1996: "Because potential regional adversaries may be able to mount military threats against their neighbors with little or no warning, American forces must be postured to project power rapidly to support United States interests and allies." Clearly, the most appropriate weapon in our arsenal for rapid power projection is the B-2 long-range-strike aircraft. Yet, because of legislation—which has now been repealed—we currently have only two squadrons of B-2's. In order to meet effectively our basic strategic objectives, just nine more B-2's, bringing the total to three squadrons, are essential. Mr. President, we must restart this program; we must provide funding for the B-2 this year.

The B-2—a long-range, precision-strike aircraft—is the best, and perhaps only, option available to us to counter emerging threats in our security environment. We are not able to spend as much for defense as we have in the past, causing us to decrease our presence abroad and base more of our forces here at home. This, in turn, limits our forward presence and ability to rapidly respond to a crisis elsewhere in the world. In addition, access to foreign bases, closer to theaters of conflict, has become more and more uncertain. And above all, weapons of mass destruction and accurate delivery systems are becoming more prolific, possibly held by rogue states and organized terrorists alike. These chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons could be used with devastation to attack American ground, naval, and air forces based within a theater of conflict.

How does the B-2 respond to these challenges? The B-2 uses stealth technology, technology more effective than that employed on F-117 fighter bombers in the gulf war. As you recall, these planes were the key to securing the advantage immediately in the air war and remained impossible for the Iraqis to stop. However, the B-2 is a more powerful and flexible weapon, and offers several advantages over the F-117.

First, it is a long-range system. The B-2 can fly anywhere in the world, from bases in the United States, with only one refueling. These factors also make the B-2 an important tool for deterrence, allowing the President the

ability to strike anywhere in the world immediately. Thus, a counterstrike can be launched from the United States, as soon as the threat is apparent, without reliance on foreign bases, or troop buildup.

Second, the B-2 carries a bigger, more accurate payload than the F-117. The precision bombs carried by the B-2 use GPS-aided targeting systems, and GPS-aided munitions [GATS/GAM], which enables up to 16 independent points to be targeted with extreme accuracy, in 1 pass. This precision is an important counter to the mobile and relocatable nature of many of our new potential enemies, such as scud missiles or terrorist encampments. The local release of a strike allows last minute adjustments to account for local conditions, or target movement. This is not possible with cruise missiles. In addition, delivering a strike via bomber also allows difficult targets, like the dark side of a mountain, or underground bunkers, to be attacked and destroyed.

One of the most important points to make about the B-2 is that it will reduce the number of American soldiers put in harm's way, and ultimately reduce casualties. Because the President can choose to respond immediately, or preemptively, engagement in a conflict or its escalation, may be avoided. Because the aircraft is launched from outside the theater, all support personnel and equipment are also outside the theater of conflict. Because the B-2 utilizes stealth, the need for escort aircraft, which are also theater-based, is eliminated. I have read several estimates about the value of stealth and precision weapons, and one that sticks in my mind is that one B-2 bomber has the combat power of 75 non-Stealth aircraft.

This last statistic illustrates another important factor in our consideration to build nine additional B-2's: the program will provide cost savings in the long run. This may be hard to believe, when we are talking about aircraft that cost \$850 million each to build, but as I have explained—the B-2 requires less support; is more precise, requiring fewer sorties to accomplish the task; and, may reduce the need for further massive troop and aircraft involvement. Air Force analysis shows that, operating independently, free of the requirement for fighter escorts, electronic jamming aircraft, and tankers, a single B-2 with two crew members can accomplish missions currently requiring 75 tactical aircraft and 147 crew members. The B-2's ability to penetrate air defenses, without the usual armada of support aircraft, means that we can, in some mission areas, replace dozens of aircraft with one bomber, potentially saving billions of dollars over the long run.

Mr. President, the American bomber force currently relies most heavily on two aging conventional bomber aircraft—the B-52 and the B-1. In order to maintain mission safety while attacking specific, above ground targets,