

by violent criminals, who we knew were violent, but yet were turned out of prison, and in many cases turned them out of prison or jail early because they earned good time for early release.

Parole, probation, early release for good time means that the young boy I have spoken about on the floor of the Senate, Jonathan Hall, murdered, stabbed over 50 times, by a man who had kidnapped and murdered twice before and was out early on good time, living in young Jonathan Hall's neighborhood, killed that young boy and threw him down a pond. The young boy, when they found him, had dirt and grass between his fingers, because he obviously had not been dead, despite being stabbed 50 times, and tried to climb out of the pond before he died.

Why was he dead? Because someone was let out of jail early to live in that neighborhood and kill young Jonathan.

Bettina Pruckmayr, a young woman who came to Washington, excited about a wonderful future, stabbed many, many times by someone at an ATM machine, someone who had been in jail and let out of jail early, who should never have been let out on the streets. I will come again to talk about that.

It is disgraceful that the average sentence served for committing murder in this country is 7½ years. The average sentence served in jail or prison is 7½ years—that is a broken system.

There is more to the broken system that I want to mention today. That is the trial that is now going on in Denver, CO, about the Oklahoma City bombing case. I will not talk about the merits or what I think about the case, but I want to talk about something that is haywire in the public defender system.

The 6th amendment to the Constitution offers a right to every American to a fair trial. Therefore, an indigent defendant has a right to a public defender. We have an alleged murderer on trial in Denver who drove a truck up in front of a courthouse and killed many, many people. No one will forget the memory of the fireman holding that young child from the day care center in his arms, dead as a result of some murderous coward who decided to kill innocent people with a truck bomb.

Now, what happens when someone who is indigent is arrested and goes on trial for committing a crime of that type? Let me tell you what happens.

The public defender system in this country today offers that defendant, on trial now in Denver, 14 attorneys. Yes, Mr. McVeigh has 14 lawyers working for him, paid for by us, and 6 investigators on top of the 14 lawyers. We are also paying 25 expert witnesses, and we paid for 9 foreign trips by his lawyers and his investigators to Israel, trips to Italy, Great Britain, Syria, Jordan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and all these trips were paid for by the American taxpayer under the public defender system, which offers someone

who allegedly committed murder by a truck bomb at the Oklahoma City courthouse offers him 14 lawyers, 6 investigators, 25 witnesses, and 9 foreign trips to 8 foreign countries. It is estimated to cost \$10 million of taxpayers' money for a defense.

I support the sixth amendment. I support public defenders being offered to indigent people accused of crimes. But, Mr. President, the Administrative Office of the Courts estimates that there is a 68-percent jump in the cost of court-appointed attorneys in Federal capital cases. In 1 year alone, there is a 68-percent jump in the cost. The Administrative Office of the Courts will overrun 1997 appropriations for these expenditures. The appropriation was \$308 million. It will overrun by \$25 million.

Now, I am not a lawyer. I suppose some will say, well, you need to understand this. I do not understand this. The sixth amendment guarantees the right to a fair trial. I believe it guarantees the right for an indigent defendant to be given a defense, and for that defense to be paid for by the American taxpayer. I do not believe any twisted interpretation of that should persuade us, the American taxpayer, to pay for 14 lawyers, 6 investigators, 25 expert witnesses, and trips to foreign countries in a case like the Oklahoma City bombing case.

Now, I don't know what the answer is. But I know this is broken. I am hoping, as I sift through this with some of my colleagues, that we can find a way, yes, to preserve the rights under the sixth amendment to every defendant, but to stop this sort of nonsense. The records, incidentally, in this case are sealed, so we don't know exactly what has been spent. It has been estimated that from \$3 million to \$10 million, in early April, was spent in this circumstance. But when I see this sort of thing happening, I get angry again about a judicial system that seems broken. I am tired of people being let out of jail early to kill again. We have over 3,000 people in prison in this country right now who were in for having committed a murder and, while they were out early, have committed another capital crime. At least 3,000 families ought to feel that someone is an accomplice when they let out a known violent criminal early only to commit murder again.

That system is broken, and one more evidence of a broken system is the lack, somehow, of restraint in a circumstance where we take a public defender requirement under the sixth amendment and decide this is a pot of money that has no bottom, hire as many lawyers as you want, and somebody will say, yes, dig as deep as you like and some will say, yes, because the old taxpayer pays for that. There ought to be a limit, and we ought to start talking about it when we see this kind of twisted logic resulting in this kind of waste. I think it is time for Congress to act.

Do I know the specific answer? No, I don't. But I think we need to define, decide, and discuss limits in this area, so we tell those folks involved in the public defender system that there is a limit. No, there is not a limit on sixth amendment rights, but there is a limit on the use of taxpayer funds to hire 6, 8, 10, 12, or 14 lawyers. It is time that we use a little common sense. I hope when we come around on the appropriations side—and I am on the Appropriations Committee—and look at appropriating again in this account, we can start thinking about how this money ought to be used. Is there a sensible limit? I sure hope to be one of those who helps to find that out in the future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Connecticut.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY KATHARINE HEPBURN

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Ohio, who has quite graciously allowed me to go forward for a few moments to join my colleague from Connecticut in kind of a statement of pride and gratitude, to commemorate and recognize the birthday this Monday of a beloved constituent but really one of the great motion picture actresses of all time, Katharine Hepburn.

As Senator DODD said, we have known Katharine Hepburn in Connecticut not only as one of our own, but as somebody who, quite appropriately, has preserved her privacy. We try our best to do that, and I suppose it is inconsistent to publicly acknowledge that this great lady is approaching her 90th birthday, on May 12. But in this case, we respectfully and humbly break the privacy and want to publicly honor her for the extraordinary career that she has had.

She grew up in a small Connecticut town and has always consider herself—and still does—the "local girl," as she puts it. She is the only four-time winner of the Academy Award for best actress, as I say, for the great roles she has played, 3 of which were won after the age of 60. Katharine Hepburn is, in the words of my colleague—and it is interesting that we both chose the same phrase, working independently—a national treasure.

For nearly 70 years of a brilliant acting career, she has captured the essence of not just what it means to be a great woman and a great person, but the American spirit both on and off the silver screen. In her leading roles and in her life, Katharine Hepburn has stood as a symbol of dignity and of independence, someone who, in the best American/New England traditions, has proudly lived life on her own terms, and with it, great results came.

Katharine Hepburn once said of her home in Connecticut, "I think I'm lucky because people with careers are

attracted to the big city and lose track of where they come from. This"—speaking of our State and her beloved town—"is where I come from. I have roots, a sense of belonging somewhere."

As much as we are honored that Katharine Hepburn has said she belongs in Connecticut, we are very proud to say that we belong to her and she to us. People around the Old Saybrook section of the State will tell you how thrilled they are to have seen her taking those dips into Long Island Sound, not only in the summer but occasionally in winter, and how grateful they are for the way in which, in her quiet way, she has become involved in the kinds of concerns that local communities have, such as buying a ladder truck for the fire department. She reaches an extraordinary age this Monday and can look back on a remarkable career.

Katharine Hepburn's artistic brilliance, her outlook on life, her spirit, have served as a beacon of light and of truth for people in America and, really, throughout the world. I am delighted to join with my colleague, and I am sure everyone else in our State and everyone here in the Senate, in thanking her for what she has meant to us as an artist, in expanding our own sense of reality, our own horizons, our own appreciation of life. She reaches a substantial age on Monday, but the truth is that Katharine Hepburn, through the miracle of the movies, is ageless and immortal, forever beautiful, forever graceful, forever magnificently intelligent, forever brilliant, forever spirited, forever Katharine Hepburn. Happy 90th birthday.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

HAITI

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like at this point to turn to a topic that I began the discussion about this morning. That is the topic of Haiti.

I said this morning, Mr. President, that the situation in Haiti is at another critical point. President Clinton will meet tomorrow with the President of Haiti, President Preval. In that discussion, what will take place, I think, is very, very important.

I talked earlier today about my recent trip to Haiti, which was the fourth trip that I have taken to Haiti in the last 2 years.

I talked about what I considered to be some of the imperatives, some of the things that absolutely have to take place if this fledgling democracy in Haiti is to survive.

They have to have privatization. They have a schedule now for privatization. It is laid out with a timetable. Everyone who I talked to in Haiti, all Government officials, assured me that they would follow this timetable. But, as I expressed to them, no one, frankly, in this country is going to take that seriously until we actually see privatization take place.

So it is important that, as we approach the date of the first privatization in July, it actually takes place. It is important because that democracy cannot survive just on elections. People have to have hope. People will only have hope if there is food to feed their children and if there is hope and opportunity for their future and the future of their children. That will only occur if some of the state-controlled industries that have really strangled the economy in Haiti for so long can be freed up, if they can be privatized, and if the economy can then begin to grow.

Privatization is also important because by privatizing these industries, that will send a sign to the international community that the leadership in Haiti, from President Preval down, is in fact serious about doing the things to create a market-oriented economy that will in fact allow Haiti's economy to begin to grow.

That is No. 1.

No. 2 is Haiti must make progress in regard to these high-profile political murders. Based on my own investigation when I went to Haiti, I believe they have the capability of doing this. I believe that some of these cases can in fact be solved—the case for example, of Reverend Leroy. I believe that case can be solved. But it can only be solved if there is political leadership. It can only be solved if there is leadership from the top, from President Preval down saying it is a priority that we bring these people who committed this act to justice.

I would like to turn now, Mr. President, to a third area; that is, the agricultural situation in Haiti.

Seventy percent of Haiti's people live in rural areas. That is about 4 million out of a total population of 7 million. Eighty percent, it is estimated, of these rural Haitians farm on hillsides. But Haiti's agriculture clearly is troubled, to say the least. Haiti loses about 36 million metric tons of topsoil every year to erosion. That is enough to cover, they tell me, about 15,000 acres. About half a million people in the northwest part of Haiti are facing today a very serious drought.

Mr. President, 30 years or so ago Haiti produced most of its own food. Today it imports two-thirds of its food. Haiti is having trouble feeding itself, and a number of causes have been assigned to that. I will mention just a few.

The environment in Haiti is certainly fragile. Seventy percent is hillside land. Intensive cropping of 60 percent of the land-surface businesses have been decapitalized—less capital. Effective loss of capital has been magnified by the 1991-1994 embargo. Land plots are sometimes too small. There is a lack of land security under the land tenure system, and, as a result of the country's weak infrastructure, farmers are many times isolated from their markets.

The USAID has instituted two programs to address these programs. The

Agriculturally Sustainable Systems for Environmental Transformation, or ASSET, as it is called, is a \$45 million program to improve hillside farming to help poor urban neighborhoods, improve water supply and waste management, and strengthen the Haitian Government's agricultural food security and environmental policy.

Mr. President, the Program for the Recovery of the Economy in Transition, or PRET, is an \$8 million program aimed at strengthening the Haitian private sector's role in national economic and business policymaking, providing innovative sources of credit, and helping key industries export the domestic market potential.

Mr. President, under ASSET's coffee project, USAID has helped over 20,000 coffee farmers produce a premium coffee that is now marketed under the trademark of "Haitian Blue." Since 1990, farmers have exported almost 200,000 pounds of this coffee. USAID has implemented a program of tree planting to reverse the impact of almost 30 million trees being cut each year. USAID plans to expand the ASSET program to assist the Haitian Government in establishing an agricultural data collection system, disseminate technology, and provide environmental management.

There is currently not a single—this is amazing—not a single source of information on agricultural production in Haiti, no central collection of this data, even though agricultural production affects the lives of approximately 70 percent of the people who live in Haiti.

The USAID Agribusiness Loan Guarantee Fund provides incentives for financial institutions to extend credit to midsized agribusinesses. By financing these businesses such lending institutions also help small farmers from whom the middlemen buy their goods. In the first 18 months of its operation, the fund had resulted in 1,300 permanent jobs and 10,000 seasonal jobs.

While our program has shown some success, I think it is important to point out to my colleagues in the Senate that United States assistance in the agricultural area still only reaches approximately 1 out of 7 Haitian farmers. Clearly the goal of our policy is and always must be self-sufficiency for Haiti.

The outlines of the bipartisan United States policy toward Haiti I think are clear. The United States should help Haiti become self-sufficient in food. We should help them build a system of law and order. After all, United States law enforcement is the best in the world and the Haitians can benefit greatly from our expertise. We should help the Haitians attract the kind of private investment that is the cornerstone of long-term economic growth.

I cannot stress enough that our good intentions cannot succeed, will not succeed in and of themselves. No matter how much we want to help Haiti, there is a limit to what we can do.