

## AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to offer an amendment during the Senate's consideration of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and that provisions of my amendment would require that: First, whenever a committee reports legislation, that committee must publish a detailed analysis of the impact such legislation might have on children; and second, it will not be in order for the Senate to consider such legislation if the committee has not published such an analysis.

---

 THE DECISION TO LICENSE THE MANUFACTURE OF RHINO AMMO

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, according to the Associated Press, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has decided to issue a license for the manufacture of Rhino Ammo by the Signature Products Corp. of Huntsville, AL. Rhino Ammo, according to its manufacturer, is designed to fragment upon impact with human tissue in order to inflict maximum injury. Mr. David Keen, the chief executive of Signature Corp., has said of this ammunition:

The beauty behind it is that it makes an incredible wound. \* \* \* That's not by accident. It's engineered by design. The round disintegrates as it hits. There's no way to stop the bleeding. \* \* \* I don't care where it hits. They're going down for good.

The application for this license should be denied. There is something sick about a chief executive officer of an American corporation making such a statement to sell ammunition specifically designed to cause, in Mr. Keen's own words, "horrific" wounds.

There is a history here. The St. Petersburg Declaration of 1868 was the first effort to ban certain types of ammunition which caused unnecessary suffering. The United States was not a party to the declaration, but we did ratify the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, both of which banned the use of dum-dum bullets.

Dum-dum bullets were invented in the late 19th century at the British arsenal in the town of Dum Dum, which was located 6 miles northeast of the Calcutta city center at the time. The rounds expand upon impact, thereby causing much larger wounds than ordinary bullets.

The Hague Conference of 1899 met in May 1899. It was attended by 26 nations and produced three conventions, the second of which was the "Convention with respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land." The Conference also produced three declarations. Here is the text of the third declaration:

III. On Expanding Bullets—The Contracting Parties agree to abstain from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body, such as bullets with a hard envelope which does not entirely cover the core, or is pierced with incisions.

It was "especially prohibited" by article 23(e) of the Hague Convention of 1899,

To employ arms, projectiles, or material of a nature to cause superfluous injury.

And it was "especially forbidden" article 23(e) of the Hague Convention of 1907,

To employ arms, projectiles, or material calculated to cause unnecessary suffering.

The Treasury Department has apparently decided that Americans may arm themselves and use rounds of ammunition which would be forbidden by treaty—the supreme law of the land—to the U.S. Armed Forces. This borders on contempt of the law.

It borders further on contempt of Congress. On Thursday, January 5, in the Washington Post I reported on efforts in the statutes and other means that Congress has adopted in recent years banning rounds of ammunition of particular threat to police officers. Any number of police officials have stated that once this round is manufactured and sold, it will end up being used against policemen. Evidently, this does not in any way trouble the Treasury Department.

Clearly, there has to be a complete review in the executive branch of this issue. Just as clearly no license should be issued until that review has been made and submitted to Congress.

---

 TRIBUTE TO BEN RICH

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate that one of the giants of American aviation history, Mr. Ben Rich, the long-time director and spirit of the famed Lockheed Skunk Works, passed away on January 5, 1995, in Ventura, CA. Ben Rich was the driving creative force behind the most potent and successful aircraft created by man, including the U-2 and the SR-71 reconnaissance aircraft, the workhorses of the cold war, and the F-117, or Stealth fighter, the backbone of our air campaign in the Desert Storm operation.

Ben Rich's life was synonymous with the great achievements of post-World War II advanced military American aviation. He joined Lockheed in 1950, and participated in the aerodynamic, propulsion, and design aspects of the F-104, U-2, A-12, SR-71 Blackbird and numerous other programs that have earned the Lockheed Skunk Works unparalleled international recognition. In 1975, he was named Lockheed vice president in charge of this talented advanced development projects organization, and from 1975 until his retirement in 1991, he led the Skunk Works through an intense period, including the U-2 production restart, the Stealth fighter development and production and the F-22 advanced tactical fighter prototype development, among other programs. Following his retirement, he continued in aviation as a consultant for the Rand Corp., Lockheed, and other defense contractors and organizations.

Anyone who was privileged even to briefly meet with Ben Rich personally could not help but be affected by his infectious enthusiasm, boundless energy, and persistent can-do attitude. It was an attitude which carried the greatest aircraft developments in the world through daunting engineering challenges at the very edge of the envelope of engineering design and system development.

Unquestionably, his most notable recent achievement during his years as the Chief Skunk was the creation of the Stealth F-117 fighter program. He organized a research and development program to respond to the Nation's need for new fighter aircraft featuring low observable technologies. These included a revolutionary faceted external design, new inlet and exhaust nozzle concepts, advanced radar absorbing materials and structures, and unique antennas and apertures. Even with this range of new technologies, they were all put together in a winning system to achieve initial operational capability in just 5 years.

Furthermore, his team was able to keep the existence of the aircraft totally secret, in the black, until its existence was formally acknowledged by the Air Force, from 1970 until 1988.

The great value of the Stealth fighter was amply demonstrated during Desert Storm when a small force of some 42 aircraft had a major impact on the war. The F-117, according to unofficial sources, destroyed 40 percent of all strategic targets with only 2 percent of the total of all Allied Forces tactical aircraft. It was the only aircraft to attack heavily defended Baghdad, unescorted, delivering laser-guided weapons with unprecedented accuracy, with minimum collateral damage and civilian casualties.

Ben Rich's many achievements have been recognized repeatedly in the aerospace industry. In May 1994, Secretary of Defense William J. Perry presented him with the Distinguished Public Service Award. Among his other awards, he and his team were awarded the 1989 Collier Trophy by the National Aeronautic Association for the Stealth fighter. This award is given annually for the most outstanding achievement in aeronautics and or astronautics.

With Ben's passing, we as a nation are poorer for our loss, but I am certain his spirit and achievements will continue to inspire a new generation of aerospace designers and engineers to new heights in one of America's premier industries.

On behalf of myself and, I know, all my colleagues, I wish to convey our sincere condolences to his wife, Hilda, his son, Michael, and daughter, Karen.

---

 WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is like

the weather—everybody talks about it but nobody ever does anything about it.

A lot of politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But just look at how so many of these same politicians so regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills that roll through the Senate. The American people took note of that on November 8.

As of Friday, January 8, at the close of business, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,802,133,808,513.71. This debt, remember, was run up by the Congress of the United States.

The Founding Fathers decreed that the big-spending bureaucrats in the executive branch of the U.S. Government should never be able to spend even a dime unless and until the spending had been authorized and appropriated by the U.S. Congress.

The U.S. Constitution is quite specific about that, as every school boy is supposed to know.

And do not be misled by declarations by politicians that the Federal debt was run up by some previous President or another, depending on party affiliation. Sometimes you hear false claims that Ronald Reagan ran it up; sometimes they play hit-and-run with George Bush.

These buck-passing declarations are false, as I said earlier, because the Congress of the United States is the culprit. The Senate and the House of Representatives are the big spenders.

Mr. President, most citizens cannot conceive of a billion of anything, let alone a trillion. It may provide a bit of perspective to bear in mind that a billion seconds ago, Mr. President, the Cuban missile crisis was in progress. A billion minutes ago, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ had occurred not long before.

Which sort of puts it in perspective, does it not, that Congress has run up this incredible Federal debt totaling 4,802 of those billions—of dollars. In other words, the Federal debt, as I said earlier, stood this morning at four trillion, 802 billion, 133 million, 808 thousand, 513 dollars, and 71 cents. It'll be even greater at closing time today.

#### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege of attending the 76th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in St. Louis, MO.

As my colleagues know, the American Farm Bureau is the largest farm organization in America, with over 4.4 million members nationwide. While in St. Louis, I met with both Kansas and American Farm Bureau members as they discussed issues of importance to agriculture and to all Americans.

The theme of this year's meeting is "The Spirit Grows." I believe that their theme reflects the spirit we have seen in American during the last few months. A growing spirit to change America and to bring common sense back to Government. Like most Americans, members of the American Farm Bureau want change.

In his opening remarks, Farm Bureau President Dean Kleckner listed seven Farm Bureau goals—goals which many of us here in the Senate share. These include adopting a balanced budget amendment, passing a line-item veto, reducing the capital gains tax, increasing the estate tax exemption, implementing legislation requiring risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, limiting unfunded mandates, and strengthening private property rights.

Mr. President, I would encourage my colleagues to read the full text of Mr. Kleckner's speech and to take to heart some of the points he makes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Kleckner's speech be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL ADDRESS, AFBF PRESIDENT DEAN KLECKNER

Good morning fellow Farm Bureau members. Welcome to this 76th gathering of the world's largest, greatest, most powerful, most influential farm organization.

Your American Farm Bureau Federation. Once again, your actions, your deeds, your policies benefitted agriculture, America's most important industry.

Through Farm Bureau, 4.4 million families speak with a unified voice. United in Farm Bureau, we implement the policies and get the results that we could not accomplish individually.

As a direct result of your work—our work—U.S. agriculture today is more oriented toward the marketplace. World trade is less subsidized. The sanctity of property rights is more recognized and appreciated. And there is a growing belief that government must lessen its impact on people and their livelihoods.

We are completing a philosophical cycle.

Our nation was founded on a belief in the integrity and common sense of the individual. Yet, over the years, this rock-solid philosophy eroded, evolving to the thought of: "Let government do it." Then to: "Government, do it." The cycle moved a few years ago to: "Should government do it?"

Now, people of all walks of life, all segments of society are answering: "Government should not do it. It is my responsibility."

President Andrew Jackson once said, "When a democracy is in trouble, the remedy is more democracy."

Our democracy may not have been in trouble, but the way voters voiced their demand for positive change by reducing government's presence was encouraging.

Farm Bureau has long championed the worth of the individual. We've stood firm on our philosophies, our policies. We've altered our policies when we recognize that change is needed, \* \* \* But our philosophies? Never.

The basics, the fundamentals, the traditional values that are still rock-solid across the country, Farm Bureau has not wavered. I know sometimes it felt like we were talking to ourselves. The lack of external response sometimes led us to question our-

selves, but we never questioned our values. Now it can be seen that others were listening.

Others harbored the same quiet, solid beliefs—beliefs that never left rural America.

For decades, Farm Bureau was one of a very few organizations that stood up and spoke out for the ideals we believe in, no matter where our position rated in the latest public opinion poll.

Great political change occurred last November. But we saw the bell cow in 1992 when the public clamored for change. At this point, it looks like no more country-club or good-old-boy politics as usual. Public dissatisfaction—really disgust—with the political system and the politicians won't allow it.

People want a return to basic American principles—individual responsibility, common sense, fairness, faith, firmness not forms, a hand up \* \* \* Not a hand out.

Where's the sense in spending billions of Superfund dollars to pay lawyers to talk about cleaning up dirt at a contaminated site? Why spend billions on a welfare system that does not foster an incentive to get off the public dole?

People have told government that a reordering of priorities and spending habits is definitely in order. And that is an order—an order that will be enforced, come next election, if changes—acceptable changes—don't come quickly.

More regulations, more taxation, more restrictions aren't the answer. We don't need consensus, we need conquerors. When will the deep thinkers, but shallow doers, learn? Free enterprise, coupled with religious compassion, works. Government making rules doesn't make change.

Princeton University economists did a study that showed environmental quality quickly starts to improve when individuals' income and investment returns top \$10,000 a year.

That's the exact opposite conclusion of some think-tank talkers who believe economic growth does unavoidable harm to the environment.

In reality, Mexico, Chile, Venezuela and many Pacific Rim countries have surpassed that threshold number and are moving to improve their environments. To see environmental degradation, look to those that were centrally planned—Russia, Poland, the Balkan states. Yet, some scholars still think that progress is a dirty word. Progress is good if we make it good.

Farm Bureau policies depend on the collective wisdom, experience and values of working people throughout this land.

1994 was quite a year for Farm Bureau. It was a year of accomplishments and yet-to-be-finished accomplishments. I want to tell you of a few, to illustrate the great breadth of your farm organization's interests and activities.

All of the efforts, all of the work, all of the strategies are aimed at our two over-riding goals. They are the same two that Farm Bureau has aimed for since we started over 75 years ago. We're working to improve net farm income. And we strive to improve the quality of rural living.

1994 saw the successful completion to two important trade negotiations. Farm Bureau was intensely involved with both. Our Congress passage of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is a major relief for U.S. agriculture. I was never more proud, more aware of Farm Bureau's influence, than I was last month as I was led down to sit in the front of that big room in Washington, D.C., to watch President Clinton sign the GATT legislation into law.

By signing on to GATT, other countries will have to follow the same trade rules we