

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts clarify, is the amendment a second-degree for Nickles or a substitute for Nickles?

Mr. KENNEDY. It would be a second-degree.

Mr. STEVENS. I have on the list, for everyone's notification, another version of the IMF amendment should the pending McConnell amendment be defeated, which I don't anticipate, but I just want people to know that.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished Senator restate what the situation will be in the event that the IMF amendment is defeated?

Mr. STEVENS. If the IMF amendment is defeated, we would call up another version of that amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Would amendments then be in order?

Mr. STEVENS. No other amendments would be in order unless they are on the list tonight, but the second IMF amendment is on the list, Senator. It is my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. On behalf of the majority leader, I announce there will be no further votes tonight.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I am hearing that further amendments would be in order if the IMF amendment is defeated. I just want to be sure that the agreement allows for such an eventuality.

Mr. STEVENS. I know there are at least three IMF amendments on the amendments listed on your side, and I have another one on my side, which is another IMF amendment similar to the one that is already before the Senate should the McConnell amendment be defeated.

Mr. BYRD. But it is my understanding other Senators may be at liberty to offer additional amendments; they need to be able to offer additional amendments, in the event the IMF amendment is defeated.

Mr. STEVENS. There are four that are there. You mean other Senators? If the Senator wishes to do this, I would say this: If the McConnell amendment is defeated, any amendment pertaining to IMF will be cleared on this list. Any amendment—any Senator will be free to offer an amendment on IMF if the McConnell amendment is defeated.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am advised that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator state again what time tomorrow morning the first vote will occur?

Mr. STEVENS. The first vote will not occur under the agreement that has already been entered before 10:50 a.m.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that the correct request would have been, since the Nickles amendment is to strike, that my amendment to that would be in the first-degree rather than the second-degree, and I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. That amends the previous agreement. That very much clarifies it, that the amendments discussed with Senator SMITH and Senator MURKOWSKI are on the list, my IMF amendment is on the list, and the amendments that are on the list that the lady has here—and the managers' package. There is a managers' package. That is ours that is on the list, also. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. For clarification, to offer those amendments we can offer them at any time? Tomorrow morning? Whenever?

Mr. STEVENS. There will be no more votes tonight, so if anyone has votes they will not be in order tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now ask there be a period for routine morning business with Senators being allowed to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

#### PASSAGE OF NATIONAL TARTAN DAY RESOLUTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, I rise to personally commend Senator HATCH, my colleague and friend, for his leadership in helping obtain the passage of the National Tartan Day Resolution.

Last week, the Senate passed the resolution by unanimous consent. This was no easy task and I want to acknowledge his efforts to ensure that the contributions of Americans of Scottish ancestry are recognized. I, along with many other Scottish-Americans, were very pleased with the passage of this legislation.

I also want to thank the national and state associations which represent citizens of Scottish ancestry for their efforts to get the word out. They made

sure that the members of the Senate were fully informed on the merits of this legislative initiative. They were active in obtaining cosponsors. They certainly made a difference in the legislative success of Senate Resolution 155.

Mr. President, Scottish Americans have made many great contributions to our country. They work in many different fields and professions. They add to the very essence of what is known across the globe as the American character. Let me name a few of the more prominent Scottish-Americans: Neil Armstrong, Alexander Graham Bell, Andrew Carnegie, William Faulkner, Malcolm Forbes and Elizabeth Taylor, just to name a few. Today many Americans of Scottish ancestry continue to make an impact.

Mr. President, National Tartan Day is more than a recognition of Americans with Scottish ancestry. National Tartan Day is about liberty. It is about the demand of citizens for their freedom from an oppressive government. Freedom is the significance of April 6th. On this day nearly seven hundred years ago, a group of men in Arbroath, Scotland asserted their independence from the English king. These Scots declared "We fight for liberty alone." These are powerful words that should not be forgotten today or in the future.

These were daring words. These Scotsmen were claiming liberty as their birthright. These were enduring words, like the mountains, hills and stones of Scotland. These words still ring true.

The words and thoughts of those long-ago Scottish patriots live on in America. Liberty has been good to their descendants in the United States.

Beyond all the accomplishments of Scottish-Americans are those words of strength, courage and perseverance: "We fight for liberty alone, which no good man loses but with his life."

By honoring April 6, Americans will annually celebrate the true beginning of the quest for liberty and freedom.

Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in supporting this resolution; so that we may never forget, so that the world, in some small way, may never forget, far-away, long-ago Arbroath and the declaration for liberty.

#### "THE LEADERS LECTURE SERIES"—REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, last night was a memorable night for this Senator and I believe a number of others in this Chamber. On Tuesday evening, I was honored and humbled to introduce to this body, Senator Mike Mansfield for an address in the old Senate Chamber. This inaugural lecture was the first of what I hope will be a continuing number of addresses for "The Leader's Lecture Series".

I think I can speak for all Members of this Senate in saying we were honored in having as the first speaker in

this series, the longest serving majority leader of this body, Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana.

I look forward to future addresses from former Senate leaders and other distinguished Americans in sharing their insights about the Senate's recent history and long-term practices.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished former majority leader be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP: A SECOND LOOK

(Remarks by Mike Mansfield—March 24, 1998)

Thank you for your very kind introduction. I am deeply appreciative of what you have had to say, even though I think you put too much icing on the cake. The real credit of whatever standing I have achieved in life should be given to my wife Maureen, who, unfortunately, could not be with us this evening. She was and is my inspiration. She encouraged and literally forced a dropout 8th grader to achieve a University degree and at the same time make up his high school credits. She sold her life insurance and gave up her job as a Butte High School teacher to make it possible. She initiated me into politics—the House, the Senate and, diplomatically speaking, the Tokyo Embassy. She gave of herself to make something of me. She has always been the one who has guided, encouraged and advised me. She made the sacrifices and deserved the credits, but I was the one who was honored. She has always been the better half of our lives together and, without her coaching, her understanding, and her love, I would not be with you tonight. What we did, we did together.

In short, I am what I am because of her.

I would like to dedicate my remarks tonight to my three great loves: Maureen, Montana, and the United States Senate.

It is an honor to "kick off" the first in the Senate Lecture Series with the Majority Leader, Senator TRENT LOTT, and the Minority Leader, Senator TOM DASCHLE, in attendance. They represent the continuity of the office first held by Democratic Senator John Kern of Indiana in 1913 and by Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts in 1917. They—the two Leaders—represent positions of trust and responsibility in today's Senate. They are the two among one hundred whom their respective parties have placed first among equals. Incidentally, it is my understanding that less than 3,000 men and women have served as Senators since the beginning of our Republic. They have been the "favored few" among the hundreds of millions in their overall constituencies.

Twenty-two years ago, on June 16, 1976, an audience of senators and their guests filled this chamber, much as you do this evening. On that occasion, the Senate convened here in formal legislative session. Their purpose was similar to ours today. Carving out a few moments from crowded and distracting schedules, those Senators of the 94th Congress came to honor the history and the traditions of the United States Senate. On that occasion, they came to rededicate this grand chamber—to celebrate the completion of a five-year-long restoration project.

The idea for this room's restoration to its appearance of the 1850's may have first surfaced in 1935. In that year, the Supreme Court, a tenant since 1860, moved into its new building across the street. I know for sure that the idea received close attention in the early 1960's. This once-elegant chamber

had become an all-purpose room—whose uses included conference committee meetings, catered luncheons and furniture storage. Where once stood the stately mahogany desks of Clay, Webster and Calhoun, there then rested—on occasion—stark iron cots. These cots accommodated teams of senators on call throughout the night to make a quorum against round-the-clock filibusters. By the late 1960's, the idea for this room's restoration moved toward reality—and the 1976 ceremony—thanks largely to the vision and persistence of the legendary Mississippi Senator, John C. Stennis.

And we now have Senator Stennis' immediate successor, Senator TRENT LOTT, to thank for inaugurating his "Leader's Lecture Series." Here is another welcome opportunity, on a periodic basis, to consider the foundations and development of this United States Senate. Thank you for inviting me, Mr. Leader.

There are very few advantages to outliving one's generation. One of them is the opportunity to see how historians describe and evaluate that generation. Some historians do it better than others.

One such historian is Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. As all of you know, ROBERT BYRD has combined a participant's insights with a scholar's detachment to produce an encyclopedic four-volume history of the Senate. Near the end of his first volume appear two chapters devoted to the 1960's and '70's. ROBERT has entitled them "Mike Mansfield's Senate."

Now, I have no doubt that he would be the first to acknowledge the accuracy of what I am about to say. If, during my time as Senate leader, a pollster had asked each Senator the question, "Whose Senate is this?" that pollster would surely have received 99 separate answers—and they would all have been right. Only for purposes of literary convenience or historic generalization could we ever acknowledge that one person—at least during my time—could shape such a body in his own image.

Senator BYRD has been doubly generous in assigning me a seat in the Senate's Pantheon. Volume Three of his history series contains forty-six so-called "classic speeches" delivered in the Senate over the past century and a half. Among them is an address that was prepared for delivery in the final weeks of the 1963 session. My topic was "The Senate and Its Leadership."

By mid-1963, various Democratic senators had begun to express publicly their frustration with the lack of apparent progress in advancing the Kennedy administration's legislative initiatives. Other Senators were less open in their criticism—but they were equally determined that I, as majority leader, should begin to knock some heads together. After all, they reasoned, Democrats in the Senate enjoyed a nearly two-to-one party ratio. With those numbers, anything should be possible under the lash of disciplined leadership. Sixty-five Democrats, thirty-five Republicans! (Think of it, Senator DASCHLE.) Of course, I use the word "enjoy" loosely. Ideological differences within our party seriously undercut that apparent numerical advantage.

I decided the time had come to put down my views in a candid address. There would then be no doubt as to where I stood. If some of my party colleagues believed that mine was not the style of leadership that suited them, they would be welcome to seek a change.

I had selected a Friday afternoon, when little else would be going on, to discuss "The Senate and Its Leadership." The date was Friday, November 22, 1963.

That day's tragic events put an end to any such speechmaking. On the following week,

as the nation grieved for President Kennedy, I simply inserted my prepared remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (November 27, 1963)

I have waited thirty-five years to give that speech. I wish to quote from that address to present views that I believe are as relevant today as they were more than a third of a century ago. But first, before I do so, I would like to quote Lao Tsu, a Chinese philosopher of ancient times, who said, "A leader is best when the people hardly know he exists. And of that leader the people will say when his work is done, 'We did this ourselves.'"

"THE SPEECH

"Mr. President, some days ago, blunt words were said on the floor of the Senate. They dealt in critical fashion with the state of this institution. They dealt in critical fashion with the quality of the majority leadership and the minority opposition. A far more important matter than criticism or praise of the leadership was involved. It is a matter which goes to the fundamental nature of the Senate.

"In this light, we have reason to be grateful because if what was stated was being said in the cloakrooms, then it should have been said on the floor. If, as was indicated, the functioning of the Senate itself is in question, the place to air that matter is on the floor of the Senate. We need no cloakroom commandos, operating behind the swinging doors of the two rooms at the rear, to spread the tidings. We need no whispered word passed from one to another and on to the press.

"We are here to do the public's business. On the floor of the Senate, the public's business is conducted in full sight and hearing of the public. And it is here, not in the cloakrooms, that the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, if you wish, will address himself to the question of the present state of the Senate and its leadership . . . It will be said to all senators and to all the members of the press who sit above us in more ways than one.

"How, Mr. President, do you measure the performance of this Congress—any Congress? How do you measure the performance of a Senate of one hundred independent men and women—any Senate? The question rarely arises, at least until an election approaches. And, then, our concern may well be with our own individual performance and not necessarily with that of the Senate as a whole.

"Yet that performance—the performance of the Senate as a whole—has been judged on the floor. Several senators, at least, judged it and found it seriously wanting. And with the hue and cry thus raised, they found echoes outside the Senate. I do not criticize senators for making the judgment, for raising the alarm. Even less do I criticize the press for spreading it. Senators were within their rights. And the press was not only within its rights but was performing a segment of its public duty, which is to report what transpires here.

"I, too, am within my rights, Mr. President, and I believe I am performing a duty of the leadership when I ask again: How do you judge the performance of this Congress—any Congress? Of this Senate—any Senate? Do you mix a concoction and drink it? And if you feel a sense of well-being thereafter, decide it is not so bad a Congress after all? But if you feel somewhat ill or depressed, then that, indeed, is proof unequivocal that the Congress is a bad Congress and the Senate is a bad Senate? Or do you shake your head back and forth negatively before a favored columnist when discussing the performance of this Senate? And if he, in turn, nods up and down, then that is proof that the performance is bad? . . .

"There is reference (by members and the media), to be sure, to time-wasting, to laziness, to absenteeism, to standing still, and so forth. But who are the time wasters in the Senate, Mr. President? Who is lazy? Who is an absentee? Each member can make his own judgment of his individual performance. I make no apologies for mine. Nor will I sit in judgment of any other member. On that score, each of us will answer to his own conscience, if not to his constituents.

"But, Mr. President, insofar as the performance of the Senate as a whole is concerned, with all due respect, these comments in time wasting have little relevance. Indeed, the Congress can, as it has—as it did in declaring World War II in less than a day—pass legislation which has the profoundest meaning for the entire nation. And by contrast, the Senate floor can look very busy day in and day out, month in and month out, while the Senate is indeed dawdling. At one time in the recollection of many of us, we debated a civil rights measure twenty-four hours a day for many days on end. We debated it shaven and unshaven. We debated it without ties, with hair awry, and even in bedroom slippers. In the end, we wound up with compromise legislation. And it was not the fresh and well-rested opponents of the civil rights measure who were compelled to the compromise. It was, rather, the exhausted, sleep-starved, quorum-confounded proponents who were only too happy to take it.

"No, Mr. President, if we would estimate the performance of this Congress or any other, this Senate or any other, we will have to find a more reliable yardstick than whether, on the floor, we act as time wasters or moonlighters. As every member of the Senate and press knows, even if the public generally does not, the Senate is neither more nor less effective because the Senate is in session from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., or to 9 a.m. the next day.

"Nor does the length of the session indicate a greater or lesser effectiveness. We live in a twelve-month nation. It may well be that the times are pushing us in the direction of a twelve-months Congress. In short, we cannot measure a Congress or a Senate by the standards of the stretch-out or of the speedup. It will be of no avail to install a time clock at the entrance to the chamber for Senators to punch when they enter or leave the floor.

"There has been a great deal said on this floor about featherbedding in certain industries. But if we want to see a featherbedding to end all featherbedding, we will have the Senate sit here day in and day out, from dawn until dawn, whether or not the calendar calls for it, in order to impress the boss—the American people—with our industriousness. We may not shuffle papers as bureaucrats are assumed to do when engaged in this art. What we are likely to shuffle is words—words to the President on how to execute the foreign policy or administer the domestic affairs of the nation. And when these words pall, we will undoubtedly turn to the Court to give that institution the benefit of our advice on its responsibilities. And if we run out of judicial wisdom, we can always turn to advising the governors of the states, or the mayors of the cities, or the heads of other nations, on how to manage their concerns.

"Let me make it clear that Senators individually have every right to comment on whatever they wish, and to do so on the floor of the Senate. Highly significant initiatives on all manner of public affairs have had their genesis in the remarks of individual Senators on the floor. But there is one clear-cut, day-in-and-day-out responsibility of the Senate as a whole. Beyond all others, it is the

constitutional responsibility to be here and to consider and to act in concert with the House on the legislative needs of the nation. And the effectiveness with which that responsibility is discharged cannot be measured by any reference to the clocks on the walls of the chamber.

"Nor can it be measured, really, by the output of legislation. For those who are computer-minded, however, the record shows that 12,656 bills and resolutions were introduced in the 79th Congress of 1945 and 1946. And in the 87th Congress of 1961 and 1962, (that number had increased by) 60 percent. And the records show further that in the 79th Congress, 2,117 bills and resolutions were passed, and in the 87th, 2,217 were passed.

"But what do these figures tell us, Mr. President? Do they tell us that the Congress has been doing poorly because in the face of an 8,000 increase in the biannual input of bills and resolutions, the output of laws fifteen years later had increased by only a hundred? They tell us nothing of the kind.

"If these figures tell us anything, they tell us that the pressures on Congress have intensified greatly. They suggest, further, that Congress may be resistant to these pressures. But whether Congress resists rightly or wrongly, to the benefit or detriment of the nation, these figures tell us nothing at all.

"There is a (more meaningful way to measure) the effectiveness of a Democratic administration. I refer to the approach which is commonly used these days of totaling the Presidential or executive branch requests for significant legislation and weighing against that total the number of congressional responses in the form of law.

"On this basis, if the Congress enacts a small percentage of the executive branch requests, it is presumed, somewhat glibly and impertinently, to be an ineffective Congress. But if the percentage is high, it follows that it is classifiable as an effective Congress. I am not so sure that I would agree, and I am certain that the distinguished minority leader (Senator Dirksen) and his party would not agree that that is a valid test. The opposition might measure in precisely the opposite fashion. The opposition might, indeed, find a Democratic Congress which enacted little, if any, of a Democratic administration's legislation, a paragon among congresses. And yet I know that the distinguished minority leader does not reason in that fashion, for he has acted time and time again not to kill administration measures, but to help to pass them when he was persuaded that the interests of the nation so required. . . . I see no basis for apology on statistical grounds either for this Congress to date or for the last. But at the same time, I do not take umbrage in statistics. I do not think that statistics, however refined, tell much of the story of whether or not a particular Congress or Senate is effective or ineffective.

"I turn, finally, to the recent criticism which has been raised as to the quality of the leadership. Of late, Mr. President, the descriptions of the majority leader, of the Senator from Montana, have ranged from a benign Mr. Chips, to glamourous, to tragic mistake.

"It is true, Mr. President, that I have taught school, although I cannot claim either the tenderness, the understanding, or the perception of Mr. Chips for his charges. I confess freely to a lack of glamour. As for being a tragic mistake, if that means, Mr. President, that I am neither a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate night club, a tamer of Senate lions, or a wheeler and dealer, then I must accept, too, that title. Indeed, I must accept it if I am expected as majority leader to be anything other than myself—a Senator from Montana

who has had the good fortune to be trusted by his people for over two decades and done the best he knows how to represent them, and to do what he believes to be right for the nation.

"Insofar as I am personally concerned, these or any other labels can be borne. I achieved the height of my political ambitions when I was elected Senator from Montana. When the Senate saw fit to designate me as majority leader, it was the Senate's choice, not mine, and what the Senate has bestowed, it is always at liberty to revoke.

"But so long as I have this responsibility, it will be discharged to the best of my ability by me as I am. I would not, even if I could, presume to a tough-mindedness which, with all due respect to those who use this cliché, I have always had difficulty in distinguishing from soft-headedness or simple-mindedness. I shall not don any Mandarin's robes or any skin other than that to which I am accustomed in order that I may look like a majority leader or sound like a majority leader—however a majority leader is supposed to look or sound. I am what I am, and no title, political face-lifter, or image-maker can alter it.

"I believe that I am, as are most Senators, an ordinary American with a normal complement of vices and, I hope, virtues, of weaknesses and, I hope, strengths. As such, I do my best to be courteous, decent, and understanding of others, and sometimes fail at it.

"I have always felt that the President of the United States—whoever he may be . . . is worthy of the respect of the Senate. I have always felt that he bears a greater burden of responsibility than any individual Senator for the welfare and security of the nation, for he alone can speak for the nation abroad; and he alone, at home, stands with the Congress as a whole, as constituted representatives of the entire American people. In the exercise of his grave responsibilities, I believe we have a profound responsibility to give him whatever understanding and support we can, in good conscience and in conformity with our independent duties. I believe we owe it to the nation of which all our States are a part—particularly in matters of foreign relations—to give to him not only responsible opposition, but responsible cooperation.

"And, finally, within this body, I believe that every member ought to be equal in fact, no less than in theory, that they have a primary responsibility to the people whom they represent to face the legislative issues of the nation. And to the extent that the Senate may be inadequate in this connection, the remedy lies not in the seeking of shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips, not in wheeling and dealing, but in an honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accommodation, by respect for one another, by mutual restraint and, as necessary, adjustments in the procedures of this body.

"The constitutional authority and responsibility does not lie with the leadership. It lies with all of us individually, collectively, and equally. And in the last analysis, deviations from that principle must in the end act to the detriment of the institution. And, in the end, that principle cannot be made to prevail by rules. It can prevail only if there is a high degree of accommodation, mutual restraint, and a measure of courage—in spite of our weaknesses—in all of us. It can prevail only if we recognize that, in the end, it is not the Senators as individuals who are of fundamental importance. In the end, it is the institution of the Senate. It is the Senate itself as one of the foundations of the Constitution. It is the Senate as one of the rocks of the Republic."

Thus ended my abridged observations of November 1963.

In my remarks during the 1976 dedication ceremonies in this chamber, I returned to the themes of 1963. I stated my belief that, in its fundamentals, the Senate of modern times may not have changed essentially from the Senate of Clay, Webster, and Calhoun.

What moved Senators yesterday still moves Senators today. We have the individual and collective strength of our predecessors and, I might add, their weaknesses. We are not all ten feet tall, nor were they. Senators act within the circumstances of their fears no less than their courage, their foibles as well as their strengths. Our concerns and our efforts in the Senate, like our predecessors and successors, arise from our goals of advancing the welfare of the people whom we represent, safeguarding the well-being of our respective States and protecting the present and future of this nation, a nation which belongs—as does this room—not to one of us, or to one generation, but to all of us and to all generations.

The significance of that 1976 gathering—and perhaps of our being here tonight—is to remind us that in a Senate of immense and still unfolding significance to the nation, each individual member can play only a brief and limited role. It is to remind us that the Senate's responsibilities go on, even though the faces and, yes, even the rooms in which they gather, fade into history. With the nation, the Senate has come a long way. And still, there is a long way to go.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, March 24, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,542,617,421,989.90 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-two billion, six hundred seventeen million, four hundred twenty-one thousand, nine hundred eighty-nine dollars and ninety cents).

One year ago, March 24, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,370,449,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred seventy billion, four hundred forty-nine million).

Five years ago, March 24, 1993, the federal debt stood at \$4,222,103,000,000 (Four trillion, two hundred twenty-two billion, one hundred three million).

Ten years ago, March 24, 1988, the federal debt stood at \$2,480,220,000,000 (Two trillion, four hundred eighty billion, two hundred twenty million).

Fifteen years ago, March 24, 1983, the federal debt stood at \$1,223,450,000,000 (One trillion, two hundred twenty-three billion, four hundred fifty million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,319,167,421,989.90 (Four trillion, three hundred nineteen billion, one hundred sixty-seven million, four hundred twenty-one thousand, nine hundred eighty-nine dollars and ninety cents) during the past 15 years.

#### U.S. FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION FOR WEEK ENDING MARCH 20TH

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute's report for the week ending March 20, that the U.S. imported 8,724,000 barrels of oil each day, 2,318,000 more barrels than the 6,406,000 imported each day during the same week a year ago.

Americans relied on foreign oil for 57.6 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf War, the United States obtained approximately 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970s, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the U.S.—now 8,724,000 barrels a day.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ZION GROVE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a tremendous community which exemplifies citizenship, character, and service to humanity, the Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church.

On January 18, 1998, the members of the Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church held their long and eagerly anticipated "Mortgage Burning Party." Under the guidance of their respected pastor, the Reverend Frank L. Selkirk III, Ph.D., the Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church will draw to a close its financial debts and begin to look forward, with faith, hope and love to a future filled with opportunity.

The history of this wonderful church has been nothing short of a small blessing. From its humble beginning on October 15, 1938, with a congregation of only eight members, Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church continued to grow and flourish with each year and each dedicated pastor until it reached its present location at 2801 Swope Parkway in Kansas City, Missouri. This church and the community which comprises it are examples of dedication, perseverance, and commitment to the future.

With God's blessing, and the faithful support of the Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church community, "The Mortgage Burning Party" will be a celebration of the blessings that will continue to reward the Zion Grove Missionary Baptist Church.

#### TRIBUTE TO HELEN COX

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a tremendous individual who exemplifies citizenship, character, and service to humanity, Helen Cox.

Helen Cox of Willow Springs, Missouri has been a foster parent since 1989. Throughout her tenure as a foster parent, Helen has cared for over 150 foster children. Helen has spent countless hours drying tears, rocking children to sleep, and sitting up night after night with children unable to sleep. The golden rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you is exemplified in Helen's home. Through pa-

tience and firmness, Helen has taught these children that household tasks, school work and other responsibilities are a part of learning how to survive and thrive in the world. The comfortable country environment, that includes the friendship and therapy of animals, has nurtured many children.

Helen recently celebrated her seventy-second birthday and was honored at a reception on December 7, 1997, by the Foster Parent Association of West Plains, Missouri. Even at the age of seventy-two, she is serving others and maintaining frequent contact with many of the children who were placed in her home. It is an honor to commend Helen for her commitment to provide a loving home for the many children she has served as a foster parent.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:55 a.m. a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 517(e)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1131), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following participant on the part of the House to the National Summit on Retirement Savings to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mr. Jack Ulrich of Pennsylvania.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 801(b) of Public Law 100-696, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Mr. WALSH of New York.

The message further announced that the Houses has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 118. An act to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

H.R. 2843. An act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to reevaluate the equipment in medical kits carried on, and to make a decision regarding requiring automatic external defibrillators to be carried on, aircraft operated by air carriers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3096. An act to correct a provision relating to termination of benefits for convicted persons.

H.R. 3211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enact into law eligibility requirements for burial in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3213. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify enforcement of veterans' employment and reemployment rights with respect to a State as an employer or a private employer, to extend veterans' employment and reemployment rights to members of the uniformed services employed abroad by United States companies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3226. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements in State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3412. An act to amend and make technical corrections in title III of the Small Business Investment Act.

At 6:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by