

like the cuckoo, might be bullying their hosts into accepting eggs under threat of violence if they did not. But in the 16 years since Dr. Zahavi's hypothesis was published, no evidence had turned up in support of it.

"He's put out a number of ideas that people have initially pooh-poohed," said Dr. Arcese, "and later people have shown that, in fact, they may operate."

Dr. Zahavi said, "Obviously it is satisfying that a model you created is found to be true at least for one cuckoo in one place."

But at the same time, researchers note that enforcement may not be the only reason that parasites like the cuckoos are destroying nests.

Dr. Arcese said that based on studies of cowbirds that parasitize song sparrows on Mandarte Island near Victoria, British Columbia, he and his colleagues had evidence that cowbirds could also cause their hosts' nests to fail. But Dr. Arcese says their studies indicate that the cowbirds may be destroying nests, not to teach the song sparrows a lesson, but for their own convenience.

Cowbirds, like other nest parasites, must find nests into which eggs are being freshly laid. In nests with older eggs or eggs of unknown age, the host's young may hatch first, ending incubation and leading to the death of the parasite's egg.

To avoid such problems, Dr. Arcese suggests that parasites, including the cuckoo, may kill young as a way of getting hosts to start another nest, where the parasites can leave their eggs at the perfect time.

Dr. Stephen Rothstein, an evolutionary biologist at the University of California at Santa Barbara, while praising the team's work as "superb," suggested a simpler explanation for the fact that many magpies keep the cuckoo eggs.

While the eggs and young of many parasites look strikingly different from that of their hosts, those of the great spotted cuckoo are good mimics of the magpie's.

"It could just be evolutionary lag," said Dr. Rothstein, describing an idea that has come out of his work with cowbirds. That is, magpies may keep cuckoo eggs simply because they have not yet evolved the ability to make the sometimes difficult distinction between the cuckoo's and their own. It is a lag that leaves the cuckoos winning the evolutionary war, at least for now.

Dr. Rothstein added that he also had evidence that parents of nests from which any eggs had been removed, whether the bird's own or a parasite's, would often desert the nest. He said this could explain the greater rate of attacks on nests from which eggs had been experimentally ejected as seen in the new study. With eggs missing, the magpie parents might be considerably less interested in tending and protecting the nests, leaving them open to attack by cuckoos or other birds.

To complicate matters even further, Dr. Rothstein said he and his colleagues have studied the same parasite, the great spotted cuckoo, in Israel where it leaves its eggs in crows' nests. Doing similar experiments, they found no evidence of mafia behavior.

But Dr. Arcese said that more and more researchers seemed to be finding such geographical differences in the behavior of these birds. One explanation is that since both the parasites and their hosts are long-lived and can learn, these complex behaviors may actually differ from place to place, depending on what they have experienced.

At the same time, researchers say that both the great spotted cuckoo and the cowbird are extending their ranges, moving into new territory and encountering new birds. Biologists say that with such changes going on, rather than some studies being wrong, all may be right, with researchers

witnessing different stages in the ongoing skirmishes of the evolutionary war between these parasites and their hosts.

#### RETIREMENT OF RICHARD EKSTRUM, SOUTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU PRESIDENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this week South Dakota Farm Bureau president Richard Ekstrum will step down after 20 years of dedicated service. During those two decades, his service to South Dakota and American agriculture has been immeasurable. I have had the privilege of working with Richard and the Farm Bureau for many years and have appreciated his invaluable advice and thoughtful discussions on farm policies and the future of rural America.

Throughout his 10 consecutive terms as president of the South Dakota Farm Bureau, Richard has been an effective advocate and promoter of free market policies for agriculture. Under his leadership, the South Dakota Farm Bureau has more than doubled its membership, from 4,700 to 10,000 members. He has donated over 100 days per year in service to Farm Bureau. His commitment to advancing the needs of rural America cannot be underestimated.

As a hog producer for 30 years Richard knows full well the rewards and challenges of American agriculture. During his tenure as president, agriculture has undergone tremendous changes. It is the mark of a true leader that he has effectively adapted to those changes and moved his organization forward. He understands the critical needs facing rural communities and the necessary steps we must take to ensure farmers and ranchers remain on the land to produce the food and fiber for our Nation.

Not only has Richard been a successful leader and farmer, but he also has traveled the world as an ambassador for South Dakota and American farmers and ranchers. I am sure the people of the many nations he has visited in his 20 years as Farm Bureau president have been benefited from his experience and expertise.

The South Dakota Farm Bureau will dearly miss the leadership of Richard Ekstrum, as will I. There is no doubt in my mind that he will continue to be an active advocate for South Dakota agriculture. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors and thank him for all his assistance over the years.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt, now slightly in excess of \$13 billion shy of \$5 trillion, has been fueled for a generation by bureaucratic hot air—sort of like a hot air balloon spinning out of control—which everybody has talked about, but almost nobody even tried to fix. That attitude began to change however, immediately after the November 1994 elections.

The 104th Congress promised to hold true to the Founding Fathers' decree that the executive branch of the U.S. Government should never be able to spend a dime unless and until it had been authorized and appropriated by the U.S. Congress.

So, when the new 104th Congress convened this past January, the U.S. House of Representatives quickly approved a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On the Senate side, all but 1 of the 54 Republican Senators supported the balanced budget amendment.

That was the good news. The bad news was that only 13 Democratic Senators supported it, and that killed the balanced budget amendment for the time being. Since a two-thirds vote—67 Senators, if all Senators are present—is necessary to approve a constitutional amendment, the proposed Senate amendment failed by one vote. There will be another vote during the 104th Congress.

Here is today's bad debt boxscore:

As of the close of business Tuesday, November 14, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly \$4,987,139,764,503.11 or \$18,931.27 on a per capita basis for every man, woman, and child.

#### EPA/OSHA FINDINGS ON PASSIVE SMOKING

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Congressional Research Service [CRS] released a long awaited report today that calls into question the validity of claims that passive smoking presents a risk to nonsmokers. It also highlights questions on the validity of the science behind the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] and subsequently the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] findings on the effects of secondhand smoke. In 1993, the EPA released a report classifying passive smoke a "class A carcinogen." This EPA report has been the basis for numerous actions taken to limit smoking in public places with the most dramatic example being the OSHA proposed smoking ban in all workplaces across the United States.

However, this CRS report, indicates well placed skepticism on the methods used by OSHA to justify the need for such draconian and invasive policies as the one espoused by this agency. CRS also questions the very harm of second hand smoke. It found fault with the EPA's premise that there is no safe level of exposure to passive smoke, and the conclusions that OSHA drew from a limited number of studies, a practice which clearly undercuts the validity of the OSHA findings.

The report released today is but the latest in a series by different high level specialists at CRS. Every report has led to the same conclusion: There is no scientific justification for smoking bans or de facto bans like the one issued by OSHA some months ago. In

previous reports CRS stated unequivocally that, "the epidemiological evidence for passive-smoking-related disease is weak." It has followed this statement up with today's report which represents a comprehensive look at this subject as well as an examination of purported risks for heart disease.

While many agenda driven researchers have picked and chosen from only the studies that support their views, CRS, an agency which is unquestioned in its objectivity, has, during a lengthy 20 month review, rigorously examined all of the data on this controversial topic. Its conclusion is that the OSHA risk assessment as stated in its proposed rule is incorrect. While CRS is prohibited under its rules from issuing specific policy recommendations, the evidence of the study is clear and bears repeating: There is no scientific justification for the current regulatory action being sought by OSHA.

The CRS study calls into question the very underpinnings that form the basis of Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] and OSHA claims regarding the dangers of second hand smoke. EPA has claimed since the release of its much criticized report back in January 1993, that there is no safe level of exposure to ETS. However, CRS directly refutes this assertion. Furthermore, it finds that the only reasonable chance of risk comes in extreme situations and even in those cases the findings are uncertain and in need of further research. This, in my view, is the scientific equivalent of the townspeople screaming out "The emperor has no clothes."

In light of the seriousness of the findings of this study and the reputation of the organization that is so questioning OSHA actions, I am calling on OSHA to reopen its hearings on the proposed rule and to re-evaluate the justification for the rule in the first place. I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that this historic study undermines the premise for all government coerced smoking bans.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York, Mr. D'AMATO, is recognized.

---

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask that the time be continued as if in morning business until I conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. How much time does the Senator anticipate?

Mr. D'AMATO. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### CONCEALING THE TRUE FACTS ABOUT MEXICO AND THE IMF

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, for months, the Clinton administration

and the Mexican Government have told Congress and the American people that the President's \$20 billion bailout of Mexico was a success. But the administration and the Mexican Government have been concealing the true facts from the Congress and, more importantly, from the American people. It is wrong and it is outrageous. Particularly in this time of budget austerity when we are having such incredible battles over how to balance the budget and deciding what programs will be cut. I think it is incredible at this point in our history that we are watching tens of billions of dollars go down a sinkhole and do nothing about it.

For almost a year, I have warned that the Clinton bailout of Mexico was doomed to failure. Over the last few weeks, it has become clear that the President's Mexican mirage is evaporating. Truth, unfortunately, is not pleasant at times, so there are those who seek to look the other way. But the truth is finally coming into focus.

The Clinton administration and the Mexican Government can no longer conceal the real facts. We know that record numbers of Mexicans are out of work, that Mexican interest rates are soaring and that Mexico is reeling under increasing social and political unrest.

Before the Mexican peso was devalued last December, it traded at 3.44 against the dollar. On December 22, after the devaluation, the peso was trading at 4.8. Then it went up to 6, and then 7. Yesterday, the peso closed at 7.81. That is a historic low closing rate. Never before has it closed at such a rate—7.81 pesos to the dollar. This morning, it opened at 7.9. That is shocking. That is unbelievable. The peso is in free fall without Mexican Government intervention.

Indeed, Mr. President, let me suggest that the only people who are making money are the currency speculators. They know that the Mexican central bank will intervene, and so as the peso is devalued, as it becomes worth less and approaches the 8 mark and 8.1 and 8.2, the money speculators begin to buy it up because they know at some point the central bank will move in and they can sell for a handsome profit. They are making their profit, while the Mexican Government is chewing up billions of dollars.

How much longer will we have to wait before we recognize that this program has been a failure? If the Mexican bailout was a success, would interest rates have climbed from 20 percent to over 60 percent? That is exactly what has taken place during this period of time. No economy can survive such crushing interest rates—60 percent. Yet when the Mexican President came to the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, indeed, the President of the United States, said that the proof that the program was working was Mexico's "pre-payment" of some of their debt. In reality Mexico flipped the \$1.3 bil-

lion remainder of their loan, rolled it over, and could not pay it in spite of their so-called early payment of \$700 million.

Since February, the United States and the IMF have poured over \$23 billion into Mexico. The Mexican Government has used American taxpayer dollars to pay off private investors. The administration should not continue to throw good money after bad.

Last week, I offered a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling for the public release of an important document, a document prepared by the International Monetary Fund. This report is known as the Whittome Report. The Whittome Report examined the International Monetary Fund's monitoring and response to the Mexican peso crisis. According to news accounts, the IMF's own report concluded that the International Monetary Fund had distorted its reporting on Mexico to placate political pressure from the Mexican Government.

I suggest that the American people have a right to see that report. Why is the Treasury Department hiding that report? Secretary Rubin has classified it on "national security" grounds.

This report talks about the International Monetary Fund's failure. Why should it be classified so that the American people cannot know what is taking place with money that we have invested with the IMF, with money we have sent down to Mexico. It is American taxpayers' dollars. That report should be declassified.

The Treasury Department's classification on national security grounds is hokum. What nonsense. This report has been made available to 178 other countries that are members of the IMF.

So here we have a report that has been widely circulated and is being held on the arbitrary, obviously sham, excuse that its release would jeopardize national security. It is our taxpayers who are providing the bulk of the funding for this bailout package, a package which is failing. This package is producing record unemployment in Mexico, record high interest rates, and has sent the peso to a record low. This bailout jeopardizes Americans' financial interests.

What do we have? We have secrecy from the Treasury Department claiming that release of this report would jeopardize the security of our country, hiding under the pretext of national security grounds.

Mr. President, 178 countries, many of which may be allied against the interests of the United States, have copies of this report, but the American people do not. And this Senator is not permitted to disclose the contents of that report? That is just simply wrong. It is obvious that this administration is attempting to hide the debacle and the fact that we should never have entered into this absolutely shameful relationship.

What we see taking place today is the currency speculators making billions of dollars of profit. Last evening,