

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 84

Whereas suicide, the ninth leading cause of all deaths in the United States and the third such cause for young persons ages 15 through 24, claims over 31,000 lives annually, more than homicide;

Whereas suicide attempts, estimated to exceed 750,000 annually, adversely impact the lives of millions of family members;

Whereas suicide completions annually cause over 200,000 family members to grieve over and mourn a tragic suicide death for the first time, thus creating a population of over 4,000,000 such mourners in the United States;

Whereas the suicide completion rate per 100,000 persons has remained relatively stable over the past 40 years for the general population, and that rate has nearly tripled for young persons;

Whereas that suicide completion rate is highest for adults over 65;

Whereas the stigma associated with mental illness works against suicide prevention by keeping persons at risk of completing suicide from seeking lifesaving help;

Whereas the stigma associated with suicide deaths seriously inhibits surviving family members from regaining meaningful lives;

Whereas suicide deaths impose a huge unrecognized and unmeasured economic burden on the United States in terms of potential years of life lost, medical costs incurred, and work time lost by mourners;

Whereas suicide is a complex, multifaceted biological, sociological, psychological, and societal problem;

Whereas even though many suicides are currently preventable, there is still a need for the development of more effective suicide prevention programs;

Whereas suicide prevention opportunities continue to increase due to advances in clinical research, in mental disorder treatments, and in basic neuroscience, and due to the development of community-based initiatives that await evaluation; and

Whereas suicide prevention efforts should be encouraged to the maximum extent possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognize suicide as a national problem and declares suicide prevention to be a national priority;

(2) acknowledges that no single suicide prevention program or effort will be appropriate for all populations or communities;

(3) encourages initiatives dedicated to—

(A) preventing suicide;

(B) responding to people at risk for suicide and people who have attempted suicide;

(C) promoting safe and effective treatment for persons at risk for suicidal behavior;

(D) supporting people who have lost someone to suicide; and

(E) developing an effective national strategy for the prevention of suicide; and

(4) encourages the development, and the promotion of accessibility and affordability, of mental health services, to enable all persons at risk for suicide to obtain the services, without fear of any stigma.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, Senate Resolution 84 recognizes suicide as a national problem, and it has been submitted by Senators REID, MURRAY, WELLSTONE, and COVERDELL.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 105-6 AND TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 105-7

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following two treaties transmitted to the Senate on May 6, 1997, by the President of the United States: Agreement with Hong Kong on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, with Annex, Treaty Document No. 105-6, and Agreement with Hong Kong for the Transfer of Sentenced Persons, Treaty Document No. 105-7.

I further ask unanimous consent that the treaties be considered as having been read the first time; that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification. I transmit herewith the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Hong Kong on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, with Annex, signed in Hong Kong on April 15, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement"). I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a related exchange of letters, with attached forms, signed the same date, and the report of the Department of State with respect to the Agreement.

The Agreement is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties that the United States is negotiating in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Agreement should be an effective tool in our continued cooperation with Hong Kong after its reversion to the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China on July 1, 1997, to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including members of drug cartels, "white-collar" criminals, and terrorists. The Agreement is self-executing.

The Agreement provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Agreement includes: (1) taking evidence, testimony, or statements of persons; (2) providing information, documents, records, and items; (3) locating or identifying persons or items; (4) serving documents; (5) transferring persons in custody and others to provide assistance; (6) executing requests for search and seizure; (7) confiscating and forfeiting the proceeds and instrumentalities of crime and otherwise assisting in relation thereto; (8) delivering property, including lending exhibits or other items; and (9) and other form of assistance not prohibited by the law of the Requested Party.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreement and give its advice and consent to ratification so that the Agreement can enter into force no later than July 1, 1997, when Hong Kong reverts to the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 1997.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Agreement Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Hong Kong for the Transfer of Sentenced Persons signed at Hong Kong on April 15, 1997. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Agreement.

At present, transfers of sentenced persons between the United States and Hong Kong (in either direction) are conducted pursuant to the 1983 multilateral Council of Europe Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons, which is in force for both the United States and the United Kingdom, and which the latter has extended to Hong Kong. Effective July 1, 1997, however, when Hong Kong reverts to the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China, the Council of Europe Convention will no longer provide a basis for such transfers.

The agreement signed on April 15, 1997, will provide a basis for such transfers to continue after Hong Kong's reversion. The agreement is modeled after both the Council of Europe Convention and other bilateral prisoner transfer treaties to which the United States is a party. It would establish essentially the same procedures as are now followed with respect to transfers of prisoners between the United States and Hong Kong, and would continue the requirement that all transfers be consented to by the sentencing state, the sentenced person, and the receiving state. When the sentenced person has been sentenced under the laws of a State of the United States, the consent to the authorities of that State will also be required.

I recommend that the Senate of the United States promptly give its advice and consent to the ratification of this Agreement.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 1997.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before I go to the closing statement, I want to talk a little bit about where we are on the supplemental appropriations bill.

We began the debate on the supplemental appropriations bill on Monday, yesterday, and we have been on it today. We did have one recorded vote at about 2:30 this afternoon, I believe it was, and I expected that we would continue then to work through the amendments, with some recorded votes being

required throughout the afternoon and even now late in the afternoon.

I understand some of the amendments are efforts to strike language in the bill. Perhaps they have been worked out and we will have some accommodation, perhaps, on the census issue. I understand the amendment of Senator WELLSTONE was worked out in some way or the other, and he is not going to offer his.

Then I received word that the Democrats decided they were not going to offer any more motions to strike, amendments to strike, or any amendments, until something was worked out with regard to the emergency continuing resolution.

Mr. President, I say to the ladies and gentlemen of America, this is supposed to be emergency supplemental appropriations. This is a piece of legislation, appropriations, to provide funds for our troops in Bosnia—and the funds that are involved there have been offset in this bill—and to provide disaster assistance to States all across America that have disaster needs.

What has happened? No. 1, the Democrats say, "We're not going to offer any more amendments until we get our way. We want to change the bill that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee, and unless it is changed to suit our desires, we won't come forward with any more amendments."

Then, we have before the Senate 109 amendments—109 amendments. Now, are we serious about this supplemental emergency appropriations or not? I do not believe there are 109 problems existing in this supplemental appropriations bill. That is certainly not the way to get this legislation moving quickly.

We will have a vote in the morning on cloture, I guess at 10 o'clock, to accommodate a request from the Democratic side. If we get cloture, then there will be 30 hours left on the supplemental. Under the rules of the Senate, you can have up to 1 hour on an amendment. That is only 30 amendments. There are 109 pending. I presume some of those will be wiped off the board if we get cloture.

I want to move the legislation. I am willing to work with the Democrats and with the White House on the issues where they have concerns, as we have on the census issue that has been before us.

But I want to serve notice now—and I am sending word to the Democratic leader—that we are going to have a cloture vote in the morning, but I am not filing another cloture motion tonight. I am not going to try to cut off debate on this supplemental. We need to get this work done. If we do not get the cloture motion passed tomorrow, if we do not invoke cloture and stop what appears to be sort of a slowdown filibuster, then we will just go to other issues or we will stay on this bill as long as it takes.

I have been told that we need to pass it right away because there are thou-

sands of farmers and other people, small businesses in States in the Midwest and in the Dakotas, and my own State of Mississippi, that are going to need this help. It is throughout the country—in the Midwest, in the South, in the Far West. And yet now we are ready to go. It has been reported out of the Appropriations Committee last Thursday—or maybe it was Wednesday—but we only had 1 day go by legislatively before we brought this bill to the floor.

I want to emphasize, Republicans are ready to move this disaster relief bill now. We can complete it tomorrow. We should complete it tomorrow so that we can then go on to the comp time/flextime bill and do a little something to help the working mothers of America before we have Mother's Day. But we are prepared to work on the disagreements.

The way it works is the Senate acts, the committee acts, and then the Senate acts. The House, by the way, has to complete their work before we can pass the supplemental anyway. We go to conference and we continue to work out the disagreements.

The way it does not work is, if you do not get your way you stop, you know, offering amendments and you slow down the process.

So we will have the cloture vote tomorrow, and hopefully we will have an agreement to cut off the filibuster and we can move this bill through. But I want to talk a minute about what the problem is.

The President has indicated that he does not want legislation included in the bill that would prevent or avert another Government shutdown. This is not something that just was discovered last year. We have had problems over the years of getting to the end of the fiscal year and Presidents or Congresses not being satisfied with the state of the situation, and the President would veto a bill or the Congress would not send a bill to the President. We would run out of funds, and you would have these shutdowns.

We had them during the Reagan years. We had them during the Bush years. And now we have had them during the Clinton years. I think this is an irresponsible way to do business. We need to work through the process, but we should not endanger the people with the threat of a manmade disaster, which is what happens at the end of the fiscal year.

It does not have to be in this bill and it does not have to be a specific way, but what we need to do is to make sure that the American people know that we are working together on a budget agreement, we are going to be working together on the appropriations, each one of the 13 that comes through, and that they will know what they can count on.

If you are in education, you want to know what part the Federal Government is going to pay on it; if you want to visit a national monument, you

would like to know that it is going to be open; if you are a private business man or woman, and you do business with some Federal facility, you would like to know that it is going to be open.

So all we want is some process that makes sure when we get to the end of this fiscal year that the numbers we have agreed to will be honored. But in the process we are not going to go through these, what I consider to be very irresponsible games, whether or not the Government is open or shut down.

So I hope that when we have—I am not going to file a cloture motion. I reiterate that. Generally speaking, if I do not have to file a cloture motion, that is well received. What I am saying is, we are ready to go. We need to work on a number of amendments that are still pending—amendments to change the bill, amendments to pay for the cost of the bill, amendments to strike various and sundry sections in the bill.

I think we have a good supplemental here the way it came out of committee. Probably nobody would say it was perfect. But it is time that we work out the disagreements, have debate, have votes, and move to final passage. We can do that tomorrow, or we can do it Friday, or we can do it some other time. But I want to make it clear that we are ready to go and we are ready to have the debate and have the votes, and then we will go on from there.

Mr. President, before I go to the closing script, would the Senator from South Dakota like to make some comments on these eloquent remarks I have been trying to deliver on this occasion?

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the chance to respond to the eloquence of my friend, the majority leader. And indeed his remarks are eloquent, although misinformed. And so I felt the need to come to the floor to clarify for the Record and for his information our position with regard to the bill.

First of all, there is no Democratic position with regard to not offering amendments. I do not know where that information was generated, but I must tell you our hope is to expedite consideration of the bill.

The current amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, is being negotiated, as the majority leader indicated, and he was asked by Members on his side not to press for a vote until this can be negotiated. So in compliance with the request from the Republicans, we have not pursued a vote. But our desire is to offer amendments, to lay this one aside if the need may be, but, regardless, to move the bill along.

If a cloture motion is filed, I will encourage every member of our caucus to support it. And my expectation is they

will. So we want to work with the majority leader in getting this legislation passed.

I share his concern about the large number of amendments. I urge our colleagues to be prudent in offering amendments. I must say, some people did not have the same opportunity as those in the committee to offer extraneous legislation. And that extraneous legislation is the source of some concern to many of us. I am hopeful that negotiations can lead ultimately to a successful elimination of many of these matters prior to the time we reach final passage.

I do not want to shut the Government down either. We have been through some very difficult times in the past Congress with regard to shutting the Government down. If that were the only concern, I do not think we would have a problem.

Our concern is the degree to which deep cuts are made in investments that we have already negotiated. And really it renders null and void the very budget agreement that I have enthusiastically endorsed that has culminated from our discussions last week. To say we are going to agree to certain levels of investments, and then deeply cut those in the very year that they were agreed upon, is not keeping very good faith. That would be the first concern we have with regard to this particular automatic continuing resolution provision.

The second concern was addressed by some of our colleagues on the other side, as reported in *Inside Congress* on April 18. It says Republicans support the automatic continuing resolution because it, would remove President Bill Clinton's upper hand in this year's budget talks and remove his ability to influence current appropriations bills. Those kinds of statements cause us to be very wary, frankly, about what the real motivation is here. We do not want to put the Congress on automatic pilot. We do not want to cut out the role the President ought to have as he negotiates with us what levels of investments we make in many of these areas. I do not know if there are political considerations here or not.

The best way with which to have a debate about this very important piece of legislation is to do it outside an emergency spending bill. I know the majority leader is working in good faith to see if we can find a reasonable compromise. I hope we can work together to make that happen.

As to the bill itself, nothing could be more important than for us to successfully conclude consideration of this legislation early this week and to get it off to the President as quickly as possible. The bill ought to enjoy the support of every Member of this body. The sooner we can get it off to the President, the better. The only way we can get it off to the President, without a veto, is to successfully conclude some negotiation with regard to the continuing resolution and these other very

sticky issues that were not added on the floor but were added in the committee, even though they are extraneous to this particular bill. We would not be in the delay that we are now in were they not added in the first place. Because they were added, we now have to deal with that. They knew they were controversial when they were added, but they were added anyway. Now we have to contend with it. We are doing our best to work with the majority leader to do so successfully.

I thank the majority leader for his statement today and hope he will recognize that there is no delay on our side with regard to the consideration of this bill, and we will work with him as best we can under these circumstances to get it done as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have to say I am very pleased to hear the Democratic leader say they are not delaying and they do not intend to delay. In this body, if you have one Senator who prefers not to vote for a while, he can pretty much make that happen. But if it is the Democratic leadership's intent not to delay, that is good news, and I am glad to hear that.

I presume, then, that based on that we will probably pass cloture tomorrow, and we can move on to dispense with the amendments that are pending in a reasonable time.

I think the Senator probably has the list of amendments that have been filed. As a matter of fact, there are only about 9 or 10 that state any purpose at all. Most of them have no statement of purpose on file.

Mr. DASCHLE. There are 54 Republican amendments out of the 120 amendments filed.

Mr. LOTT. I thought it was 61 Democrats and 48 Republicans.

The point I am making is I have a list here, 10 amendments indicated by 1 on our side, with no statement of purpose, and on the next page, 10 by your side. I think there is a lot of positioning and placeholding, and we understand that is the way it happens around here. I think if we could get cloture passed tomorrow and then work through the amendments that are still legitimately filed and we are concerned about, we can get those done tomorrow and bring this to a conclusion. If not tomorrow, at a reasonable time on Thursday so we can move on to other legislation. Of course, another thing, obviously, we would like to still hold the final passage until the House has acted. We may not actually be able to completely have the final passage until Thursday if the House has not acted by Wednesday, but we could complete everything and then have final passage on Thursday.

Now, with regard to the quote about not wanting the President to have the upper hand, that is right. I do not want him to have the upper hand. What we need to have is for nobody to have the upper hand. We need to have coequal positions: Congress has a certain re-

sponsibility, and the President has a certain responsibility and advantages. We need to find a way to work through that, where neither side can hold the other hostage, neither side. I am hoping we will find a way to do that over the next 24 hours or next 2 days.

With that, Mr. President, I am prepared to go to close.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1997

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 7. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and the Senate then proceed to consideration of S. 672, the supplemental appropriations bill, and that there be 30 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member. I further ask unanimous consent that following the 30 minutes of debate, the Senate then proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 672, with the mandatory live quorum waived.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I only ask my dear friend, the majority leader, whether he has prepared some time this week to take up the legislation he and I have discussed on occasion having to do with legislating on appropriations. That is a matter he and I have agreed to try to resolve at the earliest possible date, by rollcall vote. We would hope legislatively we could address it this week. We would not have this problem if we were not legislating on appropriations. We are doing that.

I know the majority leader shares my view because he said publicly on the floor this was a mistake. We are living with that mistake right now. The sooner we can expedite consideration of that particular legislative initiative, I think it would be very helpful, and it would solve a lot of his problems, reduce his headaches, and get us back to where we should be with regard to the appropriations process.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. LOTT. If I could comment briefly on that. I have said here before, last year, and I actually started working on that a couple of months ago, and as the Senator is probably aware, I met resistance on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Capitol, to a large extent from the appropriators, members of the Appropriations Committee. I do not want to put the blame just on them, but I, personally, think this has been abused over the years and is being abused now. This legislating on appropriations bills is not the way to do business.

However, as long as it is allowed under the rules, unless we can find