

and the TDD number for the hearing impaired is 1-800-787-3224.

Mr. President, my wife, Sheila, speaks about domestic violence all around Minnesota. Sheila was speaking in southern Minnesota 2 days before the hotline opened. She spoke with a woman who had been living in New York with her abusive husband and 5-month-old child. Her husband had moved to New York following their marriage, and he kept his wife and child very isolated there. The husband was very controlling and made it impossible for his wife to socialize, make friends, or have a job. He checked on her all the time to make sure that she was at home with their baby. In addition to beating her routinely and savagely, he took out a life insurance policy on her. So she lived in constant fear of being killed.

This woman told Sheila that every time she opened the apartment door, she was sure someone would be on the other side with a shotgun. Her husband at one time had been out of town on a business deal. He left in the afternoon and planned on returning the following morning. After he left, she decided that it was her only chance to get away. Panicked and pressed for time, she called a local hotline number but found it was disconnected. She was devastated. She called the legal aid society in New York City and was initially told that they could not help her.

Out of sheer desperation, Mr. President, she persisted with legal aid and was finally given a local agency phone number. Calling the local agency, the woman informed them that she wanted to return home to Minnesota. They were able to access a computer and put her in touch with a battered women shelter in her hometown. She and her baby were on a plane the next morning before her husband got home.

Mr. President, this woman was lucky. She was able to find the information she needed. But how much better it would have been if the hotline had been up and running to give her the information immediately. Unfortunately, some women might not have the whole day to track down information.

I think this shows how crucial the national network like the hotline will be for keeping women and children safe—even, literally, saving their lives. When a woman calls the hotline, her call will be answered by a counselor who can provide crisis assistance and who can also access a nationwide data base and provide the caller with up-to-date information about shelters and other services in her community. If the caller wishes, the hotline counselor can even transfer her call to a local counselor.

Because the hotline is toll-free, women can call in complete privacy, never having to fear a long-distance number will appear on their telephone bill and, therefore, alert an abusive partner. Help is also available in Spanish and other languages.

I hope that the new national domestic violence hotline will help women and families find the support, the assistance, and the services they need to get out of homes where there is violence and abuse.

In addition to establishing networks between counselors, shelter workers, law enforcement officers, and service providers, the hotline will help make sure that anyone who is not safe in their home has access to their services.

Mr. President, once again, the toll free number from the floor of the U.S. Senate is 1-800-799-SAFE, and for those that are hearing impaired, the number is 1-800-787-3224.

What I wish to do with the indulgence of my colleagues is for the next several weeks come to the floor of the Senate at least once a day when I can find the time—and I will find the time because this is a priority—to read this number. It is important that as many women and as many children and as many families as possible understand this new initiative. It is very important to making sure that women and children have the protection they need.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask unanimous consent I may proceed for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### SUPERFUND REFORM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, for the past several years, we have been trying to pass legislation to fix the Superfund toxic waste cleanup program. Superfund is a program with a tortured history and certainly an uneven record of success that can only be described as truly uneven. We have accomplished some good things since the law was passed in 1980, but those accomplishments under Superfund have come at a tremendous cost.

Almost everyone agrees—and I will say, Mr. President, I do not think anyone disagrees—that Congress should enact a Superfund reform bill as soon as possible. Even President Clinton said recently that “we have to repair the Superfund toxic waste cleanup program.”

I agree with the President about the need to fix Superfund. Unfortunately, in the speech that the President delivered last Monday, March 11, in New Jersey, he went on to attack the Superfund reauthorization process now underway in Congress. Using the old worn out rhetoric about “making polluters pay,” the President mischaracterized the proposals on which we are now working.

I believe it is just plain wrong to imply that the Superfund liability reform proposals we are considering

would shift costs from the polluters to the taxpayers. That is the theme that is being sounded. The pending proposals we are considering in the Environment and Public Works Committee would do no such thing. What we seek to do in the committee is to use money that comes from the three Superfund taxes which are levied on the chemical industry, the oil industry, and manufacturing corporations, and use the money, which does not come from the ordinary taxpayer; it comes through those three entities: chemical industry, oil industry, and manufacturing corporations, for the cleanup. This is the money that is collected for cleanup. It is paid into a Superfund trust fund for the suspected polluting class.

That is the source of revenues to fund liability reform. No one is trying to shift the cost of cleanup to our constituents. Unless one is already paying any of the three Superfund taxes, there is no need to worry about being made to pay for Superfund. There is no talk about letting polluters off the hook and making taxpayers pay. The President's advisers know this so why do they continue to misinform him about our plans? The President's invocation of the tired old “polluter pays” rhetoric does not help us get the job done. Maybe some focus group somewhere has told the President's advisers that this is a winning issue for the administration, but the rhetoric does nothing to advance the Superfund policy debate.

Under Superfund, anyone can be tarred with the polluter stigma. If you disposed of something—think of this—legally and in accordance with the best practices of the day in the 1970's or the 1960's or the 1950's or even earlier, you can still be held liable under the Superfund law and be called a polluter. You can be held liable for a law that passed way after the so-called pollution was done.

On Monday, the President suggested that Congress should “help small business and communities trapped in the liability net.” In other words, the President said help those communities that dispose of these polluting substances before the enactment of Superfund. Let them off the hook. I agree with the President, but how can he ask us to let one or two groups of polluters off the hook and then complain that we are doing something wrong when we try to help others who may be trapped in the same liability net? I suppose the logic is that if you are small and a public entity—a public entity being a county or a town or city or municipality—and you are liable under Superfund, somehow that is not pollution. If you let that person off but you are something else, presumably if you are a larger business and you are a polluter, you cannot let that person off. This, it seems to me, is Superfund logic at its worst. It may be good politics, but it is irresponsible in the middle of a serious policy debate.

The timing of the President's remarks was also disappointing. We are

in the middle, as I say, of a serious policy debate about Superfund in the community. In 1993 and 1994, the Democratic administration with a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate had 2 years to put together and move its own Superfund bill. They came forward with a bill, and that excused or limited the liability of big and small polluters in a number of ways. Whatever the merits of the bill, Mr. President—and I voted for it in committee—it failed to pass either branch of the then Democratically controlled House and Democratically controlled Senate. Therefore, you had at that time a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate and they could not make reforms in Superfund, showing how difficult this problem is.

Now, in our committee, Senator SMITH has taken the lead and put forward a bill some 8 months after we took over the Congress, that is, the Republicans. Since introduction of that legislation in the subcommittee, Senator SMITH and others have met with the administration for countless hours to explain the bill, to make technical changes, and to clarify its intent where needed. We are in the middle of bipartisan negotiations. We are striving to understand the administration's concern with the bill and to accommodate it wherever possible. We are waiting for more information from the administration on cost concerns the administration has raised and the impact of these changes, how they affect the agency, for example, and its resources.

In short, the administration has a serious forum in the Environment and Public Works Committee where we are meeting every day to exchange views on Superfund. This is why I find it curious and disappointing that the administration would choose this particular time to launch a factually inaccurate and politically contrived attack on the negotiation process and product.

I have counseled colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the committee that I am fortunate enough to chair that we must have a bipartisan approach if we are going to solve these complex environmental problems. I believe Superfund could be a model for how we can reach agreement on a sensitive problem in this year, a difficult year because of the political implications of the Presidential campaign. I believe Superfund could be a model for how we reach agreement on these difficult matters. I fail to understand how the President's advisers on environmental issues, who surely understand that Superfund proposals cannot be reduced to simple solutions and slogans such as "polluters must pay," can engage with us in serious negotiations while on the other hand they seek partisan advantage based on distortions.

Mr. President, it is time for the administration to choose. Does it want Superfund this year or is it willing to miss this chance and permit Superfund to continue to exact its hideous toll on

our economy? If we are going to fix Superfund, the administration must tone down its rhetoric and work with us to fix this badly broken program.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair. I will be brief so the Senate can move on.

#### TAIWAN RESOLUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to indicate how disappointed I was last evening that we were unable to take up the resolution on Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. We had prepared a sense-of-the-Congress resolution early in the week, had distributed it and talked to many. It was agreed to by the administration. It was also sponsored by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking member. In any event, the upshot was that its introduction was objected to on the minority side, I think largely by the staff, and therefore we did not do it. We do intend, however, to come back and do that next week.

Mr. President, as all of my colleagues know, over the last 8 months the People's Republic of China has held an increasing number of missile tests and military exercises.

Last year, starting in July, there were 21 to 26 missile tests; in July and August, troop movements in provinces bordering Taiwan. The purpose of these tests has obviously been to intimidate the Taiwanese. They have been accompanied by denunciations of President Li. They have been timed to coincide, of course, with the election that takes place there.

Now, unfortunately, the People's Republic of China has escalated the situation with these new tests, tests that are the closest ever to the main island and purposely, of course, timed to affect the election which will take place later this month. They have also been close to Taiwan's two ports, and that has been very worrisome. These are reckless, I think, and greatly disturbing to most people in this country.

We have a strong interest in the peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question. That interest of ours is central to the three communiqués and the People's Republic of China joint communiqués that we have entered into over the years, as well as the Taiwan Relations Act, which is to provide stability in that part of the world and which provides for a one-China policy and which provides for a peaceful movement toward that one-China policy.

I firmly believe we need to reexamine our relationship with China. I think we

have to narrow the number of issues in which we become involved and not seek to run their country. But when we do have agreements, then we have to make sure that they are adhered to by both the Chinese and ourselves. Our relationship currently is filled with items that have not been consistent with these agreements—the intellectual property agreements, the nuclear proliferation in Pakistan and Iraq.

So, Mr. President, it is necessary that we do state our position; that we do insist on a peaceful direction and resolution of this issue; that we do clarify our one-China policy; that we do congratulate the Taiwanese in their movement toward democracy and open markets and urge that same open market approach take place in China.

So I commend the Taiwanese, their government, for reacting calmly to these provocations. They, I think, have shown considerable restraint, and I congratulate them on their long march toward democracy. I hope that continues during the election next week.

I yield the floor.

#### NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION WELFARE AND MEDICAID PROPOSALS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, 3 months ago President Clinton vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. The failure to balance the Federal budget continues to hang like a dark cloud over American families and businesses. The heavy yoke of Federal budget deficits still threaten to choke off economic growth and future prosperity. Moreover, by vetoing this legislation, the President also preserved a welfare system which traps millions of children into a cycle of dependency.

A few weeks after the balanced budget veto, President Clinton stopped welfare reform again by vetoing H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995. However, the President also pledged that, "I am nevertheless determined to keep working with the Congress to enact real, bipartisan welfare reform."

Mr. President, 1 month ago the men and women who serve as the chief executives of our 50 States presented the President, the Congress, and the American people with bold new proposals to restructure Medicaid and reform the welfare system. Gathering from across the country, the Governors set aside their own differences and found the common ground and bipartisan consensus which have been missing in Washington. The Governors have presented us with a fresh opportunity to bridge the differences which divide the Congress and the President.

The Committee on Finance has recently completed a series of hearings on the National Governors' Association proposals. On February 22, six Governors, four Democrats and two Republicans, urged the Congress to quickly pass both welfare and Medicaid reforms. We heard from Governors Carper, Chiles, Engler, Miller of Nevada,