

SENATE RESOLUTION 173

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 173, A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the protection of reproductive health services clinics.

SENATE RESOLUTION 174—
RELATIVE TO THAILAND

Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 174

Whereas, the United States maintains a close bilateral partnership with Thailand and has a profound interest in furthering that relationship;

Whereas, the friendship between our two countries goes back farther than that with any other Asian nation dating back to the Treaty of Amity and Commerce and Navigation of 1833;

Whereas, the bilateral trade relationship is robust and promises to grow even more so in time;

Whereas, the U.S. security relationship with Thailand is one of our most critical, and it is in both countries' interest to maintain and strengthen that relationship;

Whereas, the new government in Thailand has committed itself to making significant structural reforms to its economy in line with the conditions placed upon it by the International Monetary Fund, including improving financial and economic transparency and cutting its budget;

Whereas, the conditions imposed on Thailand by the IMF were developed in August of 1997 when the economic environment in Asia was vastly different from that existing today;

Whereas, an example of those changed circumstances is the fact that both Korea and Indonesia provided second line of defense contingency loans to Thailand in August, 1997, amounting to US\$500 million each;

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) The United States should be prepared to take appropriate steps to help ensure that Thailand's economic recovery efforts will continue uninterrupted and to enhance the close political, economic and security relations between Thailand and the United States; and

(2) Thailand deserves praise and commendation from the United States for the measures it has implemented to resolve its financial problems.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. LUGAR, to submit a Resolution to state the sense of the Senate that Thailand remains one of America's most important partners and closest friends, and that Bangkok has been making important strides in executing its responsibilities under its arrangements with the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. President, America's friendship with Thailand is our longest-standing in Asia. Our first Envoy to Thailand

negotiated a Treaty of Amity and Commerce with that country in 1833.

Thailand was the first country afflicted with the so-called Asian contagion, and the first to receive IMF assistance. However, at the time the IMF put the package together for Thailand in August, 1997, Asia's regional economy looked far different than it does today. Let me give one compelling example of how things have changed: Last year, both Korea and Indonesia were economically secure enough to pledge so-called "second line of defense" contingency loans to Thailand.

The point is, Mr. President, many of the assumptions that the IMF used in formulating the conditions for Thailand's package are no longer applicable.

Despite the changes, however, the new Government of Thailand has been making important progress in fulfilling its IMF obligations. Already Thailand has taken steps to improve financial and economic transparency and cut its budget.

I recently visited Thailand and was very impressed by the new leadership in Bangkok, by the steps they have taken thus far and by their resolve in fulfilling their IMF obligations.

Mr. President, I believe I am safe in saying that all of us in this chamber—and Americans all across this land—are great admirers of Thailand and Thai culture. I remain optimistic about Thailand's future. Given the Thai people's energy and initiative, the country's remarkable history, and its record of economic success, I hope and expect to see Thailand's return to prosperity in the not-too-distant future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 175—TO DESIGNATE "NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES WEEK"

Mr. ROBB submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 175

Whereas the operation of correctional facilities represents a crucial component of our criminal justice system;

Whereas correctional personnel play a vital role in protecting the rights of the public to be safeguarded from criminal activity;

Whereas correctional personnel are responsible for the care, custody and dignity of the human beings charged to their care; and

Whereas correctional personnel work under demanding circumstances and face danger in their daily work lives; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates the week of May 3, 1998 as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week." The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a Senate resolution to designate the week of May 2, 1998 as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week."

Mr. President, this resolution gives needed recognition to the vital role

that correctional personnel play in our communities.

Correctional officers and employees put their lives on the line every day to protect the public from dangerous criminals. These brave men and women also protect incarcerated individuals from the violence of their circumstance, and they help prisoners work toward returning to lawful society.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to recognize the work and contributions of our nation's correctional officers and employees.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Tuesday, February 10, 1998, 10:00 a.m., in SD-430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is Tobacco Settlement IV. For further information, please call the committee, 202/224-5375.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Wednesday, February 11, 1998, 9:30 a.m., in SD-430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR). For further information, please call the committee, 202/224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Thursday, February 12, 1998, 10:00 a.m., in SD-430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is Education of the Deaf Act. For further information, please call the committee, 202/224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a hearing entitled "IRS Reform: What America's Taxpayers Need Now." The hearing will be held on February 12, 1998, beginning at 9:30 a.m. ET in three locations: room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; St. Louis, Missouri; and Salt Lake City, Utah. Description of hearing: Senate Committee on Small Business meets cyberspace; holds first virtual committee hearing on the Internet on proposals to reform the IRS and improve taxpayer rights. For further information, please contact Mark Warren at 224-5175.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an

oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will take place Wednesday, February 24, 1998 at 9:45 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the use of specialty forest products from the national forests. Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Judy Brown or Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MILITARY ACCIDENT IN AVIANO, ITALY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep sympathy to the families of those killed in Italy by a low flying plane. Like all Americans, I was shocked, saddened, and angered that an American plane caused this tragedy.

We do not have all the details at this time and are having to rely on media reports, but I want to be very clear. This tragedy never should have happened. This was a disgraceful act, military training should not be done in civilian areas.

I wish that I could say that this was an isolated incident. Unfortunately, I cannot. Accidents during training missions occur with disturbing frequency.

Last September, the Secretary of Defense was forced to suspend all training flights after a rash of six crashes within one week.

Also in September, a F-117 crashed in Maryland, injuring 4 civilians and burning a portion of a home.

In 1996, a U-2 spy plane crashed in the parking lot of the Mercury-Register newspaper, killing one and injury two others.

In October, a military jet crashed in Pennsylvania. The pilot managed to eject safely, but the plane exploded near a busy interstate highway.

It may be impossible to make training missions 100% safe for the pilots, but we have an obligation to make sure they are safe for civilians.

In the tragedy in Aviano, Italy, the pilot was flying an approved flight path though not at an approved altitude. This flight path led the plane, at a very low altitude, directly over a functioning ski lift. While I have trouble believing news reports that pilots entertain themselves by flying under the ski lift cables, that plane never should have been in the proximity of the ski lift. The potential for tragedy was simply too great. Unfortunately, it took the deaths of 20 people to prove it.

Clearly, responsibility for this tragedy lies not only with the pilot, but also with the commanders who authorized these dangerous flights. There is a certain degree of risk involved in all training missions. That risk should not

fall upon innocent civilians. How many more incidents such as the one in Aviano have to occur before it becomes clear that the potential for tragedy in these missions is too great?

I would like to see the following actions taken:

1. A change in the guidelines over where planes can fly training missions.

2. An immediate report to the American people of the facts of the accident at Aviano. It has been almost a week and we still have no information from the military.

3. If the investigation shows that the pilot was at fault, the pilot should be subject to Italian law.●

"BEWILDERING BUDGET-SPEAK" ON SOCIAL SECURITY

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, millions of Americans, myself included, listened intently to what President Clinton had to say about Social Security in his State of the Union address. What we heard—or what we thought we heard—was a plan by the President to reserve any budget surplus that might emerge in the next few years to shore up Social Security for future generations.

It was a plan that drew widespread praise from the public. But now it turns out that what we heard is not, according to White House spokesmen, what the President really meant. The Washington Post put it this way in a February 4 report: "the ringing simplicity of Clinton's call to 'save Social Security first' gave way to a fog of bewildering budget-speak from the administration's top economic advisers."

Here is what OMB spokesman Larry Haas had to say: "People who think it [President Clinton's proposal] shores up Social Security were not listening closely." Testifying before the Senate Budget Committee, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin admitted that the Clinton budget does not include any mechanism that would transfer surpluses to the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. President, why the intricate game of words? Is Social Security first or not? Let us take a look.

Next year—the year covered by President Clinton's proposed budget—Social Security itself will run an estimated surplus of about \$93 billion. Remember, the system is currently generating surpluses that are intended to build up until about the year 2016, when we will have to begin using them to pay retirement benefits to 75 million baby boomers.

But the Clinton budget does not set aside this \$93 billion Social Security surplus. The Clinton budget spends every penny of it on general operating expenses of the federal government.

The practice of using the Social Security nest egg to mask overall government deficits dates back to President Lyndon Johnson. Colleagues from both sides of the aisle have condemned it for years. It is only because President Clinton employs this sleight of hand—counting the Social Security surplus in the unified federal budget—that he is able to show an overall surplus of \$9 billion for next year. If Social Secu-

rity's \$93 billion surplus and the surpluses held in other federal trust funds were removed from the calculations, the Clinton budget would actually show a deficit of \$95.7 billion.

Even the relatively small surplus that is created by commingling all of the funds—that is, after mixing Social Security with the rest of the federal budget—is shrunk considerably from what it would have been if the President reserved the entire amount for Social Security, as he said he would. That is because he devotes the bulk of the resulting surplus to a host of new spending initiatives.

Here are just some of the new programs that President Clinton is proposing:

a new clean water initiative for about \$37 million;

two new farm programs for \$14 million;

\$170 million for new mandatory empowerment zones and enterprise communities;

a new program called the Community Empowerment Fund, which will cost about \$400 million;

a new \$10 million Indian land consolidation pilot program;

\$47 million on a new community adjustment program to help areas adversely affected by trade agreements;

at least eight new education programs totaling over \$1.8 billion;

a new Medicare buy-in program costing \$1.5 billion over five years;

\$4.5 billion for five new child-care related programs;

a new smoking cessation program for \$87 million; and

two new law-enforcement initiatives for \$200 million.

The cost of these new programs is estimated to be about \$120 billion to \$130 billion over the next five years, and that does not even count the myriad increases he proposes for other existing federal programs. In other words, some \$120 billion to \$130 billion of anticipated unified budget surpluses are not reserved for Social Security at all, but are used to create brand new programs.

Granted, many of these proposals are appealing, and some address real needs in our communities. Granted, some of the spending for these new programs is designed to come from the proposed tobacco settlement. But if President Clinton is sincere in his desire to reserve 100 percent of the surplus for Social Security, how is it that there is so much money for so many new programs? Why is the tobacco money not used to boost the size of the surplus that could be devoted to Social Security?

Given the programs I just mentioned a few moments ago, it is obvious that Social Security is not really first on President Clinton's list of anticipated uses of any unified budget surplus. It is not second or even third. It does not make the top 10 list. It is number 26 on