

As my colleague pointed out, we are not satisfied with number 5. Grabowski's always want to do better, and we are looking for the six pack, or No. 6, next year. I want to thank the Chair for this opportunity to commend the team and all the players. It is a team sport by definition. It doesn't happen just because we have superstars. They are all stars and they are all great. We are so proud of them, and our country has every reason to be proud of America's basketball team.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in closing, there are 102 counties in Illinois, and of the 12 or 13 million people in the State, most are Bulls fans. There is one exception. Hamilton County, in southern Illinois, had a banner on its courthouse which said "go Jazz go." Why would this one county in the entire State be rooting for the Utah Jazz? Because Jerry Sloan, the coach of the Jazz, came from McLeansboro, IL. He played for the Bulls, and we think he learned a lot in that process.

I join my colleague in saluting the Jazz. What a fine team. They really put up great competition. There were those in Chicago who said, "We are going to win this easily." Many of us had second thoughts. We knew the Jazz was a talented, dedicated team, and they played very well. I salute Karl Malone and John Stockton, as well as Coach Sloan, and our colleagues, Senators HATCH and BENNETT, the best fans the Utah Jazz ever had. "Wait until next year," they will say, and that is what we say to. Wait until next year for a six pack from the Chicago Bulls.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:11 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate, reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 392

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on enforcement of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 with respect to the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] proposes an amendment numbered 392.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENFORCEMENT OF THE IRAN-IRAQ ARMS NON-PROLIFERATION ACT OF 1992 WITH RESPECT TO THE ACQUISITION BY IRAN OF C-802 CRUISE MISSILES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States escort vessel U.S.S. STARK was struck by a cruise missile, causing the death of 37 United States sailors.

(2) The China National Precision Machinery Import Export Corporation is marketing the C-802 model cruise missile for use against escort vessels such as the U.S.S. STARK.

(3) The China National Precision Machinery Import Export Corporation has delivered 60 C-802 cruise missiles to Iran for use by vessels of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Navy.

(4) Iran is acquiring land batteries to launch C-802 cruise missiles which will provide its armed forces with a weapon of greater range, reliability, accuracy, and mobility than before.

(5) Iran has acquired air launched C-802 cruise missiles giving it a 360-degree attack capability.

(6) 5,000 members of the United States Armed Forces are stationed within range of the C-802 cruise missiles being acquired by Iran.

(7) The Department of State believes that "[t]hese cruise missiles pose new, direct threats to deployed United States forces".

(8) The delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(9) The Clinton Administration "has concluded at present that the known types [of C-802 cruise missiles] are not of a destabilizing number and type".

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate to urge the Clinton Administration to enforce the provisions of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 with respect to the acquisition by Iran of C-802 model cruise missiles.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I spoke on this amendment this morning when the bill was under consideration. So I will not repeat most of my arguments at this point. It is stimulated by a report this morning from the Secretary of Defense, which indicates that the Chinese Precision Machinery Import-Export Corp. has exported multiple versions of the C-802 missiles to Iran. I have notified the Senate in the past that this company has exported to Iran this particular missile for use first on ships, then for land-based operations, and today with Secretary Cohen's announcement we find that the missile will be made available to the Iranians—indeed, is available to the Iranians for use from the air. It can be fired either from an attacker or a helicopter.

This is a reproduction from the Chinese promotional material that was used to sell this missile.

One of the officers quoted in the briefing that the Secretary of Defense gave this morning said, with the addition of the air capability, the 15,000 American service men and women in the gulf now face a 360-degree threat from land, from sea, and from air.

To demonstrate the power of the missile involved here, I remind the Senate

that an Exocet missile 10 years ago struck the U.S.S. STARK and killed 37 American sailors. This missile is a more modern, more powerful, and more deadly version.

Mr. President, I have been pressing the administration on this issue since the first of this year, having asked questions of Secretary Albright and submitting letters to Secretary Albright. All I have received is a comment from the State Department that they will "monitor" the situation.

Mr. President, that is simply not good enough. There are 15,000 American service men and women within the range of these missiles in the Persian Gulf, and we need to stop this trade and stop it now. There is an ability to do this under what is called the Gore-McCain Act, which gives the President the opportunity to put sanctions on companies that violate the law and says you will not export this kind of weaponry to Iran.

My amendment urges the administration to enforce the Gore-McCain Act and is nothing more complicated than that.

With that, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, has the Senator from Utah concluded his explanation of his amendment?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have, but I will remain for questions, if there are any. It is my understanding that the Senator from Alabama has a request for 5 minutes of morning business, for which I yield the floor so that he can make that request. But if the Senator from Maryland wishes to ask questions about my amendment, I will be happy to remain on the floor and respond.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, actually I was going to seek a unanimous-consent request in order to continue the work on the bill and offer another amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have no objection to that request. It is my understanding that the Senator from Alabama has a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama be recognized for 5 minutes to speak as if in morning business, and that when the Senator from Alabama completes his 5 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that the current amendment be set aside and that I be recognized to offer an amendment to the bill at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized to speak as if in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senators from Utah and Maryland for their hospitality.

S. 891 "THE FAMILY IMPACT STATEMENT ACT OF 1997"

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, last Thursday, June 12, I along with Senators DEWINE, FAIRCLOTH, HUTCHINSON, COATS, COVERDELL, and ASHCROFT cosponsored S. 891, Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM's Family Impact Statement Act of 1997. I rise today in strong support of this important piece of legislation and to voice my complete disagreement with the recent anti-family action taken by President Clinton.

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan, realizing the importance of the America family and the need to be constantly aware of the negative impact that Federal laws and regulations can have on the family, signed Executive Order 12606. The purpose of this order was to ensure that the rights of the family are considered in the construction and carrying out of policies by executive departments and agencies.

Mr. President, even though we are faced with the staggering increase in out-of-wedlock births, rising rates of divorce, and increases in the number of child abuse cases, apparently President Clinton does not believe that considering the impact of Government regulations on families is good policy.

Much to my dismay, on April 21, 1997, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13045, thus stripping the American family any existing protection from harm in the formulation and application of Federal policies.

President Reagan's Executive order placed special emphasis on the relationship between the family and the Federal Government. President Reagan directed every Federal agency to assess all regulatory and statutory provisions "that may have significant potential negative impact on the family well-being." Before implementing any Federal policy, agency directors had to make certain that the programs they managed and the regulations they issued met certain family-friendly criteria. Specifically, they had to ask:

Does this action strengthen or erode the authority and rights of parents in educating, nurturing, and supervising their children?

Does it strengthen or erode the stability of the family, particularly the marital commitment?

Does it help the family perform its function, or does it substitute Government activity for that function?

Does it increase or decrease family earnings, and do the proposed benefits justify the impact on the family budget?

Can the activity be carried out by a lower level of government or by the family itself?

What message, intended or otherwise, does this program send concerning the status of the family?

What message does it send to young people concerning the relationship between their behavior, their personal responsibility, and the norms of our society?

The elimination of President Reagan's Executive order is just the latest in a series of decisions that indicates the Clinton administration's very different approach to family issues. From the outset of President Clinton's first term, it became clear that his administration intended to pursue policies sharply at odds with traditional American moral principles. White House actions have ranged from the incorporation of homosexuals into the military to the protection of partial birth abortion procedures.

Mr. President, many have suggested it is community villages, in other words Government, that raise children. But the real truth is, families raise children. Families are the ones who are there night and day to love, to care for, and to nurture children.

Many bureaucratic regulations produce little benefit, but can have unintended consequences. The examples are too numerous to mention. What our legislation will do is require the regulators to stop and take a moment to think through their regulations to make sure that, the most fundamental institution in civilization—the family, is not damaged by their actions. This is a reasonable and wise policy.

Mr. President, I find it very odd that of all the Executive Orders that exist, President Clinton would reach down and lift this one up for elimination. This body should speak out forcefully on this subject and I am confident we will. The families of America deserve no less.

S. 819, The Family Impact Statement Act of 1997, is a sound and reasonable piece of legislation which will restore a valuable pro-family policy that has been established for ten years.

I urge all my colleagues to stand united, Republicans and Democrats, to show that the preservation of the family is not a partisan issue. Our voices united will send a loud and clear message to the President and to this nation that we consider family protection to be one of America's most important issues and that we will not accept decisions which mark a retreat from our steadfast commitment to our Nation's families.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that American families must be considered when the Federal Government develops and implements policies and regulations that affect families. Therefore, I am honored to be an original cosponsor S. 891 the Family Impact Statement Act of 1997 which will reinstate the pro-family executive order of President Reagan.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Senators ABRAHAM, DEWINE, FAIRCLOTH, HUTCHINSON, COATS, COVERDELL, and ASHCROFT for their dedicated work and help on this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 393

(Purpose: To strike section 2101(g), limiting funding for U.S. memberships in international organizations and requiring withdrawal from organizations which exceed that limitation)

Mr. SARBANES. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] proposes an amendment numbered 393.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 160, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 7 on page 162.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this amendment, referring to pages 160 to 162 of the bill, takes out subsection (g), which is a subsection that puts forward the possibility that the United States might withdraw from the United Nations. I am very frank to tell you that I don't think the prospect of that eventuality ought to be raised in this legislation.

This legislation, in effect, says that if the amount of funds made available for U.S. membership exceed a certain figure, then withdrawal is required. Of course, we determine the amount of funds that are made available. In any event, even if the figure is exceeded, I don't think a withdrawal sanction ought to be incorporated in this legislation. If you stop and think about it, that is quite a sweeping proposition.

Let me quote from paragraph (2) of that subsection:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall withdraw from an international organization. . . .

It then goes on to set out the procedures for doing so, and the deadline for doing so. Let me read for a second.

Unless otherwise provided for in the instrument concerned, a withdrawal under this subsection shall be completed within one year in which the withdrawal is required.

Then it requires the President to submit a report on the withdrawal.

I hope that the managers of the bill, upon reflection, will agree with me that we ought not to be including in the legislation any provisions that carry with them the implication of withdrawal from the United Nations.

The United Nations is too important an organization, and our participation in it is too critical a matter to include in this legislation a provision of this sort. The provision on which I am focusing runs from pages 160 to 162, providing for the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

My amendment is focused on a limited part of this bill. I have a lot of differences with other parts of this bill, as Members well know. I supported the effort earlier in the day to take out the