to issue a semipostal stamp for breast cancer would place the Postal Service and Congress in the very difficult position of determining which worthy organizations should receive Federal assistance in fundraising and which should not

The concept of semipostals has been around for years. Some nations issue them, however most do not. The European experience with this kind of stamp has shown that they are rarely as beneficial to the designated organization as would be expected. Consider the example set by our neighbor Canada. In 1975, the Canadian Postal Corporation issued a series of semipostal stamps to provide supplementary revenue for the Canadian Olympic Committee. It was reported that while the program received exceptionally good promotional and advertising support, it fell short of its intended revenue objective. Demand for the semipostals throughout Canada was reportedly insubstantial. The program—viewed as a failure—concluded in 1976. More recently, the Canada Post issued a semipostal to support literacy. With a surcharge of 5-cents per stamp, it raised only \$252,000. After raising only a modest amount of money, combined with a tremendous administrative expense, Canada Post says they will not issue another semipostal.

There is a strong U.S. tradition of private fundraising for charities. Such a stamp would effectively use the United States Postal Service as a fundraiser, a role it has never before taken on. The Postal Service's job-and expertise—is mail delivery. Congress should be mindful that the postage stamp pays strictly for postal operations. It is not a fee for anything but delivering the mail and the cost of running the service. In fact, section 3622 of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 precludes charging rates in excess of those required to offset the Postal Service's costs of providing a particular service. In other words, the Postal Service does not have the authority to put a surcharge on a postage rate that is cost and overhead driven. There is simply no legitimate connection between the desire to raise money for a cause, and maintenance of the Postal Service's mission of providing universal service at a universal rate.

The goals of H.R. 1585 are laudatory. But, Mr. President, as I previously indicated during Senate consideration of the Feinstein semipostal amendment, the Postal Service should not be doing fundraising.

## ON AND UNDER THE DELAWARE RIVER CLEANUP

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, throughout this week, hundreds of volunteers will gather together for the annual "On and Under the Delaware River Cleanup" on the upper Delaware River. People from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania will work together to clean up the Delaware River,

picking up trash and removing debris from the shores, surface, and bottom of a 70-mile section of the river. Once again, Ruth Jones and the folks at Kittatinny Canoes will lead this effort and supply the boats, cleaning materials, trash removal, and other services needed for the effort. National Park Service employees and a member of my staff will also participate.

The Delaware River is the longest free-flowing river in the country. It starts in my home county, Delaware County, NY, at the confluence of the east and west branches of the river in Deposit, NY and continues down through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, ultimately feeding into the Atlantic Ocean. The west branch starts in Stamford, NY, just 25 miles from my home in Pindars Corners.

This river is one of New York's and the Nation's great treasures. I applaud Ms. Jones for sponsoring this event and thank all the volunteers for their hard work in helping to keep the river clean.●

# EXCHANGE OF NAVAL ATTACHÉS WITH VIETNAM

• Mr. WARNER. Mr President, I rise today to recognize an historic event in our relations with our erstwhile cold war enemy, Vietnam. On May 7, 1997, that country and our own great Nation exchanged defense attachés. Senior Col. Vo Dinh Quang of the Vietnam Army was accredited as the defense, military, naval, and air attaché to the United States. He is the first defense attaché from Vietnam since 1975, when the South Vietnam attaché positions dissolved by default with the collapse of South Vietnam.

The Corps of Foreign Attachés is a distinguished group of foreign senior officers who are accredited to the Department of Defense and the Department of State to officially and personally represent their defense secretaries in the United States with regard to military matters. Eighty-one countries around the world, allied and nonallied, are represented by over 100 navy, army, and air force officers living in the Washington, DC, area. Historically, this prestigious assignment has produced many flag and general officers who have subsequently become the equivalent of our service chiefs or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A primary responsibility of the foreign defense attaché, as recognized by the Vienna Convention, is to collect information and learn about the services of the United States. To assist in this effort, the U.S. service chiefs sponsor an aggressive information program which includes orientation tours to commands and related industrial facilities; service chief counterpart and other delegation visits; intelligence and operations briefings; and document dissemination. In turn, the attaché provides Department of Defense decisionmakers with perspectives on developments within the attaché's country and armed services.

This is the office in which Senior Colonel Quang finds himself today. Born in 1932, Colonel Quang served in the North Vietnamese and Vietnamese Armies for a total of 27 years before being assigned to the Department of Foreign Relations within the Vietnamese Ministry of Defense. While serving in that capacity, Colonel Quang was a staff member of the Vietnamese Office for Seeking Missing Personnel. His responsibility was to interface with the United States concerning our country's servicemen who were still missing in action.

Once a sworn enemy of the United States, Colonel Quang became a man who searched for the remains of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Now he serves here in Washington, representing his country as Vietnam's first postwar defense attaché.

In commemorating this historic event, I pray that this new relationship with Vietnam continues to prosper.

#### MIKULSKI AMENDMENT ON AMERICORPS LITERACY FUNDING

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend my colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, for her leadership yesterday in seeking \$20 million for President Clinton's America Reads initiative. This amendment supports 1,300 AmeriCorps members who will serve as literacy tutors to help children learn to read—and read well—by the end of the third grade.

Reading is a fundamental skill for learning, but too many children have trouble learning how to read. If students don't learn to read in the early elementary school years, it is virtually impossible for them to keep up later. According to a recent study, 40 percent of fourth grade students don't attain the basic level of reading, and 70 percent don't attain the proficient level.

Research shows that reading skills are developed not only in the home and in the classroom, but also in communities and libraries. Sustained, reading opportunities outside the regular school day and during the summer can raise reading levels when combined with other instruction. Only 30 minutes a day of reading aloud with an adult can enable a young child to make real gains in reading. Adults also serve as role models for young children.

I commend Senator MIKULSKI for her effective leadership in the extremely important area of community service and childhood literacy. Every child can learn to read well, and every child deserves that chance. No child should be left out or left behind.●

### EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON H.R. 2158

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, yesterday I voted against H.R. 2158, the bill providing fiscal year 1998 appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and various independent agencies. Funding

provided by that measure totaled nearly \$9 billion more than the comparable amount provided last year—about a 10-percent increase.

It would be one thing if the increase were devoted to improved services for our Nation's veterans. After all, they put their lives on the line in defense of our country and all of the rights and liberties we enjoy. We owe them a debt of gratitude—and the obligation to fulfill the promises our Nation made to them when they were called to serve.

Yet the spending increase in this bill is not targeted to veterans. The VA sees only a 0.5 percent increase in its budget. Medical care is increased only 1 percent. But presumably, these increases were sufficient to fulfill our obligations to veterans, exceeding President Clinton's request by nearly \$93 million. I support them, and I stand ready to do more if that is necessary.

Mr. President, compare the virtual spending freeze that our Nation's veteran population is able to bear with what happens to HUD's budget. Last year, HUD received a total of \$16.3 billion. H.R. 2158 proposes to take that figure to \$25.4 billion—a \$9 billion increase. An increase of nearly 56 percent. That is a huge increase, even by Washington standards.

Now I know that part of the reason for the added funding is the need to renew expiring section 8 housing contracts. But I believe we have a responsibility to try to offset the extra spending with reductions in lower priority HUD programs, rather than just add to the total. I see little evidence of at-

tempting to prioritize HUD and other programs in this bill.

It seems to me that the opportunity to find offsets was certainly there. The AmeriCorps Program, for example, was funded at \$405 million. Remember, this is a program that pays volunteers to work. In most parts of the country, paying someone to work constitutes employment. Volunteers provide their time and energy out of their own good will. But here we have a government program—a Clinton administration priority—that actually pays volunteers to work

AmeriCorps committed last year to try to reduce its cost per participant to \$17,000 this year and to \$15,000 in 1999. Yet that is how much a lot of people around the country earn from their jobs. This is an unnecessary expenditure of taxpayer funds, and we would do well to eliminate it. Yet I know that President Clinton would probably veto the bill—veterans funding and all—just to preserve it. So there seems to be little incentive to do the right thing and trim expenditures.

The Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] Program is another case in point. The bill provides \$1.4 billion for the program, with funding earmarked for a variety of projects, including library expansion in West Virginia, the Paramount Theater in Vermont, the Bushnell Theater in Connecticut, and economic development in downtown Ogden, Utah, to name just a few. If we had to set priorities, just like any family back home, we would probably conclude that section 8 renewals might be a little more important than some of these CDBG grants.

But when the sky is the limit, we do not have to prioritize. We simply add more spending on top of everything else. And that is how we get a deficit problem.

Mr. President, we need a new way of conducting business. We need to get back to a politics of principle, and of being honest with the American people about whether we are serious about seeking more responsible use of hardearned tax dollars and reducing the deficit. This bill represents the old way of doing things, and exemplifies the politics of pork.

I voted against the budget agreement last month, in large part because it allowed too much new spending. And the HUD and independent agencies portion of this bill is evidence of what we can expect as the agreement is fully implemented. That is why next year's budget deficit is projected to rise—and not fall—as a result of the agreement.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we do not have an opportunity to consider the various components of this bill on their own merits—veterans, HUD, EPA, NASA, AmeriCorps, and the like. I would have supported the veterans budget, the NASA budget, and environmental spending in the bill. But as a package, with the very large increase in HUD spending and a lack of sufficient offsets for it, I concluded that it was necessary to register concern about the process and our country's future, and to vote "no" on the bill.

## LLOYD D. GEORGE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

• Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise today in support of a bill I introduced on Monday to designate the new Federal courthouse in Las Vegas as the "Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse." As the Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, Lloyd George is considered to be one of the most distinguished jurists of the federal judiciary. There is no greater honor we could bestow on the new courthouse in Las Vegas than to name it after a man who has served our Nation with such distinction.

Those who have the privilege of knowing Judge George, as I do, consider him to be a man of great integrity whose career has been marked by a constant commitment to justice. As an attorney. Judge George enjoyed a successful career practicing primarily in the area of commercial law. Prior to his appointment as a United States District Judge in May 1984, Judge George served on the United States Bankruptcy Bench for 10 years. Judge George is a graduate of Las Vegas High and Brigham Young University. He

served as the student body president at both schools. He received his law degree from the University of California, Boalt Hall. Judge George was a pilot in the U.S. Air Force, attaining the rank of Captain.

Throughout Judge George's professional life he has assumed many leadership responsibilities requiring countless hours of service work all in the pursuit of improving and preserving the best aspects of our judicial system. He has served on three-and been the chairman of two-United States Judicial Conference Committee. Currently, he serves as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States. At the request of Chief Justice Rehnquist he serves as a member of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference and the International Judicial Relations Committee. He is also a member of the Judicial Council for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and has chaired the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the Ninth Circuit. Additionally, he serves on the Advisory Board of the Central and East European Law Initiative. American Bar Association's Standing Committee of World Order Under Law, and is an Advisory Committee Member of the American Judicature Society. He frequently lectures in the U.S. and abroad on various legal topics and has published a number of articles in legal periodicals. His dedication to improving and promoting our judicial system is unparalleled.

All of us are fortunate to live in a country where men like Judge Lloyd George serve as the arbiter's of our laws. He is truly a man of the highest integrity whose legal career has been guided by a keen, almost innate, sense of justice. On a personal note, I consider myself most fortunate to call Lloyd George my friend.

I believe there is no better way to honor Judge George than to name this new courthouse the Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse. The proposed courthouse is an architectural wonder that will provide a state of the art judicial forum for generations of Nevadans. Judge George was instrumental in bringing this about. We honor his service to the judiciary and his commitment to the principle of equal justice under law by naming the new courthouse after him.

## APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there was an error in the printing of the change to the Appropriations Committee allocation, which was submitted for the RECORD of July 21, 1997. The correct figure for the budget authority allocation pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act follows:

Budget Authority
Current Appropriations
Committee allocation ....
Adjustment .....
Revised Appropriations
Committee allocation ....

 $\substack{\$792,510,000,000\\8,766,000,000}$ 

801,276,000,000