

As a former teacher myself, I commend her outstanding accomplishment and well-deserved honor.

Continental Cablevision designed the Educator Award program in 1989 to encourage teachers to use Cable in the Classroom, a cable industry initiative which provides schools with free cable connections and access to more than 500 hours of commercial-free educational programming each month. Jane was chosen for this distinguished honor from among educators in all of the communities that Continental Cablevision serves in New Hampshire.

Under the direction of Jane, Exeter elementary students, teachers and their work are showcased in "Booktalk," an ambitious weekly cable TV program. The program encourages students to read and invites families to participate in activities related to their children's reading. It also raises community awareness about the elementary curriculum. Jane and an Australian crocodile puppet explore one curriculum theme each week and feature a reading by teachers, students or guests, ideas for families to further pursue the learning theme, and many creative presentations.

New Hampshire has always been fortunate to have many talented teachers, but Jane McCaffery is certainly a role model among the teachers of the Granite State. I am proud of her commitment to education and congratulate her superb achievement. It is an honor to represent her in the U.S. Senate.●

[At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.]

#### SALEM COUNTY EDUCATION ANNIVERSARIES

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Salem County School District on a number of notable anniversaries. The year 1997 marks the 40th anniversary of the district, the 25th anniversary of the initiation of occupational, technical and vocational programs and services to secondary students and the 15th anniversary of the operation of the New Jersey Regional Day School at Mannington for the Department of Education.

Mr. President, these anniversaries are especially significant because education is the key that will open the door to the future for our children. By the year 2000, 60 percent of all new jobs in America will require advanced technical skills. The industrial age has given way to the information age and, more than ever before, students need a quality education if they are going to be able to compete.

But a quality education doesn't only benefit the individual, it also benefits our Nation. If our firms and factories are to find the educated workers they need, and if these same firms are to remain competitive in the global marketplace, then our students must receive the necessary training and skills. Our economic future depends on it.

Mr. President, 300 years ago this year, the colony of Massachusetts passed the very first American education law. It required that every town of at least 50 people hire a teacher of reading and writing. Those first colonists, huddled in their tiny villages along the Atlantic coast, understood

the importance of education for their children and for their communities. And ever since, making ourselves the best educated Nation on Earth has always been the very essence of our American dream. The work of the Salem County School District, and the Salem County Vocational Technical Schools, is helping to ensure that this particular American dream remains an American reality.

To the students of Salem County, I say don't ever forget that there's always more to be learned, always more to be seen, always more to be explored. And to the Salem County Board of Education, the Salem County School District, and the Salem County Vocational Technical Schools, I say congratulations and continue your fine work.●

#### CONGRESSIONAL PENSION DISCLOSURE ACT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in order to offer my support for the Congressional Pension Disclosure Act of 1997.

This bill will require that detailed information about the pension of every Member of Congress be published twice a year. These facts—how much has been contributed to a pension plan, how much is to be received in retirement, and acquired Federal retirement benefits—should be public information.

Montanans, as well as those in every other State, deserve the right to know how public funds are being spent. The disclosure of pension contributions and benefits will allow Montanans to judge whether or not the amounts are fair and just. Taxpayers will be able to make fully informed decisions about the kind of job we representatives are doing in abiding the will of the people and keeping Government spending under control.

The Congressional Pension Disclosure Act will make facts readily available to anyone who wants them. Perception that Congress operates in secrecy would be eliminated and the people of Montana would know that their representatives have nothing to hide. Simply said, by disclosing the size of our pensions, we in Congress will make a step in the right direction toward restoring faith in government by the American people.

I commend Senator ABRAHAM for drafting this meaningful legislation, and I am proud to have signed on as a cosponsor of S. 269.●

#### SANCTIONS AGAINST BURMA

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. I commend the President for his decision to invoke investment sanctions on Burma, in accordance with section 570 of Public Law 104-208. The President deserves praise for his action. Conditions in Burma remain grim and warrant this limited measure.

Perhaps no one is more deserving of praise than the Senator from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL. He and I have stood together in support of the people of Burma for many years now and I congratulate him for his steadfast efforts to assist in achieving a democratic transition in Burma.

Burma is a democracy denied. It is a country with a democratic past. With our help it can have a democratic fu-

ture. We find ourselves at a point in history where numerous nations are struggling to build democratic governments. It is not always an easy process. Those who are involved in such transitions watch for America's response to situations such as we find in Burma, where a military junta prevents the implementation of a democratic election. Let us be clear. This is not only about human rights and trade. This is about our commitment to democracy.

There are those who argue that constructive engagement is the only way to effect change in a country. Constructive engagement is a euphemism for doing business with thugs. Foreign investment in Burma provides hard currency for the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC]. Most U.S. companies refuse to support such a regime through foreign investment. Amoco, Levi Strauss, Liz Claiborne, Macy's, Eddie Bauer, Columbia Sportswear, Oshkosh B'Gosh, Pepsi, Apple Computer, and many other companies already have cut business ties with Burma. I commend the President for his action which supports the decisions of these responsible companies.

Finally, I would note that this is not an end to our efforts in Burma, but a beginning. Strong bilateral pressure needs to be supplemented with multilateral action. I call on other nations which share our concern for the people of Burma to join us. Most importantly, the SLORC should know that we will remain vigilant and continue to defend the rights of Burmese democracy leaders.●

#### SLOVAKIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to call to my colleagues' attention human rights developments in Slovakia. These developments point Slovakia in the opposite direction from the road their neighbors have been traveling. Their neighbors accept western values and seek integration into western institutions, developments leading to individual freedom, political democracy, and economic prosperity in a free market system. In stark contrast, Slovakia is not in compliance with some important Helsinki process commitments and is showing signs of regression toward authoritarianism, if not totalitarian relations between the state and its citizens.

This country, which showed so much promise upon gaining independence in 1993, has failed to press ahead with vitally needed democratic reforms, in contrast with so many other countries in the region, including other newly independent countries. While the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland have worked hard to qualify for EU membership and NATO accession, Slovakia has lagged behind. While states like Lithuania and Slovenia have emerged from repressive empires to bring prosperity and hope to their peoples, Slovakia has not. Even Romania, which has struggled profoundly with the transition from totalitarianism, has managed to undertake significant reforms in the past few months.

From the outset, members of the Helsinki Commission have supported the

democratic transformation in Slovakia. We believe that a strong, democratic Slovakia will enhance stability and security in Europe.

Unfortunately, human rights and democratization in Slovakia have taken a severe beating—both literally and figuratively—in recent months. The hopes raised by free and fair elections and by the passage of a democratic constitution have been dashed.

Last month, I understand some officials in Bratislava criticized a congressional report on NATO enlargement and complained that the discussion of Slovakia's progress toward democracy was too superficial. Well, I will provide a little more detail for those who genuinely want to know what worries us here in Washington.

Parliamentary democracy in Slovakia took a bullet in late November, when parliamentarian Frantisek Gaulieder, after announcing his resignation from the ruling coalition's Movement for a Democratic Slovakia, was stripped of his parliamentary mandate through antidemocratic means that are unheard of anywhere else in Europe. His removal has been protested by the European Union and the United States at OSCE meetings in Vienna, but, so far, to no avail.

Even more outrageously, there was a bomb attack against Mr. Gaulieder's home, while he and his family were present. This is a tactic that reminds me of the Communists, fascists, and other similarly bloody and ruthless groups.

The 1995 kidnaping of President Kovac's son is not only still unsolved, but the manner in which this matter has been investigated has fueled speculation that the government's own security forces were directly involved in this crime. The murder last year of Robert Remias, who may have had key evidence in this case, and the ineffectual investigation of that case has deepened these suspicions.

Adding to this disturbing pattern, questions are already being raised about the official investigation of the December bomb attack on Frantisek Gaulieder's home: Mr. Gaulieder has reported that some of his testimony regarding the attack is missing from his police file, that the first investigator was removed after only 3 days on the case, and that the Slovak Minister of Interior has, shockingly, suggested that Mr. Gaulieder may have planted the bomb himself—the same “he-did-it-himself” story that no one believes regarding the kidnaping of Mr. Kovac, Jr.

I am now informed that this investigation, like the Kovac and Remias cases, has been “closed for lack of evidence.” For a country supposedly seriously committed through its OSCE obligations to the establishment of a “rule of law” state, this is a damagingly poor performance.

In addition to these acts of violence, it has been reported that the President, the President's son, and members of the Constitutional Court have been subjected to death threats. In fact, in early December the Association of Slovak Judges characterized the anonymous, threatening letters addressed to Milan Cic, the Chair of the Slovak Constitutional Court, as an attack against the court as a whole and a means of political intimidation.

It has also been reported that on February 24 an opposition political figure in Banska Bystrica, Miroslav Toman, was attacked by four assailants.

We see a country where politically motivated violence is on the increase, where public confidence in the government's intent to provide security for all Slovaks has plummeted, and where acts of violence and threats of violence have brought into question both the rule of law and the very foundations of democracy.

The ruling coalition has continued to pursue an openly hostile agenda toward a free and independent media and free speech in general. During the course of the past year, two newspapers—*Slovenska Republika* and *Naroda Obroda*—have seen a total of 21 editors quit over alleged political interference with their work. Defamation suits launched by public officials appear to be a common vehicle for harassing one's political opponents.

Most recently, on November 19, the government barred four journalists from attending a regular press conference after the weekly cabinet meeting because the journalists were believed to be unsympathetic to the government. Although this decision was ultimately rescinded after a public outcry—including a protest from the journalists' union—it was further evidence of the government's relentless efforts to curb any reporting it doesn't like.

In fact, in one of the more shocking episodes of the battle for free speech in Slovakia, it has been reported that Vladimir Meciar—the Prime Minister of the country and, not insignificantly, a former boxer—warned journalist Dusan Valko just a few weeks ago that “I will punch you so that your own mother will not recognize you.” So much for Mr. Meciar's tolerance for other points of view and nonviolence.

The Slovak Government continues to pursue a minorities policy that would be laughable if it were not so wrong and harmful. This policy has included everything from banning the playing of non-Slovak national anthems last year to the more recent decision to bar the issuance of report cards in the Hungarian language, reversing long-standing practices. Such petty gestures are beneath the dignity of the Slovak people, whose heritage has survived more than a thousand years of foreign—and often markedly repressive—rule. The Slovak language and culture, now protected in an independent Slovakia, are not so weak that they can only flourish at the expense of others.

More seriously, it should be noted that past repressive crackdowns on minorities—for example, in Cluj, Romania, and in Kosovo, Serbia—began by whittling away at the minority language opportunities that had traditionally been respected by the majority community. Accordingly, these seemingly small restrictions on the Hungarian minority in Slovakia may very well be the harbinger of more repressive tactics ahead.

With this in mind, the failure of the Slovak parliament to adopt a comprehensive minority language law, and the recommendation of the Ministry of Culture that such a law is not even necessary, defy common sense. Current laws on minority-language use in Slovakia do not provide adequate or satisfactory guidance regarding the use of

Hungarian for official purposes, as the recent report-card flap shows. Much harm can be done until a minority language law is passed based on a genuine accommodation between the majority and minority communities.

Finally, recent reductions in government-provided cultural subsidies have had a disproportionately negative effect on the Hungarian community. The Slovak Government's defense, that all ethnic groups have been equally disadvantaged by these cut-backs, is unpersuasive in light of the Culture Minister Hudec's stated intent to “revive” Slovak culture in ethnically mixed areas and to make cultural subsidies reflect that goal.

While Hungarians suffer from a more direct form of government intolerance, other ethnic groups suffer more indirectly. Put another way, it is not so much government action which threatens Romani communities in Slovakia, it is government inaction.

According to the most recent State Department report on Slovakia, skinhead violence against Roma is a serious and growing problem; three Roma were murdered as a result of hate crimes last year, and others have been severely injured. Some Roma leaders, in response to their government's inability or unwillingness to protect them, have called for the formation of self-defense units. Obviously, the Slovak Government is just not doing enough to address the deadly threats they face.

Moreover, the repugnant anti-Roma statements that have repeatedly been made by Jan Slota, a member of the ruling coalition, have fostered this climate of hatred. The fact that the Czech Republic, Germany, and other European countries also confront skinhead movements in no way relieves Slovakia of its responsibility to combat racism, just as Slovakia's skinhead problem does not relieve the other countries of their responsibilities.

It is time and past time for Prime Minister Meciar to use his moral authority and political leadership to set Slovakia on the right course. He must make clear, once and for all, that Jan Slota—who also called the Hungarian minority “barbarian Asiatic hordes”—is not his spokesman, and that the Slovak National Party's unreconstructed fascists do not represent the majority of the people of Slovakia.

Mr. President, the leadership of the Helsinki Commission, including my co-chairman, Representative CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, and ranking members Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG and Representative STENY HOYER, have raised our concern about developments in Slovakia with Slovak officials on a number of occasions. Unfortunately, all we hear from the Slovak leadership is one excuse after another, and all we see is a search for one scapegoat after another: it's the Hungarians, it's the Czechs, it's the Ukrainian mafia, it's the hostile international community seeking to destroy Slovakia's good name, it's a public relations problem abroad, not real problems back home—in short, there is always somebody else to blame besides the people that are, in fact, running the country.

I don't mean to suggest that there have been no positive developments in Slovakia over the past 4 years. In fact, I have been especially heartened by the

emergence of a genuine civil society that is increasingly willing to express its views on a broad range of issues. But positive initiatives by the Government have been too few and too far between.

I make this statement today in the hope that the leadership in Bratislava will start to make real reforms, like their colleagues in Romania, and begin to restore the promising future that the people of Slovakia deserve. Their present policies are leading down a path toward international isolation, increasing criticism, and economic deprivation for their people. One Belarus is enough.●

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1997

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 23. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and the Senate immediately begin consideration of the Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty as under the previous order.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow at 10 a.m. the Senate will begin consideration of the Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty. Under the order, there will be 10 hours of debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member, or their designees, and 1 hour under the control of Senator LEAHY.

Also, in accordance with the agreement, a limited number of amendments are in order to the resolution of ratification.

Therefore, Senators can anticipate rollcall votes late tomorrow afternoon and throughout Thursday's session of the Senate.

#### AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL REPRESENTATION

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 77, submitted earlier today by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 77) to authorize representation by the Senate legal counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as my colleagues are aware, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 created procedures for judicial review of employment discrimination claims throughout the Congress to govern cases arising after the requirements of the law took effect on January 23, 1996. The Senate's antecedent process for review of discrimination claims in Senate employment, which was created by the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991, continues to govern older cases. The case of William L. Singer versus Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, now pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal circuit, is a case initiated under the 1991 act.

The petitioner in this case, a former officer in the Capitol Police Department, seeks review of a ruling of the Select Committee on Ethics, which affirmed a decision of a hearing board appointed by the Director of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices. The hearing board decision rejected the officer's claim that his termination from the Capitol Police violated the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the Government Employee Rights Act.

Under the Government Employee Rights Act, a final decision of the Ethics Committee is entered in the records of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, which is then named as the respondent if the decision is challenged in the Federal circuit. As petitions for review in the Federal circuit challenges final decisions of a Senate adjudicatory process, under the Government Employee Rights Act the Senate legal counsel may be directed to defend those decisions through representation of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices in court.

Accordingly, this resolution directs the Senate legal counsel to represent the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, in the case of Singer versus Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, in defense of the Ethics Committee's final decision.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the resolution appear in the RECORD.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

#### S. RES. 77

Whereas, in the case of *William L. Singer v. Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices*, No. 97-6000, pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, petitioner William L. Singer has sought review of a final decision of the Select Committee on Ethics which had been entered, pursuant to section 308 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991, 2 U.S.C. §1208 (1994), in the records of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1) (1994), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend committees of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, pursuant to section 303(f) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991, 2 U.S.C. §1203(f) (1994), for purposes of representation by the Senate Legal Counsel, the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, the respondent in this proceeding, is deemed a committee within the meaning of sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a), 288c(a)(1) (1994): Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to represent the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices in the case of *William L. Singer v. Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices*.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:53 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 23, 1997, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 18, 1997, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 1997:

##### CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

GEORGE JOHN TENET, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, VICE JOHN M. DEUTCH, RESIGNED.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1997:

##### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ELIZABETH ANNE MOLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE CHARLES B. CURTIS, RESIGNED.

#### WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on April 18, 1997, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

##### CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

I WITHDRAW THE NOMINATION OF ANTHONY LAKE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, VICE JOHN M. DEUTCH, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 9, 1997.