

young Americans for their extraordinary achievements.

It is an unfortunate reality today that America's young people face more difficult challenges than ever before. The lure of gangs, drugs, alcohol, and sex increases the potential for irresponsible behavior and violence at ever earlier ages. On a daily basis, young people are exposed to a confusing array of messages and sometimes dubious role models. And even the best-intentioned working parents find it hard to spend the kind of quality time with their children that would help them sort through these pervasive influences. All too often, the media focuses on negative stories about America's young people.

Yet, there are many examples of exceptional young Americans who have risen above these challenges to accomplish extraordinary things for their community and for their country. Samantha Smith, who lived in Manchester, ME, is a prime example. In 1982, at the age of 10, Samantha wrote a letter to Chairman Yuri Andropov of the Soviet Union urging peace at the height of the cold war. As a result, she was invited by the Soviet leader to visit his country the following year. Samantha's trip received worldwide attention, and the schoolgirl became widely recognized as a spokesperson for peace and international understanding. Tragically, Samantha's life was cut short in 1985 in a fatal plane crash when she was only 13.

Other young Americans have demonstrated the same kind of initiative and vision which Samantha embodied. The youth of our country need to be aware of these positive role models from among their own age group. I am, therefore, introducing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution today calling upon the U.S. Postal Service to issue a series of stamps recognizing young Americans, starting with Samantha Smith, for the extraordinary contributions they have made.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FAMILY FRIENDLY WORKPLACE ACT

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 4, the Family Friendly Workplace Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure. By amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, this act would provide employees with flexible work schedules, and increase their choices and options for their time at work and quality time with their families. Ensuring that such opportunities are provided to our workers, better known as mothers and fathers, can only serve to strengthening our American families.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 63 percent of mother and father households now see both parents working outside of the home. Moreover, 76 percent of mothers with

school-age children now work. That is why we must take action now to help employees balance the demands of work and family lives. I believe the Family Friendly Workplace Act is an important first step in helping our Nation's working parents do just that.

In 1993, the President signed the Family and Medical Leave Act into law. While well intended, the Federal Government took a 13-page law and transformed it into 300 pages of regulations. It then became a true administrative nightmare. Instead of targeting employees with choices and options for their work schedules, the President decided instead to target employers with a mandated mound of paperwork. To make matters worse, the President announced during the 1996 campaign his intention to expand the Family and Medical Leave Act by forcing employers to provide school activity and community leave for their employees. Such misguided mandates resurrect the words of Abraham Lincoln who said, "You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer." As lawmakers, we have the ability to prevent this Nation from traveling further down the road of federally mandated workplace conditions. By passing the Family Friendly Workplace Act, we will avoid the creation of an environment littered with friction and litigation and embrace mutual cooperation and respect.

Wage payers are not heartless and cruel reincarnations of Ebenezer Scrooge. Having played the wage payer role for over 26 years, I take great offense when employers are characterized as being the bad guys. The majority of employers cherish their most valuable assets—their employees. It is truly misleading and deceptive for anyone to say otherwise. For without the employee, management will ultimately have no staff, no profits—and no business. Watching out for employees is just good business.

As an alternative to employer mandates, this legislation would provide compensatory time off that would allow employers to offer and employees to choose to use compensatory time for school and family activities and a whole range of other personal reasons—without getting the Government involved in certifying and documenting these events. The President's expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act would require employees to get certification for taking time off to attend a child's soccer match, piano recital, or even a meeting with a school teacher. Under this bill, employees have the right to choose compensatory time instead of cash wages at a rate not less than 1½ hours of each hour of overtime worked. Employees would be able to accrue up to 240 hours annually and have the opportunity to cash-out their accrued hours at least once a year. That's a lot of time we should be spending with our children—an investment in our future.

Federal employees have enjoyed flexible work schedules, chock full of

choices and options, since 1978. Legislation that amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is long overdue. We appear to have no confidence in private sector employees' ability to make rational decisions on how to spend their time.

I have been blessed with a wife and three wonderful children. Like many who place value in time shared with family, I believe that such moments are a priceless commodity that can never be replaced—or regained—once lost. At a time when our society clings to every fiber of family life, I can see no better way for Congress and the President to express our support for the American family than by passing and then urging the President to sign into law, S. 4, the Family Friendly Workplace Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in giving employees the opportunity to balance their work and family obligations.

I yield the floor. •

THE FLOOD OF 1996

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, while people in Washington and around the country celebrated the Presidential inauguration this past weekend, people in New York State observed the 1-year anniversary of an event of a very different kind—one of the worst natural disasters we have ever faced. In New York, especially upstate New York, January 19, 1996, will forever be known as the day the waters came.

A combination of severe thunderstorms and melting snow led to one of the worst floods in our State's history. Forty-one of the State's 62 counties were declared disaster areas. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, damages were greater than \$100 million. My home county, Delaware, was the hardest hit; bridges were washed away, homes were ruined, roads were destroyed, fields were inundated, and entire villages were left under water. Six of the eleven fatalities caused by the flood were in Delaware County.

Over the past year, the people of New York have tried to rebuild their homes and their lives. Our towns, villages, and counties have tried to rebuild their roads and municipal facilities. FEMA and the State Emergency Management Office, or SEMO, have been there to help, but it has not been easy. The flood of January 19 was not the only one of the year. It came just 2 weeks after the great blizzard of 1996. Then in October, the New York City area was hit by a severe flood, and only a month later, large parts of upstate New York were flooded again. Although not as severe as the January floods, heavy rains again caused damages in several areas of the State, especially Clinton and Essex Counties in the northeast corner, and once again, Delaware County was hit.

Ask any local official in upstate New York what they will remember most

about 1996 and invariably he or she will say the floods. We have spent the last year trying to recover and rebuild, and I thank FEMA Director James Lee Witt and Regional Director Lynn Canton and SEMO Director Ed Jacoby for all their help. We have made a lot of progress but, as Delaware County Board of Supervisor's Chairman Ray Christensen will often tell you, "We have to realize things will never be the same."•

DEFENDING AMERICA ACT OF 1997

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join the distinguished majority leader, and my colleagues, in cosponsoring Senate bill S. 7, the Defending America Act of 1997. This legislation builds on the significant, but still insufficient, progress we accomplished in the 104th Congress. During the last session of Congress, we were able to secure the funding necessary for the eventual deployment of a missile defense system capable of protecting the United States. But we were not able to explicitly direct that we deploy the missile defense system as soon as possible. This leaves us with no assurance that the funding we have secured will be used, efficiently and expeditiously, for its intended purpose.

Therefore, Mr. President, the majority leader, in close cooperation with Congress' national defense leadership, has crafted a proposal that would secure our Nation's missile defense through prudent development of policies and force structures. To begin with, we would produce the system necessary to protect the United States from limited, unauthorized, or accidental ballistic missile attacks. We then would augment that capability to defend our Nation against larger and more sophisticated ballistic missile threats. I am especially heartened that the most promising antiballistic missile technologies, including sea-based systems such as Navy Upper Tier, are fast approaching the point at which we will be able to make them operational.

We need this technology, in my view, because the post-cold-war world remains a dangerous place. Ballistic missile proliferation to rogue regimes continues apace. The security of nuclear armed ballistic missiles in the former Soviet Union has declined sharply. Given these facts, old strategies and treaties can no longer meet our national security needs. We must develop and deploy a ballistic missile defense system capable of protecting our cities and citizens from disastrous attack.

I mentioned old treaties, Mr. President. I would like in particular to discuss the Anti-Ballistic-Missile Treaty and its relationship to missile defense. Congress has repeatedly stated that the ABM Treaty does not, in any way, hinder the development of theater ballistic missile defenses. It has also called for a renegotiation of the ABM Treaty so as to allow the development of more robust national missile defense systems.

Mr. President, the times have changed since the ratification of the ABM Treaty. Our primary threats no longer come from a general nuclear attack by thousands of Soviet weapons—an attack that would probably overwhelm a ballistic missile defense system. Today our immediate threats come from rogue, unintentional, or unauthorized attacks of limited size and duration. I believe we are quickly approaching the point of our last, best hope in properly modifying the ABM Treaty, and protecting America from ballistic missile attack.

The majority leader has displayed the foresight and perceptiveness critical for developing effective national security strategies. There can be no doubt that a fully operational and technologically capable ballistic missile defense system is crucial to that strategy. Nor can there be any doubt that antiquated treaties which fail to adapt to vastly different national security threats must be either changed or discarded.

The majority leader's bill constitutes a reasonable and moderate attempt to bridge the philosophical gap that exists between Congress and the administration. We should not let this opportunity be lost. •

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and commemorate, with very deep patriotic pride, the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Pacific Command.

On January 1, 1947, the U.S. Pacific Command was established to unify with the Alaskan and Far East commands.

As the largest of nine unified commands within the Department of Defense today, the U.S. Pacific Command interacts daily with foreign military and civilian leaders, serving as a key link for the United States in the most dynamic region of the world—a region that contains 44 countries, two-thirds of the world's population, and 7 of the world's largest armed forces.

During the past 50 years, the Asia-Pacific theater has grown from a war-torn region recovering from the devastation of World War II to the most dynamic economic region in the world. The importance of the United States' interest in the Asia-Pacific theater is best illustrated by the pivotal role of East Asia's economies in the world's economic order. The Asia-Pacific gross national product surpassed the European Union in 1990, and today, our trans-Pacific trade now exceeds \$503 billion per year.

Fostering peace, providing security, and meeting the challenges within an area totaling more than half of the Earth's surface, the U.S. Pacific Command is represented by more than 300,000 trained and highly dedicated soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Mr. President, after World War II, our Nation's military leaders recog-

nized the importance of unity of forces worldwide. On December 14, 1946, President Truman approved the first unified command plan, and on January 1, 1947, the U.S. Pacific Command was established.

During the past 50 years, the U.S. Pacific Command's responsibilities have expanded to include the west coast of the United States, the eastern shores of Africa, all points in Asia, and the Arctic to the Antarctic.

Mr. President, during the past 50 years, U.S. Pacific Command Forces have been engaged in three major conflicts and numerous military actions. During the Korean conflict, Vietnam conflict, and the Gulf war, the United States Pacific Command Forces have fought bravely.

The United States Pacific Command provided forces to support the United States, Far East and U.N. Commands during the Korean conflict. These support forces were primarily in the form of naval assets which conducted patrolling missions and aided amphibious operations by providing naval gunfire, sealift and airstrikes from carrier task forces. The naval airstrikes were an integral part of the overall air campaign.

The United States Pacific Command oversaw our involvement through all phases of the Vietnam conflict—from the build-up and military actions to the withdrawal of United States combat forces. However, Mr. President, as many will sadly agree, memories of the Vietnam conflict were not over for the United States Pacific Command. The command became deeply involved in the emotional repatriation of American prisoners of war during Operation Homecoming. Additionally, the United States Pacific Command assisted with the movement of Vietnamese nationals to the United States and the airlift of Vietnamese children during Operation New Life and Operation Babylift, respectively.

During Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the United States Pacific Command Forces provided vital ground, sea, and air assets in support of U.S. Central Command Operations conducted in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, and off-shore in the Arabian Sea.

The United States Pacific Command deployed forces to Haiti during Operation Uphold Democracy and continues to deploy forces in support of the United States' interests in the European and Middle Eastern theaters.

Today Mr. President, the U.S. Pacific Command's mission is to foster peace, deter aggression, and rapidly respond to crisis. If necessary, they will fight to maintain security and stability throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

In order to maintain security in the vast Asia-Pacific region, the U.S. Pacific Command has the U.S. Army Pacific, the Pacific Fleet, the Pacific Air Forces, and the Marine Forces Pacific as its service components. Additionally, its sub-unified command includes United States Forces Korea, United