

Department to simply not issue any regulatory provisions that touch upon these objectionable issues. As I understand it, the ninety-five percent of the remaining regulations that deal with other issues are acceptable to the Indian tribes. The Department should publish those as final and withhold from publication of the eight provisions that are objectionable. I would inquire of the Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs as to the nature of the eight objectionable provisions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The tribal representatives have provided the Committee with a list of eight issues. They have asked the Department to agree to not publish any regulatory provision which: limits the reallocation authority of a Self-Governance Tribe/consortium by requiring that reallocation of funds may only be between programs in annual funding agreements; limits the local decision-making of a Self-Governance Tribe/consortium by requiring that funds in an annual funding agreement shall only be spent on specific programs listed in such funding agreement; prohibits Tribal Base funding from including other recurring funding within Tribal Priority Allocations; requires renegotiation or rejection of a previously executed Self-Governance Compact or Funding Agreement or a provision therein; prohibits a Self-Governance Tribe/consortium from investing funds received under Self-Governance Compacts in a manner consistent with the "prudent investor" standard; requires any Self-Governance Tribe/consortium to adopt "conflict of interest" standards which differ from those previously adopted by its governing body; applies project-specific construction requirements to a tribal assumption of project design and other construction management services or of road construction activities involving more than one project; or fails to provide that "Inherent Federal functions" for purposes of the published regulations shall mean those Federal functions that cannot be legally transferred to a Self-Governance Tribe/consortium.

Mr. MCCAIN. I want to inquire of the chairman on one of these eight impasse issues. Is it your understanding that the Department would have the regulatory authority, in one of the objectionable regulatory provisions, to delete unilaterally certain provisions in the various Compacts of Self-Governance that the Department has signed with various tribal governments and that have existed as long as nine years? I thought we expressly indicated in 1994 when we gave permanent authority to the Tribal Self-Governance Demonstration program that these Compacts and Annual Funding Agreements are to be bilateral agreements reached on a government-to-government basis that cannot be unilaterally amended by the Department?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Senator is correct. In 1994, the Congress received a series of complaints from Indian tribes that the Department was attempting to unilaterally amend agreements it

had previously reached with Indian tribes who were assuming functions previously carried out by Federal officials. The Congress had to remind the Department in 1994 that it must treat the agreements it reached with Indian tribes as bilateral accords that cannot be amended except by mutual consent. Now, the Department is insisting on a regulation that would permit it to unilaterally revise agreements it had previously reached on a bilateral basis with individual Indian tribes. The American Indian and Alaska Native organizations find these and the remaining seven regulatory provisions objectionable, and I agree with them.

Mr. MCCAIN. I hope the Department will withdraw its proposals to regulate in each of these eight areas. The negotiated rulemaking process works best when it is based upon consensus, and in these eight instances the Department has failed to make its case for regulations.

Mr. INOUE. I thank my colleagues. I share their concerns. I am hopeful that in bringing affected parties together we can resolve these differences.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the Senator and will work with him on this issue in the days and weeks ahead.

FLEXIBLE TRADE POLICY TOWARD CUBA

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise to discuss American relations with Cuba. Recently, I had the opportunity to travel to Havana with Senators BAUCUS and ROBERTS. We spent ten hours with Fidel Castro, in what has been characterized by the press as a marathon meeting. But more importantly, we had meetings with dissidents and Catholic Church representatives.

It was my first time in Cuba, and I went there with no pre-conceived notions although I did have the opportunity to be thoroughly briefed prior to our departure.

I returned from Cuba convinced that lifting the trade embargo and restrictions on travel, especially for educational exchanges, are extremely important steps in an effort to foster economic and political liberalization in Cuba. They are important steps but not for the reasons which are generally assumed.

As one Cuban told us, ending the American economic embargo on Cuba will not produce economic change. The Castro government has no interest in economic reform—even along the lines of that now seen in China or Vietnam. As the Minister of Economics and Planning explained, there is no program for privatization in the economy, insisting that capitalism does not work but "pure socialism" does. The government allows some private investments, mainly in farming, but the intent of the State is still to control the economy. Indeed, President Castro told us that he believed Cuba could not survive if it was a member of the International Monetary Fund and called the IMF the "world's most subversive organization."

While this was denied by the Foreign Minister, I came away convinced that the government does not want the American embargo on Cuba lifted because the lack of economic ties allows the government to blame the United States for its own economic failures. If the embargo was lifted, Cuba's leaders might find another excuse for their failed policies but it might make it harder for them to find widely acceptable excuses.

The Cuban people have voted already for change. Many have fled to the United States. One Cuban told us that social and economic differences are increasing. The population has declined over the last decade in part because people sadly see no future for their children. The average Cuban salary is said to be \$11 per month. The Castro regime was described to us by those we spoke to in Havana as a dying dictatorship: aging, inefficient and corrupt.

In this environment we should not exaggerate America's influence. Castro will do everything to limit it. But we can start to build a basis for a future relationship with the Cuban people after Castro. The Congress can demonstrate our good will by a partial lifting of the trade embargo. We can demonstrate our good faith by allowing freer movement of Americans to Cuba and to do what we can to encourage Cubans, especially school children, to visit the United States on exchanges. The Congress should promote cultural ties and try to direct assistance to the Cuban people.

None of this will be easy. Nothing Castro said indicated to me that he was willing to permit, for example, Cuban school children to attend American elementary and secondary schools or colleges in significant numbers. Nothing Castro said indicated to me that he was willing to allow American aid, including medical supplies, to be given directly to the Cuban people.

But even if the hand of friendship is rejected, I believe we should still offer it. The future of Cuba is not Castro. President Castro said one clear truth: Cuba still suffers from an inherited history of four centuries of colonialism. Unfortunately, he does not understand that his form of paternal dictatorship perpetuates the same horrors he claims to abhor.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who

were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

Clyde E. Frazier, 40, Chicago, IL; Ernest Jones, 57, Knoxville, TN; Jose Lopez, 29, Houston, TX; Elva V. Manjarrez, 35, Chicago, IL; Kimberly Meeks-Penniman, 39, Detroit, MI; Anthony L. Moore, 28, Memphis, TN; Donald Pinkney, 23, Baltimore, MD; James Riley, 26, New Orleans, LA; Void Sampson, 24, Philadelphia, PA; Michael A. Williams, 35, New Orleans, LA; and Unidentified male, 22, Newark, NJ.

One of the gun violence victims I mentioned, thirty-five-year-old Elva Manjarrez of Chicago, was shot and killed in a drive-by shooting while she was sitting in a parked car. No motive was ever established for her death.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of Elva and the others I named are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, July 24, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,668,098,197,951.86 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-eight billion, ninety-eight million, one hundred ninety-seven thousand, nine hundred fifty-one dollars and eighty-six cents).

Five years ago, July 24, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,938,385,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred thirty-eight billion, three hundred eighty-five million).

Ten years ago, July 24, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,161,847,000,000 (Three trillion, one hundred sixty-one billion, eight hundred forty-seven million).

Fifteen years ago, July 24, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,796,347,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred ninety-six billion, three hundred forty-seven million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 24, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$535,417,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-five billion, four hundred seventeen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,132,681,197,951.86 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-two billion, six hundred eighty-one million, one hundred ninety-seven thousand, nine hundred fifty-one dollars and eighty-six cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO INTERNS

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I extend my appreciation to my summer 2000 class of interns: Anna Gullickson, Kayla John, Sara Low, Charles Wishman, Tom Mann, Alyssa Rotschafer, MayRose Wegmann, Eric Bridges, Monica Parekh, Michelle Levar, Joe Plambeck, Ben Rogers, Robert Barron, Morgan Whitlatch, Veronica Hernandez, Cary Cascino,

Daniel Myers, Linda Rosenbury, Ryan Howell, Jay Smith, SreyRam Kuy, and Jim Dunn. Each of them has been of tremendous assistance to me and to the people of Iowa over the past several months, and their efforts have not gone unnoticed.

Since I was first elected into the Senate in 1984, my office has offered internships to young Iowans and other interested students. Through their work in the Senate, our interns have not only seen the legislative process, but also personally contributed to our nation's democracy.

It is with much appreciation that I recognize Anna, Kayla, Sara, Charles, Tom, Alyssa, MayRose, Eric, Monica, Michelle, Joe, Ben, Robert, Morgan, Veronica, Cary, Daniel, Linda, Ryan, Jay, SreyRam, and Jim for their hard work this summer. It has been a delight to watch them take on their assignments with enthusiasm and hard work. I am very proud to have worked with each of them. I hope they take from their summer a sense of pride in what they've been able to accomplish and an increased interest in public service and our democratic system and process.●

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. DANIEL C. WALL

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mr. Daniel C. Wall, who will leave his elected position as Commander of The Sons of The American Legion, Detachment of Michigan, in August. For the last year, Mr. Wall has led the Michigan Detachment of the S.A.L. with wisdom and with grace, and has used his time in this position to aid the Veterans of the United States Armed Forces in an exemplary fashion.

Mr. Wall has served in the Sons of The American Legion for many years, and holds a Life Membership card from Robert A. Demars Sons of The American Legion Squadron 67 of Lincoln Park, Michigan. During his time as a member, he has held many offices within the S.A.L., including all offices at the Squadron level; District Commander, Adjutant, and others; State Commander, Adjutant, and Zone 1 Commander.

Mr. Wall was elected to serve as the State of Michigan Commander in 1999. During his time in the position, Mr. Wall focused much of his attention upon the education of his fellow members, so that they might know more about the purpose, programs, awards, officer duties and the benefits of their organization. He believed that this would not only help to recruit new members, but would also give current members a better appreciation for the many beneficial things that the S.A.L. does on a daily basis.

As Commander, Mr. Wall has also presided over the many efforts of the S.A.L. in the State of Michigan, including assisting local posts in their activities, initiating programs for Veterans,

volunteering at V.A. homes and hospitals, and fundraising. In 1999, the S.A.L. raised over \$514,000 for V.A. homes and hospitals, and over \$181,000 for the American Legion Child Welfare Foundation. In addition, Mr. Wall has served as a member of national S.A.L. committees.

I applaud Mr. Daniel C. Wall on the job he has done as State of Michigan Commander of the Sons of the American Legion. He has dedicated much of his life to improving the lives of the Veterans of our great Nation, and for this he is to be commended. On behalf of the entire United States Senate, I thank Mr. Wall for his dedication, and wish him continued success in the future.●

A TRIBUTE TO "TALK OF VERMONT'S" JEFF KAUFMAN

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I would like to mark the end of an era in Vermont. Jeff Kaufman, host of Vermont's award-winning program, "The Talk of Vermont," will hang up his headphones at the end of this week. After 5 years on the air in Middlebury, Jeff and his family are leaving the Green Mountain State for the arguably less green pastures of Southern California.

A fixture on Vermont morning radio and a catalyst for thoughtful and provocative discussion of the key issues facing our state and nation, Jeff has not only brought wit and wisdom to the airwaves, but he has consistently managed to recruit big-name guests—Lily Tomlin, Ted Williams, Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist—to our small-market corner of the world, while never neglecting lesser-known local voices. Above all else, Jeff does his homework—he is equally adept at understanding the intricacies of missile defense as he is the physics of baseball.

While living in Middlebury, Jeff did not just entertain his listeners on the radio, but he became a valued member of the community, whether it was raising money for flood victims or serving as a member of the Citizens of Middlebury.

I am certain that I speak for my colleagues in the Vermont Congressional delegation—each of us has had the pleasure of Jeff's unique brand of inquisition—when I say that he will be a tough act to follow. He has provided an extraordinary service to Vermonters who have benefitted from his professionalism, his insights and his curiosity. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Jeff for a job well done and to wish him and his family well in every future endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a profile of Jeff from The Burlington Free Press, dated July 23, 2000.

The material follows: