The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]; amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]; amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT]; amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN]; and amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Did the Chair say the first amendment to be voted on is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. That will be No. 1.

The votes will be as follows: a 15-minute vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], a 5-minute vote on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], a 5-minute vote on amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] a 5-minute vote on amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], and a 5-minute vote on amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

One of the amendments offered was agreed to without a recorded vote being required.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in House Report No. 104–85 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 203, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No 257]

AYES—228

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Moorhead
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Morella
Archer	Frisa	Myers
Armey	Funderburk	Myrick
Bachus	Gallegly	Nethercutt
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Norwood
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Nussle
Barr	Gillmor	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Packard
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barton	Goodling	Petri
Bass	Goss	Pombo
Bateman	Graham	Porter
Bereuter	Greenwood	Portman
Bilbray	Gunderson	Pryce
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Quillen
Bliley	Hancock	Quinn
Blute	Hansen	Radanovich
Boehlert	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bonilla	Hayworth	Riggs
Bono	Hefley	Roberts
Brownback	Heineman	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hobson	Roth
Burr	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burton	Hoke	Royce
Buyer	Horn	Salmon
Callahan	Hostettler	Sanford
Calvert	Houghton	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Castle	Hyde	Schiff
Chabot	Inglis	Seastrand
Chambliss	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chrysler	Jones	Shays
Clinger	Kasich	Shuster
Coble	Kelly	Skeen
Coburn	Kim	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cox	Knollenberg	Solomon
Crane	Kolbe	Souder
Crapo	LaHood	Spence
Cremeans	Largent	Stearns
Cubin	Latham	Stockman
Cunningham	LaTourette	Stump
Davis	Lazio	Talent
DeLay	Leach	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Dornan	Linder	Tiahrt
Dreier	Livingston	Torkildsen
Duncan	LoBiondo	Upton
Dunn	Longley	Vucanovich
Ehlers	Lucas	Waldholtz
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Walker
Emerson	Martini	Walsh
English	McCollum	Wamp
Ensign	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Everett	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McHugh	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	McInnis	Weller
Fields (TX)	McIntosh	White
Flanagan	McKeon	Wicker
Foley	Metcalf	Wolf
Forbes	Meyers	Young (AK)
Fowler	Mica	Young (FL)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Zimmer

NOES—203

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Deal
Baesler	Bryant (TX)	DeFazio
Baldacci	Cardin	DeLauro
Barcia	Chapman	Dellums
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Deutsch
Becerra	Clayton	Dicks
Beilenson	Clement	Dingell
Bentsen	Clyburn	Dixon
Berman	Coleman	Doggett
Bevill	Collins (IL)	Dooley
Bishop	Collins (MI)	Durbin
Bonior	Condit	Engel
Borski	Conyers	Eshoo
Boucher	Costello	Evans
Brewster	Coyne	Farr
Browder	Cramer	Fattah
Brown (CA)	Danner	Fazio
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Roemer
Filner	Manton	Rose
Foglietta	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Ford	Martinez	Rush
Frank (MA)	Mascara	Sabo
Frost	Matsui	Sanders
Furse	McCarthy	Sawyer
Gejdenson	McDermott	Schroeder
Gephardt	McHale	Schumer
Geren	McKinney	Scott
Gibbons	McNulty	Serrano
Gonzalez	Meehan	Sisisky
Gordon	Meek	Skaggs
Green	Menendez	Skelton
Gutierrez	Mfume	Slaughter
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Hall (TX)	Mineta	Stark
Hamilton	Minge	Stenholm
Harman	Mink	Stokes
Hastings (FL)	Moakley	Studds
Hayes	Mollohan	Stupak
Hefner	Montgomery	Tanner
Hilliard	Moran	Tauzin
Hinchey	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Holden	Nadler	Tejeda
Hoyer	Neal	Thompson
Jackson-Lee	Neumann	Thornton
Jacobs	Oberstar	Thurman
Jefferson	Obey	Torres
Johnson (SD)	Olver	Torricelli
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Towns
Johnston	Orton	Traficant
Kanjorski	Owens	Tucker
Kaptur	Pallone	Velazquez
Kennedy (MA)	Parker	Vento
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Visclosky
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Volkmer
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Ward
Kleczka	Pelosi	Waters
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Watt (NC)
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Lantos	Pickett	Whitfield
Laughlin	Pomeroy	Williams
Levin	Poshard	Wilson
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Wise
Lincoln	Rangel	Woolsey
Lipinski	Reed	Wyden
Lofgren	Reynolds	Wynn
Lowey	Richardson	Yates
Luther	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—3

Doyle	Edwards	Flake

☐ 1924

Mr. NEUMANN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recorded as voting no on No. 257, the Archer amendment. Due to a delay in getting back, I missed the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the first of a series of four 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc, as modified.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc, as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—249

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—177

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Bachus
Christensen
Doyle
Edwards
Flake
Rush
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)

□ 1933

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. COSTELLO, and, Ms. MOLINARI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, let the record reflect that I would have voted yes in favor of the en bloc amendment offered by the committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARCHER]. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here, I would have voted aye.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TALENT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A record vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 337, answered not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—96

Allard
Andrews
Armey
Baker (CA)
Barr
Barton
Bateman
Bilbray
Boehner
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Burr
Buyer
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Cooley
Crapo
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Emerson
English
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Funderburk
Gephardt
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
King
Kingston
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lucas
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Minge
Norwood
Paxon
Pombo
Roemer
Roth
Royce
Sanford
Scarborough
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker

NOES—337

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lantos
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
White
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—1

Edwards

☐ 1942

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Messrs. BONO, BARRETT of Nebraska, and BEREUTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WARD and Mr. ISTOOK changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUNN OF OREGON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 351, noes 81, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—351

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—81

Abercrombie
Becerra
Bishop
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Deal
Dellums
Dingell
Dixon
Evans
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hostettler
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kolbe
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Nadler
Orton
Owens
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Reynolds
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Schumer
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Yates

NOT VOTING—2

Edwards
Frank (MA)

☐ 1952

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. WILLIAMS, SHAYS, ENGEL, and SERRANO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 104–85 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 352, noes 80, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No 261]

AYES—352

Ackerman	Duncan	Klug
Allard	Dunn	Knollenberg
Andrews	Durbin	LaFalce
Archer	Ehlers	LaHood
Armey	Ehrlich	Lantos
Bachus	Emerson	Largent
Baesler	Engel	Latham
Baker (CA)	English	LaTourette
Baker (LA)	Ensign	Laughlin
Baldacci	Eshoo	Lazio
Ballenger	Everett	Leach
Barcia	Ewing	Levin
Barr	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Barrett (NE)	Fawell	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (WI)	Fields (TX)	Lightfoot
Bartlett	Filner	Linder
Barton	Flake	Lipinski
Bass	Flanagan	Livingston
Bateman	Foglietta	LoBiondo
Bentsen	Foley	Longley
Bereuter	Forbes	Lowey
Berman	Fowler	Lucas
Bevill	Fox	Luther
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Maloney
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Manton
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Blute	Frisa	Markey
Boehlert	Frost	Martinez
Boehner	Funderburk	Martini
Bonilla	Furse	Mascara
Bono	Gallegly	McCarthy
Borski	Ganske	McCollum
Boucher	Gejdenson	McCrery
Brewster	Gekas	McDade
Browder	Geren	McHale
Brown (OH)	Gilchrest	McHugh
Brownback	Gillmor	McInnis
Bryant (TN)	Gilman	McKeon
Bryant (TX)	Goodlatte	McNulty
Bunn	Goodling	Meehan
Bunning	Gordon	Menendez
Burr	Goss	Metcalf
Burton	Graham	Mfume
Buyer	Green	Mica
Callahan	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Gunderson	Minge
Camp	Gutknecht	Moakley
Canady	Hall (OH)	Molinari
Cardin	Hamilton	Mollohan
Castle	Hancock	Montgomery
Chabot	Hansen	Moorhead
Chambliss	Harman	Moran
Chapman	Hastert	Morella
Chenoweth	Hastings (WA)	Murtha
Christensen	Hayes	Myers
Chrysler	Hayworth	Myrick
Clayton	Hefley	Nadler
Clement	Heineman	Neal
Clinger	Herger	Nethercutt
Coble	Hilleary	Ney
Coleman	Hobson	Norwood
Collins (GA)	Hoekstra	Nussle
Combest	Hoke	Oberstar
Condit	Holden	Obey
Cooley	Horn	Olver
Costello	Houghton	Ortiz
Cox	Hoyer	Orton
Cramer	Hunter	Oxley
Crane	Hutchinson	Packard
Crapo	Hyde	Pallone
Cremeans	Inglis	Parker
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Cunningham	Jacobs	Paxon
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)
Davis	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
de la Garza	Johnson, Sam	Petri
DeFazio	Jones	Pombo
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
DeLay	Kaptur	Porter
Deutsch	Kasich	Portman
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Poshard
Dickey	Kennedy (MA)	Pryce
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Quillen
Dixon	Kennelly	Quinn
Doggett	Kildee	Radanovich
Dooley	Kim	Rahall
Doolittle	King	Ramstad
Dornan	Kingston	Rangel
Doyle	Kleczka	Reed
Dreier	Klink	Regula
Richardson	Skaggs	Visclosky
Riggs	Skeen	Volkmer
Rivers	Skelton	Vucanovich
Roberts	Smith (NJ)	Waldholtz
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Walker
Rogers	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Rohrabacher	Solomon	Wamp
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Ward
Roth	Spence	Watts (OK)
Roukema	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Royce	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Sabo	Stockman	Weller
Salmon	Stump	White
Sanders	Stupak	Whitfield
Sanford	Talent	Wicker
Sawyer	Tate	Williams
Saxton	Tauzin	Wilson
Schaefer	Taylor (MS)	Wise
Schiff	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Schroeder	Tejeda	Woolsey
Scott	Thomas	Wyden
Seastrand	Thornberry	Wynn
Sensenbrenner	Thornton	Young (AK)
Serrano	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Shadegg	Torres	Zeliff
Shaw	Traficant	Zimmer
Shuster	Upton	
Sisisky	Vento	

NOES—80

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Becerra	Hefner	Reynolds
Beilenson	Hilliard	Rose
Bishop	Hinchey	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Hostettler	Rush
Brown (CA)	Istook	Scarborough
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Schumer
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Shays
Clyburn	Johnston	Slaughter
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Collins (MI)	Lincoln	Stark
Conyers	Lofgren	Stokes
Coyne	Matsui	Studds
Deal	McDermott	Tanner
Dellums	McIntosh	Thompson
Dingell	McKinney	Thurman
Evans	Meek	Torkildsen
Fattah	Meyers	Torricelli
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Towns
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Tucker
Ford	Mink	Velazquez
Gephardt	Neumann	Waters
Gibbons	Owens	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	Payne (NJ)	Waxman
Gutierrez	Pelosi	Yates
Hall (TX)	Peterson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—2

Edwards	Frank (MA)

□ 1954

Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SANFORD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 104–85.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDEN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYDEN: Page 60, line 8, insert '', using adult relatives as the preferred placement for children separated from their parents if such relatives meet all State child protection standards'' before the semicolon.

Page 72, line 4, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Each State''.

Page 72, after line 20, insert the following:

''(b) PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN WITH RELATIVES.—A State to which a grant is made under this part may consider—

''(1) establishing a new type of foster care placement, which could be considered a permanent placement, for children who are separated from their parents (in this subsection referred to as 'kinship care') under which—

''(A) adult relatives of such children would be the preferred placement option if such relatives meet all relevant child protection standards established by the State;

''(B) the State would make a needs-based payment and provide supportive services, as appropriate, with respect to children placed in a kinship care arrangement; and

''(2) in placing children for adoption, giving preference to adult relatives who meet applicable adoption standards (including those acting as foster parents of such children).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to the amendment, and I would claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would encourage our States to utilize the Nation's grandparents, with their vast treasury of love and practical experience, to help our youngsters who might otherwise be abandoned or put in foster care facilities, or put up for adoption.

From across the country in recent months I have heard from grandparents who often are not informed at all by child protection agencies in their States when their grandchildren are moved to foster care facilities or put up for adoption.

We all know that when children are separated from their parents, it is usually a painful and traumatic experience. Living with grandparents they know and trust gives them a better opportunity in the world.

This amendment would strengthen the ability of families to rely on their own family members as resources, and would promote self-reliance within our families and within our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that this amendment is not prescriptive. It is a permissive one. It would simply offer to the States to use the Nation's grandparents when those grandparents meet child safety protection standards. This amendment is supported by the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Coalition of Grandparents, and grandparents organizations from across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the majority has been extremely helpful in the developing of this amendment, for which I appreciate their assistance.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for a very wise amendment. Being a grandfather of five myself, I can certainly appreciate the full impact to which the gentleman speaks, and I think he brings a very good element to the bill. I plan to support it.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a provision in this bill that will make a dramatic difference for the kids in this country who are waiting for placement in adoptive homes.

Since the early 1980's, adoption placement agencies have been discriminating against these kids and prospective parents because of their race. Under guidelines that the Department of Health and Human Services sent out to State agencies back in 1981, race is one of the factors that can be used in placing children in adoptive homes.

In practice, when the actual placement is made by the agencies, race often becomes the sole matching factor that social workers use in making these decisions.

The result of this has been that minority children end up waiting twice as long in foster care as white children. And black children, while only constituting 14 percent of the child population, now account for over 40 percent of the children in foster care.

Since black families only make up 12.5 percent of the population, this has led Randall Kennedy, the black Harvard law professor, to note that ''even if you do a super job of recruiting, in Massachusetts, where only 5 percent of the population is black and nearly half the kids in need of homes are black, you are still going to have a problem.''

This is not an indictment of the black community. Black Americans have a long tradition of ''taking care of their own'' through informal adoption, kinship care, and other arrangements that are not made public and do not show up in official counts.

But, given all that the black community has done, and given 20 years of Federal money going for minority recruitment, we still have a large number of black children with no place to call home.

A provision in the Republican welfare bill will help solve this problem. It would deny Federal funds to any agency that uses race as a criteria in placing children in adoptive homes. It is a color-blind provision that will help a lot of children get out of foster care into permanent loving homes, and I think is consistent with our Nation's civil rights laws.

Last year, Senator METZENBAUM got a provision included in the minority health amendment bill that originally would have done what we are trying to do in this welfare reform bill. But by the time the so-called child advocates got a whiff of this and helped get it watered down in conference, the provision only codified the then-current practice that Senator METZENBAUM was originally trying to overturn.

Since the Metzenbaum bill passed, 43 States have interpreted this law to mean that they can use race to hold up children in foster care. But, now Senator METZENBAUM has indicated that he would like to see his bill repealed so that kids are not tied up in foster care just because of the color of their skin.

Back in the late 1960's and 1970's, more than 10,000 black children were adopted by white parents. Research and countless studies clearly show that these children know who they are, feel good about themselves, and do well in school. Until HHS handed down the deluded 1981 guidelines, this was a practice that was working.

I know that this is true because I have personal experience in this matter. Two of my daughters have adopted minority children—one that is Korean, one that is biracial. And I can attest to how well this has worked out for my family. The children are happy and doing well, and they have made my family a brighter and happier one.

Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between a policy that is based on race and one that is sensitive to race. A policy that prohibits delaying the placement of a child into an adoptive home because of race is not insensitive to race as a cultural issue, but cognizant of the fact that the defining variable here is not race but a loving home.

Potential parents should be judged by the love in their hearts, not the color of their skin. Potential adoptive children should be judged not by the color of their skin but by their needs as children.

The new policy in this welfare reform bill would accomplish an end to the sacrifice of tens of thousands of minority children, on the altar of political correctness. It is one of the best provisions in this entire bill, and one that I believe will really help improve the race relations in our country.

But, most importantly, it will help the kids who are in limbo now, stuck in foster homes only because of their skin color. That is sad, Mr. Chairman, and it is wrong. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and make a difference in these children's lives.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman offered this amendment, basically what he was doing was repeal the Metzenbaum provisions that were passed in the last Congress, is that correct?

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. Therefore, we would go back to language prior to the Metzenbaum bill passed last year?

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. The Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, basically, we know there are many, many kids of minority who are trapped into foster care simply because they cannot find parents who will adopt them, and I also would like to make note that it was the Personal Responsibility Act by the Republicans, under the tax cut plan, that gave a $5,000 tax credit, but it is nonrefundable.

Many of the kids that the gentleman takes reference to today will remain in foster care facilities simply because people who are working and making $20,000 and $30,000 a year will not be able to receive that tax credit.

Once again, only the wealthy and rich of this Nation will be able to receive the tax credit to adopt these kids that the gentleman is trying to help, and I support the gentleman's concept. I am not in opposition to it.

I think those in the country of biracial adoptions, I have no problem with that, but in the gentleman's tax cut bill, he comes back and creates a problem for minorities who are working and other people who have low incomes who are making $20,000 and $30,000 a year.

The tax cut plan under the Republicans, under their Contract With America, it does just what the gentleman is trying to do for rich people, but it takes it away from the working poor of this country.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] realizes we are discussing the welfare reform bill, and when we get to the tax bill I will be more than happy to debate the issue with the gentleman on the $5,000 credit for adoption.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will continue to yield, absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that, and I understand that. However, $69.4 billion in this 5-year window that will be saved will go to offset the $189 million tax cut for a 5-year period as well.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. It is possible that that could be, but it is improbable that we will need it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment. I think this is what we were trying to do in the conference committee last year with Senator Metzenbaum, and I think we got some bad advice from HHS on some language.

I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, children need love. Children need families. Children need consistency and unity as they grow up.

The best place to get the fundamentals of life is with their own families, if possible—if not, other permanent measures for the children's stability should be the primary objective.

In most cases, the two-parent family, along with other family members contribute positively in a child's life. Family should be considered as a major factor in the equation of solving the

welfare problem. Before making the automatic assumption that people should be swept into the welfare trap, the State should be given the flexibility to consider the eligibility of a member of the kinship care network—a grandparent, a noncustodial parent perhaps, or even an aunt or uncle.

I urge you to support this very pro-family proposal as an important and integral part of the House welfare reform package.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2015

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment number 11 printed in House Report 104–85.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WOOLSEY: Page 74, line 8, strike ''Secretary'' and insert ''Attorney General of the United States''.

Page 74, line 9, insert ''by contract'' after ''operate''.

Page 74, line 15, strike ''Secretary'' and insert ''Attorney General of the United States''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any opposition on the floor, but I would claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Woolsey/Ramstad amendment is a technical amendment that corrects an inadvertent error made during the drafting of H.R. 1214.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that it is in our bipartisan best interest to protect programs for missing and exploited children. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] for his support.

Mr. Chairman, in October of 1993, 13-year-old Polly Klaas was abducted by a stranger from her home in Petaluma, which is in my district. I know that many of my colleagues are aware of this tragic story. But what many of my colleagues may not be aware of is that an important role was played by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in the search for Polly.

The Center alerted 17,000 police departments nationwide. They broadcast public service announcements on all the major television networks. they distributed sketches of Polly and her abductor through the network of nearly 400 private sector partners. The Center has provided these same crucial services in searches for almost 40,000 children nationwide. This amendment preserves the effectiveness of the Center's programs by keeping these programs in the Department of Justice where they now reside. This is necessary because H.R. 4 repeals the Missing Children's Act which among other things establishes the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

In order to ensure that the Center continues to operate, H.R. 4 also authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish and operate the Clearinghouse and Hot Line for Missing and Runaway Children. However, under the current congressional mandate in the Missing Children's Act, it is the Department of Justice which works in partnership with the Center to operate the clearinghouse and hot line.

The Woolsey-Ramstad amendment moves the authority back to the Attorney General, in the Department of Justice, and gives her continued authority to contract with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to operate the clearinghouse and the hot line. This amendment is strongly supported by both the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, it is crucial that the Center and the Department of Justice continue their 10-year partnership to protect our most precious national resource, our children.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also for her cosponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

As the author of the Jacob Wetterling Crimes against Children Act, I know the importance of maintaining a partnership between the Justice Department and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Last year alone, Mr. Chairman, the Justice Department reported that over 114,000 children in this country were targets of attempted abduction. Fortunately, the National Center is doing an outstanding job to both recover abducted children and prevent abductions in the first place.

The Center's toll-free hot line has logged over 750,000 calls since 1984. Each week the Center distributes literally millions of photographs of missing children and many of these are high-tech, age-enhanced photos. In fact right now the photo of Jacob Wetterling, the young boy from Minnesota who was kidnapped a number of years ago, Jacob would have just celebrated his 17th birthday, Mr. Chairman, and that photo of Jacob, how he does look now at 17, has been circulated around the Nation. The center has also printed 8.3 million publications and trained over 130,000 police and other professionals.

Here is the main evidence that our investment in the Center is worthwhile. After working with law enforcement on over 40,000 cases, more than 26,000 children have been recovered.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this amendment as the gentlewoman from California said is technical, it simply restores the authority for the Justice Department to retain the 10-year partnership with the Center rather than start anew with another agency.

Let us pass this important amendment and preserve this important sponsorship. Our children and our families deserve nothing less.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, we both agree with the amendment and we are very pleased with the gentlewoman from California for bringing it to our attention. She is quite correct, it was a drafting error, we compliment her for bringing it to our attention and we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the rule before us today. Welfare reform is one of the most important issues we will consider in this Congress, and yet, of the more than 150 amendments filed with the Rules Committee, only 30 amendments have been made in order. And furthermore, most Democratic amendments have been shut out of the debate.

I had filed an amendment, not allowed to be considered under the rule before us today, that would have made the two nutrition block grants more flexible to changing economic conditions within states. My amendment would have established a trigger which would have made States with rising unemployment eligible for increased funding to expand its nutrition programs during economic downturns.

I offered this amendment in markup of the Opportunities Committee, and it has received bipartisan support. In addition, both Republican and Democratic Governors are on record as supporting a block grant trigger.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this restrictive rule.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, throughout my career in Congress, I have watched as Democrat majorities sat idly by and watched the welfare system destroy the lives of millions of Americans. I have watched as these failed liberal policies have burrowed a deeper and deeper hole of dependency, abuse, and fiscal irresponsibility for our children and their children.

Democrats argue today that they are in favor of change. They claim to recognize the fact that welfare has not only failed to solve problems, but it has actually made them worse. Unfortunately, this realization comes too late. Last year, Democrats who then controlled the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Presidency, could not reform the system. In historic numbers, the American people embraced the Republican reform proposal, and Republicans will reform the welfare system.

While I strongly support this bill, I must admit to some reservations. I believe it is unfortunate that we have left untouched some

programs that States could much more efficiently administer as block grants. I have concerns about the expanded use of Social Security numbers under the child support provisions. Finally, I believe there are understandable fears that this bill could adversely impact the number of abortions. But the vast majority of this bill will be beneficial and will help those in need.

Opponents of this welfare reform package have chosen to call supporters mean spirited, and they claim that the bill puts children at risk. I believe that it is far more uncaring and callous to put children and their parents into a welfare system that offers little hope of escape. I do not wish to leave future generations with the social and fiscal responsibilities of cleaning up our mess.

This bill does not, as some on the other side have argued, need a jobs program. Welfare reform, along with other provisions in the contract, is in and of itself a jobs program. By reducing the size of Government, by getting Government out of people's lives, and by cutting the tax burden felt by the American public, jobs will be naturally created. In fact, I would argue that we would today have more jobs with higher wages were it not for Government intrusion into the market.

What we do need is to end the cycle of dependency that has been created by the current welfare system. In too many cases, the current system has created what amount to reservations. So long as beneficiaries stay within certain boundaries, they will be given food and clothing and shelter and other benefits. The system not only does not reward those who try to move off of the reservation, it actually punishes them. This bill provides substantial incentives for States and individuals to make real efforts at moving beneficiaries to self-sufficiency and reducing the welfare rolls.

Perhaps most importantly, this bill gives the States the flexibility to reach those goals. While Governors across the Nation have been experimenting with innovative programs and finding great success in giving beneficiaries the opportunities and incentives they need to become independent, the Federal Government has been largely static, watching without acting. In this bill, we will give States the opportunity to push those experiments even further. We will give States very real incentives to adopt successful programs from other States, without imposing Federal mandates from on high.

Today, we begin to move in the right direction, but I hope that this will be only the first step. I hope that we will be able to implement further reforms in the future to give States more resources and more responsibilities. Some may see this bill as too large a step, others may call it too small. But it is a step. And it is one step more than Democrats ever made. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the important provisions contained in this en bloc amendment offered by Chairman Archer. I commend the chairman for his hard work on this bill and for his willingness to accept amendments that strengthen H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act.

Few disagree with the fact that our present welfare system is failing. Our Nation's 30-year-old, $5.3 trillion war on poverty has done little to improve the plight of the poor. America's current welfare system encourages illegitimacy, nonwork, and dependency. Those whom we are fighting to protect have instead been imprisoned in a cycle of poverty that is passed from generation to generation. America's campaign against poverty has claimed many victims—most notably, and tragically, our children have suffered.

For this reason, I have joined with my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, in offering a sense-of-Congress resolution regarding the use of funds under the Child Protection Block Grant. Our resolution, which has been included in the chairman's en bloc amendment, encourages States to allocate sufficient funds under their Child Protection Block Grant to promote adoption. I think we can all agree that a loving family is the best social structure in which a child can be raised.

As an adoptive mother of a 4-year-old, the issue of adoption is very important to me and has a permanent place in my heart. In the debate about policy, it is sometimes easy to lose sight of those about whom we speak. They are, after all, our children.

Today, too many children are abused and neglected in their home environment. Our child welfare systems are charged with the task of protecting these innocent victims and providing them with substitute care when necessary. Ideally, these children would be placed with a family that can provide a stable environment and a consistent caring relationship. Instead, many children end up in the often unstable and lonely foster care system, including group homes and orphanages. The adverse conditions faced by these children in an abusive home and then in institutionalized care hinders their ability to develop positive social skills and succeed in adulthood. There are tens of thousands of children waiting to be embraced into caring families willing to raise them in an atmosphere of love, self-respect, and responsibility. Adoptive families are 100 percent functional, happy, and whole.

The Burton-Pryce amendment stresses to States the importance of facilitating the permanent placement of children into loving families, and strongly urges States to devote child protection funds to adoption for that purpose. Specifically, it encourages the facilitated adoption of special-needs children and suggests a tax credit to families to make these adoptions more affordable.

I encourage my colleagues to support this sense-of-Congress resolution which seeks to protect our children and provide them with hope for the future by voting in favor of Chairman ARCHER's en bloc amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, our current welfare system strips the American people of economic opportunity and fosters a society dependent on government handouts. For far too many Americans the welfare system no longer serves as a safety net, it is a hammock. Our Republican welfare reform proposal offers real change, not false security.

Welfare clearly represents the biggest, most costly policy failure of our time. The current system encourages social behavior that destroys families, fuels skyrocketing illegitimacy, and impoverishes millions of children. It is a heartless system that blocks incentives for people to lift themselves out of poverty.

Our Republican Personal Responsibility Act offers compassionate approaches that promote personal responsibility, require work and strengthen families. It works to lift families and their children out of the government's hammock and back on to their own feet. Our proposal brings the welfare system closest to the people that need it most by giving block grants to the States.

Welfare has become a way of life for millions of Americans. Our current system traps people in a cycle of dependency and despair and offers little in the way of hope and opportunity. It is responsible for spawning crime, drug use, problem-ridden schools and other social ills, forcing taxpayers to subsidize these.

Mr. Chairman, restoring America's work ethic, a sense of self-respect and community responsibility will alleviate much of the social decay we see today. Our Republican welfare reforms will leave a more civil and compassionate society for our children and grandchildren. The Personal Responsibility Act replaces the Federal hammock with family security and responsibility.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this is an extraordinary week for the House of Representatives and for the American people.

What we are seeing on the floor of the House of Representatives constitutes a war on the poorest women and children in our country in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican Party, which recently held a fundraiser and raised $11 million dollars in one night from some of the wealthiest people in this country are now, under the guise of welfare reform, savagely cutting back on a wide variety of programs which are desperately needed by the weak and defenseless—by children, by the elderly, by the hungry, disabled and the sick.

Sixty-nine billion dollars are being cut back on low-income assistance programs over a 5-year period in order to serve as a down payment for tax breaks for the rich. Robin Hood in reverse. We take from the poor and give to the rich. We take away school lunches from hungry children and serve up two martini lunches to corporate bosses. What courage. At a time when this country, before these cuts, already has the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world it is clear that the major problem facing low-income children is that they do not fully understand the working of the entrepeurial system. If only the low-income children, who are going to see cut backs in nutrition programs, health care and child care—had the sense to pay $1,000 a plate for a Republican fundraiser, things would be different.

The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that 6 million children will be thrown off welfare as a result of the Personally Responsibility Act. Conservative estimates show that in the year 2000 close to 400,000 or 40 percent of disabled children will no longer receive SSI benefits; 14 million children would continue to receive some food stamps, but at a reduced level; over 2 million children would no longer be eligible for school lunches; 1 million children would no longer be fed in child care settings; close to 400,000 children would be denied child care; and 60,000 children would lose access to foster care and adoption assistance.

In the year 2000 the State of Vermont will lose $10 million in cash welfare and education, training and employment programs for welfare recipients and 2,450 children will be dropped from assistance. In the same year, Vermont will lose $5.1 million in aid for blind

and disabled children and 500 children will be dropped from the rolls. Vermont will lose close to $1 million in school lunch funds and 4,100 children will no longer receive free or reduced price meals. Vermont will lose $1.6 million in child care funds and 990 children will be denied care. Vermont will lose $3.5 million in funds for the child and adult care food program and 4,150 children will lose their daily meals. Vermont will lose $9 million in food stamp funds and 25,386 children would receive reduced food stamp benefits.

We all recognize that the current welfare system is not working well, but in reforming the system we do not want to punish some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

This House just passed an unfunded Federal mandate bill and, as a former Mayor, I supported that bill. This welfare reform bill is one of the largest unfunded Federal mandates that the State of Vermont will ever experience.

If we are serious about real welfare reform than we must be talking about a jobs bill which can employ those people who are leaving welfare. We must be talking about increasing child care, job training, and educational opportunities. If our goal is to get people off welfare and into jobs, then we must provide the infrastructure for that transaction. Not to do that is to simply punish poor people for being poor.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, last week we saw how the Republicans eagerly take from working families, senior citizens and children.

When I went home to my district I stopped by an elementary school—I wanted to see for myself the importance of Federal nutrition programs and to learn what these meals mean to the children.

What I saw were children being fed a hot and nutritious meal—the only decent meal they eat the entire day.

The cold and heartless attack we are witnessing is appalling.

Hunger afflicts up to 30 million Americans, 12 million of them are children. My congressional district, the East San Gabriel Valley of Los Angeles County, will be the most heavily impacted in all of California. 41,000 children, in my district alone, will be negatively impacted by the Republican proposal to cut nutrition programs.

We all know that hungry students are fatigued, cannot concentrate and end up doing worse than their peers on standardized tests.

I urge my Republican colleagues to visit their schools before denying this small but essential program from our children.

You cannot disguise the fact that block granting nutrition programs is taking food out of the mouths of children, to fill the trough that feeds corporate subsidies.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE] having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence, had come to no resolution thereon.

WELFARE REFORM IS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEINGS

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform debate that we are engaged in is not about politics, and it is not about abstract policy; it is about people, about human beings.

And one person in my hometown of Boulder, Colorado recently had this to tell me: Five years ago I was pregnant and abandoned by my husband. I had no home, no job, no money but I had a goal in my life—to be an education specialist. Today I have reached my goal. I have a happy 4-year-old daughter. I have a job that I love, teaching young children. If it weren't for government programs such as Self-Sufficiency, WIC, section 8, immunizations, Medicaid, food stamps and LIHEAP I would not have reached my goal.

''We can't know,'' she goes on, ''we can't know the individual circumstances of all who ask for assistance. I don't think anyone plans to or wants to beg for help. Thanks for not giving up on me.''

We have got to reform welfare but as we do it, we cannot give up on decent young women like this.

Mr. speaker, here is the full text of what this young woman told me:

Five years ago, I was pregnant and abandoned by my husband who was, in his own words, ''not ready'' for the responsibility of parenthood. I had no home, no job, no money, and no insurance. And I was worried. I had a goal for my life—to be an environmental education teacher. How was I going to do this and be a single parent? I still had to complete my education!

Today, I have reached my goal. I have a happy 4-year-old daughter who, contrary to an article in U.S. News and World Report which states that fatherless children were more likely to have learning disabilities and behavioral problems, is well-adjusted and has been tested as having an above average IQ. I have a job that I love, teaching young children about our environment and how to take care of it. These are children of taxpaying citizens who, through their taxes, supported me during hard time. I feel that, by educating their children, I am helping to repay that debt. If it weren't for State and local government programs such as Project Self-Sufficiency, WIC, Section 8 Housing, Free Immunizations, Medicaid, Food Stamps, and LIHEAP, (low-income energy assistance program), all of which I have received benefits from, I would not have been able to reach my goal. I qualified for and received these benefits while working full time and taking a full course load at the University of Colorado.

Today I am happy to know that some of my taxes are going to help others like myself who are trying to reach their life goals, in spite of difficulties, obstacles, and hardships which are beyond their control.

We can't know the individual circumstances of all who ask for assistance. I don't think anyone plans to or wants to beg for help. I also don't believe that two years of assistance is long enough for most people to complete education or job training and find a job that is going to pay all their bills. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the taxpayers, friends and family who have helped me over the past five years to reach my goal. Thanks for not giving up on me.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WESTERN COMMERCIAL SPACE CENTER LEASE SIGNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the 25-year lease agreement between the Department of the Air Force and the Western Commercial Space Center—better known as the California Spaceport Authority—was finally signed. It was an arduous process that tested the commitment to commercial space development on all sides.

Although this agreement had been agreed upon in principle for months, it was nearly derailed by an overzealous civilian bureaucracy within the Department of the Air Force. In essence, what would have taken less than 30 days in the private sector took several months because of the arcane manner in which the federal government tends to operate.

There were two key issues at work: first, the release of $3 million in previously awarded Fiscal Year 1994 Department of Defense grants to the Space Center; and second, signing the lease itself which would then allow construction to begin on the first polar orbit commercial spaceport in America.

The DoD grants were awarded in Fiscal Year 1994. They were awarded independently of the 25-year lease with the Air Force. On October 28, 1994, when Secretary Widnall announced the Air Force's intention to negotiate a lease with the Space Center, no mention was made of a link between releasing the grants and signing the lease. Yet, for some reason, release of grant funds because tied to the lease signing.

This lease had been agreed upon in principle for more than four months. During a December 15, 1994, meeting between the Air Force general counsel's office and the Space Center, the Space Center was told they would have a draft of the lease by January 1, 1995—and that the lease would be signed by January 15, 1995.

On January 30, 1995—30 days after it was promised by the Air Force general counsel's office—a 76-page lease with 26 conditions wa submitted to the Space Center.

For weeks, the lease was traded back and forth. Signing was set to take place twice, yet both deadlines passed because civilian bureaucrats kept adding new conditions. For example, condition 15 of the original lease addressed liability and stated that damages were

not to exceed $10 million. But the bureaucrats decided to add environmental language to the lease—despite the fact that the environmental issues had been addressed and resolved during three review processes and the fact that no launches would take place for two years thus eliminating the possibility of an environmental problem.

Then the civilian bureaucrats decided that the Space Center would have 60 days to submit a certified insurance policy. Clearly unreasonable because insurance companies rarely, if ever, issue certification of policies within 60 days.

Then, the bureaucrats decided that there should be no cap on the amount that could be sought and awarded in a liability suit—then Spaceport could be sued for any amount of money. Obviously no reasonable insurance company would issue a policy where they would be required to pay unlimited damages.

In the end, due in large part to bipartisan support and participation, the primary lease between the Space Center and the Air Force was signed.

Mr. Speaker, the process by which this lease agreement came to be signed should not be a model for future negotiations. It should have never reached an 11th hour deadline. It should have never reached a point where the Space Center was in danger of shutting its doors. It should never have reached a point where hundreds, and ultimately thousands of jobs, could have been lost. It should never have put tens of millions of dollars in private sector investment in jeopardy. It should never have put the future of commercial space development in California on the line.

One of the reasons the voters of America responded as they did during the 1994 elections was because of problems such as this. The American people have demanded a smaller and more efficient federal government that puts the interests of its people ahead of everything else. This ladies and gentleman, is the essence of the Contract with America.

While spaceport development and commercial space are not part of the 100-day agenda, they are very much in line with the goals and spirit of the 104th Congress. Our government must be willing to make America a strong and vibrant competitor in the international commercial space market. Further, the government must demonstrate to private industry that they are committed to making America a leader in the international commercial space market.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. All of our international competitors—France, China, Russia, Canada, Japan, Australia—are moving forward in the commercial space arena. We cannot fall behind. Spaceport development must go forward in conjunction with an aggressive U.S. commercial space policy.

And who stands to benefit from this approach? Certainly space states such as Alaska, California, Florida, Virginia, New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, Hawaii and others. But, more importantly, our nation stands to benefit. There is enormous economic potential if we are willing to do what is necessary to successfully compete.

As we saw at crunch time on the Vandenberg lease, commercial space is not a partisan issue—it is an American issue. It is an issue where Republicans and Democrats can come together and unite behind a cause that ultimately benefits all Americans.

☐ 2030

WELFARE REFORM: SHELL GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues once again in exposing the myths that the Republicans keep repeating about their welfare reform proposal and its impact on child nutrition programs. Later this evening, two of my colleagues will demonstrate how the Republicans are misleading the American people and how this block grant plan clearly cuts funding for essential child nutrition programs. But before they begin, here are the facts.

The Republicans claim their block grant does not cut funding for child nutrition programs, only the growth rate of these programs. They would like everyone to believe that their proposal increases funding for programs, such as school lunch, by 4.5 percent each year.

The truth is their 4.5 percent increase in funding for School Lunch is a fabrication. In fact, the bill doesn't even designate funding specifically for the school lunch, breakfast, or any other school-based meal program. The Republicans' numbers are nothing more than assumptions—I repeat, assumptions—of how much States may choose to use for lunch programs.

Even if States spent all of the money they receive under this block grant, this mythical funding increase would fall $300 million short of the amount necessary to meet real needs. That is because the Republicans' plan won't keep pace with expected increases in program enrollment, inflation, or a possible recession. These needs require a 6.5 percent increase, so even the mythical 4.5 percent increase falls woefully short.

The Republicans' mythical funding also includes only cash assistance and not the value of direct purchases of food goods such as cheese and fruit. These direct purchases of food are a critical part of the school lunch program. In the first year, Republicans cut $51 million from direct food assistance. Over 5 years, they cut $600 million. That is a total shortfall of $1 billion even if they live up to their hollow promise of a 4.5 percent increase in cash assistance.

That 4.5 percent promise comes with all kinds of trap doors that will drop even more kids from the school lunch program.

The first trap door is that States would be required to use only 80 percent of the school block grant for school meals. Governors may transfer 20 percent to other programs. That means a potential additional loss of $5 billion dollars from the program—$1 billion a year. In my home State of Connecticut, if the Governor had this kind of discretion today and exercised it, the School Lunch Program would lose $2 million in 1995 alone.

The second trap door is that these funding increases are not guaranteed—they will be subjected to the political whims of the annual budget process. So the Congress each year will be able to vote to reduce funding even more and drop even more kids from the program.

The Republicans also claim that their bill will cut bureaucrats, not kids. They couldn't be further from the truth. If Republicans were only interested in cutting administrative costs they would have done their homework: The entire administrative budget for all USDA feeding programs is $106 million per year. The Republican plan would cut $860 million in 1996 child nutrition programs alone. The bottom line is their cuts far exceed what is needed to control administrative costs.

The truth is, if the Republican proposal is enacted, 3,600 kids will be dropped from the School Lunch Program in Connecticut in the first year alone, and over half a million kids will be dropped nationwide.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded the Republican proposal will cut $2.3 billion over 5 years from school based nutrition programs and $7 billion from all child nutrition programs over 5 years.

Republicans though don't want to admit this. They actually believe that these are not cuts. They boast that their plan provides savings. I ask you, how can you have savings, if you don't have cuts? This is the biggest Republican myth of them all.

The tragedy in this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that these Republican myths are being perpetuated so that drastic cuts can be made in a program that everybody agrees is working—and working well. And the savings—the money that will no longer be used to pay for a child's school lunch—will be used to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest Americans. It's shameful. It's mean spirited. It's just plain wrong.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, as we enter into this debate on welfare in this country, I think it is important to recognize that my colleague from west

Tennessee, the Honorable JOHN TANNER, told me not long ago when I first got here that he really believed that neither party had an exclusive on integrity or ideas, and I agree with that Congressman. And this should not be a Republican or a Democrat issue. This should be an American issue.

It is clear in my heart that this country wants this welfare system to change, not to be reformed but to be replaced. They want a working opportunity society. They do not want the continuance of the status quo with regard to welfare.

The Washington Post this moring—we all know the tendency politically of the Washington Post—editorialized and said about welfare: ''Besides, what's the choice? The existing approach has failed and the public has no appetite for vast new social programs even if there were evidence they worked, and there isn't.''

You know an outstanding Tennessee Congressman, Colonel Davey Crockett on the very floor of this House said about welfare, ''We have the right as individuals to give away as much of our own money as we please as charity; but as Members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money'' for charity.

Franklin Roosevelt said in 1935 about welfare: ''Continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit.''

There is a great article in this month's Reader's Digest. It is called ''True Faces of Welfare.'' In it is a case study of a welfare recipient whose story appeared. Her name is Denise B.

''Denise says she would like to work. But she would have to earn a lot, she says, for it to be a better deal than welfare.'' She talks about how she would have to go to school, and work her way up to a higher salary. '''It's a lot of work and I ain't guaranteed to get nothing.'...Welfare by contrast, is guaranteed—(in her words) 'until they cut it out, until they say no more.' Denise knows politicians are talking about that now and she does not believe they are wrong.''

''Welfare,'' she offers, 'is an enabler. It's not that you want to be in that situation. But it's there. We always know.''

This has become a national attitude about this system, and it hurts children, and true compassion is what I want to discuss here tonight in my short time and as I rise to my feet to talk about welfare.

In my home city a social worker who I will leave unnamed came to me several times in the last few years to tell me of a story in Chattanooga, TN, where multiple children were being born for one reason and one reason only, and that is financial, to gain more benefits.

You know that system creates the worst form of child abuse imaginable, in my estimation, because children then are not born for the right reasons. They are not born because their parents want to love them and sacrifice for them and set aside their own ambitions, and give to them and nurture and educate them. They are born so that they can receive financial benefits. And the stories continue to roll in of how many situations we have like this across the country.

The neglect that those children are suffering because this system promotes this kind of activity is what we need to focus on as we say listen. Everyone agrees, it is time to eliminate the welfare system and replace it with an opportunity society.

In the last 30 years we have spent $5 trillion on welfare in this country, and we have got more illegitimacy, more poverty, more problems, more crime than you could ever buy with $5 trillion. It has not worked and it is time to move on. And I believe from the very core of my experience, Mr. Speaker, that true compassion means having the guts to replace welfare at this critical moment in America's history.

TAKING CARE OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, America is asking the question that Congresswoman DELAURO just answered, and that is how is it that the Republicans can say they are not hurting the School Lunch Program when they take over $2 billion away from the School Lunch Program and over $7 billion away from the nutrition programs for the children of this Nation?

The fact of the matter is they cannot. They cannot fulfill the promise of this Nation to feed hungry children, to take care of children in need, and at the same time remove these funds. The mythical increase as she referred to simply does not provide for the element of growth in the program that takes into account the ever increasing cost of food, the increasing number of children unfortunately in this country who continue to be eligible for this program, and what happens in the downturn in our economy.

So the result is that in fact the school breakfast program, the lunch program, the after school program, and the commodities program simply cannot be taken care of.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is referring to this Republican plan to block-grant all of these different feeding programs into one single grant of money, and they are arguing that they are not cutting back.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is quite correct. What we see here is the block grant. This is what you need, this is what you are trying to cover. This is the block, ladies and gentlemen, that you have to cover to take care of America's children. You have got to provide lunches for children who need lunches, you have to have food assistance in order to provide the commodities and fresh fruits and vegetables necessary so you can have a healthy lunch, and an after school and summer program because many children unfortunately, when school is out they still require food. It is necessary that they eat, they are still hungry. And of course the breakfast program has become more and more important as we see this is the key if children learn in the early hours of their school day and this is what is necessary.

But unfortunately you will see here that the Republicans do not do that. If you take care and provide full funding for lunches and you provide full funding for food assistance, and you do the breakfast program, you can see that the block grant does not cover the block because there is no funding available for summer programs which so many of our children rely on.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, the Republicans argue they are not killing these programs at all, in fact they are providing more money for them. And yet you have one of the blocks there, if I am not mistaken, the after school and summer program that is not provided for. How does this work?

Mr. MILLER of California. What the Republicans would do because they did not provide the increase for the commodities program, they would suggest the commodities is really taken care of, so there would be money left over to take care of after school and summer breakfasts, but there is, as is apparent readily to anyone in the audience, of course nothing here in the commodities program, and the commodities are a key component and that is why when Republicans say they are going to give a 4.5 percent increase for the nutrition programs they did not figure in the cost of commodities into their escalator. And once again there we find out that the block grant they talk about to feed American children is not fully covered and children now go without the commodities portion of that program.

☐ 2045

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will yield, the school districts I represent in Illinois, their commodity assistance which they receive actually is a way that they are feeding the kids in terms of lunches and breakfasts and so forth.

Now, if the Republican block grant does not provide enough money for the food district have?

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, your school district could take another action. It could take away the breakfast program and provide the commodities that are so terribly important for the school lunch program where they make

up a large bulk of the school lunch program menu, but because there is no increase in the food assistance, they would have to take that from the breakfast program or one of these other. No matter how you move around the plates, of course, what you see is that the Republican proposal for child nutrition in our school lunch programs simply does not cover the needs of the children currently enrolled.

And we are now estimating that almost 2 million children that otherwise would be served will not be served because one of them, it is just sort of like musical chairs. One of them is going to show up for one of these programs. There is not going to be funding for that program. They are going to go unserved. That estimate is now 2 million children in the next 5 years.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will yield, what do you make of the Republican claim? They keep saying, ''Wait a minute, we are giving a 4½-percent increase every year for school lunch; how can you complain? Four-and-a-half percent ought to be plenty.''

Mr. MILLER of California. That is really similar if I were to cut your wages by $20,000 and then say I am going to give you a 4½-percent increase over the next 5 years. You start out in the hole, and you never get well, and because they do not provide a 4½-percent increase on inflation, on the price of commodities, the price of food, the increase in enrollment, the 4½ percent turns out to be fraudulent. Under the Republican program, you can do this. You have no lunches, no food assistance, no afterschool program, and no breakfast. What a shame, shameful thing for America's children who were expecting a block grant to take care of their needs.

The plates will be available after the show.

SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to talk a little bit more about the school nutrition programs, because this seems to be the Democrats' favorite topic of the topics de jour.

Somehow, somewhere along the line the Democrats have decided or believe that somehow they can make, by telling the same lie over and over and over, that they can somehow get a wedge with the American people. And the fact is that in some ways the opposition does understand politics perhaps better than the Republicans do. They understand that politics is about power, and when it is about power, you stop at nothing to try to regain it.

Republicans are still under the impression that politics is about ideas and ideals. But this is about the politics of deceit and the politics of the big lie.

I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, I have been standing here for 2 days listening, in fact, nearly 2 weeks, to untruths.

My mom used to say, you know, it would be awful nice if people would just turn purple when they started stretching the truth, shifting words around and using wiggle words. There would be an awful lot of purple people here tonight if that were the case.

I think what we need to do is just make sure the American people understand that a 4½-percent-a-year increase is not a cut. Now, if you are used to being in Congress where you guys all have been spending more than we out there have been earning, you think a 4½-percent increase is a cut. The American people, I do not think, will agree with that.

So let us take a look at the actual members of how much the food programs are going to go up.

Mr. HOKE. Only a liberal could call a $200 million increase a cut. Only people that think the way the people think inside of Washington could call that a cut.

I would like to draw attention just for a moment to the CRS study that was published just today. We got a copy of it just today [CRS] Congressional Research Service, completely independent, nonpartisan.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Not a Republican group.

Mr. HOKE. Not a Republican group, not a Democrat group. It is a completely nonpartisan group.

Here is what they say about what is going to happen in Ohio, a State close to my heart. What we are going to find in Ohio with respect to the school-based block grants, school-based nutrition programs, is that in 1995, fiscal 1995, under current law, $190 million is being spent. Under the school-based block grant program, our Republican program, that will go up to $202 million, an increase of $11 million.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is in one State.

Mr. HOKE. That is in one State, just the State of Ohio, an $11 million increase. Now, for those who like baseline budgeting, which is to say we will take into account demographics, that is, changing populations, plus an inflation number, not the way that America thinks. I mean, this is the way that you get the phony numbers. But the fact is even using those numbers, the 1996 fiscal year current baseline would be $199 million, a $2 million increase over that.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is a real increase in food.

Mr. HOKE. A real increase. This is food, and not only that, is there not a difference in the way that these programs get administered?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, what is amazing about it is the closer you get it to home, from what I can see, the less waste there is. We do not seem to hear much about that. The closer the States have control, the less we are going to take the money here. I think the thing that surprised me the most when I flew into D.C., and I am from the west coast, did not even have a very long campaign, all of a sudden I was here as a write-in candidate. I fly in, and I see all of these buildings. I get here and find out they are all filled with bureaucrats. Those bureaucrats are deciding one layer of how money is spent, then the States decide, and then the locals, to where by the time the money gets down to food, it has a lot of red tape and rules around it.

What I like about the school lunch program is we unwrap it from a lot of that red tape and make sure the food gets to kids.

Mr. HOKE. And kids who really need it, the kids who need it most. We give them the opportunity; we make it possible for that money to get to those that need it the most. How? By making sure it goes to parents, administrators, and teachers and people right there in the neighborhoods locally making those decisions as opposed to Washington bureaucrats making those decisions.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, those other bureaucrats are going to whine, and that is the State superintendents of public instruction. They are going to whine, too, because we tell them you cannot spend any more than 2 percent on administration.

FACTS CONCERNING CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people who are following these proceedings are really at a loss to figure out which side of this aisle is telling the truth. I am not sure my 5 minutes here will convince anyone one way or the other.

I would like to lay out a few of the facts which my friends on the Republican side just do not want to point to. The fact is if you took the time to go speak to a local school principal in your hometown or perhaps one of the people who runs the local school lunch program, they would tell you, as we have all heard on the Democratic side of the aisle, that the Republican idea is a very, very bad idea

You would think, if the Republican position was so good and was going to give this authority to the local school districts and to the States, these people would be jumping up and down, and they are not. And do you know why? Because fundamentally what the Republicans are offering them is not enough money to do the job.

The Republican plan, yes, does provide additional funds in years to come. Let us concede that point. They just do not provide enough money, because we

know as sure as God made green apples that each year the cost of food is going to go up a little bit in each of our school lunch programs. We know there will be more kids enrolled in school, and we know, God forbid, if we have a recession, there will be more families that will be eligible for school lunch.

The Republicans do not build any of those possibilities into their block grant scheme. They assume none of that is ever going to occur. They think the cost of food, the increased number of kids, and the possibility of recession, the most that could ever increase the program in any given year is 4½ percent. That is it.

Then they say to the school districts, ''Listen, If that is not enough, you find a way to economize. You finds a way to cut costs.''

Do you know what principals tell me at these schools they are going to have to do? They are either going to have to cut the money that they put into classrooms, teachers, computers and microscopes and the like or basically are going to have cut kids off the school lunch program.

That really gets to the bottom line here. Is it not curious when the Republicans finally got in the majority, the first place they turned to start cutting was not waste, fraud, and abuse? The were, in fact, on the floor of the House just a couple of weeks ago asking us for $40 billion more for Star Wars, $40 billion for that loony idea under President Reagan that might have made some sense when the Soviet Union was a powerful missile threat to the United States, but does not make sense anymore. They wanted $40 billion more for Star Wars. They lost it, thank goodness. Then they turned around and said, ''We will tell you how we will save some money. We will cut school lunches.'' School lunches? Do you remember reading, I sure do not, about scandals and waste and abuse in school lunches? You do not hear about it. The reason you do not is it is being run by your local school districts, your local principals, the folks who work for them in the cafeteria. It is a good program. It is a program that most of us saw when we were growing up as a way to have a good meal each day when we went to school, and unfortunately for a lot of kids today, it is the best meal of the day. We even offer a little breakfast to the school lunch program, and the Republicans are willing to cut that, too. They think it is unnecessary. Maybe it is a frill they can do away with.

You ought to see some of the kids I have seen. You ought to talk to some of the teachers about kids who get to school who do not get enough to eat and what their school day starts out like. It is not very pretty.

My friends on the Republican side turn first to school lunch programs, which I think frankly has been a big embarrassment to them to try to explain across America. They you ask the bottom line, surely, there must be something critically important they would cut America's school lunches for, it really must be the highest possible priority.

Well, what is it the Republicans want to cut school lunches for? Why do they want to cut the food available to kids in schools? So they can pay for a tax cut, a tax cut for these same families? Well, a little bit of it, sure. But the most of the money that goes in that tax cut goes to the wealthiest people in this country. The privileged few will get the break from the Republican tax cuts. It is the kids of working families, it is the kids of middle-class families that will find their school lunches being cut.

I went into Quincy, IL, and sat down with a group of mothers and their kids and talked about the Republican plan. Mothers came forward to me and said, ''Congressman, let me tell you my story. I am not on welfare.'' This mother said, ''I am working for a living.'' One of them said, ''I am working two jobs.'' Another works 45 hours a week at fast food. They had their kids in day care. They are doing their darndest to stay off welfare. We gave them a little helping hand. You know what it is? We help pay for the meal at the day care home which the Republicans would cut.

Now, is that the way to end welfare in America, to heap more expenses on working families who are struggling every single day to make ends meet? I do not think so.

Let me offer a helping hand, whether it is the WIC program for the new mother, whether it is the day care center lunch or the school lunch, and make sure those struggling families, those working families trying to make ends meet get a helping hand to stay off of welfare and move in the right direction, the right family values, the right kind of personal responsibility.

We have to resist the Republican plan. It does nothing but cut the most vulnerable people in America. You cannot have a strong America without strong kids and strong families.

MORE FACTS ON CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, if you watched TV lately, read a magazine or a newspaper, surely you have seen photographs of Democrats surrounding themselves with children and claiming that Republicans are out to cut school lunches and be cruel and mean to little kids.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of this historic Chamber should be set based on the fact they are not on photo ops that make one party look like they love children more than the other. The American people are smarter than that, and I know they can see through it.

Between 1962 and 1992 welfare spending increased by over 900 percent, while the poverty rate only dropped less than 5 percent, and illegitimacy has increased over 400 percent.

I ask you, is that progress? My mom always told me you do not get something for nothing. But in this case, after spending $5 trillion, we have got just that. Nothing.

I do not understand, why are the Democrats defending a system that has literally enslaved its recipients into a cycle of dependency? If Democrats feel so strongly about welfare reform, why did they not do something about it during the 40 years they controlled this House?

The Republicans are talking heat right now, but it is because we are picking up the mess left behind by the failed welfare state. But that is OK. It takes leadership to make hard choices.

The current welfare system should be arrested for entrapment, because it traps its recipients in a web of dependency.

Listen to the following facts: There are 5 million families with 9.6 million children on AFDC right now, and more than one-half of those families remain on AFDC for more than 10 years. Of the 5 million families receiving that help, only 20,000 people work, and children born out of wedlock have three times greater chance of being on welfare when they grow up.

You know, we are hearing a lot of talk right now about Head Start and WIC also. Well, not one penny is being withheld from Head Start, and as for WIC, this rescissions bill merely recouped $25 million out of the $125 million the programs was unable to spend in the previous fiscal year.

Our bill does not take a single person off the WIC rolls and leaves in place the $260 million increase for the program in fiscal 1995.

□ 2100

And the School Nutrition Block Grant Program actually grows at a 4.5 percent rate. Over 5 years that is $1 billion more than is currently being spent.

As a former mayor, I spent a lot of time with programs to help people get out of the dependency cycle and learn to help themselves. My experience has taught me that people want their self-respect and their dignity restored, and the current system does not do that. In fact, it works against that goal. I trust the American people can see through the smoke screens and deception that we have heard here tonight from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I am finished.

Mr. OLVER. Would the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. OLVER. Yes, thank, you very much.

I recognize that the gentlewoman and I both serve on the Budget Committee, and the Budget Committee has had to deal with scoring the items that

we are talking about here tonight and that the gentlewoman has just finished speaking about.

The two nutrition programs that the gentlewoman has spoken of show savings by your own party's count and by the Congressional Budget Office of $6.6 billion over the next 5 years. That is the school-based nutrition program and the family nutrition program. How can you be claiming savings on those programs if in fact there has not been something cut?

Mrs. MYRICK. We are talking about, what you are talking about, the only thing that has been cut is the increases that were requested that are not being increases in the same point.

Mr. OLVER. How can you get savings if you have not cut something?

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. You get savings when you are using a baseline that is phony to begin with and you define savings as being a cut from an inflated number in the first place.

The fact is that we are going from some $6.7 billion a year up to come $7.8 billion a year in the year 2000. That is clearly an increase in spending. Only in Washington.

BASELINE BUDGETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let us talk a little bit about phony baselines, which is where the gentleman on the other side of the aisle left off before the time expired. That is a funny place here inside the Beltway in Washington, DC.

The Pentagon gets its own special baseline. That is, at the Pentagon things are very expensive, you know, over there at the Pentagon. So they get not only the inflation that seniors get on Social Security or the inflation that anybody else might think about, they get their own special inflation index. And at the Pentagon a cut is a decrease in the increase.

So say next year the Pentagon determines its own little special inflation index is 6 percent. If they only get a 5 percent increase in their $271 billion budget, that is if they only get an increase around $11 billion, if they only get $10 billion, that is a decrease, and we would hear screams from that side of the aisle. We heard screams earlier.

We have appropriated more money for the Pentagon this year. God forbid we should ask them to produce something. It costs extra.

We had to come up with a supplemental bill to pay for the Pentagon to do something. They couldn't squeeze it out of their $271 billion budget.

Now with the nutrition programs, of course, they apply a different ruler. That is, are there going to be more kids going to school next year? Yes; is food going to be more expensive next year? Yes.

There might even be a little bit of an increase in the wages for the people who cook those meals in the schools. A lot of them are getting minimum wage, and if we increase the minimum wage they will get a little bit more. Now in their world those increases don't count. Only increases in inflation for the Pentagon count.

So here is the world we are looking at. We know there will be more kids in school. We know there will be more need for those kids.

I visited a school lunch last week and talked about it last Monday night on the floor. So I won't repeat the stories about how hungry those kids are on Mondays and Fridays and what the needy really is. But the point is, in their world we will only give them enough money to increase it just a little bit. And if there are more kids, the portions get smaller. Or if there are more kids, ketchup becomes a vegetable again, whatever. We are just—can't afford those things.

But we can afford an infinite amount of money for the Pentagon. That is what is wrong with this debate. Let's put our priorities in order here. This debate is about priorities.

What will make America stronger tomorrow? Is it hungry kids who can't learn because we cut back on the school lunch program, the school breakfast program? Or is it imaginary programs like star wars and the fat defense contractors taking people out to dinner every night on the Federal budget, which we all know goes on with these Pentagon lobbyists.

So I would like to put it in that perspective. And let's just remember, when it comes to the Pentagon, a decrease and an increase is a cut, but when it comes to school lunches, a decrease in a real need is not a cut.

That is what the Republicans are trying to feed us here. It is about as real as feeding people ketchup and calling it a vegetable

They talk a lot about the bureaucrats. I checked that out. I was disturbed about that. I thought, well, maybe they are right.

We could eliminate some of these administrative cuts if we eliminated every administrator. That is from the woman who runs the program downtown here in Washington, DC., down to the person who takes the little lunch tickets, to the person who cooks in the school. That is if Congress could miraculously appropriate the money and deliver the food straight to the kids with no one in between. That would be one-eighth of the cuts the Republicans are making in the real needs of these programs.

So it is a lie. It is a lie to say we just want to eliminate the bureaucrats. No, you can't just eliminate the bureaucrats. Where are you going to get the other seven-eighths of your cut?

The gentleman, Mr. OLVER, made a great point. How is it they can talk about $7 billion, ''b'', billion dollars, in savings in school nutrition programs, WIC programs and other children's nutrition programs and then tell us there aren't any cuts.

I would like to make $7 billion in savings over at the Pentagon, and I would be happy to tell the Pentagon that those things don't constitute cuts. But we would hear screams from that side of the aisle because it is a different standard. It is a different ruler when it comes to kids. They come after the Pentagon.

STATE FUNDING AND CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, you know, every once in a whole you have to come back to real numbers that will buy real groceries. And I am starting to even get confused listening to the other side. So what I want to know, and I would like to ask this of your, Representative HOKE.

I know where we are now, and I can't go home and tell anybody that we have increased the school lunch program unless it is in hard dollars. I know we are at $6.296 billion right now a year on school lunches. I want to know how much it will take to feed those kids in later dollars, how much we put in the budget, and I want to make sure we feed those kids as many lunches as we are feeding now. You show me that.

Mr. HOKE. Okay. This has got to be so incredibly confusing to the American public watching this and trying to discern what is really going on. I can't imagine what could be more confusing until finally you are going to have to decide somebody is telling the truth and somebody is lying. Let me review.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I just want real numbers. I don't want anything spun. How much are we going to spend in this budget compared to the last budget?

Mr. HOKE. March 20, 1995, from the Congressional Research Service. Let me just read the preamble.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is the nonpartisan group?

Mr. HOKE. Yes, that is the nonpartisan group. It is anybody, any Member of Congress can ask them to do research. Let me read this. Then I will go directly to the numbers.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. HOKE. All right. This is from Jean Yavis Jones. She is a specialist in Food and Agriculture Policy in the Food and Agriculture Section. The subject is Child Nutrition: State funding under current law and block grants proposed in H.R. 1214. That is what we are talking about, the nutrition block grants.

This memorandum responds to numerous congressional requests for information on the effect that recent

proposals to block grant child nutrition programs would have on the States. The attached tables compare estimates of fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 funding to States under current law to the estimated amount of funding that States would receive under the child nutrition block grants contained in H.R. 1214 as introduced on March 13, 1995.

Now, let me go to the table. Here is the table. This is school-based block grants and current law funding by States and the total. I am going to give you the total. The total for all the school-based nutrition programs for fiscal year 1995 was $6.295 billion.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Does that include breakfast and the feeding programs?

Mr. HOKE. That is breakfast, that is after school, that is school lunches, school snacks, all. There are five programs in all. The amount that is estimated by CBO for fiscal year 1996 under current law is $6.607 billion. That takes into account, and I will read it to you exactly.

What it does, it says that those amounts are based, it takes into account the adjustments that will show the projected and actual changes in overall Federal obligations, and it takes into account the number of students that will be in the program and also inflation. So it takes into account exactly what my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. So increases in food and increases in kids?

Mr. HOKE. Precisely. Precisely. So that is what the current law is, okay? $6.296 billion in fiscal year 1995 to $6.607 billion in fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Now that is what they say we will need to keep up, to make sure we don't get behind?

Mr. HOKE. We need to get to $6.607 billion in 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Where are we then in the budget?

Mr. HOKE. The school-based block grant is at $6.681 billion, $6.681 billion. The difference between the block grant and the fiscal year 1996 CBO estimate that takes into account the demographic changes as well as the inflation is $73 million.

In other words, under the block grant program, the Republican program that is being criticized here in a bombastic way, that doesn't begin to square with the facts. We are increasing the funding for school nutrition programs by $73 million in fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Actually, we are increasing it $384 million, but part of that is to keep up with costs of inflation and new children. So we are going over what it costs and kicking in $74 million, sending it back to the States and saying get your grubby hands off it at the State level, don't spend much on administration, get it back to kids?

Mr. HOKE. You are absolutely right, Linda. We are, in fact, increasing it by $384 million over what we are spending in 1995. We are increasingly it by a third, more than a third of a billion dollars.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Well, this grandma likes that. I think we have done a great job.

NUTRITIONAL PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have had some protestations, particularly from the gentleman from Cleveland or just outside of Cleveland, with respect to baselines. Mr. DEFAZIO spoke of baselines.

And the question and answers, we pretend that there can be a savings which is going to be applied to a tax cut and for the wealthiest in America, but that somehow this savings doesn't cost anybody anything. It is a free lunch. It is sort of like supply-side economics that was brought to us in 1981, and we were told that the budget would be balanced as a result of supply-side economics by October 1, 1983.

Mr. HOKE. Would you yield for one single question?

Mr. HOYER. Four and one-half trillion dollars later.

Mr. HOKE. Have you, have you seen the CRS report?

Mr. HOYER. I have not.

Mr. HOKE. Would you like to have a copy of it?

Mr. HOYER. I would love to have a copy of it.

Mr. HOKE. It is working from the baseline. It shows the increase off the baseline.

□ 2115

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman asked me to yield. Will the gentleman yield?

Where does this savings, this magic savings come from that Mr. KASICH is applying to the tax cut?

Mr. HOKE. It is not in this school-based nutrition program.

Mr. HOYER. Where does it come from then? Let me show a little chart that we have.

Mr. HOKE. Charts are good.

Mr. HOYER. Charts are good. We have agreed that charts are good, and it is confusing.

You did not like baselines. At the beginning of this session you wanted honest budgeting, no baselines.

Now, Mr. DEFAZIO is right. I happen to be someone who supports the Defense Department, believes we need a strong defense, have supported many of, frankly, Ronald Reagan's increases in the early 1980's. But the fact of the matter is Mr. DEFAZIO is correct.

On the one hand, if buying weapons costs you more year to year, buying food also costs you more year to year. So the baseline is no more than phony for one than it is for the other.

Now, because you think charts are good, let me show you these charts.

Mr. HOKE. I totally agree with you about baselines. The problem with baselines is not taking into account the increases. It is deceiving the public about those increases.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time.

What you are saying, whether you are talking about defense or children's breakfast and lunch or whether you are talking about food for women, infants, and children so that mothers can be healthy in their prenatal period and babies can be healthy in the postnatal period and grow up healthy and able to learn, either way, you are talking about maintaining effort unless you have a decreased need.

And although I have not seen that, you responded that the number of kids increased, and you say that report shows that we are taking care of it.

Here is the chart that shows the difference between, and we use perhaps more programs here because the number is larger for all the programs that are included on this chart, which includes expenditures under current law for school meals, child care food, summer food, and the WIC program. 11.6, fiscal year 1995. 12.1 by the same products.

Mr. HOKE. Are you using home-based day care? Is that one of the programs you used?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. There is the difference. That is a program we are cutting. It is a program that the administration called to cut. It is a program that the President wants cut. You are absolutely right. That is an area that is going to show a difference because we are cutting.

Mr. HOYER. So we have agreement. There is a cut.

Mr. HOKE. That is right. And the reason that the administration wants to have that cut is that it is not means tested. Everybody gets it. And we believe that only people that really need it should be getting these nutrition programs.

Mr. HOYER. We are going to run out of my 5 minutes real soon.

Mr. HOKE. I will give you more time. We have got all night.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time.

The fact of the matter is that those five nutritional programs, if they grew as the need would require to stay even, that is all we are talking about, to stay even. You would be at 15.9. But you are at 13.6, a two billion difference. Seven billion. That is where we get that seven billion. These years are a $7 billion cut. Now, it is a cut, and you use it.

Mr. KASICH and the Budget Committee refers to this as we have got some savings from what they call, of course, a phoney baseline.

But the fact of the matter is, I want to tell you in Maryland our folks have reviewed this program and 37,000 children, real people, will have to be cut off the program if your program passes.

Now, that is what they say. They haven't seen CRS. That is what they say. Thirty-seven thousand kids are

going to be cut off the rolls in Maryland.

SCHOOL-BASED NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this evening's special orders, but I was sitting in my office answering mail and became a little vexed about the discussion and decided I needed to come over and maybe engage someone on that side in some discussion, on the same subject of child nutrition programs.

I am a member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that worked very carefully to try to craft this bill, particularly as it relates to the school-based nutrition programs.

It angers me to hear over and over again the use of the term ''cut'' for these programs. It is not fair. It is not accurate. And if we want to elevate this argument to a place maybe we could find some agreement, we have to start agreeing on what is indisputable.

What is indisputable is that we are not proposing a cut of one penny in the school lunch program, not a penny. In fact, we are proposing an increase that far exceeds, frankly, what your side of the aisle did when you had all of the tools available to you to set the budget.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. GREENWOOD, like you, I was waiting for my turn, and I also serve on the committee with you. And let us talk about that ''not cut'' a minute because we served on that committee, and we tried to take away, and there was an amendment in committee to eliminate the block granting of the school nutrition.

And it was generally a party line vote, as I recall, to take away the school lunch in this process and say, okay, let us do welfare reform without touching school lunches. And it was defeated on a party line. So the Republican majority in our committee said school lunch is a part of the welfare reform bill.

You say you have an increase, but let me talk about and ask you about if this is correct.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Let me reclaim my time for a moment to state my case, and then I will be happy to engage you in further discussion.

Last year when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House, what you did in your budget was increase the school lunch program by 3.1 percent. We are proposing 4.5 percent for 5 years, which is about 50 percent better for the kids that we are doing in our proposal than you ever did.

The President in this year's budget proposal, the President of the United States, the one who went to visit the school children in Maryland for lunch, he proposed a 3.6 percent increase this year. And we proposed 4.5 percent.

Now I want to know who has the gall to call the difference between the President's 3.6 percent and our 4.5 percent a cut.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. If you would yield again to me.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I would yield if you would respond to my question.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. The difference between the President is 3.1.

I will give you an example. In the State of Texas, we are actually growing 8 percent instead of 4.5.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I will let you reclaim your time since Mr. HOKE wouldn't let some Members reclaim their time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I will be happy to have anyone respond to me if they will indeed respond to me.

The issue is this. I have heard Members from your side of the aisle all night tonight talk about a cut in the child nutrition program, particularly the school lunch program. I just want to know how you square that with these facts.

When you ran the show here, you did 3.1 percent more in the current fiscal year for school lunch programs. The President of the United States proposes 3.6 percent, and we offer 4.5 percent for 5 years. I want to know what you have to complain about compared to what you did when you were in control and what the President proposes.

Ms. PELOSI. The difference, my colleague, and thank you for yielding, is that we are talking about a block grant versus an entitlement. When you are talking about a block grant you are talking about a limitation on the number of children and the kind of nutrition they would get.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Let us talk in those terms.

Ms. PELOSI. That is an important point because when you are talking about an entitlement, then the money will be there for the children.

You are talking about a block grant that has several shortcomings. First of all, it is a limitation on the amount of money that will be spent regardless of the growth and need for children who are hungry.

Second of all, your block grant requires that the Governors only spend 80 percent of that money on the school lunch program.

Third of all, your block grant removes the nutritional requirements so what the children are getting does not relate to what the children may need nutritionally. So you can spread it out among more kids so that they meet certain criteria for the block grant, but it may not be more kids who need the school lunch. Therefore, the nutrition that the really needy kids are getting is good.

Fourth of all, you are talking about the school-based lunch program, and you are cutting out the summer program and the afternoon program and the child care program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I request a point of order? Am I able to request two more minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to entertain that request during the 5-minute special orders.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Since I yielded half of my time last time, would the gentleman yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. BECERRA. I would be more than willing to yield if I have some time at the end of my remarks, and I probably will have. If I do, I would be more than happy to yield.

I think the gentleman from Illinois a while back stated it best, Mr. DURBIN, when he said folks probably watching this do not understand what is going on. Is there a cut? Is there not a cut? Are the Republicans providing less? The answer is yes.

I visited some elementary schools and high schools recently, and I was talking to those that do provide school lunch programs, and the principals will tell you the price of food is going up. The number of kids in schools is growing.

When you tell that principal that today the dollar that that principal has to provide a school lunch to a child is the same dollar or just a slight bit more than the principal will have to feed that same child or the child's younger brother or sister coming up, that principal will tell you, ''If the school population has grown and inflation is cut into the value of my dollar, there is no way that I as a principal will be able to feed the number of students that need free or subsidized school lunches.''

Let us not make any mistake about that. The Republican proposal cuts the amount of moneys that would be available for child nutrition programs in this Nation. It cuts them because it does not square the fact that we have inflation in this country and we have growing student populations. If they kept pace, then we would be okay.

And the problem that a number of us have as Democrats is that the current law says that whether or not we in Congress play political games with the moneys for our school kids, it makes no difference because the law protects

children. The law preserves that opportunity for the child to be able to pay a subsidized price for that school lunch or, if the child is very poor, then to get the lunch free because the law provides that right now.

But under the new Republican proposal, not only would there not be a keeping of the pace with inflation and the growth of school population but at the same time the Republican bill guts that protection for children under the law that says you will get fed. Because we understand and have recognized under the law that it is important to make sure that you have the nutrition you need to be able to learn.

The Republican bill says, no, you will get fed if the Committee on Appropriations in the House and if the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate agrees that they will fund certain levels.

So when the Republicans talk about their funding levels of 4.5 percent increases, they are speculating because they haven't provided those moneys. Those aren't there, and they will not be there until the appropriating committees in each House each year decides that they will allocate the moneys.

Let me tell you, I have very little faith that future Congresses will allocate the moneys that are authorized to be spent.

Why do I say that? Well, last week we just finished, and I voted against this, proposing and adopting a bill that cut moneys. Where did it cut? Well, it did not do much to defense. It did not do anything to programs that are out there to subsidize the wealthy.

What it did do was it cut from students, from the elderly, from veterans. And if I look at how they were able to make cuts in those programs, I have very little faith that a program like school nutrition, which will no longer be protected under the law, will be protected from cuts in the future, especially if anyone in this Congress is serious about trying to balance the budget.

So whether we want to say we are providing more money or not, the reality is that under current law our kids are protected from the shenanigans and politics of Members of Congress under the Republican proposal that is gone, and we have to hope that not only will they provide the money they say but they will see the light and provide the actual dollars needed for that principal to provide not just the same meal but provide it to the growing number of kids in the school.

What does all this do to a place like Los Angeles, CA, a place that I represent? Well, if in fact we are going to lose the $2.3 billion over the next 5 years that the Republican bill will cost us, which is about a 6 percent cut, then I know in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District, which is the second largest school district in the Nation with something over 600 and some odd thousand students in it, close to 550,000 of those children who receive subsidized or free lunches will not be able to eat, will not be able to eat the same amount, or will be told to wait until tomorrow.

That is a lot of meals. That is a lot of kids. I think we have to start doing something differently.

□ 2130

MORE ON WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I simply asked for the time so I could respond to the comments of my very good friend, the gentlewoman from California, because frankly, she brought the debate back to where I think it should be and that is a fair debate.

The previous speaker raised legitimate issues about the difference between an entitlement program and a block grant. That is the level of the discussion that we ought to have. If we have that level of discussion, then we can talk about different strategies to balance the budget.

I came over here fairly upset because I am so angered to hear over and over again the use of the term ''cutting'' the funding for this program. It simply is not true. It really should not be said.

The level of debate will be elevated tremendously if we talk about different strategies, whether it is entitlements or block grants. We can do that. We can have honest differences of opinion. We might actually learn from each other and find some common ground.

I really would encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop using the terminology of cutting funding for this program, when in fact the facts are, and I will repeat them, when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House, they provided this program with a 3.1 percent increase and the president, in this year's budget, proposed 3.6 percent, and we have offered 4.5 percent for the next 5 years.

If the appropriators do not do that, that is a discussion for another day. And perhaps we will join some of you in voting against an appropriations bill that does not live up to the 4.5 percent authorization. But let us be honest about where we are in the process.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of debate, I would like to respond to the gentleman's comments. What we have to do, if we are going to debate this in a way that is clear to the American people, is to define our terms. The gentleman from Ohio was waving the CRS report before and saying how much of an increase that the Republican proposal was of the school-based lunch plan versus, as you are referencing, President Clinton's increase on an entitlement program as opposed to a block grant.

The point I want to make is that what the gentleman was waving was already a cut, yes, a cut, because it is only referring to the school-based lunch program. It does not provide funding for the afternoon program or the summer school program. So you have already cut children's nutrition plans.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the debate on both sides as it relates to the nutrition program. I wanted to touch on welfare and the need for welfare, but first I have to make these comments as a former Democrat, that today I was interviewed by the Washington Post wanting to know why in the State of North Carolina that we went from 8 Democratic Congressmen, four Republicans to four Republican Congressmen and four—excuse me, eight Republican Congressmen and four Democrats. The whole purpose is simply because the new minority party was out of touch with the middle-class working American.

People in America are paying, the working family will spend half of what it makes on paying taxes and actually spend more on paying taxes than it will spend on clothing, housing and food. And this debate tonight about children is extremely important, and on our side we believe we are doing what is right for children.

I can tell the other side, after hearing the debate today and yesterday, that the American people are ready for downsizing Government. They are ready to see efficiency in programs. They are ready to see less taxes coming out of their paycheck. That is what I think the Republican party has done.

Let me talk just briefly, I know my time is short, about the facts on welfare. Since the 1960s, Washington has spent approximately $5 trillion of taxpayers' money on the war on poverty. It is the most expensive war our Nation has ever waged, and it is a war we have lost. The amount we spend in a year on welfare is roughly three times the amount needed to raise the incomes of all poor Americans above the poverty income threshold. Nearly 65 percent of the people on welfare at any given time would be in the welfare system for 8 years or longer.

A record 14.3 million people now receive welfare benefits, a 31 percent increase since 1989. Funding for welfare programs is estimated to increase from $325 billion in 1993 to $500 billion in 1998.

My colleagues, the people of America are demanding welfare reform. We can debate as we should debate, being a democracy, but when we really come down to it, the working people of America are tired and fed up of seeing

their money wasted. It is our responsibility and obligation to pass welfare reform.

THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Tennessee, who joins me along the Tennessee-Georgia border, Mr. WAMP, on the Republican side. He said that we do not need partisanship in this issue. I would come here tonight to suggest that we have a solution that breaks the status quo, that changes the existing programs, and we do it in a way that we think works.

We ought to all be seeking solutions that work, rather than political rhetoric. I have listened to the debate all day today, and I have come to one conclusion. We probably need fewer speech writers and more mathematicians. The only trouble is, I am reminded of the saying that ''figures don't lie but lies sure can figure.'' We seem to be caught up in that business of arguing about figures.

Now, there is something that is true, and I think my colleague made the point earlier, and that is this, you cannot have it both ways. In your welfare reform package you are either going to make cuts to have the savings to offset the tax cuts that are coming or you are not. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, we have talked about various aspects of this plan, and we focused just recently on talking about the child nutrition programs. I am looking here at a document that came from the majority leader's office in which he is talking about the savings from the Republican bill. Now, they are either savings or they are not savings. And according to this, it says that there are $66.3 billion of savings over 5 years. I understand that figure may have increased now because of some other changes.

And the one area of title III of the bill of child care and nutrition, according to the majority leader's office, saves $11.8 billion over 5 years. Well, I do not know whether you are talking about cuts or whether you are talking about cuts from base line. The point is, either you have savings or you do not have savings. They are either cuts or they are not cuts. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, let us talk about a few of the things that I think are significant, and I pointed this out today. My chart has had to be amended as a result of an en bloc amendment that came on the floor today. But this is a chart that compares and contrasts the Republican version of welfare reform with a substitute that I, along with several of my colleagues, will be offering. It talks about the concept of work.

I think all of us should agree that work is the best solution to breaking the welfare cycle. And the question is, how do you get people off welfare and into work and how do you achieve that goal of keeping them in a work force?

We both have in our plans percentages of the population that must move into the work force at certain levels. As you will notice, the Republican plan started off at 4 percent. It is has now been amended up to 10 percent. Ours starts in 1997 with 16 percent going to a total of 52 percent at the final termination in the year 2003 and thereafter.

As a result of the amendments on the floor today, the work percentages of the Republican plan have now been increased significantly. In fact, cumulatively those percentages are about 52 percent, I believe. But the interesting thing to me is that if it costs to put people into a work program to move them off of welfare into the work force, if it costs money, and it obviously does, if it did not cost any money all of us would say 100 percent from the first day must be in the work force.

I would point out, however, that under the Republican plan, they allow people to stay on welfare for 2 years and do not require anything of them.

We require within 30 days that they must sign a self-sufficiency plan and they must begin the job search process. We also have a 4-year limit once they enter a work first program. Two years in work first, at the most 2 years in a community service plan, and then a State option if they choose to put them with a voucher system for 2 years at the maximum.

Now, if it does not cost any money to move people from welfare to work, then we ought to all put our percentages at 100 percent from the word go. If it does cost money to up the percentages, we have seen the percentages on work under here by an amendment but we have not seen any revenue flow to the States to pay for that. It does not work both ways. It either costs money to do this or it does not cost money to do this. If it costs money to increase your percentages, then we ought to have some reflection in the funding proposal to pay for it. We do not see that.

WELFARE REFORM IN ARIZONA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years I have been serving in the Arizona State legislature prior to coming to this noble institution.

One of the privileges that I have had is to co-chair the Joint Select Committee on Children and Family Services. What I have seen over the last several years has really frightened me.

I think that government has become the great enabler. Those of us that have dealt with programs with alcoholics, people that we have tried to help to get off the problem, recognize that first of all, they have to have a desire deep inside that they want to change that terrible situation that has been plaguing them for probably many years. But if they do not decide that they want to change, it is not going to happen.

I think government has become the great enabler with welfare programs in that we have basically robbed people of self-dignity. We have told them, we do not want you in mainstream society. We will pay you to stay at home because you really have no value to society. I think it is a very counterfeit type of compassion. Just as it would be with the alcoholic that is going through detox, when they are writhing in agony and going through the pain, to offer them a bottle of scotch to solve their problem, I believe that the government programs that have really trapped people in a snare of government dependency and replaced it with nothing, which has robbed people of their self-dignity. They have got to be replaced. We have to flee from those programs as fast as we can.

I do not mean to belittle the efforts tonight of the minority party in trying to reform the system. But I will say, with all due respect, you have had 30 years to do it so I am not sure that the sincerity of the effort tonight is truly noted.

I really feel that it is time for us to get off of our duff. It is time for us to help people to help themselves.

It was a great President on his inauguration that said, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. How quickly, it has only been three short decades since that prophetic declaration was made, and here we are today trying to be mother and father to people that really on their own are crying for dignity and they want the ability to be able to help themselves and get out of the trap that they are ensnared in, the destructive trap that they are ensnared in.

In Arizona, we were able to pass some really key reforms within the last couple of years. In fact, I would like to talk a little bit about one of my favorite people in Arizona. It is Charles Barkley.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least two huge differences between President Bill Clinton and Arizona's own Charles Barkley. Sir Charles, for one, backs up his big talk with big action. We have no such luck with Bill Clinton.

In my home State, we have been waiting for the Clinton administration HHS to grant us a waiver so we can implement our State's innovative welfare reform proposals.

Let me tell you about one of the pilot programs which would cash out the value of food stamps and give it to an employer to subsidize them to hire an employee, to hire a welfare recipient. It is a win/win. They get a job. They get dignity and self-respect and the employer gets a valued employee.

Our bill was signed by the governor a year ago but the waiver paperwork was done last August. I personally wrote

the President in February, the first of the year. Still nothing. But there he was, just a few days later, talking big before the National Association of Counties, while the President's waiver application grows cobwebs on the President's desk, Bill Clinton declared, to applause in fact, here it is in the paper, in the Washington Times, ''Clinton wants States to have freedom to adjust welfare.''

□ 2145

He basically said, to applause, that we should abolish the waiver system altogether. Well, Mr. Clinton, we are waiting.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SALMON. No, I will not yield.

Approve the waiver now, President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I also forgot to say that there is one other crucial difference between President Clinton and Charles Barkley. I still believe Charles Barkley somewhere in the country could win an election.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to tell the gentleman we will have a great deal for you tomorrow, because in the Deal substitute plan we give the flexibility to the States to not have to deal with those waivers. It is a wonderful proposal that will be presented tomorrow and it is an opportunity for you to take a look at things that we will be able to offer to the States, flexibility to deal with their own plan.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim the balance of my time, and I would like to say I believe in private sector jobs and in more government-funded programs.

Mrs. LINCOLN. That is exactly right; that is what we do.

Mr. SALMON. I do believe people ought to have the dignity to be able to go out into the private sector to be able to get jobs, and really, if sincerely you do believe that this is a good idea, would you call President Clinton for me tomorrow and tell him to pass that waiver?

DIGNITY OF WORK IS WHAT WELFARE REFORM IS ALL ABOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say as I start here, I have been here 6 years and we have been working on this welfare reform program almost from the day I got here.

The people who have been working on the Deal substitute have been working tirelessly for the last 3 years that I know of, and we appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor tomorrow and offer the Congress, the House, a chance to vote with us.

I have been disappointed in the debate tonight. I still have trouble determining why a school lunch program has anything to do with helping people go back to work. When we started our welfare reform plan, we went from the principle that work is dignity, work is what people need, work will make this country stronger, and we insist that if you want something from the Government you must do something for yourself.

For people who are talking about the school lunch program, the school lunch program started 49 years ago and it was a national program. The reason it was started by President Truman was because so many kids from around the country in poor, rural States were unable to pass their draftee physical.

School nutrition, what kids have for lunch is not what we are about. We are about reforming the welfare system so people can go back to work and earn their own way.

We give more State flexibility in the Deal bill than anybody does. Right here, provisions, AFDC benefits, State option; mandated in H.R. 4. Families, States option, mandated in H.R. 4. Child support pass-through, State option for Deal, mandated in H.R. 4.

It is ironic that on the day the President signs the unfunded mandates legislation, which many of us have been working on for 2 or 3 years, and again we thank the majority for bringing that to the floor, that we have seen a bill now come before the floor on welfare for mandating to the States many of the things that we leave to State flexibility on the wonderful theory that many Republicans have professed through the years that local people know best.

We have work first. We give States flexibility in how they do that, and we do one other thing for those people that are just barely getting by and they are working, they are living by the rules, playing by the rules and that is this: We include public assistance for purposes of taxable income on the basic fair theory that a welfare dollar should not be worth more than a work-earned dollar. We are the only plan that does that.

Now we have, many of us who have been voting for some of the contract provisions as conservative Democrats, have asked some of our moderate Republican friends to join us on the theory, as the gentleman said earlier tonight, neither party has a monopoly on wisdom and virtue, and I think anybody who does not subscribe to that theory is fooling themselves. We asked for some bipartisan support on our plan. The Deal plan is the best plan in this Congress. You would not have had to have all of these amendments today you have had to put up. It is already in our package, if you would just give us the same consideration you ask from time to time from us, and it would be bipartisan. Come on over, read the Deal bill. If you have not, you ought to, because what we do in this substitute is exactly what many of you all have professed you want to do, and that is bring back the dignity of work to the American people and help them get off of welfare.

That is what welfare reform is about. We can talk all night about whether there is a cut in the child school lunch program or not. It does not have much to do with helping someone get back to work, an adult, and that is what we try to do, and that is what we will do. And we know this: Real welfare reform has to be a Federal-State partnership and you cannot just block grant it and say States, here is some money, do the best you can with it. That will not work. That will not put people back to work. And that is why we got this letter today from the United States Conference of Mayors. They know what is going to hit them and they do not have the equipment or the ability to handle it, quite frankly, and you cannot just say block grant it and let the States do it any way they want to.

We do, and we enter into a true Federal-State partnership and we clean up the mess here in Washington in the Deal bill before we turn it over to the States. And I believe, and I would ask everybody here to read our bill and to give us serious consideration tomorrow.

I think you will find it is by far the best approach.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on the comments of the last speaker. I think it is important to note that the gentleman from Tennessee thanked the majority party for getting the unfunded mandates legislation to the floor of the House as has the majority party brought welfare reform finally to the floor of the House. And I will say this to my moderate Democrat friends over there, that we are glad you have a plan.

I was real disappointed when the President decided to end the welfare debate as we know it by not offering a plan. I thought he was going to end welfare, but it was just end the welfare debate. So I am glad you all have stepped in and filled what is obviously a leadership vacuum and tremendous void over there both from the White House and I would say the party leadership. I am glad to see the Deal plan is on the floor. A lot of a good aspects on the Deal plan, a lot of good aspects in it and I am looking at it.

Favor H.R. 4 though. It is a bill that offers hope and independence and opportunity for people. I think it is important.

Today I had an opportunity to meet a lady named Felicia Patterson from Savannah, GA. She had been on welfare. She is right now living in public housing and she has now got a job. She is

independent, she is raising three children. She is asking for a little help on something that to my knowledge the Deal plan does not address, H.R. 4 I hope will address in the future. It is something I think both parties ought to come back and work on and that is the subject of rent reform.

You know in a public housing unit when somebody is making money, as Ms. Patterson is, and their income goes up, their rent goes up, so what they find themselves doing is running faster just to stay in place; and in a situation where they get married or the father decides to live at home, they get thrown out completely. Or if, as in Ms. Patterson's case, you have a 16-year-old child who wants to go to work but knows that all of the money is just going to go to additional rent, it is kind of hard on them. We have to make it so that the transition to getting off of public assistance in its entirety is a little bit smoother.

Now the Republican plan has a lot of flexibility. It allows States to work with people like Ms. Patterson and it grants some waivers, and I think stuff like that is important. I will not say it is totally complete. But all of these bills we are going to have to come back. After all, the current welfare system is one of despondency and dependence probably as a result of 40 years of negligence and political payoffs and so forth. We did not get here overnight. We got here slowly. And we are probably going to pull out of this thing slowly.

The thing I do like about the Republican plan is it consolidates 45 different welfare programs into 4 flexible block grants. Anytime I her the idea of eliminating duplication of consolidating Federal programs I get excited, because as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker, the number of government agencies that come in day after day, doing the exact same thing, but have a little bit different title, and of course it is a tad bit different turf and they are all saying please keep us alive, we are the only agency that can deliver such service. That is not true. The Republican plan consolidates services, it consolidates a number of different things that will free up money by eliminating bureaucrats' jobs and free up money to help create more flexibility to States, and lowers the tax burden for taxpayers so that the private sector can go out and create jobs.

One of the aspects I like about the Republican plan is the idea of requiring work. I think that that is important because we have got to give people the opportunity to end the cycle and become independent, and have that hope that you and I have when we get our paycheck and buy our own car and buy our own food and put a down payment on a House and so forth. I think all of that is very important.

The other thing that I like about it, I am not sure if the moderate Democrat plan addresses it or not, but illegal aliens, one of the problems particularly in California, Texas, and even in Georgia, we have 28,000 illegal aliens. This restricts benefits to illegal aliens. I am sick and tired, as I know my constituents in Georgia are, of going out and earning a living and then seeing a percentage of your paycheck go to people who are illegal aliens who have never paid American taxes and do not even have proper citizenship cards. I am glad to see the Republican Party addressing that.

Stopping the welfare payment and the new benefit for having a baby, we have interviewed people who have said listen, there is in fact to some women out that and some people a motivation to have an additional child if they are going to get paid for it.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are addressed in the Republican plan. I think it is a good plan. We will look at the Deal plan; I think it has some good aspects, but I hope you all will look at ours.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have another chart and I am glad to know that the gentleman is looking at the Deal plan because I think that that is very important, because I think it does do many of the things that the gentleman talked about, particularly in simplification, folding in waste, fraud and abuse. We are all trying to meet that same criteria. I think where we really get into the fights is over some of the funding issues and specifically because of some of the entitlement issues.

But I heard some remarks tonight that I really took exception to and that was that some of us may have lost or gotten into the Beltway kind of feeling up here. Let me tell you, I have never done that and I can tell you that the people that work in my office every day are out there helping people every day with problems that they have. So I am going to give you some facts, and some real-life situations, and not just about numbers, first of all, and then I am going to go to the numbers.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I will never accuse you of being an inside-of-the-Beltway person because I fly home with you every weekend. I will say this: I hope you tell some of the stories to the leadership in your party who do tend to be a little bit more inside the Beltway than someone like yourself.

Mrs. THURMAN. I think we can all take some credit for that, and I will leave it at that. I want to talk about a man and woman who live in Horsehoe Beach, Thomas and Pam Wright, and they have five children, four of which are of school age. Tom was a long distance truck driver who made $600 to $800 a week. He was diagnosed with diabetes and can no longer be certified as a truck driver and now is working as a security guard, and he makes $200 a week and he is now receiving $230 per month in food stamps. He does not like where he is at, but he does not know what to do if this is cut off.

Danielle Plummer, a 30-year-old single mother living in Holder, FL considered herself lucky because she inherited a 40-year-old A-frame house which was paid for. So she does not have to pay rent anymore. Imagine that.

Miss Plummer recently lost her job at a McDonald's restaurant because she lost her source of transportation and if you know where this area is of Florida, there is no transportation. She receives $212 in food stamps and $214 in AFDC monthly for her 10-year-old daughter. Miss Plummer has been in and out of court fighting for child support and cannot receive benefits owed for her daughter.

☐ 2200

She admits welfare is not where she wants to be, nor is it where she plans on remaining. However, when I asked her what she would do if her assistance she now receives was suddenly discontinued, she said, ''I don't know. My God, how would I take care of my daughter?'' Those are real people. Those are people that live in my district.

But in the Deal plan, I was asked to look at some situations as how the purchasing power, and I will admit, you do go up 2 percent for purchasing power for food every year, but what happens is that that power actually goes down. And this is what happens here.

In the Deal plan we keep 102 percent, the safety net, very safety net. This is the package that President Nixon and President Ford worked on, and they said, ''We have got to have a thrifty food plan. We have got to make sure there is a nutritional program out there,'' kind of like we do with food and breakfast and those kinds of things, that very basic nutritional need. What happens is, if you look at what happens traditionally in food prices, they have gone up 3.4 percent every year. In your plan it goes up 2 percent. So what we are doing is we are notching that down every year, and not leaving it so people get good nutritional value. This is what happens.

Deal leaves it 102 percent. Republicans, under H.R. 4, actually, as you see it, it declines. So think about it this way, think about this woman who is on food stamps who has to go to the grocery store next year, because she does not have a job, she is trying, she is trying to do all the right things to raise her daughter, she goes to the grocery store, and now all of a sudden she has got to start pulling food out of the bag, because she cannot afford to keep up with prices as they have increased. It may mean a loaf of bread. It may mean some eggs. It may mean that milk. It may mean one of those basic

nutritional value foods that we talk about.

And that is what you are going to end up doing here.

Now, let me tell you about Michael and his family to finish this. Well, I do not have time, but let us just remember in this debate, this is not about numbers. This is about people with real problems, and we need to be careful.

IN SUPPORT OF THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to say to my colleague from Georgia and the others over there that, yes, we do thank your leadership for bringing up some of these issues that we have worked very hard on over the past 3 years. And I guess I can say that, as a newer Member, I also think it is important that we shed our pettiness in terms of who is bringing up the issues and look more at what is happening to the American people. I think that is one of the objectives that I and many of the other colleagues that I have shared this bill with, the Deal substitute bill, in trying to put people above politics, and that is a very important issue that we have to do right now.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LINCOLN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thought it was the Democrat chart that had a T shape on our plan versus your plans. I was only responding to your plan.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just think it is very important for the American people to know our group and the bill that we have produced is very nonpartisan. It is a very practical bill. It is very realistic. And we are here because we want to put people before politics. That is what is important, taking the American people, looking at what their needs are.

Tomorrow we will have the options of looking at the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the Deal bill, and the Republican Contract bill.

We have worked hard. We have produced a bill that is really realistic in terms of what it does for the American people and in terms of what it does for this Nation in long-term getting people off of welfare, and that is what we want. We do not want to just throw them off of welfare. We want to get them off of welfare, get them off of the generational dependency and put them into a constructive, contributing life style.

People have a tendency really to ignore the voice of reason, and I think really that is what we have got to present in the Deal bill is real reason, looking at what people need to survive and to become independent.

It is time that we finally hear what that voice of reason is. We have talked about priorities tonight. Are you going to talk about food and making sure children get fed, or are you going to talk about $20 billion to $40 billion of increases in military spending? Are you going to talk about putting people back to work and giving them the opportunity to provide for themselves? That is what is important. We have got to look at where this Nation is spending its money.

In terms of percentages, if you look at the money we are spending on both military, on interest, on the debt, the talks we have had here tonight in terms of nutrition, less than 0.1 percent are a drop in the bucket in what we need to do, and our voice of reason, the Deal substitute, puts more people to work than the alternative bills that will be offered tomorrow.

The Deal substitute is the only one that devotes its entire savings to deficit reduction, and if you are serious about deficit reduction for your children and your children's children, you have got to realize that we have got to put those savings toward deficit reduction. We realize the same amount of savings roughly that the Republican plan does, but we direct our savings to deficit reduction, because we are worried about the future of our children, not only in welfare reform, but also in deficit reduction.

The Deal substitute recognizes that it is impossible to work without proper job training and child care. You cannot ask a single mother to work for her benefits if she has nowhere to take her children.

And, yes, you are right, the family structure in this Nation is deteriorating, and that young woman does not have the support network of a family, a grandparent or a parent to look after that child. She has got to depend on some child care, and we have got to provide it, and we do in the Deal substitute. We not only provide it, but we pay for it, and that is an important part of what we do.

The Deal substitute identifies the problems that have been created in the crazy checks abuse, and it solves the problem. I have seen a tremendous amount of that problem in my district, and I have been working hard over these past years to look for a reasonable solution that does not throw out the baby with the bath water. It does not put that child with cerebral palsy out on the street, but it makes sure the disabled children, especially those that are multiply disabled, are going to be helped, but the ones that are abusing the programs, those loopholes will be closed.

The Deal substitute is the only one that sets a 2-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits, the only program that is going to be offered that sets a 2-year lifetime limit.

We give the States the option of extending benefits for 2 more years with community service, and that is what we have heard from most people is that the States know better how to craft and to recraft those programs to get their people back into the work force.

The Deal substitute gives States more flexibility than any other proposal without passing massive costs on to the States, no unfunded mandates. We do not produce the unfunded mandates, because we know it is unrealistic, and in the long run it will not work.

The Deal substitute does not demand family caps. Instead, we give that flexibility to the States, that option of denying additional benefits to mothers who have more children while on welfare.

The Deal substitute includes welfare benefits as taxable income. It is the best alternative you are going to get, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

WELFARE REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see my good friend from Ohio in the chair tonight.

At the outset, I yield to my good friend from Georgia for a moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say one thing about the Deal alternative. I do agree, Mr. Speaker, with the previous speaker. It is the best alternative that is out there, not as good as H.R. 4, the Republican plan, but in terms of an alternative, I agree that the moderate Democrats are showing some leadership over there, and I hope maybe you can inspire your official leaders to show some leadership, too.

One thing though I do want to say about the Democrats' newfound interest in deficit reduction is that, you know, for since 1969, the Democrats have controlled the House, and each year we have a new debt. Now, I say since 1969; that is the last time we had a balanced budget, but year after year the deficit has gone up.

But I say this: It is a Republican and A Democrat obligation to address it, because I believe both parties created the deficit, and I am glad now that both of us are talking about it, and let us have this one-upmanship. Let us see who can top each other's deficit-reduction plan. That is what two parties are all about.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just wanted to reemphasize the fact if we are really truly talking about deficit reduction that all of what we have been talking about in terms of cuts, rescissions, and certainly in the welfare reform and the

moneys that we can save should be going to deficit reduction, and I would certainly encourage the gentlemen when those amendments are offered and certainly when we talk about the lockbox aspects of putting those moneys towards deficit reduction, that we will see that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I note with interest the gentlewoman from Arkansas preceded me in this Chamber by one term, part of the 103rd Congress, I know not her voting record personally, but I do not know the former majority is on record as voting for the largest tax increase in history, a tax increase which hit so many Americans in the wallet as to be just grossly unfair, and went on with the gasoline tax the average impact of which being in excess of an average of $400 per year in additional energy payments for every family in America, regardless of their socioeconomic status. So I would contend with the lady and my other good friends on the other side of the aisle, I do not believe we can tax ourselves to prosperity, and nor, although there are certainly some noble aspects to the notion of a deficit lockbox, I believe we have to return the money to the people who earned that money in the first place.

If I could speak for just a few moments on the 5 minutes I have, I thank my good friends on the other side for their restraint. I would also add that I certainly welcome tonight's meaningful dialog in stark contrast to the hysterics we heard earlier today.

I mentioned that earlier today during the debate I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone from any political party would choose to compare their opposition to the Third Reich of Nazi Germany or to slave holders. I believe that was inexcusable, but I welcome certainly the tone tonight which has changed.

You and I just happen to have a difference of opinion. I think we also have a different interpretation on some of the numbers, but let me yield in the interests of fairness to my friend from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just want to say that we have also seen three consecutive years of deficit reduction. I would just like to encourage the gentleman to make sure that he knows that there are those of us who are speaking out for deficit reduction.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would point out that deficit reduction came at the expense of hardworking taxpayers who would like to keep more of their money in their own pocket, and if we cut taxes and cut the deficit and build this economy, then that will be the answer for everyone including those trapped right now in the prison, if you will, of welfare, and a system that is broken, and we all agree is in need of some radical change.

We asked for that type of change, and that is what we are working to do with your majority bill, H.R. 4. We welcome your thoughts on it, but we would ask you to take a much closer look at the numbers you purport with reference to the Federal lunch program. One is tempted to recall the words of our good friend from California, ''There you go again,'' not talking about the real numbers. We call for increases in the school lunch program of 4.5 percent over the next 5 years, an increase over 5 years of $1.1 billion in expenditures, and we are getting the job done while we are hearing a lot of rhetoric.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to reference your remarks where you just said there was an increase in school lunch program, and I want to, and I appreciate the time to respond to that, there is not an increase in the school lunch program. There is a cut.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentlewoman has to understand how on Earth can you increase a program, now, in fairness, if you are saying there is a reduction in anticipated increases, I would certainly contend that is an interesting way to define a cut.

Ms. PELOSI. I wish the gentleman would wait until my time so we can continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLEMENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE CURRENT WELFARE SYSTEM DOES NOT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about something that I think we all agree upon. There has been a lot of discussion, a lot of debate today, and it seems that one thing that we do agree upon is the current welfare system simply does not work, and instead of requiring work, it actually punishes those who go to work. Instead of instilling personal responsibility, it encourages dependence on the Government, and instead of encouraging marriage and family stability, it penalizes two-parent families and rewards teenage pregnancies.

We all agree welfare must be drastically changed, and that welfare should only offer transitional assistance leading to work, not leading to a way of life.

Now, I am one of the cosponsors of the Deal substitute, and we are committed in our bill to making some pretty major changes. Our bill is the only bill that will be considered which ensures that its savings are used for deficit reduction.

Now, I think that is an important goal that many of us share, and our bill is the only bill that ensures that our savings will be used for that purpose. We support welfare reform that emphasizes work. It emphasizes personal responsibility. It emphasizes family stability.

The Deal substitute imposes some pretty tough work requirements while providing opportunities for education and training and for child care and health care to support working people.

☐ 2215

It provides States with the resources necessary in order for welfare reform to succeed without shifting costs to local governments or without creating unfunded mandates, and it gives the State the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs they need without sacrificing accountability of the Nation's taxpayer's dollars. We believe that real welfare reform must be about replacing a welfare check with a paycheck.

The Deal substitute's time-limited work first program is designed to get people into the work force as quickly as possible by requiring all recipients to enter a self-sufficiency plan within 30 days of receiving their benefits.

The Republican welfare bill allows recipients to receive cash benefits for up to 2 years before they are required to work or even to look for work.

The Deal substitute also encourages welfare recipients to leave welfare for work by providing adequate funding for safe child care and by extending transitional medicaid assistance from 1 year to 2 years.

The Deal substitute provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to become self-sufficient, but it also requires recipients to be responsible for their own actions by setting clear time limits on benefits. No benefits will be paid to anyone, and this is extremely important, no benefits will be paid to anyone who refuses to work, who refuses to look for work or who turns down a job.

In addition to making individuals responsible for their own welfare, we demand that both parents be responsible for their children. The Deal substitute includes the toughest child support system ever to make sure that the noncustodial parents simply don't walk away from the children that they helped bring into this world.

The sponsors of the Deal substitute recognize that in order to reform welfare States must have the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs that are tailored to their unique needs, to the unique characteristic of their States. And we believe that States should not have to go through any cumbersome Federal waiver process in order to implement innovative reforms in their welfare programs.

The Deal substitute, in fact, puts into place a Federal model for the work

first program, but it really encourages States to develop their own work programs. And, unlike the Republican bill, the Deal substitute does not remove some existing mandates only to replace them with different mandates regarding payments for children born on welfare or payments to teenage mothers.

I believe that the Deal substitute offers the best approach to welfare reform. It takes a tough approach by setting time limits, and it requires people to be responsible for their own actions. It provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to realistically achieve self-sufficiency, and I believe that the Deal substitute is the only welfare reform bill which gives the American people what they really want, which is a plan that makes work the number one priority, individuals responsible for their own actions, and welfare reform that gives the States the flexibility they need.

I thank the gentleman. I am sorry I am out of time.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have said maybe on two occasions today that this is one of the most important debates that this 104th Congress will be engaged in, and it is important for us to understand what we are about to do here.

I know there are a lot of unhappy folks in this country, unhappy about the fact that there are too many families and too many children on welfare. I know that most people want change.

We must be fair in our representations about who wants change. Republicans want change. Democrats want change. Workers want change, and recipients want change. I think it is one thing that we can agree on.

No one has the corner on wanting reform. We would all like to see reform in the system, and it is absolutely incorrect to say that the President or Democrats did not have a bill, did nothing about reform.

The President had a comprehensive piece of legislation that he attempted to get into this Congress, the 103d Congress, and we got caught up in the health debate, and it turned into a nightmare, and there was not the opportunity to move on welfare reform as the President had planned. So it is not true that the President did not want welfare reform.

The difference between the Democrat and Republicans is the question of implementation. How will we do welfare reform? Will it be a plan that will offer real opportunities for people to get off welfare or will it simply be a plan to punish folks because for whatever reasons they have found themselves on welfare?

I think it is time for us to try and speak about this in a language that the American public can understand. No, they don't really understand block grants and waivers.

Let's put a face on this discussion. We are talking about, for the most part, just plain old poor people and working people. We are talking about people, some of whom were born into situations through no choice of their own that keeps them locked into the cycle of poverty, and there have been no real guidelines, rules by which they can get out of the cycle of poverty.

We have some folks who work everyday, and they are poor. They can't take care of their families. They need food stamps. They need some help with their health care needs.

And so these are real people. These are not pawns that should be used by politicians to gain favor with people who are very vulnerable at this time. This should not simply be a political issue where some politician stands up and says vote for me. I am going to save you money. I am going to get rid of all these bad people.

And we should not have politicians simply defining all of America's problems by talking about the welfare state. And we certainly should not have politicians who talk about taking America's children and putting them in institutions, in orphanages.

We need to talk about these problems in a real way. Yes, there are teenage pregnancies, too many of them, and most of us don't like the idea that babies have babies. But we live in a society where sex is glamorized, where it is promoted, where it is expected. In order for young women to be looked upon with favor, they must be sexual. Young women are sought after by young men and old men, some of them in their neighborhoods, some out of their neighborhoods, some of them who are poor young men who have not very much to offer, some of them politicians and others. We know what is going on in American society.

We need sex education. We need jobs. Jobs have been exported to Third World countries for cheap labor. We need jobs for educated people and not-so-educated people. We need a better education system. We need to deal with the root causes of this problem, and we need to build into welfare reform the real opportunity for people to become independent by offering real jobs, job training and child care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

FOOD ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in American history. The Republican Majority, with brute and brutal force, has begun a process to undo a half century of laws—laws that have taken this Nation from the depths of depression and malnutrition to soaring heights of health. This process threatens the very strength of America. Federal nutrition programs were first started when it was realized that many of those poor upon whom we depended to join the military and defend us came to the job undernourished and poorly fed. If they could die for America, we reasoned, we should feed them while they were young.

This Personal Responsibility Act is irresponsible. It is irresponsible, for many reasons. I want to share five of those reasons with you. First, this Bill penalizes children. It penalizes children because, beginning immediately, fewer children than we now help and who need our help, will be helped. More than fourteen million children will receive less in food stamp benefits. More than six million children, born to younger mothers, will be denied benefits altogether. More than three million children, who do not know their fathers, will get reduced benefits, through no fault of their own. But, worse yet, more than 700,000 of those disabled children who received benefits last year will not receive benefits next year, under provisions of this Bill.

The Republican Majority will say they are making the system more efficient. The children born to children, without fathers and with disabilities, will simply suffer.

Second, this Bill has unfair work requirements. Because it does not clearly define the amount of compensation for the requirement to work, it could mean eighty hours of work for sixty-nine dollars in benefits—less than a dollar an hour. That is not fair. That is not just. That is not humane. At the very least, forced labor should require payment of the minimum wage. The Republicans will say that these workers may get a package of benefits worth as much as ten thousand dollars a year. That is deceptive. What about those who do not live in public housing? What about those who do not receive Medicaid? What about those who only get food stamps? What about child care costs? Those recipients will be forced to work for compensation far below the minimum wage. That does not encourage self-sufficiency. Third, the Bill puts people off welfare, without putting them to work.

Time limits for benefits, without job opportunities will not work. If an individual is able to work, we must insure that a job is available. Fourth, reasonable child care options should be a part of any work program. The Majority recognizes this by offering an amendment to increase the amount of money in the Bill for child care. But, the amendment falls far short. Under the Bill, there is a twenty percent cut in child care, affecting some 400,000 children. The amendment, if it passes, will put a small dent in those affected children. And, finally, but certainly not least, The Personal Responsibility Act creates block grants out of federal food assistance programs, thereby shifting the burden of nutrition programs to

the States. Instead of one nutrition standard, we will have fifty different standards. Instead of promoting our children-our future-we punish them.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Majority has the votes to force this Bill upon the American people. But, what they want and what we want are clearly different. They want block grants. We want healthy Americans. They want cheap labor. We want fair labor. They hurt children. We want to help children. They call the seventy billion dollars in benefit reductions ''savings''. We call them ''cuts''. They want to use that money to give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. We want to use that money to give a break to the children of America. They want change. We want change. Their change is mean and cruel and will cause misery. Our change is for improvement. We want to put people to work, get them off welfare, prevent teen pregnancy, nourish infants, feed needy children and prepare our young for a productive future.

When the record of this period in our Nation's history is written, we want it said that we took people off welfare and put them to work, at a livable wage. We want it said that we fed children in their stomachs so that we could feed them in their minds. We want it said that while some wanted to hurt the people, reason prevailed, and we helped the people. I urge my colleagues to reject the Personal Responsibility Act. It is irresponsible.

□ 2230

CHILD NUTRITION IN THE WELFARE REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today utterly and totally appalled by what I am reading in the bill H.R. 1214, the so-called ''Personal Responsibility Act.''

If this bill passes, and it just might—judging by the rapid-fire way this and other ill conceived ''Contract With America''-inspired legislation is making its way on and off the House floor—the GOP itself should be held ''personally responsible'' for creating a measure that could create the specter of millions of hungry American children.

Let us take a close look at what will be cut and, if I may, let us use South Carolina as a case study on just how these cuts will affect some of the nation's neediest children.

First, the bill proposes to cut almost $70 billion over 5 years in low-income assistance programs. As a part of these cuts, the bill will end the entitlement status of all federally funded child nutrition programs in lieu of State block grants, for the States to do what they will.

On the surface, this may sound like big government savings. But a closer look at this bill reveals that these savings are being made at the expense of our children.

On the chopping block are school breakfast and lunch programs, summer feeding programs, the special milk program and the commodities portion of school nutrition programs.

In South Carolina alone, the absence of the school lunch program could mean that 400,000 children will be denied what may well be their only balanced meal of the day.

Further, the bill repeals the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC.

In South Carolina, the WIC caseload is close to 124,000. WIC has been proven to be highly successful in meeting nationally standardized nutritional needs of women and children.

All totaled, South Carolina would receive $96 million less in Federal funding for the school lunch and WIC programs.

Also on the cutting board are food stamps. This bill will cut spending by $20.3 billion in the Food Stamp Program over 5 years. This portion of the bill would impose a rigid cap on food stamp expenditures, with no adjustments for inflation. It would also require certain recipients to go to work without providing any funds to States for job creation.

This portion of the bill would affect over 350,000 food stamp recipients in South Carolina and the State would receive $174 million less in Federal funding for food stamps over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a steady stream of visitors to my office in the past few weeks—bipartisan visitors—from the South Carolina PTA, the South Carolina Guidance Counselors, the South Carolina Food Service Association, the South Carolina Dietetics Association—people who are horrified at what this bill contains because they know first-hand what the true affects would be on children if this measure were to pass.

What is the impetus behind the GOP trying to pass a measure that has raised the ire of such diverse groups as the National School Board Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Heart Association and the National Education Association?

Why are they so bent on passing a plan that would literally take food out of the months of the Nation's young?

It is not secret that Republicans intend to use the revenues raised from cuts to welfare programs to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Well, this ''steal from the poor to pay for the rich'' Robin Hood-reversal scheme has come under fire from all corners.

And the fact of the manner is, even though the Republicans would like to pretend that welfare mothers and their children are the bane of the Federal budget, the realities do not bear them out.

For even if the entire welfare program were totally cut today, it would make only a dent in deficit reduction.

So, this mean-spirited attack on welfare, and in particular, this hatchet job being waged against child nutrition program, is totally unnecessary and will not make any significant cuts in the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, when this 104th Congress began, much reference was made to the orphanage heralded in the movie ''Boys Town'' as a model for the Nation on how to deal with children born to poor mothers.

Now, the Draconian measures proposed in this bill brings to mind another movie image, that of young poor and hungry ''Oliver Twist,'' his small child's hands cupped, standing before a scowling orphanage director, piteously pleading, ''More, sir?''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SACRIFICES IN THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, we have debated for many hours today on the welfare reform bill, the so-called Personal Responsibility Act, and it is a very important piece of legislation indeed.

The Republicans say that this bill is about sacrifices. And indeed there are going to be 5 million families, and in those 5 million families there are 9.5 million children who are indeed going to make some sacrifices. Because for each one of those families, for each of the next 5 years on average, they will use nearly $2,000 worth of income and food and care for children while the parents go to work and care for abused children and such.

And every one of those 5 million families has under $15,000 of income at the

present time from which they are going to sacrifice least $2,000.

Why are we doing that? Is it to balance the budget? No, not even the first step on that. Not a single economist of some 20 or so, mostly chosen by the Republican majority for their willingness to say what the majority wanted them to say, not a single one of those economists supported the tax cut as a way to get about balancing the budget.

Is it to reduce the deficit? Well, here is a chart that shows indeed what the deficit is and what it has been over a period of time. And you can see this massive deficit that was built up during the Reagan years and the Bush years, year after year, after many years of nearly balanced budgets and then slowly rising, but this huge deficit in the Reagan and the Bush years, year after year after year.

But, no, it is not going to reduce the deficit. Because after the amendment that we adopted today which allows the savings to come from the welfare bill, the welfare reform bill, those savings are not to be used for reducing the deficit. They are, in fact, to be used to give a massive tax cut to the richest among us.

Fifty billion dollars of moneys from families, from the 5 million families with under $15,000 a year is going to be transferred. Fifty billion dollars is going to be transferred to the 2 million families who have now presently over $200,000 per year. Each one of those families is going to see almost $5,000 per year for the next 5 years on average of tax reductions.

Now, where is the sacrifice here for those 2 million families who presently make over $200,000 per year under the present tax laws? Where is the sacrifice there? I know, if you hadn't already guessed, there is not a single family of a Congressman or Congresswoman who is going to be sacrificing a penny in that process.

And what are we as Americans going to be gaining from this? Are we going to get growth in the economy by putting people to work or a lower unemployment rate?

Well, every time the economy looks as if it is going to take off and grow a bit or the unemployment rate goes below 6 percent, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, raises the interest rate to cut the growth rate and to put people out of work.

Where is the sacrifice for all of those 2 million families that are going to be given $50 billion in tax cuts that is going to be taken from the 5 million families and their 9½ million children, families that have less than $15,000 a year of income?

Well, there is a sacrifice here ultimately, even if it is a little hard to see. And it may take a few years to see it, and it comes in crime particularly.

Because we are going to see in a few years down the road thousands more people in prisons, prisons that cost $60,000 a cell to build and $20,000 to maintain a prisoner in one of those cells. We are going to see more drive-by shootings and more thefts and robberies and house breaks and drug abuse and sales of drugs. And it will only take a few more years. That is a few years down the road.

In all of my years in the legislature of my State, and there were quite a number of those, and my few years, 4 years now, in the Congress, that is the most vicious and the most far-reaching attack on children that I have ever seen, and I have seen more than a few of those in my years in government.

Because whenever you need to cut revenues, whenever you need to cut expenditures, children are targeted. They can't fight back. They can't vote.

But some of us are going to fight back for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited or 2 days ago I visited in Sheffield Lake in Lorain County in my district the Tennyson Elementary School to see the School Lunch Program up close and to talk to students and teachers and parents and administrators and cafeteria people.

I was taken around by a couple of third graders, Will Emery and Zach Russell, and met with lots of students, Jennifer Ward and her two sisters, who had some things to tell us, with Mrs. Armstead, the principal, and with several other people that all agreed on one thing. People, whether it is from a PTA or from school administrators or teachers or parents, the one thing they agree on about the School Lunch Program is that if it ain't broke don't fix it.

And perhaps I shouldn't use grammar like that talking about a grade school, but when you think about all the talk, that the Republicans say it is block grants and the Democrats say that these are very real cuts as they are about nutrition programs for children and about school lunches, the fact is, as my friend from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] said a few minutes ago this has been a program in existence for 49 years.

It works. There is simply no reason to fix something that is not broken. It is a government program that works. It is for the future of our children.

Why mess with it? Why make these radical, divisive kinds of changes that Republicans are suggesting about school lunch? It simply doesn't make sense.

PRESSLER AMENDMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to shift gears and talk about another matter, different from the school lunch issue that people have been debating tonight.

In 10 days, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Benazir Bhutto, is coming to Washington to meet with the President.

Business Week magazine reports that one of Bhutto's key goals in courting President Clinton is to ease enforcement of the Pressler amendment. The Pressler amendment, Mr. Speaker, prevents Pakistan from obtaining 60 F–16 fighter jets.

The Pressler amendment made good sense when it was enacted, and it makes better sense today because of the political and social upheaval that is wracking Pakistani society and threatening the stability of the Bhutto government.

Pakistan is in a chaotic state. Just in recent weeks, we have witnessed:

The murder earlier this month of two American diplomats in Karachi;

A show trial in which two Christians, one of them a 14-year-old boy, were sentenced to death for blasphemy against Islam and narrowly escaped Pakistan with their lives; and

A stunning piece of journalism by the New York Times Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter, John Burns.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD the article from the New York Times by Mr. Burns.

At considerable risk to himself, John Burns has traced a good deal of the world's terrorist activity to the University of Dawat and Jihad in Peshawar, Pakistan. Roughly translated, it is the University of the Community of the Holy War. It is simply a school for terrorism.

According to Mr. Burns, ''Just about everyone has a hidden Kalashnikov assault rifle.''

The university is a haven for Muslims militants from throughout Asia and the Arab world. The University of Dawat and Jihad is under investigation as a possible training ground for terrorists who have struck in the Philippines, Central Asia, the Middle East, North Africa and now investigators believe the World Trade Center bombing in New York 2 years ago.

Burns says that the area in and around Peshawar represents, ''One of the most active training grounds and sanctuaries for a new breed of international terrorists.''

According to high-ranking U.S. diplomats, students are taught that the Islamic renaissance has to be born out of blood and by only striking at the West will Islam ever be able to dictate events in the world and events have

been dictated up to now by the West. Burns says intelligence reports in recent years have suggested that militants trained here have taken part in almost every conflict where Muslims have been involved. For instance, the Philippines, where there was an attempt on Pope John Paul II's life; the Middle East; of course, Bosnia; Tajikistan; and certainly in Kashmir, where the Kashmiri Pandits have been the target of ethnic cleansing carried out as part of a campaign of terrorism.

□ 2245

Pakistan supporters cite the threat posed by Islamic terrorists as a reason not to pressure from us the Bhutto government. But then they turn around and say that Pakistan is a stable government and that the extremists represent only a tiny fraction, a tiny minority of the population.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that supporters of Pakistan can have it both ways. We should insist that Prime Minister Bhutto stand up to Islamic extremists and repeal the biasphemy laws that are the method of choice for abusing the human rights of Christians and abusing the human rights of other Pakistani minorities.

We should insist that Pakistan bust up the terrorist network operating on Pakistani soil, a network that is spreading violence and frustrating political solutions throughout South Asia, the Middle East, North Africa, and even here in the United States.

We should insist that Pakistan crack down on extremists. And, Mr. Speaker, in closing, until Pakistan demonstrates that it is ready to participate in the world community as a responsible player, any consideration of waiving the Pressler amendment must simply be out of the question.

The article referred to follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1995]

A NETWORK OF ISLAMIC TERRORISM TRACED TO A PAKISTAN UNIVERSITY

(By John F. Burns)

PESHAWAR, PAKISTAN, March 19.—Glimpsed from a taxi, there is nothing obviously sinister about the University of Dawat and Jihad. Like much of the sprawling Afghan refugee camp that surrounds it, the campus crouches unobtrusively behind high walls of sun-baked clay. Beyond a guardhouse, clusters of young men in Afghan tribal garb move about languidly.

The scene could be anywhere in this tense and often lawless region along the frontier with Afghanistan. There is no police presence for miles around, and no sign of any other Government authority. In the bazaars that line the road running past the university, the name of which translates roughly as ''University of the Community of the Holy War,'' just about everybody has a hidden Kalashnikov assault rifle, and a sharp eye for anything deemed intrusive, especially Westerners.

But nothing in this atmosphere of suspicion and imminent violence compares with the university, which for years has had a reputation as a haven for Muslim militants from Arab and Asian countries. Now, top Pakistani police officials say, it is under investigation as a possible training ground for terrorists who have struck in the Philippines, Central Asia, the Middle East, North Africa and even, investigators now believe, in the 1993 explosion of a 500-pound bomb in the basement of the World Trade Center in New York that killed six people and wounded more than 1,000.

This weekend, American investigators were working behind the scenes here with Pakistan's intelligence services, scouring for links to the bombing as well as the recent attack on Americans by gunmen who leapt from a taxi 12 days ago in Karachi, Pakistan's largest city, shooting to death two Americans who were driving to work at the United States Consulate.

Officials interviewed here said today that the questioning of six suspects captured a week ago has led to further arrests. A top police official said details of the newest arrests would not be made known for ''a couple of days.''

''But,'' he said, ''these are not innocent citizens, I can tell you.''

So feared has the university become that even men reared in the harsh gun culture of the Afghan frontier wilt at the sight of its gates.

''Don't go in there, sir, it is too dangerous. They can kill you,'' said Syed Gul, the taxi driver, watching anxiously in his rearview mirror for any sign that a black pickup truck idling at the campus gates might decide to give chase. Mr. Gul, one of 1.5 million Afghan refugees living around Peshawar, then sped away from the campus at Babbi, 20 miles east of Peshawar.

With its obsessive secrecy and hostility to outsiders. Al Dawat, as it is known, remains little but a name to most people in Pakistan's North–West Frontier Province. But what has not been so much of a secret is that Peshawar, and the wild valleys and passes of the tribal areas along the Afghan border, have emerged as one of the most active training grounds, and sanctuaries, for a new breed of international terrorists fighting a jihad—a holy war—against Governments and other targets they regard as enemies of Islam.

Until the 1990's, Peshawar received scant notice among known terrorist training centers like Beirut, Teheran or Tripoli in the search for groups who hijack aircraft, assassinate public figures, and plant bombs.

But the two terrorist attacks involving American targets, have swung the spotlight on this ancient city at the eastern end of the Khyber Pass, where violence and intrigue are as much a part of the city's legacy as the towering battlements of its 19th-century fort.

Investigators, including a 50-member team from the F.B.I., are working in the knowledge that almost all the groups that have punctuated life in Karachi with drive-by shootings and mosque bombings have ties to Peshawar, either to the Arab-led terrorist underground or to gangs of gun-runners and heroin-traffickers who are based in the frontier province's tribal districts, historically ungovernable areas along the border with Afghanistan.

In the World Trade Center bombing, the clues being followed by the investigators are clearer. Beginning last weekend, Pakistani police working with officials of the C.I.A. and the F.B.I. began a round of arrests in Peshawar that have flowed form the discovery that Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, a prime suspect in the New York attach, used Peshawar as a base for several years. He was seized in a joint American-Pakistan's capital, on Feb. 7, and immediately deported to face trail in New York.

RAID IN ISLAMABAD SHAKES MILITANTS

The arrest of Mr. Yousef in Islamabad set off a chain of events that has rocked the Peshawar underground and resulting this weekend in the issuing of a police alert for two men identified as Abdul Karim and Abdul Munim, who the officials said are Mr. Yousef's brothers.

The six men seized a week ago are being held at a jail at Adiala, outside Islamabad, on suspicion of involvement in the World Trade Center bombing and a botched attempt to assassinate Pope John Paul II during his visit in January in Manila, the capital of the Philippines. They included three Arabs, an Iranian, a naturalized Pakistani born in Syria and a native-born Pakistani.

Nervousness among American officials over the possibility of revenge killings led the top diplomat at the United States Consulate in Peshawar, Richard H. Smyth, to announce on Friday that the American Club in the city, long a favorite gathering place for diplomats, relief workers and others, would be closed temporarily, as would the American school. Similar steps were taken in Karachi.

The risks for Americans seem unlikely to diminish, at least in the short run, especially if Pakistan follows through on another move that top officials here hinted at today—closing Al-Dawat University.

''It has to go,'' one official said, noting that the questioning of Mr. Yousef, and of others seized since, have confirmed that his links in Peshawar were mainly to an Afghan group headed by Abdul Rab Rasool Sayyaf, the university's founder. Mr. Sayyaf, a militant Muslim with strong anti-American leanings, established the school and recruited its staff and students in the mid-1980's.

In many ways, Al-Dawat serves as a symbol for the events that turned Peshawar into a terrorist haven. The a law-abiding reputation, going back to the days when Britain, as the colonial power in what was then India, fought fierce battles against the Pathans who dominate both sides of the border with Afghanistan, and eventually allowed them a broad degree of autonomy. In the idiom of 19th-century Britain, ''the frontier'' became synonymous with fierce warriors, banditry, and a culture of guns and revenge.

A FLOOD OF ARMS AFTER SOVIET SWEEP

But the uneasy balance with the border tribes that was achieved by Britain, and later Pakistan, tipped after the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979. The huge amounts of weapons and money that the United States, Saudi Arabia and other nations poured into supporting Afghan groups established in Peshawar unleashed new levels of lawlessness on the frontier.

This anything-goes atmosphere encouraged large numbers of foreigners—mainly Arabs but also Asians, Europeans and some Americans—to volunteer to fight with the Afghan guerrilla groups. According to a high-ranking Pakistani military officer, 25,000 of these volunteers were trained with assistance from Pakistan's military intelligence agency, Inter-Services Intelligence, during the 1980's.

Some died in Afghanistan, and some went home after Soviet troops withdrew in 1989, but others remained in and around Peshawar or across the border in Afghanistan, ''looking for other wars to fight,'' as the Pakistan's Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto, put it in Karachi last week.

According to Western diplomats familiar with the investigations, current American estimates of the number of Arabs, Asians and others currently active in terrorist groups with bases here run to about 1,000. Of

these, some are believed to have taken sanctuary inside Afghanistan, with Afghan armed groups that have Muslim fundamentalist leanings, including Mr. Sayyaf's. Police officials in Peshawar said this appeared to have been the pattern with Mr. Yousef.

''He'd stay here for a few days, then disappear into Afghanistan for months, then come back,'' the official said.

Others are said to have taken refuge in what are known here as the ''inaccessible'' areas of the frontier, meaning regions where no Pakistani laws apply. But a large number, according to diplomats and police officials, still live in and around Peshawar, using as cover some of the 18 Arab educational and relief organizations that registered with the Pakistani authorities during the Afghan war, among them the Al Dawat University. ''Some of these organizations actually do what they are supposed to be doing,'' one diplomat said, scanning a list of the groups. ''But others are just fronts for terrorism.''

Another high-ranking diplomat said that Pakistani officials had been aware for years that at Al Dawat and other training centers, youths were being taught that Muslims had a duty to join in an international brotherhood that could avenge the humiliations Muslims are said to have suffered at the hands of the west.

''They are taught that the Islamic renaissance has to be born out of blood, and that only by striking at the West will Islam ever be able to dictate events in the world, as events have been dictated up to now by the West,'' the diplomat said.

A FLOW OF GUERRILLAS TO OTHER CONFLICTS

According to the diplomats, intelligence reports in recent years have suggested that militants trained here have taken part in almost every conflict where Muslims have been involved. The diplomats said Muslims trained here have fought in places including Mindanao, the largest of the Philippine islands, where Mr. Yousef is said to have had links with a Muslim insurgency; the Indian-held portion of the state of Kashmir, where 500,000 Indian troops and police officers are tied down by a Muslim revolt; the former Soviet Republic of Tajikistan; Bosnia; and several countries in North Africa that face Muslim rebellions, including Egypt, Tunisia and Algeria.

Like previous Pakistani Governments, Ms. Bhutto's has responded to Western pressures cautiously, fearing a backlash from powerful Muslim groups within Pakistan.

But many senior Pakistani officials resent Western pressures, saying that the terrorist groups that became established here got their start under politics that the United States and other Western countries eagerly supported, so long as the target was the Soviet Union.

''Don't forget, the whole world opened its arms to these people,'' one senior official said. ''They were welcomed here as fighters for a noble cause, with no questions asked. They came in here by the dozens, and nobody thought to ask them: when the Afghan Jihad is over, are you going to get involved in terrorism in Pakistan? Are you going to bomb the World Trade Center?

''The Afghan War was a holy war for everybody, including the Americans, and nobody bothered to think beyond it,'' the official said.

MORE ON WELFARE REFORM AND BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call to the attention of our colleagues H.R. 4. My colleagues who are viewing this from home, our friends who are viewing this from home should read this and weep. This is the Republican welfare proposal. It rewards the rich, cheats children and is weak on work.

But one particular aspect of this proposal is the federal children's nutrition program which I wish to address this evening.

My colleague earlier this evening referenced the fact that the child nutrition programs came into being following World War II, when the military told us that our recruits were malnourished and this took its toll on their physical and mental well-being. Since that time, feeding the hungry has not been a debatable issue in our country. Indeed, President Richard Nixon said, a child ill-fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina and distracted from learning.

This has been our national policy until now. The proposal that the Republicans have placed on the table will take food off the table for America's poor children. And this is why.

You have heard much discussion here this evening about whether the Republican proposal is a cut or is not a cut in what they call the school lunch program. But what we are addressing in this bill is the full federal children's nutrition program. So if we are only talking about school lunch, then you are talking about a situation where the Republicans are saying, we are not cutting school lunch. But what they are cutting are the after-school and summer programs. They are giving the same amount of money and they say with an increase except they are cutting out one very important facet of the children's nutrition program.

In addition to that, they are making this a block grant and not an entitlement. Under the law now, there is a formula for needs-based, a formula that is needs-based for children who are poor. And now the Republican proposal will eliminate that entitlement and call it a block grant instead, which means a definite amount of money will be sent to the states. Why does that create a problem?

For the following reasons: First, in that block grant, there is a reduction of the money for the full children's nutrition program, including school lunch, school-based lunch program, and assistance for after-school and summer programs. These programs are very important to day care, children in day care who have to stay after school because their parents work. And work is the goal that we have for the welfare program. So that undermines that goal there.

Second, in this block grant, it removes eligibility, so you do not have to be poor to be a beneficiary of the Republican proposal, which means that poor children will get less nutrition because more children can avail themselves of the program. This is supposed to be needs-based.

In addition to that, on the block grant program, it only says that a governor must spend 80 percent of the money that the Federal Government sends to the state. The governor only has to spend 80 percent of the money on the children's nutrition programs.

So already we have had a reduction of 20 percent because that is all the requirement is.

This is why people are concerned about what they hear coming out of Washington, DC. People are not fools. People who have received this benefit because it is necessary for children's nutrition know when they are getting cut. And then to hear semantics used about, well, when I said school lunch program, I did not mean after school or I did not mean summer school. Well, we are talking about the children's nutrition program. Let us refer to it there, and that is being cut. And eligibility is being removed and the requirement to spend all the money is being removed.

This is not even a fight between domestic spending versus defense spending, as is classic in this body, because this came from the military, recognizing the deficiencies and the malnutrition that they saw in our troops coming out of World War II. So this is about the strength of our country.

I did not even really get started. What I want to just say is that what the Republicans are doing is a real cut in the children's nutrition program. The welfare proposal they are proposing should not even contain a nutrition cut. Nutrition has never been part of the welfare program. It rewards the rich because that is what this cut is about, giving a tax break to the wealthiest Americans. It cheats children, and it is weak on work.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

REPUBLICAN SHELL GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House tonight. I want to compliment our speaker on his ability tonight, but also when I heard last week that you were fortunate to have Dave Berry sit in your office just briefly as your press secretary, you are a very brave man, Mr. Speaker.

Let me talk about the welfare bill that we are considering because that has been the topic this evening. The Republican shell game continues with the lives of the children hanging in the

balance literally. Today my office received updated estimates on exactly how much the welfare reform bill would cost the state of Texas, and it would be over a billion dollars in the year 1996 and 1997.

The good news, if you can call it that, is that the early estimates of 60 million reduction for the Texas school nutrition program is now, after looking at the final bill that came out of the committee, will now only be a 35.1 million cut. And my Republican colleagues tonight, when they talked about that it is really an increase, they obviously, I would rather read and depend on outside the beltway information from someone who is looking at it than from someone who is inside the beltway.

The chief financial officer of Texas estimates, in fiscal year 1996, the appropriations will be sufficient. But after that year, with only the 4.1 percent increase, and I would like to read part of the letter and also have it all inserted from John Sharp.

I am happy to provide you with our analysis of the federal welfare reform proposals. The analysis below has been updated based on the bill language expected to reach the House floor.

Again, I received this today.

My concern isn't with making cuts in federal spending but rather with the unfair way in which Texas is being placed at a disadvantage and asked to shoulder more than its fair share. The proposals currently under consideration in Congress have a disproportionate and grossly inequitable effect on Texas. Nothing has changed since our preliminary analysis. While I support block grant funding as an effective way to reduce federal spending, the fact is that the current formulas being debated by Congress are based on past allocations for the states. It is unfair to Texas that high-spending, low-growth states like Michigan and Wisconsin would make money with the current formulas while Texas would be one of the hardest hit.

Texas is a typically low-spending and high-growth state for funding:

The inequity of the current formula would result in a loss of $1 billion anticipated federal funds for Texas in the 1996–1997 biennial budget. I know Texans are willing to take their share of the cuts, but we want to make sure that we aren't penalized while other high-spending states avoid cuts and actually make money.

That is what we are looking at, if you are a member of Congress from Texas.

And to continue:

As far as your specific request regarding current funding formula proposals for the school nutrition program, we expect to sustain a shortfall of $35.1 million during the next two-year budget cycle. The family-based nutrition program funding formulas will also cost Texas more than $149.5 million during the same period.

I know earlier this evening my colleague from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] talked about how Ohio is going to benefit, but let me tell you, Texas is low spending on welfare but a high-growth state and we will lose money.

The Republicans will not admit that we grow at 8 percent each year. What they do not tell you is that now we have a guarantee of a school lunch and that an increase in authorization, with an increase in authorization but a possible cut in the appropriations each year, the Republicans should not play the shell games with our children and take nutrition programs out of welfare reform. Under this shell game, the authorization under this bill is one shell. The appropriations is another. And yet the 80 percent that will only be required to be used is the other shell.

We ought to take school lunch out like the Deal amendment talks about. I am not a cosponsor of the Deal amendment, but I intend to vote for it because it is so much better than the current bill that we have. We do not call buying textbooks, computers, desks or other material in our schools welfare. And we should not call a school lunch or a breakfast that they are providing that helps them to be a better student welfare.

Congress must stop the shell game and calling school lunch and breakfast welfare. Call it like it is. It is a helping hand to our students. That is what we need to consider. That is why it should not be part of this bill, and that is why I would, the Committee on Rules did not let us have an amendment on the nutrition. But at least we will get a shot at it when we have the Deal amendment up.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred.

COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS,
Austin, TX, March 22, 1995.

Hon. GENE GREEN,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: I am happy to provide you with our analysis of Federal welfare reform proposals. The analysis below has been updated based on the bill language expected to reach the House floor. My concern isn't with making cuts in federal spending, but rather with the unfair way in which Texas is being placed at a disadvantage and asked to shoulder more than it's fair share.

The proposals currently under consideration in Congress will have a disproportionate and grossly inequitable effect on Texas. Nothing has changed since our preliminary analysis. While I support block grant funding as an effective way to reduce federal spending, the fact is that the current formulas being debated by Congress are based on past allocations to the states. It is unfair to Texas that high-spending, low-growth states like Michigan and Wisconsin would make money with the current formulas, while Texas would be one of the hardest hit states in the Union.

The inequity of the current formulas would result in a loss of more than $1 billion in anticipated federal funds for Texas' 1996–1997 biennial budget. I know Texans are willing to take their fair share of cuts, but we want to be sure we aren't penalized while other high-spending states avoid cuts and actually make money.

As for your specific questions regarding current funding formula proposals for the School Nutrition program, we expect to sustain a shortfall $35.1 million during the next two-year budget cycle. The Family-based Nutrition program funding formulas will also cost Texas more than $149.5 million during the same period.

Attached are two charts illustrating the estimated five-year impact of current nutritional block grant funding proposals. We derived the estimates for the proposed block grants by taking the anticipated 1996–97 federal revenues for the affected programs from the current Biennial Revenue Estimate (BRE) and then subtracting the anticipated revenues from these programs in each block grant. The BRE revenue estimates are based on projected caseload growth, program costs and the federal share of total costs of the programs under current law.

Again, I strongly support block grants as a means of cutting federal spending, balancing the federal budget and returning control to the states. However, the future losses to be incurred by our state under the proposed funding formulas are unfair because they ignore the fact that Texas, with one of the fastest-growing populations and lowest per capita income rates in the nation, will have one of the greatest needs for these funds in the years ahead and yet, states like Michigan, which is losing population, face no loss of funds.

I look forward to working with you, the Texas delegation, the Governor and Texas' legislative leadership to ensure the necessary curtailments to federal spending occur—without treating Texas unfairly.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHARP,
Comptroller of Public Accounts.

Comptroller Estimates of Potential losses in federal funds under block grant formula for federal nutrition payments with Block Grant Caps, under formula approved by Committee.

NUTRITION FUNDING BLOCK GRANT FUNDING PROPOSAL

Combining total WIC, Child Summer Nutrition programs into single lump sum payment to the states (including growth rates in bill formula):

Year	BRE Estimate (millions of $)	Proposed Block Grant (Grant formula)	Rev. loss
1996	$476.1	$412.7	$63.4
1997	514.1	428.0	86.2
1998	555.3	442.1	113.2
1999	599.7	458.5	141.3
2000	647.7	475.4	172.3
Total			576.2

Total loss for 1996–97 biennium $149.5 million.

SCHOOL NUTRITION FUNDING BLOCK GRANT FUNDING PROPOSAL

Replacing current enrollment-based funding formula for total school nutrition programs with Block Grant amount as approved in formula (including growth) by House:

Year	BRE Estimate (millions of $)	Proposed Block Grant (Grant formula)	Rev. loss
1996	$591.6	$577.3	$14.3
1997	621.8	601.0	20.8
1998	653.5	625.0	28.4
1999	686.8	651.3	35.5
2000	721.8	678.0	43.9
Total			142.9

Total loss for 1996–97 biennium: $35.1 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SCHOOL LUNCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal school-based nutrition program is not like welfare, which cries out for fundamental change. On the contrary, the New York Times calls the school lunch program ''a rousing success in boosting health and academic achievement.'' It feeds 25 million American children each day. But the new majority is willing to slash and burn a program serving America's hungriest and most vulnerable population.

They want to use them as guinea pigs for the revolution. But one bad thing about a revolution is that a lot of people starve in them.

Under this proposal, New York State could lose as much as $373 million in funding. They could cause 60,000 New York City children to be dropped from the school lunch program. The Republicans say they are just handing over the program to the States who are bound to do a better job. But let us take a hard look at their proposal.

They are going to dismantle an entire nutrition infrastructure that successfully feeds 25 million children, hand it over to 50 new State bureaucracies, sharply cut funding for the program from projected levels of need, and eliminate minimum nutrition standards. They say this will provide better lunches to more kids at lower cost.

I cannot speak for other Americans, but I do not have any great confidence that the majority of Republican governors nationwide will make school lunch programs for poor children a high priority.

I do not think our State bureaucracy is any more efficient than the Federal one. And the fact is the school-based nutrition block grant will create more bureaucracy, not less. It is written into the bill. The administrative cost currently in Federal child nutrition programs, excluding WIC, is 1.8 percent.

□ 2300

The school-based block grant proposal increases the administrative cap to 2 percent. It retains most Federal administrative burdens such as meal counting and income verification. It imposes an additional bureaucratic procedure to establish citizenship, and it requires States to create 50 new bureaucracies of their own.

Child nutrition bureaucracies will be a growth industry nationwide. The new majority denies they are cutting school-based nutrition programs. They say they are increasing it by 4.5 percent per year. But that would cause decreases in child and adult care food programs, the summer food program, and after school programs, as my colleague the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] pointed out.

That simply is robbing from Peter to give to Paul.

They also fail to account for the 3.5 percent rise in food inflation, or the 3 percent growth in school enrollment.

And they fail to mention that they will allow States to transfer 20 percent of funds to programs for purposes other than food assistance to school children. They say, ''Only in Washington would a 4.5 percent increase be considered a cut.''

Well, most American families do not see it that way. Assume an American family is financially breaking even this year. The next year their daughter's school tuition goes up by 9 percent, but their family income only goes up by 4.5 percent. The fact that their income went up is irrelevant to them. Their concern is only that they do not have enough. The alleged 4.5 percent increase is a phony number, and even if it were accurate it would not be enough.

The bill strips school-based nutrition programs of their entitlement status. It makes no allowance for the growing number of children who live in poverty. The new majority knows this full well, but apparently does not care.

In 1987, one in five American children lived in poverty. By 1992, it was one in four. The new majority talks about flexibility, but capped block grants are totally inflexible.

Ultimately school-based nutrition programs will face dramatic shortfalls. Under President Reagan, a smaller cut led to 3 million fewer children being served a school lunch. But these new State bureaucrats will not just reduce the number of children served, they have a cost-saving instrument that today's Washington school lunch bureaucrats do not. They will not have to meet strong Federal nutritional standards that have been refined and developed over 50 years by scientists and nutrition experts.

By abolishing these standards we effectively throw out the window half a century of expertise in feeding our children so they can learn, so they can think, so they can grow, so that they can succeed.

The child nutrition program is a health care program, it is necessary to our children, it is an education program, and it is an important part of our country.

REFORMING WELFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to do a longer special order this evening on defense, but listening to some of the comments tonight by our colleagues on both sides, I had to come over here and speak about the current welfare reform debate and to lend some feeling that I have personally.

My background in coming to the floor tonight to speak on welfare reform is not one of being an attorney who has never had to live in an area where people of poverty have to survive on a daily basis. I was born the youngest of nine children in one of the most distressed communities in Pennsylvania. Neither parent was able to complete high school because of their having to quit school when they were in sixth and eighth grades to help raise their families. Even though we were poor and even though we were a blue collar family, my father worked in a factory 38 years, we were proud.

My father was proudest of the fact up until the day he died that during the 38 years he worked for the plant, ending up making about $6,000 a year when he retired, never once did he accept public assistance. There were many times when he was out of work because of strikes, because of situations involving labor unrest at the factory, but never once did he have to resort to taking money from the taxpayers.

He was proud of that because he felt it was his responsibility to support his children. And all of us are better for that spirit.

I realize all families are not in that situation. My parents were, and I am fortunate to have had parents of that caliber. They taught us that in the end it is our own responsibility for how far we go and what we achieve.

I went on to go to college, working my way through undergraduate school with a student loan, and taught school in one of the second poorest communities in our area, Upper Darby right next to west Philadelphia.

Unlike many of my colleagues in here, out of 435 most of them were lawyers. When we talk about school lunches I ran a lunch hour in our school for 7 years with kids eating lunch, and understand the problems and concerns that that brings. I also ran a chapter I program for 3 of those years aimed at educationally and economically deprived kids.

While working as a teacher during the day, I decided to run for mayor of my hometown because of the distressed nature of the community and the problems we had. All of these experiences were experiences I was involved in before coming here, and what bothers me the most is the level of debate we hear in the House today that somehow because the systems that we are trying to fix have not been addressed in the last 30 years in a constructive way in terms of change, somehow what we are doing is going to harm American young people.

Somehow what we are trying to do in the welfare reform debate is mean-spirited and we really do not care about children. I resent that. I have been a teacher and an educator, my wife is a registered nurse. I live in a poor community. I helped turn that town around

as a mayor, as a community activist. I want to do what is right for America, but let me tell you the system today does not work.

Over the past 30 years we have had two wars in America. We won one, that was the Cold War. We spent $5 trillion on defense. Today the Berlin Wall is down. We have seen Communism fall and the investment we made worked.

The second war was the war on poverty. We lost that war and we spent about $6 trillion on poverty programs that in inner city areas and in areas where I taught school and grew up actually created disincentives for people and actually took away self-pride, self-initiative and took away the ability of people who were poor to feel good about who they are.

We are trying to change that. We may not get it right the first time, but for someone to question our motives, like somehow we do not care about kids or somehow we do not care about what people eat is absolutely ridiculous. It is not just ridiculous, it is absolutely offensive.

As a Republican who has crossed the arty line on many times, to support family and medical leave, strike breaker legislation, efforts to deal with programs serving the working people of this country, environmental legislation, I take exception to the kind of characterization that is occurring on this House floor that says that Republicans do not care about people or people problems. That is not what we are about.

We have a series of programs in this country that are not working. Talking about school lunch. The largest school district in my district, Upper Darby Township, population 100,000, has opted out of the Federal school lunch program for almost a decade; even though they border west Philadelphia and even though they have 100,000 people in the school district, they have chosen voluntarily not to be a part of the school lunch program. Now maybe they know something that we do not know, at least our Democrat colleagues do not know down here about the school lunch program. For almost a decade they have opted out; they do not want any of our money; 100,000 people in an urban school district have chosen in my district not to partake of the school lunch program.

Where are the doom and gloom predictions that were supposed to have occurred in Upper Darby Township? How could a school district that serves a population of 100,000 people that chose not to be in this program have their children dying of hunger and starvation? Where are the answers from our liberal friends?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this debate would be on factual information, and cut the rhetoric and the garbage coming out of Members on both sides of the aisle in terms of welfare reform.

CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise today to speak on the same topic of child nutrition and really again say that so much of what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, I can remember sitting on a picket line many years ago when I was a news reporter, and the company that was being picketed had said they were going to open their books to the striking workers, and I asked one of the grizzled old union fellows who was out there, I said, ''You know we can go in there and take a look at those figures.'' This striker looked at me and said, ''Well, you know, figures don't lie but liars sure know how to figure.''

And let me say a lot of the rhetoric I have heard from the other side of the aisle would remind me you can shuffle figures any way you want to, but the bottom line is when you take a look at the proposal of child nutrition we have given a whole new meaning to the term women and children first. We are whacking women, we are whacking children, and we will see more children going hungry because of this welfare proposal that is being put forward by the majority side.

□ 2310

There is not any doubt about that.

You talk about increases, 4.5-percent increase, yes, there are increases. But they do not account for the fact that food prices are going to go up. They do not account for the fact that in most of our districts we are seeing an increase in the number of children coming into the schools. They do not account for the fact that is spots throughout this country, we currently, because the Federal Government has the ability to adjust when there are recessions in certain areas, when there is a high rate of unemployment in a certain area, to get that additional funding in there.

We are going to see under a block grant program for child nutrition far less money going in to provide the same level of food that we have today. Five million children across this country are going hungry today under the current system. You are right. The current system does not work. It needs to be tweaked, but not giving as much food, not accounting for inflation, not accounting for increased enrollment, not being able to move food where it is needed is certainly not the answer.

I was just at a school in my district on Monday with leader DICK GEPHARDT, who happened to be coming through our area. It happens to be in Aliquippa, PA; now, Beaver County, in which Aliquippa is located, is of those counties in what we commonly refer to now as the Rust Belt of our Nation, that saw a tremendous decrease in the number of jobs in the 1970's and 1980's. In fact, in 13 counties in southwestern Pennsylvania, we have seen a loss of 155,000 manufacturing jobs, and it just so happens that Aliquippa is one of those towns that was hit the hardest. In one day in 1982 they lost 15,000 jobs in one small town when one steel mill went down, a 7½-mile-long steel mill along the Ohio River shut down in 1 day.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that causes a lot of problems. Those problems persist today. But through hard work we have begun to get some reinvestment back in that county. We are beginning to see some of those steel industries not adding 15,000 jobs at one whack, but adding a few hundred here, a few hundred there, and our industry is coming back.

At a time when there is a ray of hope, we are going to tell these children in Aliquippa, 80 percent of whom qualify for free or reduced meals, that we are going to change the rules on them now. Many of these kids who are eligible for free or reduced-cost breakfasts, and the teachers will tell you they cannot teach children that cannot eat, and they will tell you on Monday morning many of these children come in and they are famished. You can tell that they have not had adequate meals over the weekend, and the parents will tell you that they have children that they have to depend on the free and reduced meals, and that block-granting will not get it, that the ability to take 20 percent out of the block grant to pave roads, to build sewers, to lay water lines is not going to put food in the mouths of these children.

They will tell you that children do not vote, and there is going to be a temptation in 50 States across this Nation for some people to decide to take more of that money out of child nutrition and put it into projects where people do vote.

What are we going to have, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to have 50 different social laboratories across this Nation? Fifty different social laboratories where we attempt to see if we are able to do a better job than the Federal Government?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are people in States that are going to do a better job, but there are some that are going to do worse.

This is not something that we want to risk.

TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 23 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

THE WELFARE ISSUE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to talk tonight about term limits. I wanted to respond very briefly and share with the gentlewoman who is here from Washington State some views on the welfare issue.

I cannot help but respond on the question of the block grants that have

been talked about all evening by members of the Democrat Party and the minority, how they think that if we block-grant money for child nutrition and other welfare programs to the States, to let the local governments and the States decide how to spend this money in detail and specificity, that somehow all of this is going to mean something terribly harmful to children and to others. That is just nonsense.

Just like with the crime block grants, just like with any other block grant program, where we pass the money back to the States, it seems to me the Republican Party recognizes, and I think the American people who really think about it do, that government closest to the people governs best and knows best. Washington is not all wise. The Federal Government is not all wise.

But there have been people who were in power for 40 consecutive years in the United States House of Representatives who stand on the other side of the aisle and come to the well person after person tonight to talk about why Washington knows best and what great harm is going to occur because we let the money go back to the States and to the local governments to decide exactly how to use it, and within the framework of the parameters we give them, they have got to use it for child nutrition, in the child nutrition area, they have got to use it for certain specified reasons in welfare, for assistance to those who really are deserving of it.

Why should we in Washington be dictating all the minutiae, running the program, doing it in these old-fashioned ways with entitlements where we know lots of people on welfare today are abusing that system and will continue to abuse it?

The worst case of all, of course, is the situation of the illegitimate mother and welfare mother whom we have heard about many times over who gets on the system and stays on it for year after year after year.

And with that, just for a couple of minutes with the time we have got, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington. I think you have got a great illustration of Sally, I believe you call her.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. If it were not so sad, you know, Sally is a happy name. I have known Sallies who were happy, but the Sally I am going to talk about is not happy.

Sally is 18 yeas old, but you know, Sally is probably the reason we are in the welfare debate today, because America's people sent a group of us here and said, ''Change welfare, change the system.''

Sally, when she was 15, did what a lot of little girls do. They thought if they got out of their home and got a baby, got in their own place, that they would be happy, because they would be independent. And Sally saw a couple of other girls in the housing close to us do that, and she thought that looked good. She had not seen the misery yet.

But you know, once she got pregnant, and she did know how to get pregnant and how not to get pregnant, she got into that housing, and about when she was 16, and she got scared, and I think the interesting thing about Sally is you go visit Sally, is she was brave, and then scared, and she was still a little girl, and all I could think about was this little girl out on her own by herself under the name of compassion with this baby. If she had not been pregnant, we would have put this little girl in a foster home or group home, if she was unhappy at home, but because she was pregnant, we put her out in tenant housing.

You know, that tenant housing, that group housing, is not always the nicest place to be. It was not for Sally. You know, Sally got scared. Before I knew it, Sally had a guy shacked up with her. He was not young. He was in his twenties. Still Sally was still a kid.

But, you know, once they are out there, there is nobody to watch. She felt safer. You could not convince this little kid it was not going to be a good life, because she felt safe with him, and not too long, Sally had another baby, and Sally is 18, and this guy is gone.

Now, Sally, there are over 500,000 Sallies we have identified, and this bill is about Sallies. Sally is going to be on welfare over 10 years average. Actually many Sallies will be on most of their lives.

What is even worse is what is going to happen to her kids. Sally's little kids are only going to see, unless we can find some way to get her out of welfare and onto her feet, all they are going to see is her mom who goes to a post office and picks out a check and does not work for it. That is what we have to do with this welfare bill. That is why I like the welfare bill we are working on, because it would not have put Sally on the street. It would not have given her money.

It would have taken care of her and foster care, if she needed it. It would have encouraged her to stay home, but I bet Sally would not have gotten pregnant to begin with.

Now that Sally is there, we have to do something to help Sally, and this is a tough love for Sally. Sally is scared. She is going to stay there unless we figure out a way to say, ''Sally, you are just going to stay here so long, and you are going to get off.''

That is what I like about what we are doing. I like the child care supplement. I like the idea the health care going on so she can get off. Mostly I like the idea that says, ''Sally, you have got 5 years total. You are going to work on it. You know, your kids get big enough, you're going to have to go to work. But there is an end.''

And I think the best thing we can do for Sally now that we have trapped her on welfare by an unfeeling system is to help her off, and so I wanted to share Sally tonight with you, because I think what we have gotten into is numbers and rhetoric, and the people sent us here to fix the system that they know has trapped people in welfare.

Do you know that most of them start as teenagers? Over 50 percent that are now on welfare are kids, and if we do not stop that level, then they grow up, and they stay on welfare, and they are on long-term welfare, not the safety net, but that safety net becomes a spider web, a trap that holds them and literally sucks the very lifeblood out of their life and destroys their children.

☐ 2320

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, now how does the Republican bill that we are offering out here, welfare reform, very briefly in your judgment change this for Sally?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Well, for right now, now that Sally is there, she probably wouldn't be there to begin with under this bill because we wouldn't give her cash assistance and put her in her own home.

We would tell the States, she is a kid. Treat her like a kid. She gets pregnant, help her. Help her at home. Do whatever. And if her parents are needy, make sure you supply medicaid, medical care for her, food, but don't put her out on her own.

But now that Sally is there, under this bill we get done amending it, she will have the ability to get child care to help her get back on her feet while she is starting to go to work. She will get health care ongoing. And Sally again will know for certain that she can't stay on forever.

One thing I found with these young girls, and I have worked with several, is they get out there and they lose all their self-esteem. They just believe after a few years there is nowhere to go. And it is awful hard each day to want to go out, but if they know they have to, that is going to make a lot of difference.

It will mean that they will see hope as they are pushed out a little bit, but we will carry them out and help them out the door of poverty. And that is what we will be doing for Sally, a compassionate hand up and a little push out as we bring her back into freedom from the poverty and slavery of welfare.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, far from being anything radical, the Republican proposal actually is a common-sense approach to trying to correct a very bad deficiency in the welfare system that has allowed the Sallys of this country to continue down a hopeless road, and a hopelessness not just for themselves but for the offspring that they produce who then become a part of the welfare system.

It seems for those who want to criticize this, they offer no real meaningful alternative. I cannot hear on the other side of the aisle in all the rhetoric tonight anything more than wails of, hey, you guys are bad guys. Somehow you are going to, by trying to correct this problem for Sally, do some gosh awful evil out there.

We are not about that. You are as compassionate a person as I have heard out there tonight, and I know you are.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. The American people know this makes sense. They know it makes sense. They sent us here for change.

With all you are doing on term limits, I feel they sent you here to continue to beat the drum for term limits in spite of the fact that you get beat up on it occasionally. You fought for it real hard. Tell us where are we at tonight and how did we get where we are and what is the hope for term limits?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I would like to do that a little bit. I would certainly be glad to share with the gentlewoman. I know you have had the experience in Washington State. I have had it in my State.

The history of term limits goes back a long way. The limited time tonight doesn't allow us to go all they way back into delving into it.

I would say rotation in office or term limits was something that way back in the days of England was conceptualized. And when our Founding Fathers began to look at our Constitution and our way of government, we had term limits for legislators. In the original kind of Congress that we had before the Constitution was adopted, there were limits on the length of time somebody could serve.

James Madison, who wrote a good deal of the Federalist papers we are familiar with, was a big believer in term limits. Somehow in the debates over the Constitution that got left out. And for quite a while in our country it didn't really make much difference, but the history shows that around the turn of this century we began to see careerism, professionalism creep into government, and we began to see Members serve long periods of time in the House, not just a couple of terms and then go home.

The length of time that somebody had to spend in a period of a given year for serving in Congress stretched as we began to reach the middle of this century much longer than anybody could have conceptualized.

We are now today virtually a year-around Congress. We have a very big government. We have a lot of things we have to do as an institution. Now, many of us, you and I, I guess, would like to shrink the size and scope of the Federal Government, and I believe over time that will occur, but it will never return to the days that our Founding Fathers envisioned where Members of Congress came perhaps here for a month or two at the most each year and then went back to their jobs, served maybe one or two terms in the House and went home again. We have long since passed that.

Today I think there are some very valid reasons which have been put forward why so many across this country, nearly 80 percent of the American public, have come to support term limits. They don't always recognize why, but I would put them in about three categories. I don't know that these are necessarily in the order of importance. In fact, I am going to save the one, I think perhaps the most important one, to the end.

One of them is the fact that we have had power vested in the hands of a very few people who served as committee chairman for years and years and years, and that power emanates to the point that they decided what would come to the floor for votes, what came out of the Rules Committee. Just a handful of people determined a great deal about what happened in this government of ours.

Now, when we Republicans took over with our new majority and your freshman class came along, that ended in terms of the rules. We changed the rules of the House so that you can only serve for 6 years as a committee or subcommittee chairman.

But that is not permanent. Who knows what is going to happen next year or the year thereafter? The only way you can permanently end the kind of potential problems and abuse that comes from a handful of people holding power for years and years and years in this Congress through chairmanships of committees and leadership posts is by a constitutional amendment to limit the length of time somebody can serve in this House and Senate. That is one reason.

The second reason why I think the term limits has been a very important concept and grown in popularity is because of the fact that we have a need to reinvigorate this body with fresh faces regularly.

Yes, we had a big turnover this time. We have had it for a couple of times in a row in the House of Representatives, but that has not been the norm over the past century, and it probably won't be the norm over the long haul unless we limit terms so that we can bring new voices from the community in here.

And, yes, we will give up a few experienced people who we would like to have here, but I am confident, as I think most term limits supporters are, that there are literally thousands if not hundreds of thousands of Americans out there ready to take their place with creative new ideas that can give us a spark and more than make up for the absence of the experience we might lose with a few people who leave.

And then the third and perhaps the most important reason we really need to have term limits is to end this careerism I mentioned earlier. The fact of the matter is that only if we limit the length of time somebody can serve in the House and Senate will we take away what has become the compelling reason about this place for all too many of us, and that is to try to get reelected, to spend time pleasing every interest group, every faction, as James Madison would call it, in order to be sure that the next time around we will get back to coming back to Washington again to serve and to stay here for that length of time. You cannot end it altogether, but we can mitigate it by term limits and only by term limits.

Now, I would like to relate this into the present situation in the very limited period we have. I am going to ask the gentlewoman a question or two about that in a minute, but in perspective from a Washington, DC, standpoint, I think it needs to be understood that just two congresses ago in the 102d Congress there were only 33 Members of the House of either party willing to openly embrace the idea of being a term limits supporter.

In the last Congress, in the 103d, the number grew to 107. In the eve of what is going to happen here next week, it is certainly monumental. We are going to have a vote, a debate and a vote on the Floor of the House of Representatives for the first time in the history of this Nation on a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Members of the House and Senate, and I fully expect us to have well over 200 members voting for one term limits proposal or another.

Now, I think that is truly remarkable. Now, it takes 290 to get to the two-thirds required in order to send the constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. But it is remarkable whether we get to the 290 or not, A, that we are just having the debate and, B, that we are going to have the numbers probably double or better than double who announce support for term limits in the last Congress to this Congress.

A lot of that comes because of the State initiatives, like your State and mine, Washington State and Florida, we have, what, 22 States now, I believe, who have passed term limit initiatives.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, I think so.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Tell me briefly how has it gone in Washington State, your home State with regard to term limits.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Term limits was passed, and we were sued on the congressional portion, but the rest of it for the legislature is going on. And it is a 6 year for the House. And, let's see, what is it for the Senate? I think it is three terms for the Senate.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. For the State legislature?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes. Then it is for the Congress and the Federal also, I always say Congress and the Senate, the House and the Senate at the Federal level. You can tell I have been in the State level too long. That is a good reason for term limits at the State level.

☐ 2330

But we passed term limits, and it became real important last year in our elections because the Speaker of this body that stood there for many years in the majority decided to sue the State of Washington over term limits, the people of the State of the Washington.

They didn't take it lightly. As you can see, he is no longer here. He was defeated.

We saw him as a rock. Nobody would ever move this man. But what he did is show the people the arrogance of this place by suing the Washington State people who had passed this initiative.

Now, we are still in court over the Federal portion, but he is out of office. And the people sent us with a very strong message Do not mess with what the people did.

So that is probably part of the mix here that is a little bit difficult for some of us. Anything that does not protect our State's rights gives us a little bit of a problem.

So tell us how are we going to overcome that hurdle.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. We are going to have several options out here on the floor next week. And while many of us are going to debate which one is the preferable one, a lot of us are going to conclude, I think rightfully so, that if we are ever going to get to 290 and do what the public wants and have a national constitutional amendment that limits the terms of the Members of the House and Senate, we are going to have to pull together on a common bond on whatever emerges out of the great debate that will take place.

Next week, we are going to have a rule that brings to the floor three hours of general debate where we can talk about it like this among ourselves like this. It is going to bring us an opportunity to vote for four different options.

There will be a base bill, which is something I have sponsored for a number of years. It will be known as House Joint Resolution 73. And that bill will propose that we have an amendment to the Constitution that limits the length of time Senators and House Members serve to 12 years in each body: Six 2-year terms in the House, two 6-year terms in the Senate.

And that they be permanent limits. That is, you cannot sit out a term and run again. Once you serve 12 years in one body or the other, that is it.

There is no retroactivity to this particular proposal, and there is no touching of the question of whether or not the States-passed initiatives are to be held inviolate or whether they are to be disturbed by this amendment.

Which means that the Supreme Court, which is now hearing the case involving Arkansas and may hear the Florida and Washington State cases eventually, when it makes its decision, it will make its decision.

According to former Attorney General Griffin Bell, who represents both the Arkansas State issue and the Washington State issue, it will make its determination under the McCollum amendment free of any burden. Whatever they decide will be the law of the land.

If they decide the States presently have the power to make the decisions that they have been making and that is upheld as constitutional, then the State individual initiatives will still bind the term limit issue. But if they decide that the State initiatives are unconstitutional, then the 12-year limit that I would propose would be a national total limit across this country. That would be uniform.

Now, there will be three other options.

One of those options will be an option for a 6-year term in the House and 12 years in the Senate.

One of the options that will be offered out here will be to include a provision that allows specifically, regardless of the Supreme Court decision, that the States can decide under a 12-year cap for the House lesser limits, perhaps 6 years, eight years or whatever it might be, but ingrain that in the Constitution, something that is not there now, but that some Members really should be actually placed there regardless of what the court decides.

Then there will be an effort to try to establish retroactivity, that is to apply term limits, whenever they become effective, to Members now and say if you served however many years, bang, that is it.

Those will be the proposals.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Does this have any votes, that last one, the retroactivity?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I think there are probably some, but I think the biggest problem is it is going to be proposed by some Members of the other side of the aisle who really do not believe in term limits.

There is a good deal of cynicism out here, and the problem with that is that we have not really seen yet what all is going to come forward, but there are certain Members who really do not believe in term limits, and they are going to try to figure ways to be able to vote and have cover and hide behind that vote.

And I think retroactivity is probably a device to do that. It is one that many of the term limits organizations believe is that kind of a device. They are very worried, I think, because they do not want to be criticized for being opposed to them, but they are not willing to vote for whatever comes out at the end.

As you know from your experience in Washington State, no State initiative in the 22 States that have passed term limits has had the retroactive feature. And the one that did try it was your State of Washington, and the voters defeated that, and you came back with one that was not that way.

I would like to wrap up by pointing out something that I think is important, particularly to my proposal on 12 years.

I personally do not think that it is good and healthy to have the length of time the Senate serves and be limited to different from what the House serves. I think it will make the House an inferior body. I think it will make it a weaker body vis-a-vis the Senate.

So I think whatever we determine, whether it is 12 years or 6 years or any other number of years, the Senate and the House should serve the same number of years. That is true because of conference committees and a lot of other reasons.

I also think that 6 years in particular is too short a period of time. We need people who are experienced in this body in order to serve as chairmen of committees, And we need people who can be in leadership who have had some experience here. Otherwise, you do fall into the trap the critics of term limits say, and that is that there will be staff who will dominate that place.

I think there is a call and a good reason to say when we have finally decided with a constitutional amendment that goes to the States that three-quarters have to ratify a constitutional amendment on it, that at that point in time we really should have uniformity. It should be the same throughout the country at that point in time.

Although my version of this amendment that is proposed out here today would still leave open the opportunity for the Supreme Court to decide that there could be a hodgepodge out there, it is unlikely in my judgment that that side will come out. If the proposal that is being offered that will give the States an absolute right to make that decision were to be adopted, then forever it would be ingrained in the Constitution that we would have a hodgepodge of some States having 6-year terms, some 8, some 12.

I personally believe, and I think a lot of people do, that it does not make good sense, and it is not good government. And it is the Federal Government's responsibility to make this kind of decision, just as we did with the 17th amendment when we decided direct election of U.S. Senators was preferable to the old system of electing those Senators through the State legislatures, even though there were those at that time who debated the issue who wanted the question of elections left to the State as a States' rights matter.

Ultimately, the States do decide any constitutional amendment. Three-quarters of the legislatures have to ratify. That is States' rights. Once that is there, once they have decided, it seems to me that the best bottom line is whatever they do decide.

The key thing, though, is we are going to get the first-time-in-history vote on term limits out here next week. All of us who support term limits, regardless of our view on the variations, ought to vote for the final passage, and we ought to encourage people to help get this movement going and pass the word that we are really going to have the vote and, by golly, whoever is for term limits ought to be here for the last word when the final version, whatever it is, is left standing at that point in time.

WELFARE AND CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON LEE] is recognized for 23 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just wanted to respond to some of the comments that the gentleman from Florida made in terms of term limits.

It is very popular to stand in the aisle or stand up in the well and talk about how one is for term limits, but it is very interesting to know that the gentleman who is for a proposal to limit a Member's term to 12 years he himself has served in that body for 15 years and about to serve one more year which would be a total of 16 years and is not for retroactivity.

I just find it amazing that Members of Congress, those who speak the loudest about term limits, are those who have served in this Congress for 16, 20 and some have served as long as 25 years.

If the gentleman is really for term limits, then I would suggest to the gentleman that he not run for reelection and commit to the American people and basically practice what he preaches and say to the American people here tonight that since he is so committed to this term limit ideal that he is not going to seek reelection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I do not have the time, but I would be happy to engage with the gentleman on the debate of term limits. But I do not control the time, but I would certainly suggest to the gentleman that if he really wants to be true on the issue of term limits and true to the American people he himself ought to not seek reelection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Would the gentlewoman yield just on that one point?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I can yield you 15 seconds.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I just want to respond that I am ready to walk out of here voluntarily when every other Member of this body is willing to do it. Other than that, I am penalizing my district.

I do not think that is a good, logical thing to do, but when we have uniform term limits for everybody, whether it be voluntary or otherwise, I am ready to go out. I think that is the logical thing to do, but I do not believe we are going to do it voluntarily. That is why we need a constitutional amendment.

☐ 2340

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. We are never going to do it voluntarily, because you have decided not to do it yourself.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I do thank you and I know that we have had a vigorous debate this evening, a myriad of issues which include term limits.

I want to just, for the brief time that I have to really speak to the American people, I might imagine that some would say that they have been spoken to, but there has been a fury, if you will, and a flurry of discussions today dealing with welfare reform and dealing with where this country needs to go in the 21st century.

One of the great concerns, when you involve yourself in great debate, is, of course, the rising emotions. Today I have heard a number of examples of people who pull themselves up by their bootstraps, individuals who looked over on this side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, and talked about African American illegitimacy in terms of babies. I know that this is not a castigating of one race of people over another or one group of Americans over another. We know this whole question of welfare reform is not a question of African Americans, White Americans or Hispanic Americans or Asian Americans or any other kinds of Americans.

It is a question of people. What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that in fact all of us are looking for the best way to deal with the issue of welfare reform.

I have maintained since this debate has started, and let me offer to say to those who might be listening, that I am a new Member. So I think it pales worthless to be able to talk about what happened in 1982 and 1983, which I hear many of my Republican colleagues talking about. We now have before the American people the agenda that they want us to have. And that agenda has been an agenda supported by Democrats and Republicans. I imagine Independents. And I imagine all people. That is an agenda that moves people from welfare to independence, the ability to be Americans and stand up and be counted and to be responsible but to also have dignity and self-esteem.

The debate that we have gathered this evening and over these last hours points decidedly by the Republicans to undermine and to cause the lack of self-esteem to come about in people who are now on welfare. By those stories of talking about how people should be independent and how they pull themselves up by the bootstraps, it is accusatory and it is not helpful.

I spent time in my district, as many people have, and I have touched those who are experiencing the need to be on welfare. And I can tell you that the mothers have told me, one and all, this is not the way I want to run my life. This is not the way I want my children to live. I really want to be part of the all American dream.

I hear from people like Alicia Crawford who said, to go and ask a person for assistance, this is a welfare mother, age 30, and she said, is as if you are giving up everything, your dignity, your self-esteem, your ability to walk about. She said, your self-esteem is low. With the help of the welfare system, you can find a job which will give you a sense of independence, self-esteem and self-worth.

But you know what, the program that is being offered by the Republicans that they call welfare reform takes away job training, has a sense of mean spiritedness that does not include child care and certainly blames the Government but yet has no way of creating jobs.

Three amendments that I offered to the Committee on Rules and offered to be presented to this House, and that was an amendment that included job care, job training, rather, child care, and a unique, I think perspective, that many my colleagues have supported in the past and are supporting even now, and that is to provide a reasonable incentive for the private sector to provide those welfare recipients who have been trained and are able to work.

Is that not fair? Is it not fair to recognize that Government cannot be the only employer of those seeking independence? Unfortunately, the Republican plan does not include any of that sense of understanding.

Able-bodied parents who are on welfare two to one have said, We would like to work. But yet there is no recognition in the present legislation that is before us to allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, say we are not asking for a handout. We are asking for a hand up. But I tell you what we get with the Republican bill, major cuts for the state of Texas. Our comptroller has already indicated what rescissions will bring about. Let me tell you what would happen to the State of Texas over a 5-year period if we have the present welfare reform package passed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Title 1 would block grant cash assistance for needy families resulting in $323 million less in federal funding for Texas over the next 5 years. Title II for abused and neglected children, in foster care or adoptive placements would lose $196 million for Texas. What does that actually mean?

I served on the Harris County Protective Services Administration's Foster Parent Retention Program. I lived and breathed the stories of foster parents in terms of the great need, one, that we have in our communities to retain foster parents and what foster parents go through to mend the broken spirits and sometimes broken bodies that come into their homes. Are you telling us that we will block grant them and when there is no money in the bottom of the pot we then say to those abused and neglected children, we have nowhere for you to go, stay and be abused. And if happenstance, you are maimed or killed, so be it.

That is what we are saying. Foster parents who are sometimes at their very last rope because we do not have a enough across this Nation. We did not have enough in Harris County, and we are looking for different resources to be able to allow them to hang on because they were doing such a wonderful

job. But yet we are telling them in this new welfare reform, which I really call welfare punishment, that we will tell those in the state of Texas and many other States that you will have 196 million. That is abusive in and of itself. That is child abuse. That is not being responsive to the needs of our community and of our children.

Title III would consolidate child care programs into a block grant that would cut $172 million from Federal funds that would be provided for Texas children over the next 5 years. That is 29,000 fewer Texas children that would be served.

I heard a discussion here today that saddened me for it failed to realize the excitement of a young woman. First off, the young woman has not gotten pregnant to get welfare. It has been documented that that is not the case. In fact, most Americans do not believe that. And I would say that primarily because we have documentation that says, and it is refuting all of what the Republicans are saying their mandate has given them.

It says, they asked the question of the American people, should unmarried mothers under the age 18 be able to receive welfare? Interestingly enough, 57 percent of the Republicans said yes; some 63 percent of the Independents said yes; and 67 percent of Democrats. Should welfare recipients in a work program, should they be allowed to receive benefits as long as they are willing to work for them? Same high numbers: 63 percent Republicans said yes; 70 percent Independents and 66 percent Democrats.

I do not know what the mandate is that the Republicans are saying that they have in order to be able to cut off people who are trying to rise up.

My point about child care is, these young energetic mothers who happen to have babies are looking for job training to prepare them for the 21st century. They want to work in high tech jobs. They want to work in clerical jobs. They want to understand the new computer age, the new superhighway. And they are prepared to go out to work. Yet child care is costing any of them, no matter what wages they are getting, particularly if they are at the minimum wage, they are getting some one-third of whatever their wages might be for child care.

Here in the Republican bill we find out that they do not want to give child care to anyone with children under 5. These are young women and possibly young men who are at the prime of their life, who want to have training, who want to get out and work, who want their babies who are 15 months old and 2 years old and 3 years old and 5 years old to understand that mom or the parent, whoever it might be, has the dignity to go out and want to be something and someone.

And then we find title III and title V repealing the nutrition programs, the school lunch programs. And, oh, the stories we have been told about the school lunches.

First we are told that there are really people who are working-class people who really do not want the lunches. Then we are told that bring the old fashioned bag lunch and go back to the good old days. I can tell you that I truly came from a family, a mother and father, lived with my grandmother. We worked to pull our bootstraps up, if you will. We were looking for the shoes, but we did not have the sadness that people have today, and we were gratified by the kinds of services that were offered to us and my brother. And we made the best of it.

Those were the days that maybe you could bring a mayonnaise sandwich or maybe you could skip, if you will, a lunch for a period of a day or so because things were not as bad as you would find them today, but we go into homes today and we find people living in such degradation, not brought upon by crack and selling drugs but simply because of the poverty, the need of jobs, the lack of education, poor schooling.

☐ 2350

So I would simply say rather than maybe getting a good oatmeal breakfast every morning which I got, which even though it was the same old same old, it was a good breakfast, some of these children are not getting any kind of breakfast. And we are told by the American pediatric Association that these children are going hungry in school here, suffering from dizziness; they are not understanding what is going on if they are not on the school breakfast program; that sometimes these meals are the only meals that our children get throughout the week. Kid Care, which is in Houston, a private organization in the city of Houston, has said how many meals children miss. And in fact if they do not get the Kid Care, which is a charitable organization, over the weekend and sometimes during the week, they do not eat all weekend long, and the only time they eat is when they come to the school that Monday morning.

What are you going to say when you block grant child nutrition programs that in fact help our children to learn, help the teachers to be able to control the classroom, and clearly as you can note, the kinds of loss that we are suffering here in Texas, the impact that nutrition block grants will have on WIC programs which have proven to be successful in and of themselves.

If you just look at these numbers, although they go up simply to 1992, you can simply see when we have the prenatal WIC which deals with nutrition and the prenatal care of those mothers that we say have gotten pregnant just to get on welfare, and I have never heard that story, but we notice what has happened: the decline in infant mortality.

Is it not interesting that a community like the city of Houston that has such a high rate of infant mortality is being compared to Third World countries. Can we even stand as an international world power when we are losing infant children at the rate of Third World countries? That is what will happen with the kind of nutrition programs that is in the Republican plan.

I am looking clearly and supporting both the Deal plan that has been proposed, a Democratic plan, and as well the Mink plan. All of those concern themselves with welfare to work. But at the same time, they recognize that you cannot fill a bucket up with water, then let it run out, and when a dying man or child comes for a drink of water you say to them, ''I am sorry, we have no more.''

This is what the program is that we have. And then title IV talks about the difficulty or the lack of welfare for legal immigrants. Let me simply say something to you. I am reminded of being taught as a child what the Statue of Liberty stood for, and let me share any misconception. Legal immigrants pay taxes. They pay taxes. I think what we need to understand is that welfare dollars come from our taxes, and so it is certainly irresponsible not to consider those who pay taxes and work and fall upon hard times.

Interestingly enough, we find ourselves with the SSI allotment under title VI denying some of our most severely disabled children. What I am bringing to the point of the American people is I think that we have a voting population and a constituency that is certainly more sympathetic than what is occurring on the House floor. They have decidedly said that if people are willing to work, let them continue to get benefits so that they can bridge themselves to independence. Do not cut off 18-year-olds. Help them get to the point of independence by job training, by child care, and certainly job incentive.

It is interesting to find out there are letters coming in from adoption agencies begging my office for children. We feel it is a mistake to make child protection a block grant. There should be a Federal standard to protect abused and neglected children. It should not be a matter of geography that determines how children should be treated.

This is the issue because what is happening in the State of Texas, which has not been traditionally high in its AFDC payments, this new formula that will be utilized as indicated by our comptroller has said that we will be hurt, we will be hurt in the State of Texas, our children will be going to drink out of an empty bucket. There will be known dollars for abused children, there will be no dollars for adoption assistance, there will be no dollars for WIC assistance programs, there will be no dollars for school lunches and breakfast programs, there will be no dollars to help us understand our own children.

I do not understand this. It is frustrating that when I go home and I have to see a headline like ''do not short change Texas children.'' Is this a raving radical, somebody irresponsible? No. It happens to be the President and chief executive of Children at Risk, because before we left home we were pleaded with by the youth commission that is formulated in Harris County, we were pleaded with to remember the children.

Under the proposed legislation Texas would get $558 million annually for our children, but it would indicate that we would lose dollars because of the formula.

This means that Texas has 7.3 percent of the U.S. child population, New York 4.4 percent but we would be losing money because we would not get the number of dollars to serve that population.

Our children are at risk. And it is very important to understand that as our children are at risk, we are in fact suffering the lack of investment in those children.

Where are the family values we talk about and I have heard them discussed in this very emotional debate about grandmothers and mothers and those good people who raised us? I hear the comments saying that the good people who work do not want their tax dollars thrown away. And if I can share with you what has happened in the WIC Program, gain, and to emphasize again, for example, how this program has again been effective, but I hear all of that kind of talk about where we are, and why we are in fact trying to do it this way, the Republicans say.

But let me show you these numbers. WIC prenatal care benefits saved, if we want to save taxpayer dollars, $12,000 to $15,000 for every very low birth weight baby prevented. Is that saving the taxpayers dollars? Is that true investment for the time that we spend?

The gentleman from Louisiana is interested in this issue as well. But, does this save us money? It does save us money; that we would invest to avoid a child that is born that cannot learn, that cannot think and then to have dysfunctional behavior in school because they were a low birth weight baby. This is an investment in our future.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This whole debate is really not necessarily about mothers, it is really about children. And I think all too often we lose sight of the fact that this is really about 15.7 million children who cannot make the decision and could not make the decision about what household they are born in, they cannot make the decision as to whether or not they are handicapped or not handicapped or have some type of birth defect.

But we can help in the area of prenatal care and we still find ourselves in this Congress cutting money for prenatal care where we have babies dying, high infant mortality all across this country, and I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Texas for taking out the time at this very late hour in talking about the need to preserve some of these programs, because these programs actually affect real people and those real people so happen to be children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman, and let me simply say as I close, I have this picture up because I want to emphasize our children are our future. Our Democratic colleagues know that and they know that Texas will lose 100,000 children who will not be able to eat school lunch and of course this is not a me, me situation, me in Texas, you in Louisiana, someone else in New York. This is really about our children.

I think what we need to do in the U.S. Congress is clearly to emphasize not the stories of yesteryear about what grandmother did for me and how we pulled our bootstraps up because we realize by the year 2000 we will be losing $1.3 million in aid to children, SSI will be losing 348,000 children, in foster care 59,000 while about 14 million children will not have school lunches, 2.2 million under this program, and 14 million children will lose food stamps.

We need to move this agenda forward and vote for legislation that will in fact assure that parents, but yes, children can be able to move with their parents from dependence to independence.

We must ensure our children of a future and we must ensure that the ugliness that has been brought about by the debate or the mean-spiritedness is not the way that we go.

We must ensure that these numbers that I have cited, the 2.2 million in school lunches will not be caught up in the term limits debate, is not caught up in what part of the country we come from, but realize actually we confront that we must represent and govern all Americans. It is so very important.

I hope tomorrow will be a day and Friday will be a day that we vote for legislation that is not a mean-spirited, mishmash, patchwork, but in fact will be a comprehensive and informative piece of legislation that goes to the U.S. Senate that represents all of the people and reflects the polls that are saying Americans are compassionate taxpayers, middle class, rich, whatever you want to call them, working class, poor people are compassionate for our children. That is what we are missing in the legislation that is being proposed. And that is what I had hoped that we would be able to work toward, my colleagues, that that would be the case and that we would be successful in making this legislation effective for all of the people and especially our children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to again speak against the short-sightedness and apparent spitefulness of H.R. 1214—the Republican welfare reform proposal.

Mr. Speaker, all Democrats unequivocally acknowledge the shortcomings of our current welfare system and are genuinely determined to do the bipartisan work necessary to fix that system.

I, for one, have always believed that welfare should be a hand up, not a hand out.

I want very much to join with all my colleagues in crafting forward-thinking reform that will provide welfare parents and their children with real hope and a renewed sense of individual responsibility.

By promoting the American work ethic with intelligent reform, we can finally make our welfare system live up to its original purposes and promises: To lift people out of poverty; move them into real jobs; and empower them to become independent, self-supporting and productive citizens.

To that end, I offered, in good faith, amendments to this welfare bill that would have accomplished three very important things.

First, so that able-bodied welfare parents ready to work could actually find real jobs in the private sector—as opposed to make-work government jobs—I proposed offering a tax incentive for businesses willing hire them.

I believe corporate America is willing and able to do more when it comes to expanding and preparing our workforce.

Second, so that welfare parents could acquire the training and job-skills private sector employers rightly demand, I proposed that the Federal Government ensure funding for training and education programs needed to prepare welfare parents for the competitive world of work.

And third, so that parents could complete their training and begin a regular work schedule without undue fears about the safety and care of their young children, I proposed that the Federal Government provide assistance for transitional child care.

Mr. Speaker, these common-sense amendments were rejected out-of-hand by the majority on the rules committee.

Unfortunately, the G-O-P proposal before this body makes no job training or child care provisions for welfare parents. And the short-term budget savings it boasts are to be squandered on tax breaks for some of the most comfortable citizens.

For the moment, let's set aside the obvious moral questions the GOP proposal raises. Let us just talk practicality.

If we just begin slashing aid to families with dependent children, emergency assistance for families, childcare assistance, nutrition assistance including the WIC and food stamps program, and supplemental security income for families with disabled children, what will we accomplish beyond tax cuts for the well-to-do?

And what will we do when the bills for our shortsightedness come due?

Will we be forced to raise taxes 5 years from now to pay for costly emergency health care as nutrition-related childhood diseases reach epidemic proportions?

How will we cope with the inevitable explosion of homelessness of women and children?

Are we fiscally prepared to build jails and orphanages to the horizon so that we might incarcerate or house all those Americans who

the GOP bill would relegate to futures outside the mainstream economy?

And does corporate America want a workforce that excludes the potential and creativity of millions of Americans who, in some cases, are literally dying for a chance to succeed?

I do not think the American people would answer yes to any of these practical questions?

The Department of Health and Human Services has analyzed the GOP welfare proposal and their findings are not encouraging.

HHS projects that, during the next 5 years, 6.1 million children nationwide would be cut off from AFDC benefits. Nearly 300,000 in my home State of Texas alone.

I will share more revealing numbers in a moment but my point is this: if family values are truly a concern of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, why won't they work with us to preserve America's safety net for families.

This welfare reform debate is indeed one of values. We must ask ourselves, what kind of nation shall America become as we prepare for the 21st century?

Shall we wisely seek to nurture the vast potential of all our citizens, or merely those with political clout?

Do we want welfare reform that steers people into productive work, or shall we continue driving them down the dead-end road of dependency?

Mr. Speaker, these are our choices and we dare not consider them lightly?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. EDWARDS of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the death of a friend.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MINGE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today until 7 p.m., on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLER of California for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEAL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LINCOLN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KLINK, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MFUME, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WAMP for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SEASTRAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLF.
Mr. COOLEY.
Mr. ISTOOK.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. BATEMAN.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UNDERWOOD in two instances.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. HOYER.
Ms. LOFGREN.
Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Ms. DELAURO.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE.
Mr. PALLONE.
Ms. PELOSI.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Ms. PRYCE.
Mrs. MORELLA.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 midnight), the House adjourned until Thursday, March 23, 1995, at 10 a.m.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1994 TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 14, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85–804, enclosed is the calendar year (CY) 1994 report entitled, ''Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense.''

Section A, Department of Defense Summary, indicates that 45 contractual actions were approved and that 5 were disapproved. Those approved include actions for which the Government's liability is contingent and can not be estimated.

Section B, Department Summary, presents those actions which were submitted by affected Military Departments/Agencies with an estimated or potential cost of $50,000 or more. A list of contingent liability claims is also included where applicable. The Defense Logistics Agency, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, Defense Information Systems Agency, Defense Mapping Agency, and the Defense Nuclear Agency reported no actions, while the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, provided data regarding actions that were either approved or denied.

Sincerely,

D.O. COOKE,
Director,
Administration and Management,

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

EXTRAORDINARY CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE (Public Law 985–804), Calendar Year 1994

FOREWORD

On October 7, 1992, the Deputy Secretary of Defense (DEPSECDEF) determined that the national defense will be facilitated by the elimination of the requirement in existing Department of Defense (DoD) contracts for the reporting and recoupment of nonrecurring costs in connection with the sales of military equipment. In accordance with that decision and pursuant to the authority of Public Law 85–804, the DEPSECDEF directed that DoD contracts heretofore entered into be amended or modified to remove these requirements with respect to sales on or after October 7, 1992, except as expressly required by statute.

In accordance with the DEPSECDEF's decision, on October 9, 1992, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition directed the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Directors of the Defense Agencies, to modify or amend contracts that contain a clause that requires the reporting or recoupment of nonrecurring costs in connection with sales of defense articles or technology, through the addition of the following clause.

The requirement of a clause in this contract for the contractor to report and to pay a nonrecurring cost recoupment charge in connection with a sale of defense articles or technology is deleted with respect to sales or binding agreements to sell that are executed on or after October 7, 1992, except for those sales for which an Act of Congress (see section 21(e) of the Arms Export Control Act) requires the recoupment of nonrecurring costs.

This report reflects no costs with respect to the reporting or recoupment of nonrecurring costs in connection with sales of defense articles or technology, as none have been identified for calendar year 1994.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85–804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, CALENDAR YEAR 1994

SECTION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUMMARY

SUMMARY REPORT OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85–804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—JANUARY–DECEMBER 1994

Department and type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Department of Defense, total	45	16,016,149.00	16,016,149.00	5	18,459,908.00
Amendments without consideration	1	16,016,149.00	16,016,149.00	4	3,459,908.00
Formalization of informal commitments	0	0.00	0.00	1	15,000,000.00
Contingent liabilities	44	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Army, total	1	16,016,149.00	[1] 16,016,149.00	0	0.00
Amendments without consideration	1	16,016,149.00	16,016,149.00	0	0.00
Navy, total	41	0.00	0.00	5	18,459,908.00
Amendments without consideration	0	0.00	0.00	4	[2] 3,459,908.00
Formalization of informal commitments	0	0.00	0.00	1	[3] 15,000,000.00
Contengent liabilities	41	[4] 0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Air Force, total	3	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Contingent liabilities	3	[4] 0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Defense Logistics Agency, total	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, total	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Defense Information Systems Agency, total	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Defense Mapping Agency, total	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Defense Nuclear Agency, total	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00

[1] Libby Corporation requested extraordinary contractual relief under P.L. 85–804. The request for relief was approved for $16,016,149.
[2] Denials involved Delphi Painting & Decorating Company ($50,000); Farrell Lines, Incorporated ($87,200); Mech-Con Corporation ($2,076,082); and Truax Engineering, Incorporated ($1,246,626).
[3] Southwest Marine, Incorporated requested extraordinary contractual relief under P.L. 85–804. The request for relief was denied.
[4] The actual or estimated potential cost of the contingent liabilities cannot be predicted, but could entail millions of dollars.

SECTION B—DEPARTMENT SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Contractor: Libby Corporation.

Type of action: Amendment Without Consideration.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $16,016,149.

Service and activity: U.S. Army Aviation Troop Command (ATCOM).

Description of product or service: Tactical quiet generator sets (TQG's).

Background: Libby Corporation (Libby) submitted a request for extraordinary contract relief under Public Law (P.L.) 85–804 requesting an amendment without consideration pursuant to Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 50.302–1. Libby asserted that if it did not receive relief, it would not be able to complete performance on U.S. Army Aviation Troop Command (ATCOM) Contracts DAAK01–88–D–080 and DAAK01–88–D–082 for tactical quiet generator sets (TQGs) which are essential to the national defense.

Justification: Libby was awarded two firm fixed priced requirements contracts on August 30, 1988, for the production of a new generation of tactical generators. Contract D080 called for the production of: 4,498–5KW, and 3,417–10KW TQGs. Contract D082 called for the production of: 1,240–15KW, 1,261–30KW, and 2,436–60KW TQGs. A total of 12,852 TQG were placed under contract. The contracts classified these TQGs as Level III Nondevelopmental Items (NDI). No formal research and development effort preceded the award of these contracts because it was believed that contract performance would require little more than the assembly/integration of existing commercial components into generator sets, meeting military requirements.

Under the terms of the contracts, first article testing (FAT) was set to start in February 1990, production release was set for March 1991, and completion of deliveries was set for May 1993 (Contract D080) and June 1993 (Contract D082). Difficulties were encountered during the preproduction/FAT phase of the contracts. In September 1991, Libby filed a claim alleging Government delay, defective specifications, Government superior knowledge, and impossibility of performance. The contracting officer found that the Government did delay Libby during FAT and revised the delivery schedule to start production in March 1993, with completion by September 1995. While a new delivery schedule was established, the other issues were not fully resolved and a new contract amount was not definitized.

In October 1993, Libby advised the contracting officer that it could not complete production of the TQGs unless it received an additional $46,000,000 beyond the $106,800,000 priced for the production of the two contracts. As of October/November 1993, Libby had manufactured, and the Army had accepted, 3,500 of the 12,852 TQGs under contract. Libby's initial position was that these additional amounts were due under the contract as a result of defective specifications, Government superior knowledge, and impossibility of performance.

During October, November, and December 1993, a negotiation team from ATCOM and the U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) conducted a detailed evaluation of Libby's position. The negotiation team reviewed the amount Libby claimed it needed to complete performance of the contracts and evaluated liability for the claimed amount. After intensive negotiations, supported by DCAA, the parties agreed that $32,047,879 was needed to complete performance of the two contracts. However, of this amount, the Army

was only legally liable for $16,031,748. The remaining $16,016,149 reflected costs that could not be attributed to the Government and, therefore, the Government was not legally liable for this amount.

On December 11, 1993, Libby submitted its formal request for extraordinary contract relief to the contracting officer. The Army Contract Adjustment Board (ACAB) heard the case on December 22, 1993, and approved relief in the amount of $16,016,149, subject to the execution of a Settlement Agreement between Libby and the contracting officer which reflected the understandings of the parties as to liability. On February 23, 1994, a Settlement Agreement was executed.

Applicant's contentions: Libby contended that it could not complete performance of its contracts for $106,800,000. Libby contended that it needed an additional $32,047,897 to complete performance of the contracts. Of this amount, Libby acknowledged that it was not legally entitled to $16,016,149. Libby contended that if it did not receive this relief, it would suffer a cash flow problem so severe that by December 1993/January 1994, it would have to terminate its operations and, with that, stop performance of contracts essential to the national defense. Libby cited FAR 50.302–1, Amendments Without Consideration, as authority for relief.

Decision: As of October 1993, Libby's TQGs contracts were priced at $106,852,103. By October 1993, Libby had concluded that it could not complete performance for that amount and had submitted a claim to ATCOM for an additional $46,000,000. Libby asserted that many of the difficulties it had incurred during the early phases of the contracts entitled it to additional compensation to perform the contracts. Libby characterized those problems under various legal theories like: Government caused delay, defective specifications, Government's superior knowledge, and impossibility of performance. Although the Army conceded that it had delayed Libby's performance during FAT, because the contracts called for the assembly and integration of existing commercial components, the Army was not particularly receptive to Libby's claim.

During the period October to December 1993, Libby engaged in negotiations which reached the conclusion that it would take an additional $32,047,879 to complete performance of the TQGs contracts. Of this amount, the Army agreed that it was liable, under different contract principles, in the amount of $16,031,748. Libby agreed that the Army was not responsible for the additional $16,016,149 needed to complete the TQGs contracts.

Before the ACAB, Libby presented detailed financial information which disclosed that without the additional $16,016,149, its cash flow would not be sufficient to continue performance past January 1994. This figure does not include any amount for profit.

FAR 50.302–1(a) provides that:

When an actual or threatened loss under a defense contract, however caused, will impair the productive ability of a contractor whose continued performance on any defense contract found to be essential to the national defense, the contract may be amended without consideration, but only to the extent necessary to avoid such impairment to the contractor's productive ability.

It was found to be essential to the Army and, therefore, the national defense, that it receive the TQGs currently being manufactured by Libby. The Chief of the Combat Support, Combat Service Support & Common Systems Division, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (DCSOPS), verified the need in a memorandum dated December 22, 1993, subject: ''Mission Criticality of Tactical Quiet Generators for the U.S. Army.'' That memorandum detailed the impact on the Army if action was not taken and Libby ceased production of the TQGs. In particular, the following concerns were identified:

(a) A large percentage of the 132,000 Army Military Standard (MILSTD) generators currently in the inventory had two problems impacting on readiness: one, many exceeded their expected useful life of 17 years; and two, about one-third of these generators operated on gasoline instead of multi-fuel. The continued use of gasoline increases support costs and represents a safety concern because of the volatility of gasoline.

(b) Many of the critical major components required to maintain the readiness of the current fleet of generators were no longer available in the supply system. The cost of having to overhaul MILSTD generators was almost twice that of buying comparable TQGs. Delays in fielding TQGs would result in the expenditure of needed operation and maintenance funds at nearly twice the amount of procurement costs.

(c) New weapons systems that were being developed, tested, and fielded depended on the timely fielding of the TQGs. If the TQGs were not fielded as scheduled, these programs may not have been fielded or may have incurred expensive alternative costs.

(d) Modern battlefield requirements had become more sophisticated and had resulted in new needs that MILSTD generators could not fulfill. Most notable was audible and infrared signature suppression. TQGs provided an 80 percent reduction over MILSTDS in both areas, significantly reducing the vulnerability of soldiers to enemy attack. Improved survivability is a high priority on the modern battlefield.

The December 22, 1993, DCSOPS memorandum clearly established the urgent need for the TQGs and the negative impact on the national defense if the TQGs were not delivered as soon as possible.

Libby presented data, confirmed by ATCOM, which indicated that the TQGs being manufactured met the Army's specifications and would be able to meet the current delivery schedule if Libby was provided the $16,016,149 requested under P.L. 85–804.

Conclusion: Under these circumstances, the Army Contract Adjustment Board (ACAB) is of the belief that Libby's continued performance of the TQGs contracts is essential to the national defense. ACAB therefore granted Libby's requested relief. This action will facilitate the national defense. The contracting officer was authorized to amend the TQGs contracts without consideration in the total amount of $16,016,149, as memorialized in the Settlement between Libby and the contracting officer, dated February 23, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Contingent Liabilities: None.

Contractor: None.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Contractor: Delphi Painting & Decorating Company.

Type of action: Amendment Without Consideration.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $50,000.

Service and activity: The Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Description of product or service: Removal and disposal of paint that potentially contains lead.

Background: The subject action is an Amendment Without Consideration under FAR Section 50.302–1. Delphi submitted a request for extraordinary relief by letter dated December 21, 1992. Delphi based the request on contractor essentiality and stated that they were entitled to compensation in the approximate amount of $50,000. Within the Department of Defense, P.L. 85–804 is implemented by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). FAR Part 50, Extraordinary Contractual Actions, Section 50.302, lists the type of adjustments available for relief. The only potentially applicable basis for adjustment in this case is contained under paragraph 50.302–1, Amendments Without Consideration, subparagraph (a). Subparagraph (a) allows Amendments Without Consideration if an actual or threatened loss will impair the productive ability of a contractor whose continued operations as a source of supply is found to be essential to the national defense. The essential nature of the work being performed is the essence of this exception. Upon review of the nature of the work involved in this contract (the removal and disposal of paint that potentially contains lead), it has been determined that this type of work is not uncommon and can not be considered essential to the national defense. Further, the suggestion that future contracts will have to be awarded on a sole source basis is unfounded.

Decision: In conclusion, the Contracting Officer determined, that pursuant to FAR 50.101, the request must be denied in its entirety.

Contractor: Farrell Lines, Incorporated.

Type of action: Amendment Without Consideration.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $87,200.

Service and activity: The Department of the Navy, Military Sealift Command.

Description of product or service: U.S. flag ocean and intermodal transportation service.

Background: The subject action is a request for a portion of the amount which was the subject of a certified claim under the Contract Disputes Act, which was previously denied by the Contracting Officer. Because the basis of the present claim involves some of the same facts as in the certified claim, a brief discussion of those facts follows.

The SMESA contract covered U.S. flag ocean and intermodal transportation services, including combination U.S. flag and foreign flag services, if all U.S. flag service was not available to meet Government requirements between the United States, as well as other parts of the world, and areas in the Middle East. The purpose of the Contract was to support U.S. Gulf War operations. The Contract was solicited and awarded during August 1990, on a firm fixed price basis for a period not to exceed one year. The effective date of the Contract was August 23, 1990. Farrell offered a combination U.S. flag/foreign flag service between the U.S. East Coast (USEC) and the Middle East (ME), including, but not limited to, service to and from Damman. Farrell offered and provided U.S. flag vessel service between the USEC and the Mediterranean, with connecting foreign flag service to the ME.

The connecting service offered and provided by Farrell under the Contract involved the use of a slot charter with Compagnie Maritime D'Affretement (CMA) which, in turn, had entered into various time charters, including one with the owners of the VILLE D'OMAN, Gebr. Peterson Schiffahrtsgesellschaft Westertal GMBH & Co. (Owners). Farrell commenced performance under the Contract in late August/early September 1990.

On January 11, 1991, the owners of the vessel VILLE D'OMAN, asserting the threat of war and reports of floating mines in the Persian Gulf, gave notice of their intent not to permit the vessel to proceed to Damman and discharge its Department of Defense (DoD) cargo. CMA, after several unsuccessful attempts to convince the Owners and crew to proceed to Damman to discharge the DoD cargo under the Contract, directed the

VILLE D'OMAN on January 21, 1991, to discharge its DoD cargo in an alternate port. Farrell subsequently arranged for the replacement of the VILLE D'OMAN by another CMA chartered vessel, the TITANA, which was engaged in the European/Far East trade route, to deliver the DoD cargo to Damman, in accordance with the Contract. The costs associated with the diversion of VILLE D'OMAN and the use of the replacement vessel, the TITANA, to deliver the cargo are at issue.

Farrell's certified claim and the contracting officer's final decision: On July 10, 1992, Farrell submitted a certified claim for $485,978 for reimbursement of unanticipated costs (the $87,200 adjustment sought by Farrell was originally part of this claim). Farrell sought recovery of the additional expenses incurred in shipping the DoD cargo to Damman under a clause in its SMESA contract, which provided for reimbursement of unanticipated costs. Farrell claimed that the Contracting Officer had suggested the clause as a means by which Farrell could be reimbursed.

In support of its claim, Farrell asserted that it had considered trying to invoke the Liberties Clause. However, Farrell alleged that it was discouraged from doing so by the Contracting Officer. Farrell further alleged that the Liberties Clause, if applicable, would have relieved Farrell of the duty to ship the DoD cargo to Damman, based on the VILLE D'OMAN's refusal to proceed there out of safety concerns for the ship and its crew, and would have allowed it an equitable adjustment for its services. Farrell further asserted that it was discouraged from alternately imposing a special surcharge increase to the SMESA rates to cover the additional cost.

The Contracting Officer's Final Decision denied Farrell's claim, concluding that the contract clause permitting reimbursement for unanticipated costs was inapplicable. The Contracting Officer noted that Farrell had contracted to deliver cargo safely to Damman and that the performance of its subcontractors were Farrell's responsibility. The Contracting Officer also pointed out that the unanticipated costs clause applied only to costs not otherwise covered in the Contract, and that the Liberties Clause was the appropriate avenue for Farrell to recover its additional expense. The Contracting Officer concluded, however, that no valid claim existed under that clause because the VILLE D'OMAN was not justified in refusing to proceed to Damman. Further, Farrell had failed to seek the Contracting Officer's approval before arranging alternate delivery of the DoD cargo to Damman, as required by the Liberties Clause. Finally, the Contracting Officer was unable to conclude that MSC personnel had discouraged Farrell from seeking relief under the Liberties Clause or through surcharges.

Request for adjustment: Farrell sought extraordinary relief in the form of a contract adjustment under the provisions of P.L. 85–804 for $87,200. Farrell asserted that its loss was directly caused by Government action. To determine whether an adjustment was appropriate, the Government had to determine whether a loss occurred, whether the loss was caused by Government action, and whether that action resulted in a potential unfairness to the Contractor. 48 C.F.R. 50.302–1(b).

Farrell claimed that when they approached the Contracting Officer with the possibility of invoking the Liberties Clause under the Contract because of the VILLE D'OMAN's refusal to proceed to Damman, the Contracting Officer insisted they perform and stated that Farrell would receive no further bookings if the clause were invoked. Based on this, and the Contracting Officer's subsequent demands for assurances of performance capabilities, Farrell claimed they were forced to abandon their rights under the Liberties Clause and were required to incur additional costs to deliver the cargo to Damman.

Assuming that an $87,200 loss existed, it was not caused by the Contracting Officer's actions. The viability of Farrell's service under the Contract was clearly in doubt during the January 1991 time frame due to Farrell's problem with the owners of the VILLE D'OMAN. The Contracting Officer's response to Farrell's comment about invoking the Liberties Clause was legitimate. It was reasonable for the Government to expect Farrell to perform, as contracted, and resort to the clause would have realistically suggested that Farrell was incapable of performing. This conclusion was bolstered by Farrell's responses to the Contracting Officer's inquiries which confirmed the service problems and detailed operational plans to continue performance under the Contract. Considering that the Contract permitted the Contracting Office to suspend bookings with a carrier for its prospective inability or failure to perform, the Contracting Officer's comments to Farrell were entirely reasonable, under the circumstances, in that they only highlighted contract rights available to the Government.

Government attempts to actively ascertain and secure Farrell's commitment to continue contract performance can not be construed as an unreasonable influence causing Farrell to abandon its contract rights under the Liberties Clause. The Government had a legitimate, real, and urgent need to determine Farrell's intent and ability to provide service. If Farrell was unable to perform under the Contract, then the Government clearly would have been entitled to exercise its rights, under the Contract, to suspend the booking of cargo with Farrell for failure to perform or for the prospective inability of Farrell to make good any future bookings. Farrell's decision to abandon any contract rights it may have had under the Liberties Clause and incur additional costs to ship the cargo to Damman is considered an affirmative and voluntary business decision on its part that was not induced by the Contracting Officer. Consequently, any additional expense incurred by Farrell was not caused by Government action.

Decision: After a careful and thorough review of Farrell's case, the Navy did not find that payment of the requested amount would facilitate the national defense. Further, it was concluded that Government action was not the cause of Farrell's loss. The Government had a right and a responsibility to seek full contractor performance under the terms and conditions of the Contract, particularly during a contingency such as Desert Shield/Desert Storm. No contractual relationship existed between the Government and Farrell's subcontractor, CMA. It was Farrell's responsibility to insure that CMA fulfilled its obligations under its contract with Farrell. Thus, it was decided that Farrell must absorb the loss resulting from CMA's failure to perform. Farrell accepted the cargo under the Contract and was obligated to deliver that cargo to Damman. Farrell made a conscious business decision in choosing its subcontractor, and must, therefore, bear the consequences of that decision, not the Government. Accordingly, Farrell's request for extraordinary relief under P.L. 85–804 for a contract adjustment in the amount of $85,200 was denied.

Contactor: Mech-Con Corporation.

Type of Action: Amendment Without Consideration.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $2,076,082.

Service and activity: The Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Description of product or service: Construction of the Propellant Disposal Facility.

Background: By letter of May 29, 1992, Mech-Con Corporation, Pomfret, Maryland, submitted a request for extraordinary relief. The Contractor's request is based on alleged unconscionable and unfair acts by the Government.

Within the Department of Defense, P.L. 85–804 is implemented by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). FAR PART 50, EXTRAORDINARY CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, Section 50.302, lists the type of adjustments available for relief. The only appropriate adjustment in this case is contained under paragraph 50.302–1, Amendments Without Consideration, subparagraphs (a) and (b). Subparagraph (a) allows Amendments Without Consideration if an actual or threatened loss will impair the productive ability of a contractor whose continued operations as a source of supply is found to be essential to the national defense. A review of the file does not establish that Mech-Con is essential to national defense. Therefore, contractor has not met the requirements of FAR 52.302(a).

Subparagraph (b) allows relief in instances where the Government directs its action primarily at the contractor and acts in its capacity as the other contracting party, the contract may be adjusted in the issue of fairness. However, any relief under this subparagraph is limited by paragraph 50.203(c), which states that no contract shall be amended or modified unless the contractor submits a request before all obligations (including final release and payment) under the contract have been discharged.

The Contractor claimed monies in the amount of $2,076,082 for legal fees, interest expenses, and other miscellaneous costs under or relating to Contract N62477–74–C–0333, Construction of the Propellant Disposal Facility, Naval Ordinance Station, Indian Head, MD.

A review of the contract file showed that the contact was awarded to the joint venture of Mech-Con and Heller Electrical Corporation on September 26, 1977. The contract was awarded in the amount of $4,258,643, with a contract completion date of 455 days. On June 30, 1981, modification P00029 was issued which terminated the contract for the convenience of the Government. On January 27, 1982, Mech-Con signed a final release on the contract.

Decision: Entitlement could not be granted under FAR 50302–1(b), because Mech-Con signed the final release. Contained within the final release, Mech-Con agreed that for the sum of $6,433,894.38, all liabilities, obligations, and claims had been discharged and satisfied. However, following the signing of the final release, Mech-Con alleged that the Government coerced it into signing the final release. However, Mech-Con did not provide any documentation to support this allegation. Thus, the final release is valid. Therefore, Mech-Con did not meet the requirements of FAR 52.302–1(b) and FAR 52.203(c).

Contractor: Truax Engineering, Inc. (TEI).

Type of action: Amendment Without Consideration.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $1,246,626.

Service and activity: The Department of the Navy.

Description of product or service: Development of a low-cost, reusable rocket.

Background: The claimed potential cost involved in the request is $1,246,626 as of November 1, 1993, plus a claimed $50,000 per month since then. This was TEI's second Government contract, for development of a low-cost reusable rocket to be launched and recovered from the sea (SEALAR). Funding for the program was limited from the beginning. A subsequent contract modification (P00009) substantially descoped the Contract by deleting all tasks not specifically related to the proof-of-principle launch and recovery. On June 4, 1991, a burst liquid oxygen tank damaged the rocket and caused delays and additional costs. Although later contract modifications increased the estimated cost, the Contract was allowed to expire on its completion date without the proof-of-principle launch and recovery having been achieved.

Justification: As stated, the Contractor's request was for a contract adjustment without consideration. The standard, set by FAR 50.302.1(b), for granting such an adjustment is one of fairness to a contractor that sustains a loss (not merely a decrease in anticipated profit) under a defense contract because of Government action. When the Government directs its action primarily at the contractor and acts in its capacity as the other contracting party, the contract may be adjusted. When this action increases performance cost and results in a loss to the Contractor, fairness may make some adjustment appropriate. A review of the facts in this case, however, indicated that fairness with regard to the Contractor's claimed losses had already operated under an administrative provision of the contract.

Decision: For purposes of this decision, the facts regarding this case are outlined in the Contracting Officer's findings and recommendation dated December 13, 1993. In that document, it is noted that the Contractor's request was based on substantially the same circumstances as a previously settled claim, including nonbinding arbitration, under the disputes resolution process of the contract. The Contractor had misinterpreted the favorable recommendation by the arbitrator and the subsequent negotiated settlement of the earlier claim as ''proof'' that TEI was entitled to the entire amount claimed under P.L. 85–804. The company's approach is inconsistent with a negotiated settlement. Moreover, TEI's position overstated the arbitrator's findings and recommendation, as well as the role of the arbitrator. In submitting its P.L. 85–804 request for relief without a breakdown of actual costs incurred, the Contractor ignored a provision in the contract modification which settled the earlier dispute, viz., that it ''. . . agrees to forgo any further claim or requests for relief . . . except that this shall not preclude . . . relief under Part 50 of the [FAR] for costs or losses not included in the Contractor's . . . claim.''

The Contracting Officer's statement also observed that TEI further asserted it had to remain in business at continued losses until its dispute and P.L. 85–804 claims were settled. There was no apparent reason for this except that TEI apparently anticipated further SEALAR-related business from the private sector, and made a business decision to continue operations albeit at a heavy loss. The Contractor calculated its losses by comparing unaudited, undifferentiated balance sheets from December 1991 and August 1993 and requested the difference as relief under P.L. 85–804. Essentially, then, TEI asked the Government to underwrite all its business operations after the expiration of its only remaining Government contract.

Finally, given the facts that (1) the SEALAR program was canceled, and (2) TEI's self-declared principal reason for being in business was the SEALAR program, relief action under P.L. 85–804 would not appear to facilitate the national defense. In addition, information on the Contractor's recent business activity with regard to trying to develop the concept of reusable ICBM's has been evaluated and the same conclusion reached in that situation.

In light of the above circumstances, and under authority delegated by NAPS 5250.201–70, the request by Truax Engineering, Inc., for relief under P.L. 85–804 was disapproved.

Contractor: Southwest Marine, Inc.

Type of action: Formalization of Informal Commitments.

Actual or estimated potential cost: $15,000,000.

Service and activity: The Department of the Navy.

Description of product or service: Drydock overhauls performed at Atlantic Dry Dock Corporation and Southwest Marine, Inc.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the early 1980s, Southwest Marine, Inc. (SWM), and Atlantic Dry Dock Corporation (ADD) invested in drydock facilities in San Diego, California, and Jacksonville, Florida, respectively, expecting to receive more Navy ship repair and overhaul contracts. Claimants asserted that they added facilities because of representations of senior Navy officials of more repair work if increased drydock facilities were available in the homeports of San Diego and Jacksonville, and because of the existing Navy homeport policy, planned changes in the Navy master ship repair policy to require ownership of facilities, as well as planned Navy use of additional multi-ship repair contracts. SWM and ADD asserted that increases in work did not materialize to the extent expected due to Navy alteration of, or failure to implement, these policies. In particular, claimants pointed to the change in the homeport policy from all overhauls performed in the homeport if adequate competition existed, to one third of overhauls reserved for the homeport if adequate competition existed, to later all overhauls competed coastwide. SWM and ADD claimed harm because the expected number of contracts were not competed only in the homeport or for work restricted to the homeport, but due to high debt burden/facilities costs, claimants' prices were not competitive with other companies.

Conference Report No. 103–339 (at 93–94) for the FY 1994 DoD Appropriations Act provides:

The conferees are aware of a long standing dispute between Southwest Marine of San Diego, California, and Atlantic Dry Dock of Jacksonville, Florida, and the Department of the Navy over facility investments made by these two shipyards. Although [] the shipyard owners agree that there is no legal remedy for a claim to be paid by the Navy, they continue to believe that, in fairness, the Navy should pay costs which the yards incurred in making facility investments. The conferees direct the Navy to examine this issue again and inform the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by May 31, 1994, on what course of action it recommends to resolve this matter.

Pursuant to this language, the Navy has conducted a reexamination of the SWM/ADD facility investment claims, making an impartial and independent review of the record. This review has encompassed the Navy Report to Congress of November 1992 on this matter and data considered in that Report, including all SWM/ADD submissions made prior to that Report. As well, the SWM/ADD joint submission of January 29, 1993; SWM 1994 submissions of May, August 8, and September 2; and ADD submission of May 1994 were considered. Additionally, ASN(RD&A) met with claimants on October 24, 1994, to provide them the opportunity to present the issues and facts of the dispute from their perspective. Also, a letter from the shipyards dated October 24, 1994, was reviewed.

II. PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL LANGUAGE AND NAVY CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS

In 1986, P.L. 99–500, Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1987, Section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriation (hereinafter referred to as Sec. 122), directed:

The Secretary of the Navy shall enter into negotiations with shipyards located on Sampson Street, San Diego, California, and on Fort George Island, Jacksonville, Florida, to determine what liability (if any), the United States has for damages suffered by such a shipyard resulting from facility improvements made by such shipyard during 1982 in good faith reliance on representations and assurances provided to officials of such shipyards by representatives of the Department of the Navy in 1981 and 1982 with respect to future work of the Department of the Navy at such shipyard.

Pursuant to Sec. 122, SWM and ADD submitted a joint request for relief on October 29, 1987, totaling $59,558,447 for lost profits not realized after the facility investments. In response to questions from the Navy, claimants provided supplemental documentation. The parties held negotiations on January 24 and 25, March 14, and April 26, 1989. By a May 10, 1989, letter to Congress, the Secretary of the Navy determined that the Navy bore no legal or equitable liability to the shipyards and formally denied the request. This position was supported by a 5-page Contracting Officer Memorandum of Decision and a 60-page legal memorandum.

In 1989, Conference Report No. 101–331 (at 422) for the FY 1990 DoD Authorization Act provided:

The conferees desire that the Navy fully explore all equitable and legal aspects of certain claims for relief submitted by shipyards pursuant to section 122 of the FY 1987 Military Construction Appropriations Act (P.L. 99–591).

Accordingly, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Navy to reconsider actively and together with the shipyards all facts and the quantum aspects of the claims and to report to the committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of such reconsideration with a definitive analysis of such claims under section 122.

Pursuant to this language, the parties met (first on March 28, 1990) and exchanged considerable documentation regarding the facts and legal issues of the case. On November 2, 1992, by letter to Congress, the Secretary found that the shipyards were not entitled to compensation, either as a matter of law or equity, and formally denied the request. This letter forwarded a detailed 97-page Navy analysis conducted by the Navy General Counsel of the facts, legal and equitable issues, and quantum, including copies of relevant documentation (87 attachments). This analysis will hereinafter be referred to as the 1992 Navy Report.

III. BACKGROUND

SWM and ADD claimed that, in the early 1980s, each invested in certain capital improvements at its San Diego facility and Jacksonville facility, respectively, with the expectation of receiving increased Navy ship repair and overhaul contracts. SWM began serious plans for purchase of a drydock in late 1981. The drydock was purchased in December 1982, with the loan requirements finalized in March-April 1983 with Wells Fargo Bank. SWM installed a large new floating drydock, new piers, and a new warehouse. In the first half of 1980, ADD began planning for

the construction of a 4,000 ton marine railway and made a firm decision to proceed in January/February 1982. The railway was completed in October/November 1982. ADD added a pier extension, begun in June 1983 and completed in July 1984.

Claimants alleged that investments in these facilities improvements were made in reliance on Navy policies in 1982, including the Navy's existing homeport ship repair policy, planned changes in the Navy master ship repair policy, and planned Navy use of additional multi-ship repair contracts, combined with various Navy representations of increased homeport repair work if SWM or ADD invested in increased drydock facilities. The following summarizes these areas.

Navy Representations: SWM/San Diego Homeport. Prior to facility improvements by SWM and National Steel and Shipbuilding Company (NASSCO) in the 1980s, there was a shortage of drydocking capability in the San Diego homeport. The only drydock was the Navy graving dock which the Navy leased to the San Diego Unified Port District, which made the dock available to local ship repair firms doing Navy ship repair work. The Navy dock permitted adequate competition, but only one drydock in the area limited the number of overhauls or other repair work that could be done in the homeport in any one year.

A March 12, 1981, letter from VADM Fowler, Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), to Arthur Engel, President of SWM, advised of ''* * * an increase in the size of the Navy Shipbuilding Program in the forthcoming years;'' that the problems caused by the increase ''* * * will be solvable if the Navy and industry embark on innovative, cooperative planning;'' and that one of four objectives of the Navy and industry should be to ''* * * [s]trengthen the industrial base and enhance the vitality of the shipbuilding industry.''

In late 1981, NAVSEA prepared a draft report outlining a business plan for overhaul and repair of Navy ships in the San Diego area which provided:

Addition of another graving dock or floating drydock would enable a significant number of Naval vessels to remain in the homeport of San Diego for repair and overhaul. ''In order to foster a robust private sector industrial base, the Navy should investigate immediately all alternatives to relocate a floating drydock in San Diego.''

An option for obtaining additional drydock capability would be to provide a ''contractual means of providing incentives to a contractor or contractors to make substantial capital improvements in a new drydock and pier'' and fully explore all appropriate methods to provide incentives to assist or encourage private development of drydocking facilities, including multi-year contracts, capital investment incentive clauses, capital investment sharing, and contractor consortiums.

''[T]here is little the Navy can do to guarantee future work to individual companies in the private sector to encourage capital investment to expand facilities/capabilities.''

Acknowledgment that SWM was seeking to add a 20,000 ton drydock to its facilities.

Recognition that there was a need to establish more stringent qualification criteria for Master Ship Repair (MSR) contract holders to ''continually glean contractors with inadequate resources from the ranks of eligible bidders'' and that the Navy ''should develop quantitative criteria for MSR eligibility that specifies minimum, albeit substantial, levels of technical, management, financial, and facilities resources.''

Acknowledgment that there was a need to provide schedule stabilization of ship repair requirements to give the local ship repair industry more certainly in workload demands: ''There should be a commitment to retain in San Diego as much depot maintenance repair work as port capability allows. . .'' with multiship packages maximized, with minimum concurrence in schedules, for overhauls and Selected Restricted Availabilities (SRAs).

According to a Declaration by Mr. Engel, submitted with SWM's 1987 claim submission in early 1982, Mr. Engel met with Mr. Lehman, then Secretary of the Navy, to discuss SWM's intended capital improvements. ''Secretary Lehman indicated that SWM's facilities improvements would be appreciated and encouraged by the Navy.'' In early spring of 1982, Mr. Engel met with ASN(S&L), Mr. Sawyer. ''We again discussed SWM's improvement plans. Mr. Sawyer also indicated that facility improvements would be followed by more repair work in the homeport.''

In March 1982, a cost type overhaul contract for USS HENRY WILSON was awarded outside the homeport at a price nearly twice that proposed by two San Diego shipyards. In relation to this award, certain Government statements were reported:

The March 31, 1982, San Diego Union reported that Mr. Carlucci, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, told Congressman Hunter that lack of sufficient drydock facilities in San Diego was the main consideration in this award decision.

The April 2, 1982, San Diego Union reported that ASN(S&L) Sawyer stated that the award was based on a superior proposal in the solicitation's higher weighted factors [presumably, facilities was one of these factors] and that ''I would like to encourage some of the local (San Diego) firms to invest in their own facilities. The real bottom line is, if I could urge something on the people of San Diego, looking at the market projections for overhauls and repairs there, is to do it the American way and invest in better facilities.'' Mr. Sawyer was also reported as saying that improved repair facilities in San Diego would make it easier for the Navy to adhere to the homeport policies on repairs, which ''is alive and well.''

The June 7, 1982, San Diego Union reported that, in response to a question regarding what was needed to get overhaul contracts in San Diego, ASN(S&L) Sawyer stated: ''three good shipyards.''

In an undated and unidentified newspaper article provided by SWM, it was reported that a Navy memorandum to Edwin Meese, then Counselor to the President, regarding the WILSON award stated that, in order for homeport firms to obtain greater number of ship overhaul contracts, they should increase facility investment, noting that SWM has no drydock while the awardee does.

On August 12, 1982, Chapman Cox, DASN (Installations) met with San Diego business leaders and the San Diego Port Commission. (This meeting is described by SWM but not mentioned in the 1992 Navy Report.) He stated that the homeport policy was still in effect despite the recent change in policy requiring only one third of overhauls to be restricted to the homeport (discussed below); the overall percent of homeport repair and overhaul work would remain the same; there would be an increase in the number of ships homeported in San Diego there was a need for additional homeport facilities and private investment to that end was encouraged; and endorsed a proposal to build a drydock to be operated by the Port Commission and used by local firms.

The September 22, 1982, San Diego Daily transcript and San Diego Union reported that Mr. Sawyer and VADM Fowler met with San Diego contractors at a September 21, 1982, session organized by the local Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Sawyer emphasized the need to improve the quality of area facilities, noting that with the anticipated 30 percent growth in Navy work over the next two years, there was a potential for $240,000,000 in assured work in the period. Mr. Saywer said that these predictions depended on improved facilities, adequate competition, and local contractors' ability to win one third of coastwide overhaul solicitations. Both Navy officials sought to encourage interest in the Port District obtaining a drydock for the use of area contractors. Mr. Sawyer said that there was no guarantee San Diego firms would receive additional work just because the facilities were there unless a public body were involved in its construction. Mr. Engel pointed out the risk in private investment in the absence of Navy guarantees and asked whether the homeport policy would be eliminated.

According to a Declaration by a Wells Fargo employee responsible for investigating and recommending approval of the drydock loan to SWM, he met with personnel from the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair (SUPSHIP) San Diego to discuss the future of Navy ship repair and overhaul business in San Diego. ''Although the Navy would not formally commit itself, SUPSHIPS personnel did indicate that there would be a substantial amount of future work in the San Diego homeport and that there was a need for additional drydock capacity and pier capacity.'' It was the Wells Fargo employee's impression that the Navy was encouraging the development of improved facilities to handle future work. ''The anticipation of an increase in the volume of overhaul and ship repair contracts in the San Diego homeport was one of several major considerations in our credit decision.''

Navy Representations: ADD/Jacksonville Homeport. Before ADD completed its marine railway, only one contractor in the homeport, Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc. (JSI), had an adequate drydock to repair Navy ships. Consequently, because there was no competition for overhaul work in Jacksonville between at least two sources, overhauls of ships homeported in Jacksonville had to be competed coastwide. A further barrier to repairing ships in the Jacksonville homeport was that JSI did not actively compete in coastwide competitions.

RADM Kinnebrew was Commander of Cruiser Destroyer Group Twelve (homeported in Mayport) from February 1980 to August 1981. According to a Naval Sea Systems Command attorney interview with RADM Kinnebrew on June 7, 1988, at some point during his tenure, RADM Kinnebrew had one or two discussions with Mr. Gibbs, President of ADD, in which he indicated that additional ship repair capability in the Mayport/Jacksonville area would be welcome because it would increase the possibility of accomplishing ship repair in the homeport. RADM Kinnebrew also indicated to Mr. Gibbs that the Navy planned to homeport some FFG–7 Class ships in Mayport and that the Navy would continue to homeport destroyers in Mayport for the foreseeable future. According to RADM Kinnebrew, he did not make any promises or commitments to ADD regarding future work. The Admiral cannot recall what was said at a particular meeting, but indicated in this interview that these were the general remarks made over the course of the discussions with Mr. Gibbs.

According to a Declaration by Mr. Gibbs, RADM Kinnebrew met with Mr. Gibbs in February 1980 and stated that he wanted ADD to construct facilities that would enable ADD to repair and overhaul destroyers and frigates and indicated that his statements to ADD were authorized by his superiors. After this conversation, Mr. Gibbs ''was

convinced that the initiation of a substantial facilities improvement program at ADD would result in substantial business opportunities with the Navy.''

As reported in Vol. 12, Number 24 of the Weekly Report of the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce (undated), ADM Train, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, addressed a session of the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce in Norfolk on May 2, 1980. ADM Train indicated that: if Jacksonville expands its ship maintenance and repair capabilities, it will be in line for more Navy work; such additional capabilities in an area ensure more competition which, in turn, could lead to more Navy ship repair and maintenance work in Jacksonville; Jacksonville lacks the drydock facilities necessary for major overhauls of Navy ships; and the Navy wants major overhaul facilities to exist in the ship's homeport to avoid having the crew relocated. As a result of these remarks, the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce indicated they would contact local shipyards about plans for expansion and help in locating additional ship repair facilities in Jacksonville.

According to a Declaration by Mr. Gibbs, in the summer of 1981, ADD and its consulting firm, SEACOR Associates, made presentations to the Navy in Norfolk and to RADM Nunnelely, Director of the Ships Maintenance and Modernization Division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, regarding the proposed construction of the marine railway. The Navy audience at both sessions ''responded favorably'' to the proposed improvements and ''encouraged continued construction.''

On December 18, 1981, VADM Fowler met with a group of Jacksonville area Navy, business, and industrial leaders at the Mayport Officers Club to discuss ship maintenance support for Navy expansion at Naval Station Mayport (NAVSTA Mayport). According to a Declaration by Mr. Gibbs, VADM Fowler ''. . . reiterated the notion that, if improved facilities were built, Jacksonville contractors would get work to fill those facilities.''

To prepare VADM Fowler for the December 18, 1981, talk in Mayport, RADM Johnston, SUPSHIP Jacksonville, sent VADM Fowler copies of background memoranda. One memorandum (undated), entitled ''Growth of Support Capability in Jacksonville,'' states: current ship intermediate and depot level maintenance support facilities in the Jacksonville area have a maximum capacity of 20,000 man-days per month, which capacity will be ''overtaxed'' by the Selected Restricted Availability (SRA) workloads projected in FYs 1983, 1984, and 1986; there is a need to expand the current ceiling of industrial capacity to between 30,000 and 35,000 man-days per month to meet long term needs; ''the projected maintenance needs are well publicized and discussions with the industrial community have been conducted by local flag officers, SUPSHIPS JAX and CO, NAVSTA Mayport''; ''[a]n extensive effort has been and continues in the Jacksonville area to outline the programmed Navy build up and to call for community support. A stable, predictable plan will enhance credibility and reassure commercial activities who will be investing their resources''; ADD is proposing a major expansion of facilities in order to handle FFG–7 SRAs; the problem of assuring adequate depot and intermediate level repair capacity ''is real but solvable.'' Another memorandum (undated), entitled ''Background of Current Situation,'' references a request from the Commander, Naval Air Forces Atlantic to review ''community planning in light of Navy expansion'' in the Mayport area and develop a program to encourage commercial growth for both ship maintenance support and housing for personnel. It also identifies possible questions for the meeting: ''What assurances can be given that SRAs/RAVs [Restricted Availabilities] will be committed to the Mayport area and not contracted out of homeport?''; Will the NAVSEA policy of soliciting most regular overhauls on a coastwide basis continue?''

According to a Declaration by Mr. Hoepner, former President of the bank (Flagship Bank, subsequently acquired by Sun Bank) that provided the marine railway loan, Mr. Lehman and Congressman Bennett met in Washington in January 1982 with the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce. At that meeting, Mr. Hoepner ''was led to believe that existing and proposed Navy policies and practices would result in greater business for ADD if it were to make proposed capital improvements.'' In other discussions between bank employees and Navy officials, Navy officials reaffirmed the homeport policy and were not equivocal about its policies or the likelihood that ADD's capital improvements would result in more business.

According to a Declaration by a former employee of Flagship Bank involved in evaluation of ADD's loan application, he had several discussions with Navy personnel in which the Navy indicated that, ''if another company improved its facilities so that there would be competition in the homeport, the Navy would provide more overhaul work in the homeport.'' Based on these discussions, he concluded that ADD's market projections were valid and that it was reasonable for ADD to rely upon Navy assurances regarding future ship repair and overhaul work in Jacksonville.

A May 1982 draft report of the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce Ship Repair Facility Task Force stated that ship repair awards will increase during the 1980s and 1990s as a result of ADD's soon-to-be completed marine railway and JSI's drydock, which will create a competitive situation in the homeport, and that SUPSHIP advised that the Navy will restrict overhaul and SRA work requiring drydock capability when a competitive situation exists. The task force should do all it can to ascertain that this work is indeed restricted to the homeport to provide an opportunity for a fair return on the shipyards' investments in view of the ''financial risk being undertaken by these shipyards in anticipation of the needs of the Navy.''

The April 1982 Jacksonville Seafarer reported that: by the end of 1984, NAVSTA Mayport will be home to 45 vessels (compared to 25 in December 1981); the expansion ''could mean a bonanza of repair and maintenance contracts for area shipyards;'' at a March 18, 1982, meeting of local subcontractors chaired by JSI, a JSI representative indicated that Navy concerns expressed at sessions between Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce and Navy officials was that the Jacksonville area have a viable competitive base and that the industrial base capacity be adequate to handle the increase in Navy work; that JSI was encouraging ADD to proceed with the planned marine railway to meet the competition requirements in the homeport; JSI had made commitments of manpower levels to be maintained to support Navy needs; Congressman Bennett stated that, if the community does not have the industrial capacity to meet Navy ship repair needs, he will ''see that the ships go somewhere else, and not only for repair, but for home basing''; the Jacksonville area shipyards, business community, and Navy were ''working to expand the area's capacity for repairs,'' and the Navy itself was actively working to encourage capacity expansion; upon assuming his command in the area, SUPSHIP cited three goals: increased Navy housing in Mayport, development of ship repair capacity, and development of industrial capacity in the community to support that ship repair capacity.

The May 1982 Jacksonville Seafarer reported that: the Navy wants three drydock-capable yards in Jacksonville to provide a guaranteed competitive situation for repair work on new and existing ships homeported in the area; over $1.3 billion of work is scheduled to be done on vessels homeported at Mayport and Charleston during the next decade; because there are no drydocks capable of performing this work in Charleston, SUPSHIP Jacksonville indicated that Jacksonville yards can ''expect to get much of the work from there [Charleston] if the area has the drydock capacity''; ''Navy and Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce Task Force have agreed that if local yards cannot handle the work, it would favor having new companies established in the Jacksonville area to perform the work;'' and regarding doubts about the ability of the projected ship repair business volume to support the new shipyard facilities, the Navy ''can not guarantee in writing contracts over the long-term, largely because of its inability to award multiyear repair contracts because of budgeting restrictions, though Johnston [SUPSHIP JAX] did assure task force members that the work would be available if the facilities were. . . .''

Navy Homeport Policy. Before 1982, the Navy's homeport policy required that all ship repair availabilities, including overhauls (six months duration or more) or shorter term availabilities (selected restricted availabilities (SRAs), restricted availabilities, or technical availabilities), of ships having crews attached be accomplished in the homeport area when adequate competition was available. The primary goals of this policy were to minimize disruptive effects on Navy personnel and families caused by conducting ship maintenance away from the homeports and to provide industry better predictability of future business opportunities.

In testimony on March 10, 1982, before the House Armed Services Committee regarding the Naval Ship Overhaul Program, VADM Fowler had testified that the Navy policy is to overhaul ships in or near the homeport to minimize family disruption and improve crew morale. Other key factors in determining where a ship will be overhauled include ship complexity, fleet operations schedules and material readiness requirements, shipyard workload and qualifications, shipyard capacity and capability in the homeport area, and contract requirements regarding competition and small businesses. The following statements by the Admiral were also included in the record: ''the long-term effect [of the homeport policy] is expected to be an increase in private sector industrial capacity near major homeport areas. In fact, the industry is already increasing its capability in areas of heavy fleet concentration such as San Diego, California; Norfolk, Virginia; and Jacksonville, Florida.''

On July 19, 1982, OPNAVNOTE 4700 directed that at least one third of the regular overhauls of ships having crews attached be reserved for the homeport, with the balance to be competed coastwide and that SRAs be performed in the homeport ''where feasible.''

In 1985, the homeport policy required unrestricted competition for all overhauls, a change that resulted from Congressional direction (in the Conference Report on Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1985 dated October 10, 1984) to terminate the policy of reserving one-third of overhauls for the homeport. The direction was based on factors which Congress believed would adversely affect the mobilization capability of non-homeport private shipyards—namely, decline of commercial ship repair workload

making private ship repair firms more dependent on Navy work; increased ship repair work being done by shorter repair availabilities (specifically SRAs) that were 100 percent reserved for the homeport area; and corresponding decrease in overhauls available for coast-wide competition above the 30 percent homeport reservation.

In 1987, the homeport policy was codified at 10 U.S.C. 7299a by Sec. 1101 of the FY 1988/89 DoD Authorization Act. This law directs the Navy to restrict to the homeport area short-term repair or maintenance work if there is adequate competition. Short-term is defined as performance of six months or less.

Master Ship Repair (MSR) Policy. The 1981 NAVSEA draft report, mentioned above, noted that about 70 percent of work awarded under MSR contracts was subcontracted and recommended that MSR contract holders be required to meet certain qualifications regarding technical, management, financial, and facilities resources. As reported in the September 22, 1982, San Diego Union, at the September 21, 1982, meeting between the Navy and San Diego contractors, in response to a question regarding MSR contractors, VADM Fowler stated that the Navy had reached no conclusion regarding a requirement for firms to have waterfront facilities.

In the Conference Report to the Continuing Resolution for FY 1983, dated December 20, 1982, Congress directed the Navy to establish a certification procedure to qualify firms as MSR holders to guarantee fully qualified private sector capability. This language led to the Navy's establishment of a MSR recertification program on January 28, 1983, intended to ensure that MSR holders had the necessary facilities, management capability, and technical expertise.

On May 27, 1983, NAVSEAINST 4280.2 was issued to revise policy for MSR contracts. MSR contractors would be required to have the ability to perform an entire overhaul or SRA of a Naval ship of 500 tons or larger, including control (possession or committed access) of facilities (piers, shops, and a Navy-certified drydock), and an organization capable of performing 56 percent of the work for an overhaul in-house.

(In this respect, it is noted that SWM finalized its drycock purchase negotiations in December 1982—before Congressional identification of the MSR recertification program and before the SR policy change in May 1983.)

Multi-Ship Contracting Policy. In the Naval Sea Systems Command Ship Overhaul Policy Statement dated January 18, 1982, VADM Fowler stated that multiple ship procurements will be used, when appropriate, to provide incentives for shipyard improvements and capital investments as well as to obtain benefits of learning and economies of scale. In March 1982 Congressional testimony, VADM Fowler stated that multi-ship and cost type contracting under negotiated solicitations provided incentives for shipyard improvements and other benefits. The 1981 NAVSEA draft report mentioned above had recommended multi-year contracts as a possible way to provide incentives to encourage private development of ship repair facilities.

A July 13, 1982, San Diego Tribune article reported an internal NAVSEA memorandum indicating a NAVSEA desire for ''a plan to award in one package in San Diego to the yard that promises to build the biggest and best facility to support this multi-ship overhaul and the Navy: 6 ships.'' This article stated that Navy officials would not comment on the authenticity of the memorandum or elaborate on ship repair plans in San Diego.

OPNAVNOTE 4700, issued on July 19, 1982, provided that multiple ship overhaul contracts would normally be competed coast-wide and that increased use of multiple ship overhaul solicitations was desired to provide incentives for shipyard capital improvements and to achieve improved performance through greater competition. NAVSEA NOTICE 4710, issued September 3, 1982, reflected the policy to compete multiple ship contracts coast-wide.

(In this respect, it is noted that when SWM finalized its drydock purchase negotiations in December 1982, the multi-ship contracting policy provided that such contracts would normally be competed coast-wide. Moreover, multi-ship contracts never were in widespread use (partly because of the inherent restriction on competition) and have decreased in use since 1982. SWM admits that by 1982, the Navy had only awarded one multi-ship contract in San Diego and had canceled another multi-ship solicitation, repackaging the work as single ship contracts.)

IV. CLAIM SUBMISSIONS

The following discusses the SWM/ADD claims by addressing the claimants' submissions made since the last Navy analysis and decision regarding the facility investment claims—the Navy's November 2, 1992, Report to Congress—in relation to the prior record. As noted above, all the claimants' submissions have been reviewed, considered and analyzed as well as prior Navy reports.

January 29, 1993, Submission. Claimants submitted a joint document entitled ''Claimants' Response to Navy Report to Congress,'' Dated January 29, 1993, (forwarded to Congress on February 1, 1993) in response to the Navy's November 2, 1992, Report to Congress which concluded that there was no legal or equitable basis to compensate SWM and ADD for their claims.

In arguing that it is essential that an equitable settlement be achieved and that Congress, if necessary, should give further direction/clarification to that end, claimants include various statements. Claimants identify ''Navy barriers'' to equitable resolution of the claims, namely: Navy placed a significant burden on claimants to draft a statement of facts, only to subsequently unilaterally draft a Navy statement of facts which raised a ''whole host of new issues'' and, thereby, delayed agreement on a statement of facts; Navy refused to give weight to sworn statements submitted by claimants or to provide any sworn evidence to contradict these statements; and Navy placed undue reliance on written versus oral exchanges, which denied claimants access to top-level Pentagon personnel and resulted in entitlement analysis being delegated to NAVSEA officials. Claimants also take issue with certain factual and legal conclusions of the Navy Report, which are discussed below; maintain their position that Sec. 122 creates Navy liability, with quantum being the only item to be determined; argue that P.L. 85–804 provides a ''mechanism'' to provide monetary settlement under formalization of informal commitment or residual powers authority; state that promissory estoppel represents a basis to provide monetary relief; argue that the doctrine and sovereign immunity is not a defense to Navy liability; and take issue with Navy conclusions regarding quantum.

This submission does not provide new facts or legal theories to support the claims but rather primarily consists of rebuttal arguments to conclusions made in the 1992 Navy Report. Those rebuttal arguments are discussed below.

May 1994 Submissions. SWM submitted in May 1994 a revised quantum proposal as a ''resolution'' to the claim, seeking a $15,000,000 cash payment in 1994, to be repaid $2,500,000 annually over a six-year period (1995–2000) by reducing SWM's depreciation cost pool allocated to current/future Navy cost contracts. This submission does not provide new facts or underlying legal theories to support the claim. Relative to the 1992 Navy Report, SWM's quantum request after discussions with the Navy was $18,600,000 in reliance damages for unrecovered depreciation and facilities capital cost of money, plus profit, from the time of the investment through 1987.

ADD also submitted in May 1994 a revised quantum proposal as a ''resolution'' to the claim. ADD and North Florida Shipyards (NFS) would form a third company (X Co.) to receive a 10 year lease of Navy AFDM 7 at NAVSTA Mayport for $1 rent per year, in return for yearly drydock operation/maintenance at X Co. expense, and ADFM 7 use dedicated to Navy ship repair. Use of AFDM 7 would be limited to ADD and NFS, which would compete for its use for specific Navy work. This submission indicates a different quantum than previously requested; ADD's request addressed in the 1992 Navy Report was for $6,900,000 in reliance damages. It does not provide new facts or underlying legal theories to support the claim.

August 8, 1994, Submission. SWM requested that the Navy provide SWM a $15,000,000 payment in 1994 pursuant to P.L. 85–804 to formalize an informal commitment or pursuant to exercise of residual powers. SWM asserted that the Navy should ''report to the [appropriations] committees the amount of relief that it views as appropriate, in view of the Navy officials' inducement of Southwest's facilities investments.'' A legal memorandum provided arguments to support its conclusion that ''relief along the lines proposed by Southwest would be an appropriate exercise of the Navy's discretion under P.L. 85–804, and in particular its discretion to formalize informal commitments by Navy officials.''

This submission contains no new facts or underlying legal theories but, expands on the May 1994 submission by providing additional legal argument that P.L. 85–804 authority is available to make the $15,000,000 payment and rebuts P.L. 85–804 statements in the 1992 Navy Report. The relief requested is also different in quantum and type from that addressed in the 1992 Navy Report. See discussion above regarding the May 1994 SWM submission.

Sepember 2, 1994, Submission. In response to an Assistant General Counsel (Research, Development & Acquisition) letter of August 24, 1994, requesting that SWM submit any additional ''facts and information, or theories of relief'' in support of its request for relief, SWM reiterated its request for extraordinary contractual relief in the form of a payment of $15,000,000 in 1994, with the following conditions: SWM will enter into an advance agreement providing for repayment by reduction of the depreciation cost pool allocated to SWM's Government contracts by $2,500,000 annually for the six-year period 1995–2000; SWM will reduce remaining long-term debt associated with the capital asset expenditures that gave rise to the dispute; SWM will provide a written release of any further Government liability for this claim. Alternatively, the $15,000,000 could be forgiven in equal increments over six years. According to SWM, because tax obligations relating to payment arise in the year of loan forgiveness rather than in the year of payment, more of the proceeds of payment would be applied to long-term debt reduction. SWM's request, certified in accordance with the Contract Disputes Act by Mr. Herbert Engel, SWM's President, seeks relief under P.L. 85–804 based on formalization of informal commitments or residual powers.

The narrative factual background of this submission essentially repeats the text in

the January 29, 1993, submission, with minor changes. The discussion of P.L. 85–804 essentially repeats the text in the August 8, 1994, submission, with additional allegations that SWM's financial position is ''far worse now than it was last April'' when the Department of Transportation Board of Contract Appeals denied SWM's request for extraordinary relief; SWM will soon run out of credit and that, absent some financial relief, will ''probably be insolvent within a matter of weeks.'' September 2, 1994, Submission at 40. A ''1994 Consolidated Forecast'' is also provided.

V. SPECIFIC CLAIMANT ARGUMENTS AND RELEVANT FACTS

The following summarizes those SWM/ADD arguments that take issue with the 1992 Navy Report as well as sets forth corresponding facts and Navy conclusions. (Cites are to the January 29, 1993, submission; as the other two submissions are repetitive, they are not specifically cited.)

Claimants were denied access to top-level Pentagon decision-makers. January 29 Submission at 9–10.

Facts: The negotiations and analysis of the claims undertaken for the 1992 Navy Report were handled by the General Counsel of the Navy, at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, with the exception of certain quantum issues when the General Counsel was unavailable and the Deputy General Counsel (Logistics) acted in his stead. Claimants were not denied access to senior Navy decision-makers.

The process of jointly drafting an uncontested statement of facts was arduous and unfair. January 29 Submission at 7–9.

Facts: More important than the length of time or difficulty in compiling a statement of facts is that the Navy fully considered claimants' views on all issues. When agreement could not be reached on certain issues, the 1992 Navy Report noted the claimants' differing views so that Congress would be able to consider all sides of the matter.

The Navy failed to give proper weight to sworn statements provided by claimants or to obtain sworn statements from relevant former Navy officials.

Facts: Claimants raised this argument, and the navy fully considered it, before issuance of the Navy 1992 Report. The Navy did not (and does not) consider that claimants' declarations, even if accepted as entirely accurate on their face, provide a factual basis for recovery on legal or equitable principles. Therefore, there was no need to substantiate or refute the facts asserted by claimants.

In the years following the facilities expansion programs, both ADD and SWM failed to realize the promised levels of work, which result is attributable to the Navy's refusal to issue homeport-restricted solicitations. SWM and ADD suffered a competitive disadvantage over other overhaul contractors due to the debt incurred by the facilities investments. January 29 Submission at 35.

Facts: The shipyards were independently contemplating facility improvements in the 1981–82 period and the investments were made after independent market analysis and business risk assessment. The investments were planned and initiated, in part, before Navy representations and, in part, based on expected increases in commercial work. The improvements resulted in benefits to each shipyard: an increase in Navy ship repair business and valuable operating asset improvements which enabled the shipyards to bid on and perform contracts for which they would otherwise have been unable to compete. From FY 1983–87, total overhaul work increased and total dollar volume of ship repair business in each homeport increased. The shipyards realized profits on most fixed priced Navy contracts performed during the relevant period. ADD was profitable during this time. SWM did not recover $2,600,000 of costs of performance. However, there is no evidence that this loss was attributable to purchase of the drydock. Instead, other factors could have caused the loss, such as SWM's loss of its small business size status just before its workload started to decrease, the general decline of the commercial ship repair industry during the period in question, SWM's decision to purchase a drydock with more than twice the capacity necessary for the vast majority of Navy homeported ships, or SWM inefficiencies in performance. SWM represented to its bank when obtaining the loan that SWM would lease the drydock to competitors when it was not using the drydock itself, but has not done so.

Furthermore, the shipyards do not offer any credit for cost recoveries realized under Navy fixed price and commercial contracts. SWM received over $80,000,000 in Navy payments for fixed price repair work performed in FY 1984–87 and asserts that none of this $80,000,000 represents recovery of its costs of performance. SWM also received over $50,000,000 in payments for commercial work during this time, but offers no credit for use of the drydock or recovery of drydock costs from this work. ADD received over $60,000,000 in Navy payments for fixed price repair work performed in FY 1983–87 and asserts that none of this $60,000,000 represents recovery of its costs of performance. ADD also received over $48,000,000 in payments for commercial work and non-Navy government work during this time and offers no credit for use of the marine railway or recovery of marine railway cost from such work.

Additionally, Navy policy is to not grant use of government drydock facilities to perform ship repair contracts if there is adequate competition in the homeport between private yards with dedicated access to privately-owned drydocks. This policy has benefited the shipyards. For example, in San Diego, because there is such competition between SWM and National Shipbuilding and Steel Company (NASSCO), the Navy does not make available its graving dock to offerors. As a result, offerors without dedicated access to private drydock facilities are ineligible to compete for phased maintenance multi-year/multi-ship solicitations.

The Navy attributed the decline in overhaul work in Jacksonville and San Diego to the trend to perform shorter repairs rather than overhauls, but the examples cited by the Navy do not prove that there was an inadequate supply of overhauls work for the Navy to honor its representatives. January 29 Submission at 33–41.

Facts: The Navy 1992 Report identified other trends in ship maintenance that ''affected Navy ship repair planning[]'' and that led to a decrease in the percentage of overhauls solicited only in the homeport. In particular, more complex ships meant that the length of time to perform an overhaul increased. Therefore, to maintain fleet operational requirements, a greater number of SRAs vice overhauls were scheduled. The Navy describes these trends as part of the factual background to the claims and does not argue that the increasing preference for SRAs somehow gave an excuse to not ''honor its representations.''

The Navy's correlation between SWM's loss of its small business size status and a subsequent loss of revenue does not take into account that, during ''large parts'' of FY 1984, SWM's facilities were unavailable for Navy work because the company was in the process of installing and testing its new drydock and SWM ''expected some disruption of normal operations,'' and the new drydock changed SWM's business from primarily topside work and small drydock availabilities to larger jobs beyond the capacity of most small businesses. January 29 Submission at 42–43.

Facts: SWM lost its small business size status in December 1983, causing a significant loss of business because of an inability to bid on the many small business set-asides offered in the homeport. SWM had ranked first or second in Navy homeport repair business in FYs 1981, 1982, and 1983, but fell to fourth in FY 1984 and fell further to eighth in FY 1985 before beginning to recover in FYs 1986 and 1987. The Navy noted in its Report, the SWM rebuttal to this issue—specifically, that SWM in a November 25, 1991, letter asserted that it expected a decline in its FY 1984 business volume due to installation and testing of the drydock which is inconsistent with an earlier SWM statement that it is entitled to the award of numerous FY 1984 repair availabilities. Finally, where the new drydock gave SWM the capacity to perform larger jobs, the choice was with SWM to continue bidding on set-asides if it so desired; the loss of its size status took that choice away from SWM.

Contrary to the Navy's position, Congress should not be blamed for the change in homeport policy, because Congressional language on homeport policy only established ''short-term, expedient measures designed to alleviate problems experienced by non-home port yards during a recession.'' The Navy must take responsibility for its role in reversing the homeport policy; the Navy had a ''disposition toward the elimination of all homeport restrictions on overhaul solicitations'' and never advised Congress of the SWM or ADD facility investments made in reliance on Navy representations. January Submission at 43–47.

Facts: See discussion above of homeport policy. In addition to direction to terminate the policy for reserving one-third of overhauls to the homeport in the Conference Report on the FY 1985 Continuing Appropriations Acts, the Conference Report for the FY 1984 DoD Appropriations Act added five additional overhauls, above the number included in the President's budget, to be awarded to private shipyards—two to be competed on the West Coast and three to be competed on the East Coast. The Navy 1992 Report notes SWM arguments similar to those in the January 29, 1993, submission and finds that there is no evidence to support that the Navy was, off the record, advocating to Congress that the homeport policy should be abandoned. Also, Congress was aware of Navy public statements regarding the need for additional drydock facilities in San Diego and Jacksonville at the time Congress directed relaxing the homeport policy. Members of the Florida and California Delegations were aware of those statements and actively participated in conveying many of them to constituents. In October 1984, Congress directed abandonment of the policy to restrict one-third of the homeport overhaul contracts to the homeport, and the Navy thereafter implemented that direction.

The principles of statutory construction dictate that Sec. 122 be interpreted to recognize Government legal liability for the claim. The words ''if any'' in the statute mean that Congress made no determination as to quantum of damages; Congressional interpretations of Sec. 122 after its enactment are relevant. Furthermore, Sec. 122 is like a Congressional reference case where the Court of Claims has previously ruled that equity demands compensation. January 29 Submission at 58–69.

Facts: These arguments were fully addressed in the Navy 1992 Report. Sec. 122 provides, in pertinent part, that ''[t]he Secretary of the Navy shall enter into negotiations * * * to determine what liability (if any) the United States has for damages suffered by such a shipyard * * *.'' After the Navy originally denied the claim in 1990, Congress, in again addressing the matter, did not direct entitlement, but rather reconsideration of the claims. Conference Report accompanying the FY 1990 DoD Authorization Act. In the Conference Report for the FY 1994 DoD Authorization Act, Congress again only directed reconsideration—not entitlement. Special reference cases are generally enacted either to waive a Government affirmative defense or to provide an admission of liability by the Government, leaving to the courts the factual and legal questions relating to damages. These cases are strictly construed, and a Congressional confession of liability must be clearly expressed. Sec. 122 and its progeny have no expression of liability and is not a Congressional reference case. Post-enactment interpretations by Members of Congress are given legal effect only where not inconsistent with the statute and legislative history.

The Navy's conclusion that the Secretary will not exercise residual powers under P.L. 85–804 because such action is not ''necessary and appropriate'' or would not ''facilitate the national defense'' runs counter to the record, Sec. 122, and the post-enactment Congressional letters of clarification. P.L. 85–804 is authority for the Navy to provide equitable relief on the basis of formalization of informal commitments or residual powers authority. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 50.302–3 and FAR 50.401, respectively.

Facts: The Navy in 1992 denied relief under P.L. 85–804 on both formalization of informal commitment and residual powers grounds based on the facts. The Navy did (and does) recognize that the residual powers authority could be utilized but was (and is) not appropriate on the facts of the case. Both shipyards were never precluded from ship repair competitions; the facility improvements enhanced the ability to receive future Government contracts; and the shipyards received benefits from the capital improvements, including an increase in Navy ship repair work. Regarding the requirement to determine that granting relief will facilitate the national defense, the Navy found no evidence that the shipyards' continued viability was endangered. See also discussion below.

Although claimants now concede that they could not prevail if they sued the Government in the Court of Federal Claims on a claim of promissory estoppel, they assert that all elements of promissory estoppel essentially are present which ''indicates why Congress felt a moral or honorable obligation to compensate the shipyards.'' Sec. 122 permits application of the ''tenets of promissory estoppel to the matter.'' January 29 Submission at 74–75.

Facts: Statements by Navy representatives were opinions and predictions that an increase in homeport drydocking capability would increase the amount of Navy ship repair work which could be solicited within the homeport. The statements were reasonable predictions about future Navy ship repair business and expressed legitimate goals for enhanced competition and a stronger national industrial mobilization base. While the Navy desired and encouraged facility improvements in the two homeports, it disavowed any guarantees that future work would follow (and in fact expressly rejected making guarantees of work prior to the investments being made) and did not unfairly induce these investments. The Navy also did not urge specific improvements which were rather chosen by the shipyards.

There is no evidence that the Navy misled the shipyards by misrepresenting or concealing material facts. When the Navy statements were made, they were accurate and reasonable in light of the expanding 600-ship Navy and existing policy, and the Navy in 1981–82 did not know Congress would later direct changes in the homeport policy or that other later changes in policy would occur to reflect changing requirements. Navy officials never promised specific contracts or a specific amount of future repair work. The Navy representations were too indefinite and uncertain to support a claim of promissory estoppel. The record also shows that others (e.g., the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce Ship Repair Facility Task Force) made representations and inducements to encourage homeport investment.

These shipyards were aware that Government policies affecting contractors are subject to change and, to the extent that they based their business decisions on certain existing Navy policies, they assumed the business risks that those policies could change.

Sec. 122 effectively waives sovereign immunity. The analogy of Congressional reference cases applies because Sec. 122 must be interpreted as a determination of liability. January 29 Submission at 76–78.

Facts: The Navy changes in homeport, master ship repair, and multi-ship policies were actions taken by the Government in its sovereign capacity. They were actions with a public and general application that affected all Navy ship repair contractors, all Navy ships, and ships' crews and their families, among others. These actions were not directed at SWM and ADD. The Government is immune from liability for its sovereign acts. The arguments regarding interpretation of Sec. 122 and the applicability of Congressional reference cases were found legally unpersuasive in other sections of the Navy Report. Furthermore, the case law on reference cases requires that the Government be guilty of wrongful or negligent acts in order to have liability on broad equity grounds. There is no evidence that the Navy acted wrongfully or negligently in making any representations or in changing contract or homeport policies.

Claimants repeat their disagreement with the Navy on various quantum issues—e.g., what facility investments can be considered ''drydocking capacity'' investments; propriety of ADD's inclusion of facilities capital cost of money; propriety of claimants' inclusion of imputed profit; and propriety of ADD's application of a discount to proposed change order prices. Claimants state that they did not recover investment costs from the fixed price contracts awarded in the claim period because, in order to win competitions, they could not raise prices to a level that would result in cost recovery for facility investments. January 29 Submission at 97–112.

Facts: Claimants have not presented any evidence to demonstrate that any alleged unrecovered facility investment costs are attributable to decreased levels of work competed in the homeport or to below-cost bids for fixed price ship repair contracts rather than other causes (such as inefficiencies). Furthermore, each shipyard realized increased Navy work after the facility investments. From FY 1983–87, the dollar volume of Navy ship repair business in Jacksonville doubled and ADD experienced a significant increase in Navy work following the investment. From FY 1983–87, San Diego Navy ship repair business increased substantially. SWM Navy work significantly increased in FY 1987 and after. Prior to FY 1987, SWM sales did not increase due, in large part, to SWM's loss of small business status in February 1984. The damages suffered are highly speculative. ADD/SWM have not acknowledged any recovery of investment costs in $60,000,000 and $80,000,000, respectively, of fixed price Navy and commercial ship repair work in the claim period. The companies may have already recovered more than the booked depreciation costs of the investments. During the October 24, 1994, meeting with ASN(RDA), both claimants admitted that they have been profitable for the last few years, with the exception of loss years in 1993 and 1994 for SWM.

VI. REEXAMINATION SUMMARIZED

In its 1993 and 1994 submissions, SWM/ADD did not submit any new facts, issues, legal theories, or supporting documentation relating to Navy actions during the relevant claim period that were not analyzed as part of the 1992 Navy Report. Also, SWM's P.L. 85–804 request at that time was the same as the present request—formalization of an informal commitment or residual powers. The only new data submitted relates to SWM's P.L. 85–804 request for payment of $15,000,000—specifically, data on its current financial position and its 1993/94 ship repair workload. The 1992 Report fully and completely documented the facts, substantive differences of opinion between the parties, legal and equitable issues and analysis, including supporting documentation. The Navy's 1992 Report fully analyzed claimants' claim on legal entitlement and on certain equitable or ''fairness'' theories: P.L. 85–804, broad moral responsibility, equitable estoppel, and promissory estoppel. The Navy cannot find a basis to reach conclusions different from those in the 1992 Navy Report.

Based on the Navy's independent review of the record—that existing for the 1992 Navy Report and all additional information submitted after the 1992 Navy Report—the Navy finds no legal entitlement for the claims and no reason to grant relief to the claimants based on fairness.

VII. P.L. 85–804

As mentioned above, SWM has requested payment of $15,000,000 to allow SWM ''to reduce the long-term debt resulting from its facilities investment, which is contributing to its current serious cash flow problems,'' September 2 Submission at 4–5, pursuant to P.L. 85–804 (formalization of an informal commitment or residual powers).

Formalization of an Informal Commitment. FAR 50.302–3 provides: Under certain circumstances, informal commitments may be formalized to permit payment to persons who have taken action without a formal contract; for example, when a person, responding to an agency official's written or oral instructions and relying in good faith upon the official's apparent authority to issue them, has furnished or arranged to furnish supplies or services to the agency, or to a defense contractor or subcontractor, without formal contractual coverage. Formalizing commitments under such circumstances normally will facilitate the national defense by assuring such persons that they will be treated fairly and paid expeditiously.

No informal commitment shall be formalized unless the contractor submits a written request for payment within six months after furnishing, or arranging to furnish, supplies or services in reliance upon the commitment and the approving authority finds that, at the time the commitment was made, it was impracticable to use normal contracting procedures. FAR 50.203(d).

The 1992 Navy Report determined that these two conditions were absent. The Report stated that the facts ''do not involve an urgency, emergency or other situation that

precluded use of normal procurement procedures'' (at 64) and that SWM and ADD submitted their request for relief years after the investments and changes to Navy policies (at 95).

SWM argues that it would be unfair to hold it to the six month period because it believed that payment for facilities investments would occur in the future by being awarded additional contracts pursuant to the homeport and other policies. Only years later did SWM realize such contracts were not going to be awarded. However, the Navy does not have authority to waive this regulatory limitation or allow the six months to run from when SWM knew, or should have known, that the facts upon which it relied had changed. In any case, SWM knew years before 1987, when it first submitted its claim, that the ship repair policies had substantially changed. Therefore, there is no basis to find that SWM acted promptly under any reasonable standard.

Regarding the impracticability of normal contract procedures, SWM argues that the Navy does not normally contract for private shipyards' facilities improvements and there is no requirement to find an emergency or other urgent situation. However, FAR 50.203(d)(2) requires that the agency must make a finding that, at the time the commitment was made, it was ''impracticable to use normal contracting procedures.'' The subject matter of the informal commitment in question (e.g., private facility investments) is irrelevant to this regulatory limitation on formalization of informal commitments. While there is no specific regulatory requirement to find an emergency or other urgent situation, such time-sensitive situations are typical examples that can justify the impracticability of going through the often lengthy steps required to award a contract.

Residual Powers. Residual powers to enter into, amend, or modify a contract, or indemnify a contractor for unusually hazardous or nuclear risks, may be used ''when necessary and appropriate, all circumstances considered.'' FAR 50.401.

The 1992 Navy Report found that the circumstances of this case did not warrant finding that extraordinary contractual relief was necessary and appropriate or that such relief would facilitate the national defense. The Report found that there was no liability on a theory of promissory estoppel because Navy representations were too vague and uncertain, were merely projections of anticipated future work in the homeports, and never promised specific contracts or guaranteed additional work. There was no liability under an equitable estoppel theory because the Navy did not mislead the claimants by misrepresentations or by concealing material facts. Navy representations in the nature of predictions of future homeport workload were reasonable and true, at the time, based on existing policies, and the claimants' investments resulted in valuable capital improvements that led to additional ship repair work. Finally, the Report found that there was no basis for relief on a theory of broad moral responsibility because there was no wrongful or negligent Government conduct.

The only new circumstances presented by SWM in its new submissions is its alleged cash flow problems, i.e., that it will soon run out of credit; absent relief, SWM will probably be insolvent within ''a matter of weeks''; and insolvency may impact SWM's ability to complete Government contracts and ''may require drastic actions to protect the company's assets.'' September 2, 1994, Submission at 40–41. In support of its financial situation, SWM submitted a ''1994 Consolidated Forecast'' (Attachment 19), ''Projected Impact of $15,000,000 Relief Payment on Cash Flows For the Period 1994–1997'' (Attachment 52), and a Port of San Diego breakdown of workload from October 1, 1992, to September 30, 1993, (Attachment 49).

SWM states that its financial position is ''far worse'' than last April when its P.L. 85–804 request for losses under four Maritime Administration (MARAD) contracts was denied by the Department of Transportation Contract Adjustment Board (DOTCAB). SWM's request to DOTCAB was for a $5,500,000 amendment without consideration, on the basis that it may lose sufficient working capital and have to cease operation before it can process its claims pursuant to the Contract Disputes Act.

DOTCAB solicited the positions of affected agencies regarding SWM's essentiality to the national defense and whether granting relief would facilitate the national defense. The Coast Guard responded that SWM was not essential and its continued viability would not facilitate the national defense. MARAD responded in the negative to both issues. The Navy stated that it cannot conclude that SWM is essential to the national defense and:

The company provides a significant source of competition for depot level availabilities that require drydocking of Navy ships homeported in San Diego. The loss of Southwest Marine's drydocking capability could have an adverse effect on Navy ships homeported in San Diego from a cost and time standpoint as well as on the quality of life for the ships' crews and their families.

The Navy is mindful that ''[w]hether appropriate [extraordinary relief] action will facilitate the national defense is a judgment to be made on the basis of all the facts of the case.'' As we are not in possession of all pertinent facts and, equally important, because the matter is before the Maritime Administration and not the Navy, we offer no comment as to the advisability of granting Southwest Marine's request.

DOTCAB interpreted the Navy's letter as withholding an opinion on the question of whether granting relief (versus the continued viability of SWM) would facilitate the national defense; conveying that SWM is not essential to the national defense; and stating that the continued viability of SWM does aid and assist (i.e., facilitate) the national defense, because avoiding the adverse impact identified makes the Navy's tasks easier.

DOTCAB, in analyzing whether granting or withholding relief will affect SWM's ability to continue operations, found that SWM's actions have impaired its financial situation. SWM paid bonuses in 1993 to senior executives who, as a group, represented the four major stockholders (while aware of substantial losses being incurred under the MARAD contracts) and wrote off almost $5,000,000 in loans made to subsidiaries, both of which contributed to losses leading to default of the credit agreement with Wells Fargo Bank. SWM made a loan of $5,000,000 to its Chief Executive Officer for personal investment in another business, obtaining the funds in a transaction with its bank secured by SWM property—an impairment of SWM's ability to borrow further against its assets.

DOTCAB concluded that SWM was not essential to the national defense; that granting relief under P.L. 85–804 at that time would not facilitate the national defense; that SWM did suffer losses under the four MARAD contracts (although there is no finding as to the cause of the losses); and that it does not find that relief under the Contract Disputes Act is unavailable in sufficient time to continue SWM's viability.

Facilitation of National Defense. A prerequisite to granting relief under P.L. 85–804, including the use of residual powers, is the agency's determination that granting relief will facilitate the national defense. FAR 50.301 provides that ''[w]hether appropriate action will facilitate the national defense is a judgment to be made on the basis of all of the facts of the case.'' Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the impact on the Navy if SWM's operations were to cease due to financial difficulties.

Uniqueness or Essentiality of SWM's Capabilities. Based on Navy projections of ship repair requirements in San Diego through the year 2000, the Navy needs at least two drydocks and sufficient pier space to conduct up to 12 depot maintenance availabilities at any one time. NASSCO and SWM are the only two private shipyards in San Diego that have the capability to drydock all Navy ships, with the exception of the largest (CVs/LHA/LHDs). If SWM were to go out of business, the Navy would be able to meet the foregoing facility requirements in San Diego. The drydocking facilities of NASSCO and the Navy in San Diego are adequate to meet Navy projected repair requirements. NASSCO has a Navy-certified floating drydock (20,750 LT capacity). The Navy has the Naval Station graving dock (33,000 LT) and the Steadfast floating drydock (9,700 LT). In addition to this drydock capacity, four other contractors (apart from NASSCO and SWM) hold Master Ship Repair Agreements (MSRA) and three contractors hold Agreements for Boat Repair (ABR). Therefore, the continued viability of SWM as a ship repair company in San Diego is not essential for Navy operations or for industrial mobilization considerations.

Consequences if SWM Goes out of Business. If SWM were to cease operations, the Navy would lose the services of a ship repair firm with good facilities and performance record. The quality of SWM's piers and Navy-certified drydock is good. SWM's performance record, both past and current performance, on Navy ship repair contracts has been good. SWM is the San Diego shipyard with the most experience on AEGIS cruisers and destroyers. Unlike NASSCO, whose primary focus is on ship construction, SWM devotes its business to ship maintenance and modernization. Other examples of its experience include a successful completion of a major cruiser New Threat Upgrade, selection to support the USS *John Paul Jones* (DDG 53) shock trials, and award of the major amphibious ship (LPD/LSD) phased maintenance contracts in San Diego for the past five years.

Other effects should SWM cease operations include a decrease in competition and facilities available to perform homeport maintenance. There would remain only one private shipyard (NASSCO) with its own Navy-certified drydock capable of drydocking most Navy ships homeported in San Diego. Furthermore, if SWM's certified drydock were no longer available, the drydock capacity in San Diego would be significantly reduced. The Navy would have to award certain work sole source to NASSCO, if justifiable on a case by case basis; make the Navy's drydock or pier facilities available for purposes of achieving competition; or expand the solicitation area to include more distant facilities. The capacity of Government drydocks in San Diego is limited and making them available for competition would reduce their availability for emergent voyage repairs. Expanding the solicitation area could lead to contracts outside the homeport, with attendant costs of moving the ship and crew and negative affect on personnel quality of life. This could also cause a violation of Personnel Tempo (PERSTEMPO) Program Turn-Around-Ratio criteria, which could disrupt operations.

The following ships are, or soon will be, undergoing maintenance availabilities at SWM:

Contract No., ship, and completion date

N00024–89–C–8507, *Denver* (LPD–9), 10/28/94.

N00024–89–C–8507, *Duluth* (LPD–6), 1/06/95.

N00024–94–C–0057, *John Young* (DD–973), 12/16/94.

N62791–94—0103, LCM's (3), 10/14/94.

N62791–94–C–0108, *Peleliu* (LHA–5)[1], 12/09/94.

N00024–92–C–2802, *John Paul Jones* (DDG–53), 11/14/94.

N62387–93–C–3001, *San Jose* (T–AFS–7), 11/01/94; *Curtis Wilbur* (DDG–54), 12/19/94; *Fort McHenry* (LSD–43), 4/21/95; *Rushmore* (LSD–47), 4/21/95; *Cleveland* 4/28/95.

[1] The U.S.S. *Peleliu* is located at a Navy pier.

If SWM were to file for protection under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, work on these ships would be affected and operating schedules delayed. The work would be delayed until the Bankruptcy Court approved either an assumption of these contracts by SWM or Navy terminating the contracts. Although there would be delay and perhaps additional cost in completing these contracts, the negative impact on Navy operations could be accommodated.

Therfore, as concluded in the Navy response to DOTCAB (a conclusion that remains valid), ''loss of [SWM's] drydocking capability could have an adverse effect on Navy ships homeported in San Diego from a cost and time standpoint as well as on the quality of life for the ships' crews and their families.''

SWM Viability. SWM has not demonstrated that it cannot obtain further lines of credit to support its cash flow requirements. There is no substantiation that SWM will cease operations any time soon. SWM merely stated that it ''will probably be insolvent.''

DCAA Audit Report No. 4221–94J17600001 of January 26, 1994, which analyzed SWM's financial condition in relation to its P.L. 85–804 request before MARAD, found ''no adverse financial conditions which would preclude SWM from performing on its government contracts. Our audit disclosed relatively insignificant financial distress, and no indications of significant long-term problems.'' A basis for this opinion included audited 1994 business volume forecasts and projected cash flow resulting from this business volume. An updated financial capability audit of SWM, DCAA Audit Report No. 4151–94J17600007 of November 1, 1994, discloses ''no adverse financial conditions which would preclude it [SWM] from performing on its government contracts,'' and ''relatively insignificant'' financial distress with no ''indications of significant long-term problems.'' Regarding SWM's line of credit, SWM entered into an amended loan agreement with Wells Fargo Bank in June 1994. Although SWM may now be noncomplaint with the amended loan agreement's covenants on profitability and cash flow coverage, the bank has indicated that it will probably restructure the loan agreement. Accordingly, the audit concludes that SWM has demonstrated that it can work with the bank in resolving its needs.

Moreover, even if SWM's allegations of financial straits were accurate, granting the requested $15,000,000 relief would not necessarily result in SWM remaining a viable entity in San Diego. There is no evidence demonstrating that the amount and type of relief requested will satisfactorily resolve the alleged cash flow problems. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the amount requested related to SWM's financial viability. SWM has provided no explanation of the basis for requesting the $15,000,000 amount, i.e., how was it calculated? Nor is there any guarantee that SWM will not continue certain actions that DOTCAB found to have at least partly caused SWM's financial difficulties, such as granting bonuses to stockholders and writing off loans to subsidiaries.

Conclusion Regarding P.L. 85–804. Based on all of the foregoing considerations, it is not considered necessary to make a finding regarding ''facilitation of the national defense,'' and, although SWM's operations in San Diego are beneficial to the Navy, the Navy cannot find that granting the requested P.L. 85–804 relief to SWM is appropriate in this case.

VIII. CONCLUSION

the Navy finds no legal entitlement for the SWM/ADD claims and no reason to grant relief to the claimants based on fairness. Moreover, the Navy cannot find that granting the requested P.L. 85–804 relief to SWM is appropriate in this case.

Contingent Liabilities: Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities because of claims for death, injury, or property damage arising from nuclear radiation, use of high energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the Contractor's insurance program were included in these contracts; the potential cost of the liabilities can not be estimated since the liability to the United States Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described in the indemnification clause. Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear armed missiles, experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives, or performance in hazardous areas.

Contractor:	*Number*
Hercules, Inc	1
Rockwell International Corp	2
Interstate Electronics Corp	1
Unisys Systems Corporation	1
Westinghouse Electric Corporation	4
Honeywell Incorporated	2
Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc	3
Raytheon Company	4
Kearfott Guidance & Navigation	4
Hughes Aircraft Company	4
Martin Marietta Defense Systems	8
General Dynamics Corps., Electric Boat Division	3
Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co	3
Hughes Missile Systems Company	1
Total	41

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Contractor: Various.

Type of action: Contingent Liability.

Actual or estimated potential cost: The amount the Contractors will be indemnified by the Government can not be predicted but could entail millions of dollars.

Service and activity: Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF).

Description of product or service: FY 1994 Annual Airlift Contracts.

Reference: ''Definitions of Unusually Hazardous Risks Applicable to CRAF FY 1994 and FY 1995 annual airlift Contracts'' are described on pages 50 and 51.

Background: Twenty-six contractors have requested indemnification under P.L. 85–804, as implemented by Executive Order 10789, for the unusually hazardous risks (as defined) involved in providing airlift services for CRAF missions (as defined). In addition, Air Mobility Command (AMC) has requested indemnification for subsequently identified contractors and subcontractors who conduct or support the conduct of CRAF mission. The contractors for which indemnification is requested are those to be awarded as a result of Solicitation F11626–92—R0030 and future contracts to support CRAF missions, which are awarded prior to September 30, 1994. The 26 contractors requesting indemnification are listed below:

CONTRACTORS TO BE INDEMNIFIED AND PROPOSED CONTRACT NUMBER

Air Transport International (ATN), F11626–93–D0037.

American Int'l Airways (CKS), F11626–93–D0038.

American Trans Air (ATA), F11626–93–D0035.

Arrow Air (ARW), F11626–93–D0039.

AV Atlantic (AVA), F11626–93–D0040.

Buffalo Airways (BVA), F11626–93–D0041.

Continental Airlines (COA), F11626–93–D0042.

Delta Air Lines (DAL), F11626–93–D0043.

DHL Airways (DHL), F11626–93–D0044.

Emery Worldwide (EWW), F11626–93–D0036.

Evergreen International (EIA), F11626–93–D0036.

Federal Express (FDX), F11626–93–D0035.

Hawaiian Airlines (HAL), F11626–93–D0045.

Int'l Charter Xpress (IXX), F11626–93–D0046.

Miami Air (MYW), F11626–93–D0047.

Northwest Airlines (NWA), F11626–93–D0035.

Private Jet (PVJ), F11626–93–D0048.

Rich International (RIA), F11626–93–D0036.

Southern Air Transport (SAT), F11626–93–D0035.

Sun Country Airlines (SCX), F11626–93–D0036.

Tower Air (TWR), F11626–93–D0051.

Trans World Airlines (TWA), F11626–93–D0050.

United Parcel Service (UPS), F11626–93–D0051.

US Air (USA), F11626–93–D0052.

World Airways (WOA), F11626–93–D0036.

Zantop International (ZIA), F11626–93–D0053.

Note: The same contract number may appear for more than one company because in some cases the companies are providing services under a joint venture arrangement.

Desert Shield/Storm showed that air carriers providing airlift services during contingencies and war require indemnification. Insurance policy war risk exclusions, or exclusions due to activation of CRAF, left many carriers uninsured—exposing them to unacceptable levels of risk. Waiting until a contingency occurs to process an indemnification request could result in delaying critical airlift missions. Contractors need to understand up front that risks will be covered by indemnification and how the coverage will be put in place once a contingency is declared.

Justification: The specific risks to be indemnified are identified in the applicable definitions. The Government will not incur a contingency liability as an immediate direct result of this advance indemnification approval; however, if the air carriers suffer losses or damages, exclusive of losses or damages that are within the air carriers' insurance deductible limits are not compensated by the contractors' insurance, the contractors will be indemnified by the Government. The amount of this indemnification can not be predicted, but could entail millions of dollars.

All of the 26 contractors are approved DoD carriers and, therefore, considered to have adequate, existing, and ongoing safety programs. Moreover, AMC has specific procedures for determining that a contractor is complying with government safety requirements. Also, the contracting officer has determined that the contractors maintain liability insurance in amounts considered to be prudent in the ordinary course of business within the industry. Specifically, each contractor has certified that its coverage satisfies the minimum level of liability insurance required by the Government. Finally, all

contractors are required to obtain war hazard insurance available under Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for hull and liability war risk. All but one contractor has obtained this coverage with the Federal Aviation Agency. The remaining firm will obtain it before receiving an Air Force CRAF contract. Additional contractors and subcontractors that conduct or support the conduct of CRAF missions may be indemnified only if they request indemnification, accept the same definition of unusually hazardous risks as identified, and meet the same safety and insurance requirements as the 26 contractors currently seeking indemnification.

Without indemnification, airlift operations to support contingencies or wars might be jeopardized to the detriment of the national defense, due to the non-availability to the air carriers of adequate commercial insurance covering risks of an unusually hazardous nature arising out of airlift services for CRAF missions. Aviation insurance is available under Title XIII for air carriers, but this aviation insurance, together with available commercial insurance, does not cover all risks which might arise during CRAF missions. Accordingly, it is found that incorporating the indemnification clause in current and future contracts for airlift services for CRAF missions would facilitate the national defense.

Decision: Under authority of P.L. 85–804 and Executive Order 10789, as amended, the request was approved on June 2, 1994, to indemnify the 26 air carriers listed above and other yet to be identified air carriers providing airlift services in support of CRAF missions for the unusually hazardous risks as defined. Indemnification under this authorization shall be affected by including the clause in FAR 52.250–1, entitled ''Indemnification Under P.L. 85–804 (Apr 1984),'' in the contracts for these services. This approval is contingent upon the air carriers complying with all applicable government safety requirements and maintaining insurance coverage as detailed above. The AMC Commander will inform the Secretary of the Air Force immediately upon each implementation of the indemnification clause.

Approval was also granted to indemnify subcontractors that request indemnification, with respect to those risks as defined.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, HEADQUARTERS AIR MOBILITY COMMAND MEMORANDUM DATED OCTOBER 11, 1994

Findings: By Memorandum of Decision dated June 2, 1994, SAF granted indemnification to contractors for unusually hazardous risks involved in providing airlift support for CRAF missions. A CRAF mission means airlift services ordered pursuant to CRAF activation or directed by Commander AMC for missions that are deemed to be substantially similar to, or in lieu of, those ordered under CRAF activation.

Contracted civil air missions in support of possible military operations in Haiti could expose contractors to unusually hazardous risks, specifically war risks, because of the hostile environment they will encounter. AMC is requesting the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to provide Title XIII insurance for contractors flying missions in support of potential Haiti operations. Based on experience with past contingencies, AMC/DOF advises that commercial insurance may not be available at reasonable rates. Consistent with the SAF approval, indemnification will apply to the extent that the risks are not covered by Title XIII insurance or other insurance. Participation of civil air carriers is essential to successful completion of the mission. Contractors can not be expected to absorb the liability for loss that could arise while performing operations in Haiti. Without indemnification, the ability to support the airlift mission will be jeopardized.

Determination: On September 14, 1994, it was determined that missions in support of possible military operations in Haiti will be in lieu of CRAF activation and that indemnification under P.L. 85–804 is necessary to protect contractors against unusually hazardous risks associated with such missions.

AIR MOBILITY COMMAND DETERMINATION SUPPORTING INDEMNIFICATION UNDER PUBLIC LAW 85–804

Memorandum for SAF/OS dated October 11, 1994, from AMC/CC, subject: Indemnification of Contractors and Subcontractors for Unusually Hazardous Risks Involved in Providing Airlift Support for Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) Missions (SAF Memorandum of Decision, June 2, 1994).

As the June 2, 1994, memorandum requires, on October 11, 1994, AMC/CC provided notice of implementation of the indemnification clause for civil air missions supporting military operations in Haiti. The AMC staff provided verbal notice to SAF/AQCO during the week of September 12, 1994. The clause was implemented only after air carriers requested indemnification, and after it was determined these missions would be in lieu of CRAF activation and would require indemnification to protect carriers against unusually hazardous risks as defined in the June 2, 1994, memorandum. The indemnified missions began September 19, 1994.

AMC has implemented the indemnification clause for five contractors. Four of them (American Trans Air, Tower Air, World Airways, and Sun Country Airlines) are on the original list of 26 air carriers approved in the June 2, 1994, memorandum. Three additional contractors (Express One, US Air Shuttle, and North American Airlines) received FY 1994 contracts containing the indemnification clause. The indemnification clause was implemented for one of them—North American Airlines.

Contractor: Various.

Type of action: Contingent Liability.

Actual or estimated potential cost: The amount the Contractors will be indemnified by the Government can not be predicted, but could entail millions of dollars.

Service and activity: Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF).

Description of product of service: FY 1995 Annual Airlift Contracts.

Reference: ''Definitions of Unusually Hazardous Risks Applicable to CRAF FY 1994 and FY 1995 Annual Airlift Contracts'' are described on pages 50 and 51.

Background: Twenty-nine contractors have requested indemnification under P.L. 85–804, as implemented by Executive Order 10789, for the unusually hazardous risks (as defined below) involved in providing airlift services for CRAF missions. In addition, Headquarters Air Mobility Command (HQ AMC) has requested indemnification for subsequently identified contractors and subcontractors who conduct or support the conduct of CRAF missions. The contractors for which indemnification is requested are those contracts awarded as a result of Solicitation F11626–94–R0001, and future contracts to support CRAF missions through September 30, 1995. The 29 contractors requesting indemnification are:

CONTRACTORS TO BE INDEMNIFIED AND CONTRACT NUMBER

Air Transport International (ATN), F11626–94–D0026.
Alaska Airlines (ASA), F11626–94–D0033.
American Airlines (AAL), F11626–94–D0029.
American Trans Air (ATA), F11626–94–D0026.
Arrow Air (ARW), F11626–94–D0030.
Atlas Air (GTI), F11626–94–D0031.
Buffalo Airways (BVA), F11626–94–D0034.
Continental Airlines (COA), F11626–94–D0035.
Delta Air Lines (DAL), F11626–94–D0036.
DHL Airways (DHL), F11626–94–D0037.
Emery Worldwide (EWW), F11626–94–D0027.
Evergreen International (EIA), F11626–94–D0027.
Express One (LHN), F11626–94–D0038.
Federal Express (FDX), F11626–94–D0026.
Int'l Charter Xpress (IXX), F11626–94–D0026.
Miami Air (MYW), F11626–94–D0040.
North American Airlines (NAO), F11626–94–D0041.
Northwest Airlines (NWA), F11626–94–D0026.
Rich International (RIA), F11626–94–D0027.
Southern Air Transport (SAT), F11626–94–D0026.
Sun Country Airlines (SCX), F11626–94–D0027.
Tower Air (TWR), F11626–94–D0044.
Trans World Airlines (TWA), F11626–94–D0043.
United Air Lines (UAL), F11626–94–D0045.
United Parcel Service (UPS), F11626–94–D0046.
US Air (USA), F11626–94–D0047.
US Air Shuttle (USS), F11626–94–D0048.
World Airways (WOA), F11626–94–D0027.
Zantop International (ZIA), F11626–94–D0049.

Note: The same contract number may appear for more than one company because in some cases the companies are providing services under a joint venture arrangement.

Desert Shield/Storm showed that air carriers providing airlift services during contingencies and war require indemnification. Insurance policy war risk exclusions or exclusions due to activation of CRAF left many carriers uninsured—exposing them to unacceptable levels of risk. Waiting until a contingency occurs to process an indemnification request could result in delaying critical airlift missions. Contractors need to understand up front that risks will be covered by indemnification and how the coverage will be put in place once a contingency is declared.

The specific risks to be indemnified are identified in the definitions. The Government will not incur a contingent liability as a direct result of this advance indemnification approval; however, if the air carriers suffer losses or incur damages as a result of the occurrence of a defined risk, and if those losses or damages, exclusive of losses or damages that are within the air carriers' insurance deductible limits are not compensated by the contractors' insurance, the contractors will be indemnified by the Government. The amount of this indemnification can not be predicted, but could entail millions of dollars.

All of the 29 contractors are approved DoD carriers and, therefore, considered to have adequate, existing, and ongoing safety programs. Moreover, HQ AMC has specific procedures for determining that a contractor is complying with Government safety requirements. Also, the contracting officer has determined that the contractors maintain liability insurance in amounts considered to be prudent in the ordinary course of business within the industry. Specifically, each contractor has certified that its coverage satisfies the minimum level of liability insurance required by the government. Finally, all contractors are required to obtain war hazard insurance available under Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for hull and liability war risk. All but one contractor has obtained, and is required to maintain, this coverage under the Federal Aviation Act. The remaining firms will obtain it before receiving an Air Force CRAF contract. Additional contractors and subcontractors that conduct or support the conduct of CRAF

missions may be indemnified only if they request indemnification, accept the same definition of unusually hazardous risks as defined, and meet the same safety and insurance requirements as the 29 contractors currently seeking indemnification.

Without indemnification, airlift operations to support contingencies or wars might be jeopardized to the detriment of the national defense, due to the non-availability to the air carriers of adequate commercial insurance covering risks of an unusually hazardous nature arising out of airlift services for CRAF missions. Aviation insurance is available under Title XIII for air carriers, but this aviation insurance, together with available commercial insurance, does not cover all risks which might arise during CRAF missions. Accordingly, it is found that incorporating the indemnification clause in current and future contracts for airlift services for CRAF missions would facilitate the national defense.

Therefore, under authority of P.L. 85–804 and Executive Order 10789, as amended, the request to indemnify the 29 air carries and other yet to be identified air carriers providing airlift services in support of CRAF missions for the unusually hazardous risks, as defined, was approved on September 30, 1994. Indemnification under this authorization shall be affected by including the clause in FAR 52.250–1, entitled ''Indemnification Under P.L. 85–804 (Apr 1984),'' in the contracts for these services. This approval is contingent upon the air carriers complying with all applicable Government safety requirements and maintaining insurance coverage as detailed above. The HQ AMC Commander will inform the Secretary of the Air Force immediately upon each implementation of the indemnification clause.

Approval was also granted to indemnify subcontractors that request indemnification, with respect to those risks as defined below.

DEFINITIONS OF UNUSUALLY HAZARDOUS RISKS APPLICABLE TO CRAF FY 1994 AND FY 1995 ANNUAL AIRLIFT CONTRACTS

1. Definitions:

a. ''Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) Mission'' means the provision of airlift services under this contract (1) ordered pursuant to authority available because of the activation of CRAF, or (2) directed by Commander, Air Mobility Command (AMC/CC), or his successor for missions substantially similar to, or in lieu of, those ordered pursuant to formal CRAF activation.

b. ''Airlift Services'' means all services (passenger, cargo, or medical evacuation), and anything the contractor is required to do in order to conduct or position the aircraft, personnel, supplies, and equipment for a flight and return. Airlift Services include Senior Lodger and other ground related services supporting CRAF missions. Airlift Services do not include any services involving any persons or things which, at the time of the event, act, or omission giving rise to a claim, are directly supporting commercial business operations unrelated to a CRAF mission objective.

c. ''War risks'' means risks of:

(1) War (including war between the Great Powers), invasion, acts of foreign enemies, hostilities (whether declared or not), civil war, rebellion, revolution, insurrection, martial law, military or usurped power, or attempt at usurpation of power;

(2) Any hostile detonation of any weapon of war employing atomic or nuclear fission and/or fusion, or other like reaction or radioactive force or matter;

(3) Strikes, riots, civil commotions, or labor disturbances related to occurrences under subparagraph (1) above;

(4) Any act of one or more persons, whether or not agents of a sovereign power, for political or terrorist purposes, and whether the loss or damage resulting therefrom is accidental or intentional, except for ransom or extortion demands;

(5) Any malicious act or act of sabotage, vandalism, or other act intended to cause loss or damage;

(6) Confiscation, nationalization, seizure, restraint, detention, appropriation, requisition for title or use by, or under the order of, any Government (whether civil or military or de facto), public, or local authority;

(7) Hijacking or any unlawful seizure or wrongful exercise of control of the aircraft or crew (including any attempt at such seizure or control) made by any person or persons on board the aircraft or otherwise acting without the consent of the insured; or

(8) The discharge or detonation of a weapon or hazardous material while on the aircraft as cargo or in the personal baggage of any passenger.

2. For the purpose of the contract clause entitled ''Indemnification Under P.L. 85–804 (APR 1984),'' it is agreed that all war risks resulting from the provisions of airlift services for a CRAF mission, in accordance with the contract, are unusually hazardous risks, and shall be indemnified to the extent that such risks are not covered by insurance procured under Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of other insurance, because such insurance has been canceled, has applicable exclusions, or has been determined by the government to be prohibitive in cost. The government's liability to indemnify the contractor shall not exceed that amount for which the contractor commercially insures under its established policies of insurance.

3. Indemnification is provided for personal injury and death claims resulting from the transportation of medical evacuation patients, whether or not the claim is related to war risks.

4. Indemnification of risks involving the operation of aircraft, as discussed above, is limited to claims or losses arising out of events, acts, or omissions involving the operation of an aircraft for airlift services for a CRAF mission, from the time that aircraft is withdrawn from the contractor's regular operations (commercial, DOD, or other activity unrelated to airlift services for a CRAF mission), until it is returned for regular operations. Indemnification with regard to other contractor personnel or property utilized or services rendered in support of CRAF missions is limited to claims or losses arising out of events, acts, or omissions occurring during the time the first prepositioning of personnel, supplies, and equipment to support the first aircraft of the contractor used for airlift services for a CRAF mission is commenced, until the timely removal of such personnel, supplies, and equipment after the last such aircraft is returned for regular operations.

5. Indemnification is contingent upon the contractor maintaining, if available, non-premium insurance under Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act and normal commercial insurance, as required by this contract or other competent authority. Indemnification for losses covered by a contractor self-insurance program shall only be on such terms as incorporated in this contract by the contracting officer in advance of such a loss.

Contractor: Boeing Defense and Space Group, Seattle, WA.

Type of action: Contingent Liability.

Actual or estimated potential cost: The amount the Contractor will be indemnified by the Government can not be predicted, but entail missions of dollars.

Service and activity: Department of the Air Force, AFMC/CC.

Description of product or service: Inertial Upper Stages (IUS) Program.

Background: Boeing Defense and Space Group, Seattle, WA, has requested indemnification for themselves and their major subcontractors, United Technologies Chemical Systems Division (CSD), and Lockheed Missiles & Space Company (LMSC), under P.L. 85–804, as implemented by Executive Order 10789, for the unusually hazardous risks as defined below. This indemnification request is applicable to performance of contract F04701–91–C–0011. An accident resulting from launch or landfall of the IUS or its components could be catastrophic.

The Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) has reviewed Boeing's safety program and deemed it to be in compliance with the applicable safety requirements and acceptable for performance of this contract. In addition, Boeing currently has insurance coverage in force, and complete details of the exclusions and deductibles are contained in the schedule attached to their request. The cognizant ACO has reviewed the insurance policies and found them satisfactory and reasonable under normal business conditions. No significant changes in these insurance coverages are expected to occur during the course of this contract, except for annual updates of insurance in force and monetary limits. If the dollar value of coverage varies by more than 10 percent from that stated in the schedules provided, the contractor shall immediately submit to the contracting officer a description of the changes. It was found that the insurance coverage identified in the schedules represents an appropriate level of financial protection to permit indemnification.

Justification: The specific risks for this indemnification of Boeing have been identified below. No actual cost to the Government is anticipated as a result of the actions to be accomplished under a memorandum signed by the Secretary of the Air Force on November 4, 1994. However, if the contractor suffers losses or incurs damages as a result of the occurrence of a risk as defined below, and if those losses or damages, exclusive of losses or damages that are within the contractor's insurance deductible limits, are not compensated by the contractor's insurance, the contractor will be indemnified by the Government. It is recognized that the amount of this indemnification can not be predicted, but could entail many millions of dollars.

Aside from their importance to the IUS program, Boeing is a prime contractor for other major programs. A catastrophic financial impact on Boeing could have implications on their ability to produce launch vehicle upper stages, and ultimately on the existing defense system. Accordingly, it was found that the incorporation of an indemnification clause in this contract would facilitate the national defense.

Decision: Therefore, under the authority of P.L. 85–804 and Executive Order 10789, as amended, the indemnification of Boeing against those unusually hazardous risks, as defined below, to the extent claims arising thereunder are not covered by self-insurance or compensated by insurance coverage, facilitates the national defense was approved. Indemnification under this authorization shall be effected by including the clause at FAR 52.250–1, entitled ''Indemnification Under P.L. 85–804 (Apr 1984)'' and Attachment 1 in contract F04701–91–C–0011. This approval is contingent upon Boeing maintaining their aggressive safety program and current insurance coverage.

Boeing has requested indemnification be extended to their major subcontractors, United Technologies Chemical Systems Division (CSD), and Lockheed Missiles and Space Company (LMSC), with respect to the same

risks as defined below. Approval to indemnify these subcontractors was granted exclusive of any insurance coverage amounts provided the contracting officer approves inclusion of the clause in each subcontract. This approval may only be granted in the case where the contracting officer determines that the subcontractors' insurance coverage represents an appropriate level of financial protection, and that, based upon a safety inspection, the subcontractors adhere to good safety practices.

DEFINITION OF UNUSUALLY HAZARDOUS RISKS CONTRACT F04701–91–C09911 (APPLICABLE TO BOEING DEFENSE AND SPACE GROUP, UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CHEMICAL SYSTEMS DIVISION, AND LOCKHEED MISSILES AND SPACE COMPANY ONLY)

For the purpose of contract clause entitled ''Indemnification Under Public Law 85–804 (APR 1984),'' it is agreed that all risks resulting from, or in connection with:

a. The burning, explosion, or detonation of launch vehicles or components thereof during preparation, casting, and testing of Solid Rocket Motor (SRM) propellant, shipment of SRMs, launch processing liftoff or flight, abort landing or subsequent return of the Inertial Upper Stage (IUS) to the launch site; and

b. The landfall of launch vehicles or components or fragments thereof, are unusually hazardous risks, unless it is proven that the contractor's liability arose from causes entirely independent of the design, fabrication, testing or furnishing of products or services under this contract.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

576. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the calendar year 1994 report on ''Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense,'' pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1434; to the Committee on National Security.

577. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Environmental Response Task Force, transmitting a report of the Defense Environmental Response Task Force for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on National Security.

578. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95–08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

579. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Brazil (Transmittal No. 15–95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

580. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an update of events in Haiti (Operation ''Uphold Democracy'') consistent with the War Powers Resolution to ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed regarding events in Haiti (H. Doc. No. 104–50); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

581. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the 1994 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

582. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

583. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

584. A letter from the Vice President and General Counsel, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

585. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the financial audit for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1994, together with the auditor's opinion, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(47), 1103; to the Committee on Judiciary.

586. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report addressing the deficit entitled ''Budgetary Implications of Selected GAO Work for FY 1996'' (GAD/OCG–95–2); jointly, to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Budget.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 1288. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to permit Governors to limit the disposal of out-of-State solid waste in their States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLEMAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONDUIT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORD, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRISA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YATES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1289. A bill to require in certain circumstances that States disclose the HIV status of newborn infants to legal guardians of the infants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 1290. A bill to reinstate the permit for, and extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of, a hydroelectric project in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 1291. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the provisions of law preventing Members of Congress from sending mass mailings within the 60-day period immediately before an election be expanded so as to prevent Members from mailing any unsolicited franked mail within that period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform

and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 1292. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to aliens and nationality, as title 8, United States Code, ''Aliens and Nationality''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to rules governing litigation contesting termination or reduction of retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 1294. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Army from modifying water control policies in a manner which would interfere with the use of navigation channels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BONO, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1295. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. HORN, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 1296. A bill to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 1297. A bill to promote a new urban agenda, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Science, Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Government Reform and Oversight, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. Thomas (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to exempt fluid milk standards of the State of California from preemption in order to guarantee the same high quality fluid milk to the consumers of California that they have received since 1961; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain charitable risk pools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BURR, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COX, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the export of new drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. HOKE):

H.R. 1301. A bill to establish the American Heritage Areas Partnership Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WISE (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YATES, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 1302. A bill to establish the Capital Budget Commission; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request) introduced a bill (H.R. 1303) for the relief of John T. Monk; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 29: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 65: Ms. DANNER and Mr. COX.

H.R. 103: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FOX, Mr. WILSON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 104: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 107: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 116: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HORN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KIM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 125: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 218: Mr. BONO.

H.R. 248: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 303: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 329: Mr. FUNDERBURK.

H.R. 359: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 467: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 497: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 528: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 580: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 592: Mr. BONO and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 605: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 661: Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 682: Mr. LAHOOD and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 698: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 743: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 769: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 777: Mr. ABERCOMBIE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROGERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COOLEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 778: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROGERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COOLEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 779: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 780: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 782: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 789: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 820: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 842: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KLINK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BONO, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. NEY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. DORNAN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 893: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 896: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LOWEY, and Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 914: Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 934: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 935: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 990: Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 995: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 996: Mr. ALLARD and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1010: Mr. JACOBS, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1020: Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 1023: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1033: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FRISA, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1044: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1056: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1085: Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 1103: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1114: Mr. ROSE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1143: Mr. KIM, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1144: Mr. KIM, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1145: Mr. KIM, Mr. EVANS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BONO, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1244: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. NADLER.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. BONO.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. MANTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. REED.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. Res. 21: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 39: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H. Res. 97: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 390: Mr. STARK.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *104th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1995 *No. 53*

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 16, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our prayer this morning will be delivered by our former beloved Chaplain.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

In a moment of silence, let us remember Chick Reynolds, from our official reporters office, who is very ill.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.—Psalm 46:1.

Loving Father, this a place of great power, and powerful people often suffer in silence. They grieve alone, weep alone, confront personal inadequacy alone. Our culture does not permit people of power to admit weakness or vulnerability. We pray for those who may be hurting. Where there is alienation, bring reconciliation; where there is illness, bring healing; if there be a child in trouble, restore that one to the family; where there is financial difficulty, provide out of Thy boundless resources; where there is grief, give comfort.

Dear God, give us grace to be kind to one another. Help us to be sensitive and caring. Let Thy love be shed abroad and Thy peace rule in our hearts. In the name of Him who was love incarnate. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this morning, the leader time has been reserved and the Senate will immediately resume consideration of S. 4, the line-item veto bill. In accordance with the consent agreement reached last night, the cloture vote on the majority leader's substitute amendment to S. 4 will occur at 6 p.m. this evening. All Senators should be aware that there are several pending amendments to the substitute. Therefore, rollcall votes may occur throughout the day today.

Also, the majority leader has indicated that a late night session can be expected in order to complete action on the line-item veto bill this week.

LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, under the order, the freshmen have an hour reserved this morning to talk about the line-item veto. I am happy to join in that.

The first to present views will be the president of the class, the Senator from Oklahoma.

I yield him as much time as he may consume.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding this time on this very significant subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have been listening attentively to the discussion that has been taking place in the Chamber on the line-item veto. I think there may be some misconceptions floating around as to who really wants a line-item veto and how much they want it, and who perhaps does not want it.

I have heard over and over again, as I was sitting in the chair where the President pro tempore is presiding, Senators standing up and saying, ''Our President, President Clinton, wants the line-item veto. We need to give it to him so he will have the ability to veto those items and spending bills that are out of line.''

I suggest that, even though the President has made the statement, ''I want a strong line-item veto bill and I want it very soon,'' that that is the same thing he said about a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. And we were to find out later that he was the one who led the opposition to the balanced budget amendment on the telephone, lobbying those Democrats who had previously committed themselves to a balanced budget amendment. I suggest this may even be happening today.

The reason I say that, Mr. President, is not to make an attack on President Clinton or to question anything that he has said. But the idea of the President having the ability to use this new device, a line-item veto, to take top spending things, pork items, out of a bill does not seem to make any sense to me.

If you look back to 1993, when President Clinton came up with his budget and tax hike, it was characterized by many people, including PATRICK MOYNIHAN, as the largest tax increase in the history of public finance or anyplace in the world. It was a $267 billion tax increase, with all kinds of spending increases. The taxes went back retroactively to January of 1993, and that is the first time I can remember that happening. It increased the top rate to 36 percent. Then it went in and started taxing Social Security recipients.

Now, this was kind of interesting because in arguing against the balanced budget amendment, they were trying to use Social Security as the argument against the balanced budget amendment when in fact this President in 1993 increased dramatically the taxes on Americans' Social Security. Of course, it was not a good argument anyway, because if we do not do something to get the budget under control,

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

whether we use the balanced budget amendment or line-item veto or anything else, there will not be anything left in Social Security anyway in another 15 years.

In that same bill, he increased the taxes on gasoline by 4.3 percent. He increased the corporate rate up to 36 percent. And in spite of all the increases in taxes, 267 billion dollars' worth, it would increase the debt by $1.4 trillion over a 5-year period.

My question would be: Would he have line-item vetoed any of those items? No, because this was his bill.

Then he came out with the stimulus plan. This was a $16.3 billion increase in spending, with all kinds of pork. I was very happy that a filibuster, led by Senator DOLE, was successful in giving him his first defeat.

But if you look at what he tried to pass—a $1 billion summer jobs program; $1.1 billion for a variety of items, such as AIDS and food distribution; a $1.2 billion subsidy to Amtrak and to subways and light rail packages that are located in the districts of certain friendly people, I suspect; a $2.5 billion pork-barrel bunch of items—swimming pools, parking lots, ice rink warming huts, an Alpine ski lift, and other pork-barrel projects.

Now, the question is, if this had passed and he had the ability to use a line-item veto, would he have done it? No. The answer is a resounding no, because this is what he was promoting.

So, I think that we need to look at this in a little different context, and that is, we are going to have one of two different kinds of Presidents of the United States. Either we are going to have one like President Clinton, who is the biggest tax-and-spend President in contemporary history, or in a couple of years, when this agony is over, we are going to have a conservative President.

Now, regardless of whether we have a Democrat or Republican, or a conservative or liberal, a line-item veto is very helpful to us. Because if it is a liberal President who is for taxing and spending, such as our current President, then this takes away his excuse for signing big spending bills.

What have we seen historically in this country? We have seen bills coming in with 25, 30, or 50 items unrelated to each other, all this pork, such as that which was included in his stimulus bill, and he says—

> I have to sign it, because if I do not, we will not get the veterans' cost-of-living adjustments or we will not get a Social Security adjustment, or something that people want, and that is good and is consistent with the philosophy and the desires of a majority serving in both bodies.

So this would take away the ability of someone who is trying to use that for an excuse to pass pork-barrel legislation so that he could not do it, and would make him accountable.

Let us say we have a conservative President. It would work equally well there, because a conservative President could go through and he could line out this pork stuff and could send it back for an override.

I will conclude by saying that we often overlook the real reason for a line-item veto. It is not that it is going to be the cure-all. It is not going to balance the budget. It is not going to do all these things.

It is a vehicle to be helpful. However, what it does do is make the President and the House and the Senate accountable. If we have a liberal President or a conservative President, that President will have to be accountable for his acts, because with this ability to line out items and veto specific items, a President can no longer say that he has to do it.

Then the glorious thing about it is it goes to the House or the Senate and there is a veto attempt to override, and that way we have to go on record—Members of the House, Members of the Senate, and the President.

None of those now have to be accountable to the people back home. I have often said, none of this silliness, the foolishness that goes on in Washington would happen if people were held accountable for their acts. That is exactly what the line-item veto would do. So regardless of what kind of President we have, regardless of the philosophy of Congress, a line-item veto does make Congress accountable. And that serves the American people best.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me simply say I endorse this notion of accountability. If there is anything that is necessary in this Government and something that this bill will help to do, it is accountability.

I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I appreciate the indulgence of my friend, Senator GRAMS, from Minnesota, who has let me jump ahead to speak.

I have just two major points to make here this morning. One of the reasons I wanted to come down here, one of the reasons the freshmen were so excited about talking about this line-item veto bill, because this is actually a bill where the Senate version of the Contract With America bill is actually stronger than the House version. The Senate bill is actually a tougher bill, is actually a bill that goes after more spending, that provides more power, in fact, to the President, to keep Congress in check here of providing pork or other kinds of preferential treatment to selected individuals or institutions in this country.

That is an exciting thing to stand here on the Senate floor and argue for. I am very pleased with the work that was done by the folks here, Senator DOMENICI, Senator MCCAIN, Senator COATS, and Senator STEVENS, in putting this bill together. It is a stronger bill.

It does not just go after appropriations or annual appropriations, which all the traditional line-item veto bills have done. But it goes after what are called tax expenditures, or tax provisions that are targeted at specific individuals or specific companies. It does not go after tax cuts. It allows tax cuts to go into place without threat of Presidential lining out, but it does go after sort of those favored treatment things, those little goodies that have slipped into tax bills that heretofore have never been included in any line-item veto proposal.

It goes after entitlement spending. New entitlement spending is now separated out so we can have an opportunity to go after that which has never before been done. This is a much better bill, one that I think everyone can be supportive of, and I think we will get strong support.

My final comment is I just hope that this institution does not disintegrate, as it did on the balanced budget amendment, into playing partisan politics on things that people in the past have agreed to. I have a list of Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who, in the last 4 or 5 years, have voted consistently in many cases for line-item veto bills, for bills similar to this one—like the Bradley bill a few years ago, which got, I think, 16 Democratic supporters.

This is a bill that should and was drafted to attract bipartisan support. If this bill does not succeed on cloture today—if we have a cloture vote today, which I anticipate, I guess we will—if it does not succeed, it is not because the other side does not agree with what we are doing. It is because the other side does not agree to do anything and they want to play partisan politics and put partisanship above policy and the better future for our children and for this country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would just like to say briefly, I think it is significant that the freshmen have joined together in the Senate to come to speak again on this issue. Most have indicated our support. I think this is a demonstration of those who are newly elected who are taking a look, first, at what the voters said in November; and second, are not encumbered by the debates that have gone on here before, but rather are interested in making some changes in process so that there can be changes in results.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments during this very important debate over the line-item veto to remind my colleagues here in the Senate of the revolution that is taking place next door.

In the House Chamber, our colleagues are making history. They are throwing out 40 years of bloated, irresponsible government and replacing it with new

ideas, a new spirit, a new partnership with the American people.

They have passed the balanced budget amendment in the House. They have passed regulatory relief and legal reform. They have voted to strengthen our national defense, to crack down on crime, and to rein in Government spending.

In fact, so far, they have passed every piece of legislation they promised to pass in the Contract With America. At the breakneck pace the House is keeping, our colleagues there will meet their self-imposed 100-day deadline and still have a week to spare.

People back home ask me what it is like to be part of this revolution. I say, ''I don't know, because I am in the Senate.'' The House is passing history, and too often all we seem to be passing is time.

We would like to tell ourselves we are the more deliberative body, that here in the Senate, passion is tempered by prudence. Nobody is going to ride roughshod over the Senate, we boast. But not meeting our responsibilities is not a new definition of being deliberative. Maybe what we are doing is exactly what our Founding Fathers intended Congress to do. But maybe, though, some just did not hear the message in November, when Americans took the promises of the Contract With America with them to the polls, and there they cast their ballots for change.

''But I did not sign any contracts. I haven't even read it,'' I heard some of my Senate colleagues protest. Maybe not. But he might just as well have, Mr. President, because when the American people think about the U.S. Congress, there is no thick, black curtain separating the House from the Senate. They just see Congress, and it is Congress as a whole—not just the House of Representatives, not just House Republicans—that will be held to the promises in the contract.

Of course, if the American people seem a little suspicious when it comes to our promises, well, maybe they have a right to be. We have already let them down once this year. The first plank in the contract, the Fiscal Responsibility Act, calls for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The House passed it, but the Senate voted it down. Even though 85 percent of the American people said they wanted it, and said our financial future may depend on it, we voted it down.

The voters have a right to be furious. They thought we had promised a balanced budget amendment. Now, how can we possibly explain that it was really the House, not the Senate, without sounding a lot like political trickery?

Try to explain that Congress as a whole does not have to balance its budget, that somehow Congress is special, or it can act irresponsibly and it does not affect the taxpayers of this country.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act now also calls for a line-item veto. Again, a vast majority of Americans, 64 percent of them, consider the passage of a line-item veto as a high or a top priority. It is one of the bold print provisions of the Contract With America—a nonretractable promise—and it, too, has already passed in the House. But like the balanced budget amendment, it may also face trouble here in the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, whether they like it or not, Senate Republicans are tied to the legislative coattails of the Contract With America right alongside our House colleagues, because it is what Americans want Congress to do.

Senate Democrats will be held accountable as well, because for the most part, the American people do not care whether a certain piece of legislation is a Republican bill or whether it is a Democratic bill. They care about legislation that is going to help their families and protect the future for their children and their grandchildren.

Now, the line-item veto is one of those bills, a bill that is not about politics, a bill that is simply about doing the right thing. If we do our job right, young people will someday hear stories about how the revolution of November 8, 1994, transformed the Nation. Old timers will look back to this Congress and wonder at the courage that it took to effect such a tremendous change. Or maybe the 104th Congress will go down in history as one-termers who promised change but failed to deliver.

If the line-item veto and the $500 per child tax credit go the way of the balanced budget amendment, you can guess what the history books will be saying about us.

Mr. President, this is your contract, this is my contract, this is America's contract, and whether my Senate colleagues signed it or not, this is their contract, too.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, the tree of liberty is nourished by elections, which water and grow the process of good government. Last November, we got a real shower. The people of the United States of America said that they wanted us to change the way we do business in Washington, DC. They wanted us to live by the laws that we established for others, and so we provide for congressional accountability. They wanted us to stop telling State governments and city councils how to spend their money. Soon, S. 1 will be signed into law by the President. But there is another very important aspect of what the people told us. They said they wanted us to live within our means, like every household must live within its means.

Last month, we failed to pass the balanced budget amendment. It was a tragedy, but that was the loss of a battle, not the war. Now, the American people are waiting—and the world community is waiting—to see whether or not we, as a government, will live within our means, as well as embrace the kind of tools which will allow us to get the job done.

Every kitchen table in America has a line-item veto, Mr. President. We sit down with the resources we have and we look at the list of things we would like to buy, and we scratch off the things we can't afford. That is the line-item veto. It is that simple.

It means nothing more than saying that we will not spend money we do not have, and we will mark through things which we cannot afford. Unfortunately, the U.S. Congress has never seen it that way. We send the President a great big wish list and indicate that he has to either throw away the entire list or else sign it into law. Ridiculous. Few Americans would approach the kitchen table and say, ''If we can't have the frills, we don't want the food.'' We all know that there are things, both good and bad, that we can't always afford.

So it is important for us to respond to the voters' desire to change the way Washington works. The American people have spoken. They have spoken clearly. It is time now for us to act.

Now, there are a variety of voices being raised against the line-item veto. While these voices are loud, they are also misleading. They have been saying that if we have the line-item veto or the balanced budget amendment, we will hurt Social Security.

Mr. President, the biggest threat to Social Security is a Nation which does not have the fiscal and financial integrity to address and deal with its national debt. When we force the President to have an all-or-nothing approach to the budgets we forward, we increase the likelihood of fiscal mismanagement.

This has several negative effects. First, it increases the interest that we pay to service the debt. A 1-percent rise in interest rates on the national debt costs us $35 billion a year. Second, it decreases confidence in the dollar. We saw what happened when we failed to pass the balanced budget amendment. When people are insecure about America's economy and about our fiscal discipline, they are less likely to finance our debt. In the end, it is our inability to meet these fiscal obligations that is the single greatest threat to Social Security.

Another argument against the line-item veto, Mr. President, is that it would impair the rights of children; that somehow, if we have fiscal integrity and financial management, we will hurt our children. The truth of the matter is that we are spending the yet unearned wages of the next generation today. We are destroying their future.

We are eroding the financial foundation of the country that they will ultimately lead. We are mortgaging their future, and it is wrong. We need a strong country that will provide a foundation and framework in which those children can be prosperous. The line-item veto would help do just that.

Mr. President, others have argued that we are eroding the Constitution. I, however, would argue that the Constitution came into existence as a protest against the improper taxation of Americans without representation. If we do not control spending, we are taxing the next generation. If we have a balanced budget and if we move toward it with a line-item veto, we are acting in a way that is entirely consistent with the actions and the intent of the Framers.

This is the U.S. Senate. It is not a packing house. This debate is not about the Constitution, it is a debate about whether we are a packing house, or a place of public policy.

So, we must recognize the voice of the people in their call for change. We must provide the President an opportunity to knock out inappropriate spending without vetoing an entire bill. We must protect Social Security with financial integrity. We must protect our children by not mortgaging their future. We must protect the idea of the Constitution by not taxing the next generation without representation. We must eliminate pork. We must, in the end, serve all the people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Ohio for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my strong support for the legislative line-item veto. The line-item veto will be a very effective tool in helping this country achieve a balanced budget.

Let us be clear, though, Mr. President. This is not some sort of magic potion that is going to solve all of our problems. We are going to be faced with very, very difficult choices that we as Members of the Senate and House will have to make in the upcoming months in regard to our budget. But while it is not a magic potion or magic wand, it is a reasonable, rational tool, a tool that will help us achieve this very important fiscal goal. This legislation will give the President the power most Governors already have, the power to cut wasteful spending items and special tax breaks out of the budget.

I believe, though, that this power which most Governors have today and which I hope the President will have after we pass this bill is valuable not because of what the Chief Executive actually vetoes. Rather, the true importance of the line-item veto lies in its value as a deterrent. I believe the passage of this bill will change the climate in which Congress operates just as it has affected the climate in which most of our State legislators operate.

Think of all the wasteful taxing and spending provisions that will never be included in legislation, never be included simply because Congress knows that the provision will not stand up to public scrutiny, will not stand up to scrutiny in the light of day.

This I believe is the real value of the line-item veto at the State level, and it would be equally valuable at the Federal level.

Talk to the Governors. My colleague from Missouri, who just sat down, was a Governor, and he outlined for us several days ago some of the provisions that he had to veto as a Governor and why he made those decisions and how he felt that was an effective tool. Governors I have talked to say the same thing.

When you really pin the Governors down, what they will tell you usually—it is what Governor Voinovich has told me—is that the value of the line-item veto is not so much in what they do veto but, rather, in the fact that the legislature does not put certain items in the bill because they know the Governor has that veto, and so that is really the true value, it is the value of the deterrent.

Frankly, I do not expect to see a huge number of vetoed items when we pass this legislation. We may, but I do not think so. The very existence of the line-item veto will prevent these items from ever being included in these bills in the first place.

Mr. President, I know there are some of our colleagues who are concerned that any form of a line-item veto would effectively transfer power from this body and from the House to the executive branch, to the President. I understand those concerns. But I think if we look at this from a historical point of view, what we will really find is that the passage of this legislation is merely restoring the balance of power to where it was many, many years ago.

As a practical matter, I believe passage of this bill will return us to the situation that originally existed in Congress when Presidents in the early days of this country were presented with simpler and shorter bills. I believe the Framers of the Constitution had that in mind when they wrote the Constitution, and when the original provision about the veto was put into law.

Over the last several decades, the Federal legislative process has really gotten out of hand. For too long the process has been distorted and perverted by the practice of enacting huge omnibus bills which the President is forced to accept or reject in their entirety. This historic change I believe has been for the worse.

Appropriations bills, tax bills, entitlement bills, the passage of these bills is followed, many times within a week or two, by a story in the paper outlining all the hidden projects, all the hidden provisions that somehow were put in a bill at the last moment, maybe in a conference committee. If these special projects or special tax breaks had to stand alone in the clear light of day, they simply would not withstand public scrutiny and, quite frankly, would never be included at all.

The line-item veto will help take us back to the original legislative process, an original legislative process in which we can count on the President to represent the national interest in deciding on the value of legislation. Today the President is hindered in this important constitutional duty. He must either accept or reject outright these huge taxing and spending bills that contain literally thousands of separate line items. Some of the line items, Mr. President, are necessary. Some are desirable but not necessary. Some are questionable, and some are downright indefensible. Congress regularly says to the President take it or leave it. If you think the national interest requires the passage of some of what is in the bill, you have to sign all of the bill.

By now we are all familiar with thousands of examples of Federal spending items, special tax breaks that would never have been approved if those responsible for them were truly held accountable to the American people. The line-item veto is tailor-made to solve this problem. Eleven former Presidents have endorsed it. Forty-three of our Nation's Governors have it, and it works. In 1992, the Cato Institute surveyed current and former Governors, and 92 percent of them believed that the line-item veto would help restrain Federal spending.

I think they are right. That is why I will be voting for the legislative line-item veto.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I think it is interesting and important that the newer Members of the Senate have come here today to talk about the line-item veto. They have talked about accountability, accountability in Government. Nothing can be more important than that.

They have talked about change, change based on issues, not change based on partisan political things.

They talked as well about responsibility of the President to take a look at these items as they are returned from Congress. They talked about the fact that families do this every day. Families have to set priorities. Families have to go through their budget and say here are some things that are less important than others, we cannot afford them all, and we have to line-item veto.

They have talked about business as usual, which I guess is a reasonable thing and predictable thing for new Members of the Senate to talk about because they have not been a part of business as usual. Indeed, they came here—having talked about these issues at home, having talked about them

with the voters—with a dedication to change. They talked about items that appear in large budgets that are passed because they are in large budgets, that would not pass on their own merits, that would not even be considered if they were to stand alone.

So I think it is important that this point of view be stressed. I think it is important this group of Senators who come with a little different view of the world, perhaps, in terms of not having been here, express their views in these particular areas.

We have the Senator from Michigan, who will be here shortly.

This is one of the items that does speak to change, one of the items that we have been considering and we are hopeful there will be passage of this week. We are hopeful that some accommodation will be made.

Let me talk a little bit, however, about the broader context, it seems to me, that line-item veto fits into. We have talked about it for a week. I suspect we will talk about it for much of this week. It has been talked about last year. It has been talked about in previous years. It is not a new item, not a new issue. We have talked about the details. Maybe it is useful to talk a little bit about how it fits into a broader context, and to understand that it does have something to do with the overall role of Government, the overall size of Government, the overall impact of Government on people's lives.

There is a legitimate difference. There is a legitimate reason to have debates about the things that go on here. There are those who believe more Government is better; that the Government should be expanded; that there should be more spending; that the Government should have more programs. There is another point of view, the one that I share, the one that I think was the message of this November's election. That is the Federal Government is too big and that it costs too much and that it is overly intrusive into all aspects of our lives.

That is a legitimate debate. In fact, that is the core of much of the debate that goes on here, what you perceive to be the role of Government and what, indeed, then, goes with that. If you see more Government, then there are going to be more regulations. If you see more Government there are going to be more taxes, or more debt, or both. But, in fact, if you see the role of Government as one of a referee, one whose primary responsibility is defense, and ensuring fairness, ensuring opportunity, then you see the Government as somewhat smaller, as something less intrusive. And that is really the underlying debate in much of what we talk about, the role of Government—and, of course, who pays for it.

That has been true in the procedural issues that we have talked about, the issues that have to do with changing the process, with changing the structure of the way decisions are made. Frankly, if you expect to have a different result you are going to have to do something different. If you want to continue to do everything in the same way as you have in the past, then the expectation is the results are going to be the same. If we continue to use the same process there is no reason to expect that the debt or the deficit is going to be smaller.

We will be voting this summer on a new debt limit. That new debt limit will be $5 trillion or more—$5 trillion debt. Each of us as citizens shares in that debt. The interest payment on that debt will soon be the second largest item, line item in the Federal budget. This year I think it is somewhere in the neighborhood of $260 to $265 billion interest on the debt. So the procedural things we have talked about have to do with changing the results.

The balanced budget amendment is a procedural change, one that in my view needs to be made. Line-item veto, another of those—not to balance the budget, it will not balance the budget—but it changes the character of budget considerations; it changes how you look; it changes some of the responsibilities.

We have to change budgeting, change it so we start from a base that is the same as last year's spending, not a baseline that goes up. That is what has caused much of the discussion around the country, that everything is being cut. The fact is it is not being cut. There was a group in my office yesterday talking about an educational program, about the cuts. The fact is the cut is 25 percent of the increase. It is not a cut. But based on budgeting it seems to be a cut. So we continue to spend more with the sort of notion that we have had a cut, and indeed we have not had a cut at all, we have had an increase.

These are the kinds of changes that do need to be made. Line-item veto needs to be there because things are done differently. Someone the other day on the floor showed an early—150 years ago—bill on appropriations: On one page. On the other hand, we looked at one that is 2½ pounds now.

My favorite story, of course, is always the Lawrence Welk Museum that is in the highway bill. In the House we had no opportunity to talk about the Lawrence Welk Museum. We did not want to vote against the highway bill. The Lawrence Welk Museum would have never gotten any attention at all had it had to stand on its own merit, but it was there and line-item veto is what that is all about.

So we do have big bills. We have big deficits. And the fact of the matter is it is difficult. All of us have a certain parochial interest. That is the way it is. I represent Wyoming. The President represents Vermont. We all have a parochial interest, and should. So we are for things that are for our State. It is very difficult to be against somebody else's proposal, because you want their help. That is a fact of life. It is a fact of life. So we do need a line-item veto. And there are pork-barrel activities.

So, Mr. President, it begins to be increasingly important that we do take a look at these structural changes. The argument that we do not need to change things, we can just change them because they should be changed—the evidence does not support that. How many years has it been since we balanced the budget—25? Maybe five times in 50 years? So that does not work.

Now is the time to make that tough decision. And we have an opportunity here to do that. We have an opportunity to pass a bill that has had support in this Chamber, more than enough to pass it, and now is the time.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Arizona for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding this time to me. I appreciate his work on trying to finally get this line-item veto passed.

Mr. President, I think most people agree that the top priority of the Federal Government today is to reduce the size of the budget deficit. Not to do so is to relegate all of us—especially our children—to a lower standard of living.

Balancing the Federal budget will not be easy. Some popular programs will have to be cut. Others will have to be eliminated as Congress finally begins to set priorities—to distinguish between needs and wants—just like families across America must do every day.

When a family runs short of money, it does not sacrifice food from the table or the roof overhead to go to the movies every weekend, to buy new furniture, or put a new stereo in the car. The choices that a family has to make are often far more difficult—whether to buy new clothes for the kids or supplies for school; whether to buy food or medicine; whether to fix the roof or repair the car. When resources are limited, the family eliminates the extras and then tries its best to meet its basic needs. Even that can be trying. The head of the household has to make tough choices that will not necessarily be very popular with the rest of the family, but that is what it takes to try to make sure the family can survive and prosper.

Like the family, the Federal Government cannot satisfy every want; it cannot even answer every need. With interest payments on the national debt eating up a substantial part of the Federal budget—about $300 billion this year alone—we are finding ourselves with less and less every year for many basic Government programs. Hurt most are those who are dependent upon Government services—the poor and the elderly—and our children and grandchildren whose future will be marked by a lower standard of living as they struggle to pay off the debts we are accumulating today.

The line-item veto is no panacea, but it is an important first step in gaining control over the budget.

Mr. President, this is the ''1995 Congressional Pig Book Summary,'' a list of 88 projects that will cost taxpayers more than $1 billion. Compiled by the nonpartisan organization, Citizens Against Government Waste, it represents just a fraction of more than $10 billion in pork-barrel spending that the group identified in last year's appropriations bills. These are the kinds of projects that are likely to be the target of a line-item veto: Russian wheat aphid and swine research; highway demonstration projects; civilian sporting events funded out of the defense budget; and a program that has used funds in the past for a golf video and pony trekking centers in Ireland.

These are the kinds of projects that are typically hidden away in annual spending bills. They are enough to demonstrate legislators' ability to bring home the bacon and curry favor with special interest groups back home. But, they usually don't amount to enough to prompt the President to veto an entire bill bringing large parts of the Government to a standstill in the process. The result, as Citizens Against Government Waste put it, is that it all adds up to a raw deal for taxpayers.

The line-item veto is designed to bring accountability to the budget process. Instead of forcing the President to accept wasteful and unnecessary spending in order to protect important programs, it puts the onus on special interests and their congressional patrons. It subjects projects with narrow special interests to a more stringent standard than programs of national interest. After a Presidential veto, the special interests would have to win a two-thirds majority in each House.

That is the shift in the balance of power which the line-item veto represents. It is a shift in favor of taxpayers, and it is long overdue. If the government were running a surplus, the taxpayers might be willing to tolerate some extra projects. But the Government is running annual deficits in the range of $200 billion for as far as the eye can see. There is no extra money to go around. There is not even enough to fund more basic needs.

Mr. President, when you find yourself in a hole, the first rule of thumb is to stop digging. Our Presidents have indicated a willingness to use the line-item veto—begin climbing out of the hole we have dug for ourselves and future generations. Let us pass the line-item veto.

Mr. President, I want to conclude by complimenting my colleague from the State of Arizona, Senator JOHN MCCAIN. He has worked for about 10 years in opposition to pork-barrel spending on the floor of the Senate. He accumulated what he calls an enviable record of defeat. Frequently, his efforts to cut out pork are defeated by almost 2 to 1. But he keeps at it, and over the years he figures that, while he may not have won every vote, his efforts to bring to light some of these projects may at least have prevented some Members from inserting this pork in the appropriations bill in the first instance because of the fear that they might be embarrassed if their special-interest projects are brought to light.

That is what the line-item veto would do. It not only gives the President the ability to line out projects that have been inserted, but it provides a disincentive for Members to put those projects in the bill in the first instance because now, with the President being capable of lining them out and bringing them to public attention, Members know that they had better be able to defend everything that they ask to be inserted into these bills.

So it has a good effect on Members and their constituents, who come to them asking for special interest projects to say, ''Maybe in the past, I would have been able to do this, and I would like to do it to be of help to you, but you know that if we do it, all of the world will know that the President could line it out, and then I would have to get two-thirds of my colleagues to override the veto. Do you really want that much public attention paid to this special project?''

So there is a deterrent effect, if you will, in the line-item veto. That is one of the things that JOHN MCCAIN has talked about when he has stumped for this proposal in the last 10 years. I think a great deal of credit goes to Senator COATS, Senator MCCAIN, and most recently, Senators STEVENS and DOMENICI, who had different points of view but got together with the supporters of this basic version of the line-item veto proposal to work out a compromise that is acceptable to virtually all.

The President is supportive of the line-item veto. All of the Republicans are ready to call an end to the debate at the appropriate time, and have a vote on the line-item veto. We certainly call on our colleagues from the other side of the aisle who support frugality in Government and understand we need to balance the budget and want to end pork-barrel spending to support us in this effort to vote for the line-item veto.

Mr. President, I see that my colleague from Tennessee, Senator FRIST, is here. I am sure he has some comments on the subject, as well. If the Senator from Wyoming is agreeable, I will yield at this time to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me first thank the Senator from Arizona and say that I have observed him in his work in the House. He has been a real supporter of change with the line-item veto and with the balanced budget amendment, and has been a leader in the House, and continues to be that.

I now yield for 4 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to commend Senator THOMAS and Senator SANTORUM for leading the charge of the 11 freshmen Senators in support of the line-item veto. It is important that the newest Members of this body continue to voice the message from Americans on November 8.

Mr. President, no single measure would do more to restore fiscal sanity to our budget process than the line-item veto. We, like our Republican colleagues in the House, must continue to push for reforms that will bring real change to the way business is done in Washington. There is no doubt in my mind that the press and defenders of the status quo will think of all kinds of reasons why the line-item veto is not a good idea. But the truth of the matter is, the President must be provided with precise tools to control Congress' insatiable appetite for spending the taxpayer's money.

Mr. President, I understand that in years past, Democrat opponents of the line-item veto charged that the Republican support of the concept was a partisan power grab. The thought was that the Republicans in Congress, then in the minority, wanted to transfer power to their Republican President. And now, a Democrat President supports the measure, but there is still staunch opposition.

Now the opponents claim that enactment of the line-item veto would be an unprecedented power shift. In fact, the President had the power to stop unnecessary spending, through a process called impoundment, until the Congress stripped the Presidency of this power in 1974. Granting a line-item veto is not unprecedented. Rather, supporters of the line-item veto want to restore the rightful budgetary powers of the President.

Opponents also claim that the line-item veto will not work. Well, Mr. President, that is just not true. Forty-three of our Nation's Governors have this power, and they have shown over and over again that they can and do save money with this tool.

Mr. President, again, I strongly support this measure, and I urge the Members of this body to join the 11 freshmen in our strong support for the Dole substitute.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, thank you very much for the time for this group to express its support of this issue.

It seems to me that we have an opportunity to make some decisions here. We are here as trustees for the American people, as trustees who have a responsibility to be financially responsible, fiscally responsible, and morally responsible for spending. The easier thing to do is to continue as we have. Now is the chance, however, to change.

To borrow from Robert Frost who said, ''Two roads diverged in the woods

and I chose the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference.''

This may be the road less traveled by, but it will indeed make all the difference.

Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 4, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Dole amendment No. 347, to provide for the separate enrollment for presentation to the President of each item of any appropriation bill and each item in any authorization bill or resolution providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits.

(2) Feingold amendment No. 356 (to Amendment No. 347), to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to limit consideration of non-emergency matters in emergency legislation.

(3) Feingold/Simon amendment No. 362 (to Amendment No. 347), to express the sense of the Senate regarding deficit reduction and tax cuts.

(4) Exon amendment No. 402 (to amendment No. 347), to provide a process to ensure that savings from rescission bills be used for deficit reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, is recognized to offer an amendment on tax expenditures, on which there shall be 45 minutes of debate, with 30 minutes for Senator BRADLEY and 15 minutes for Senator MCCAIN, the Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 403 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To modify the definition of targeted tax benefit)

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. ROBB, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 403 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, strike lines 13 through 20 and insert the following:

(5) the term ''targeted tax benefit'' means any provision which has the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a different treatment to a particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is limited by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers but such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, we begin this Congress with, I think, two obligations. The first is to change the way we do business, and the second is to cut Government spending. I think reform has been bottled up for years.

So, Mr. President, I believe now is the time to adopt a line-item veto and have the line-item veto applied both to tax expenditures and to appropriations. Two years ago, I introduced legislation that would give the President the authority to veto wasteful spending in both appropriations and tax bills. I reintroduced this line-item veto the very first day of this Congress, and its passage has been one of my highest legislative priorities. The separate enrollment approach that I adopted was modeled on the bill offered by Senator HOLLINGS and introduced several Congresses ago. I want to thank and commend Senator HOLLINGS for his leadership on that issue.

Therefore, I am pleased to see that our Republican colleagues have come to recognize the wisdom of the separate enrollment approach that Senator HOLLINGS and I have been championing for years. I also want to comment our colleagues across the aisle for taking steps to include tax expenditures in the line-item veto bill they introduced yesterday. The approach our Senate colleagues have taken toward tax expenditures is a significant improvement over the approach adopted by the House.

We need to be honest with the American public about the fact that for each example of unnecessary, pork-barrel spending through an appropriations bill, there are numerous, similar examples of such spending buried in tax bills. The Tax Code provides special exceptions from taxes that will total over $450 billion this year, more than double the entire Federal deficit and nearly one-quarter of total Federal spending. Because many of these Tax Code provisions single out narrow subclasses for benefit, the rest of us must pay more in taxes. How serious can we be about balancing the budget if we let billions in tax pork go virtually unchallenged each year?

Mr. President, I believe that our fellow Americans would be shocked if they knew some of the ways we spend money through the Tax Code. My favorite special-interest tax loophole is the roughly $100 million we will give away over the next 5 years to allow homeowners to rent their homes for up to 2 weeks without having to report any income. Word has it the provision was put in the Tax Code to benefit a rich homeowner who lived near the Masters Golf Tournament in Augusta, GA. The lucky man hit the jackpot every year by renting his house to tournament spectators for a small fortune, without having to declare any of this money as income.

Then there is the $12 million in tax subsidies that go to help producers offset the costs they incur to mine lead, asbestos, and uranium—deadly poisons we spend millions more to clean up. We also give away a cool $60 million a year to corporations that make electricity using plants and windmills. In addition, we generously allow U.S. citizens who work overseas to exclude $70,000 per year from their income taxes. Over the next 5 years, this loophole will cost the rest of us $8.6 billion.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I have seen an almost endless stream of requests for preferential treatment through the Tax Code. For example, the 1992 tax bill was littered with special exemptions. In that bill, we included a special accelerated depreciation schedule for rental tuxedos at a 5-year cost of $44 million to the rest of us. We also provided special accounting rules for the owners of cotton warehouses and created an special tax exemption for custom firearms manufacturers and importers. Over the years, I have been presented with hundreds of other requests, including exemptions from fuel excise taxes for crop-dusters and tax credits for clean-fuel vehicles.

There are obvious reasons why the American public knows so little about these loopholes. They are often written in complicated language and buried deep in the Tax Code. In addition, unlike appropriated spending, which is reviewed every year, once a tax loophole becomes law, it rarely sees the light of day. In fact, according to a recent GAO study, almost 85 percent of the 1993 tax expenditure losses were attributable to tax expenditures that were enacted before 1950, and almost 50 percent of these losses stem from tax expenditures enacted before 1920.

Reducing the deficit will require leadership, not gimmicks. In passing a line-item veto bill, we must demonstrate this same type of leadership. Sadly, I note that the line-item veto proposal passed by the House resorts to what I would describe as a mere gimmick. By defining ''targeted tax benefits'' to include only those loopholes that benefit ''100 or fewer taxpayers,'' the House has forfeited an opportunity to address the impact that tax loopholes have on our Nation's continuing budget crisis.

Mr. President, obviously, there are plenty examples of the so-called rifle shot tax giveaways. In 1988, the Philadelphia Inquirer ran a series of articles which identified billions of dollars worth of tax loopholes in the 1986 and 1988 tax bills. As stated in that series, these loopholes included special provisions for some trucking companies but not others, for some insurance companies but not others, for some utilities but not others, for some universities but not others. Of course these special provisions should be subject to a potential veto. However, these rifle shots are not the only examples of wasteful spending through the Tax Code; there

are plenty of other examples which benefit more than 100 taxpayers.

In fact, of all of the loopholes that I described earlier, not even one could be determined to benefit 100 or fewer taxpayers. The income exclusion for home rentals at the Masters Golf Tournament could benefit more than 100 taxpayers. The tax subsidies given to corporations that mine lead, asbestos, and uranium could benefit more than 100 taxpayers. The tax subsidies for electricity production from windmills and plants could benefit more than 100 taxpayers. And, the tax giveaways to citizens who work overseas benefit more than 100 people. Therefore, under the House version of this bill, none of these tax loopholes would be subject to a potential line-item veto if they were created today.

In addition to the fact that the House definition of a targeted tax benefit would allow billions of dollar in tax expenditures to go unchecked, that definition leads to a number of practical problems. Under the House version of the line-item veto, in order to veto pork in a tax bill, the President would first have to determine that the loophole would benefit 100 or fewer taxpayers. No one knows how the President would make such a determination. As far as I am aware, no Federal agency keeps track of how many taxpayers benefit from individual tax expenditures. Although this may seem surprising, it is understandable given that many tax expenditures consist of exclusions from income, rather than simple deductions. As a result, information on the number of beneficiaries is not readily available. In fact, of the 25 largest tax expenditures, 14 provide exclusions from income rather than deductions. Although these are large and well known examples, there are other examples of income exclusions for which the information would not be readily available. Therefore, there is no easy way to determine how many taxpayers would benefit from a proposed tax expenditure. In addition, what would happen if the President vetoed a tax loophole only to find out later that he did not have such authority because the provision would have benefited more than 100 taxpayers?

Even if one could determine how many taxpayers would benefit from a particular loophole, it would be easy enough for any of the big dollar lobbyists that prowl the Halls of Congress to rework the loophole to make it vetoproof. Clearly, if lobbyists are sophisticated enough to insert a loophole into a tax bill in the first place, they will be more than sophisticated enough to ensure that the language is sufficiently broad that it escape a possible veto. Therefore, the ''100 or fewer'' definition will create a perverse incentive to make bigger and even more expensive loopholes just to avoid the veto.

I am pleased to note that the version of line-item veto offered in the Senate does not resort to the same gimmicks that the House used. The language in the line-item veto before us today would make subject to a potential Presidential veto all new and expanded tax expenditures which both lose revenue during the any period of the budget window and have ''the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared to other similarly situated taxpayers.''

Yesterday, Senator DOMENICI stated that this language would subject to a potential veto all tax expenditures which particular companies, businesses, or taxpayers relative to other taxpayers. I agree that this provision would allow the President to veto new tax subsidies for individual companies and industries such as the ethanol industry, small oil and gas producers, dairy farmers, owners of cotton warehouses, and the like. However, I am concerned that the version offered by our Republican colleagues may lead to confusion and gaming. Although I believe that the language offered as part of the Republican substitute to S. 4 is very broad, a few of our colleagues have indicated that it might be narrower than the language itself would suggest. In my mind, the term ''when compared to other similarly situated taxpayers'' simply makes explicit a comparison that was implicit in similar language in S. 14.

Therefore, in order to clear up any confusion and to ensure that all new tax loopholes are subject to the same scrutiny as other types of spending, I have sent to the desk an amendment that would authorize the President to veto wasteful spending in future tax bills.

Mr. President, the language in the amendment that I have offered is not new, nor should it be particularly controversial. This language uses the exact same definition of ''targeted tax break'' as was included in S. 14, introduced by Senator DOMENICI and originally cosponsor by Senators EXON, CRAIG, COHEN, DOLE, and me. Furthermore, the amendment I have introduced uses the exact same language that our Republican colleagues promised the Nation they would use when they introduced their Contract With America. The language in this amendment, which was introduced in the House by then-Minority Leader Michel, simply states that the President may veto those tax loopholes which have ''the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a different treatment to a particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is limited by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers. Such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.''

By its very terms, this language does not cover those types of tax provisions that provide general benefits. It would not subject a reduction in tax rates to a veto. Obviously, that would be a benefit for all Americans. Similarly, it would not subject an expansion in the standard deduction or the elimination of the marriage penalty to a veto. At the same time, the amendment that I have offered would not effect any of the provisions currently in the Tax Code. My amendment would not allow the President to touch such provisions as the home mortgage interest deduction, the deduction for State and local taxes, or the deduction for charitable contributions. Instead, this amendment would only effect new or expanded tax provisions.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD copies of two letters, one from Dr. Rivlin at OMB and the other from Dr. Reischauer at CBO, interpreting the language that I have introduced. As our colleagues will note, these letters make clear that the amendment that I have offered simply places spending through the Tax Code on par with other types of spending. Adoption of my amendment will prevent additional loopholes from creeping into the Tax Code at the same time we are cutting assistance for the poorest and neediest in our society.

My amendment would also reduce the danger of gaming the revenue estimating process to avoid a potential veto. Under the current version of the line-item veto, a tax loophole cannot be vetoed unless it is scored as losing money during any part of relevant budget window. However, as we have seen with some proposals such as the backloaded IRA's and neutral cost recovery provision in the House's tax package, by slowly phasing in tax expenditures, they can be estimated to raise revenue during the first 5 years even though they lose billions of dollars over the 10-year budget period. My amendment would eliminate this gaming process.

If the President had the power to excise special interest spending, but only in appropriations bills, we would simply find the special interest lobbyists who work appropriations turning themselves into tax lobbyists, pushing for the same spending in the Tax Code. Spending is spending whether it comes in the form of a Government check, or in the form of a special exception from the tax rates that apply to everyone else. Tax spending does not, as some pretend, simply allow people to keep more of what they have earned. It gives them a special exception from the rules that oblige everyone to share in the responsibility of our national defense and protecting the young, the aged, and the infirm. The only way to let everyone keep more of what they have earned is to minimize these tax expenditures along with appropriated spending and the burden of the national debt so that we can bring down tax rates fairly, for everyone.

Therefore, Mr. President, I encourage all of our colleagues to pass a line-item veto bill that includes both appropriations and real tax expenditures. In

their so-called Contract With America, the Republicans promised that they would subject wasteful spending to a potential line-item veto whether this spending occurred in an appropriations or tax bill. I believe that the definition that the Republicans promised in their contract, the same definition that was included in S. 14 when it was introduced in this Chamber, is an appropriate way to prevent new wasteful spending projects from creeping into the Tax Code.

Mr. President, the line-item veto is not in itself deficit reduction. But if the President is willing to use it, it is the appropriate tool to cut a certain kind of wasteful spending—the pork-barrel projects that tend to crop up in appropriations and tax bills. Although this type of spending is only one of the types of spending that drive up the deficit, until we control these expenditures for the few, we cannot asked for the shared sacrifice from the many that will be necessary to significantly reduce the deficit.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the side of the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

TAX LOOPHOLES SHOULD BE COVERED BY LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise as an original cosponsor of this amendment to subject a host of special interest tax breaks and loopholes to the President's expedited rescission, or line-item veto authority provided for in this bill. This amendment would give the President the same authority to rescind new special interest tax breaks that he would have under the bill to cancel new direct spending. The logic of the amendment is simple, and straightforward: We should treat tax breaks just as we treat direct spending in the Federal budget.

In all of our debates on budget priorities, there has been too little discussion about a particular kind of spending that enjoys a special status within the Federal budget: tax breaks for special classes or categories of taxpayers. Many of the benefits from these breaks and loopholes go to corporate or other wealthy interests in our society. If we are going to give the President line-item veto authority over direct spending programs, then we should give him the same power to veto special interest tax breaks and tax loopholes. That is what this amendment would do; it would cover all new tax breaks, hold them up to scrutiny, and subject them to potential rescission, or cancellation.

This is not the first time in this session of Congress that I have raised the issue of closing special interest tax loopholes as a part of our deficit reduction efforts. A couple of weeks ago my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator BRADLEY, and I offered a sense-of-the-Senate resolution as an amendment to the proposed balanced budget amendment which said that tax expenditures ''should be subjected to the same level of scrutiny in the budget as direct spending programs'' in our efforts to balance the budget. That proposal received 40 votes from my colleagues on our side of the aisle. We have argued for months, and will continue to argue, that savings from restricting special interest tax breaks must be a key part of our efforts to further reduce the deficit.

Let me make a simple point here that is often overlooked. We can spend money just as easily through the Tax Code, through what are called ''tax expenditures,'' as we can through the normal appropriations process. Spending is spending, whether it comes in the form of a government check or in the form of a tax break for some special purpose, like a subsidy, a credit, a deduction, or accelerated depreciation for this type of investment or that. Some tax expenditures are justified, and should be retained. But some are special interest tax breaks that should be eliminated, or loopholes that should be plugged.

These special tax breaks allow some taxpayers to escape paying their fair share, and thus make everyone else pay higher taxes. They are simply special exceptions to the normal rules, rules that oblige all of us to share the burdens of citizenship by paying our taxes. They also limit State revenues because many State income taxes are tied to the Federal tax rules. It seems only fair that if the President can use the line-item veto authority to cut special-interest spending programs, then he should also be able to cut special-interest tax breaks which will cost the Treasury billions of dollars in lost revenues.

Special-interest tax breaks are simply a subcategory of the larger group of tax provisions called tax expenditures. The Congressional Joint Tax Committee has estimated that tax expenditures cost the U.S. Treasury over $420 billion every single year. And they also estimate that if we do not hold them in check, that amount will grow by $60 billion to over $485 billion by 1999. That is why tax breaks must be on the table along with other spending as we look for places to cut the deficit.

Now, not all tax expenditures are bad. Not all should be eliminated. Some serve a real public purpose, such as providing incentives to investment, bolstering the nonprofit sector, encouraging charitable contributions, and helping people to be able to afford to buy a home. But some of them are simply tax dodges that can no longer be justified. At the very least, all of these should undergo the same scrutiny as other Federal spending. If we are going to allow the President to line-item veto specific spending programs, then we should also allow him to veto specific tax breaks that subsidize a targeted class of taxpayers.

The particular language of this amendment has a long history, and has often been supported in the past by Members on the other side of the aisle. This language is taken directly from the so-called Contract With America about which we have heard so much recently. On pages 32–33 of the commercially available version of the contract, when discussing the line-item veto, it says, ''Under this procedure, the President could strike any appropriation or targeted tax provision in any bill.'' Thus we are offering an amendment first outlined in the provisions in the Contract With America.

In addition to being part of the contract, a similar amendment was offered on the House floor by Representative Michel, the former House minority leader, to a previous version of the line-item veto legislation. Gaining bipartisan support, this amendment was adopted in 1993 in the House during consideration of a version of the line-item veto bill. The language of this amendment also appeared in the original version of Senator DOMENICI's expedited rescission bill which he introduced in January of this year. Therefore this language simply fulfills a promise made by many of those on the other side of the aisle, including those who wrote the Contract With America.

Although there are many things in that Republican so-called Contract With America which I oppose, I agree completely with the contract when it says that we should give the President the power to veto all new special tax breaks and loopholes, and not just those new tax breaks that affect fewer than 100 taxpayers, as included in the bill the committee reported. Tax attorneys will have a field day if we adopt that arbitrary 100 taxpayers limit on the President's authority to line-item veto tax expenditures. This is a sham, which some have estimated would cover only a tiny percentage of all tax breaks currently in the Code if it had been in law when they were established.

How would we decide which special tax breaks will benefit fewer than 100 taxpayers? Even if a specific provision is intended to benefit only a small group of people or corporations, crafty tax attorneys will always find ways to expand the group of intended beneficiaries. In addition, as I understand the situation, no Federal agency currently keeps track of how many taxpayers benefit from individual tax expenditures. This is perfectly understandable, because many tax expenditures are exclusions from income, rather than deductions which must be reported to the IRS. How do we calculate how many people exclude income from taxation, when of course those taxpayers do not even report this excluded

income? Thus the arbitrary 100 taxpayers limit is absurdly narrow.

But the language of the Dole substitute is even more unclear on tax expenditures than the 100 taxpayer language used by the committee. The backers of the Dole substitute claim that their bill would allow the President to veto special interest tax breaks and loopholes. But the language of the Dole substitute uses a very confusing and vague definition of ''targeted tax benefits'' subject to the President's line-item veto. The substitute defines ''targeted tax benefits'' as those provisions which are estimated as ''losing revenue within the periods specified in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget'' and which have ''the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers.''

What does this definition mean? What does a similarly situated taxpayer mean in this context? Should we bring in high-priced tax attorneys to help us understand the effects of this language? Under this definition, could Congress give special tax breaks to a specific industry such as the oil and gas industry, and shield these tax giveaways from the President's line-item veto because all companies within the favored industry would be allowed to claim the same special interest tax break? Under current law, U.S. citizens working overseas can exclude $70,000 per year from their U.S. income taxes. If Congress were to foolishly increase this exclusion to $80,000 per year, would that change be subject to the President's line-item veto authority under the substitute? Of if Congress were to give new special tax breaks to American companies operating overseas, such as we already do under current law, would that change be covered by the language in the substitute? How would this language affect companies doing business in Puerto Rico, who enjoy special tax breaks under current law? The existing Tax Code is riddled with numerous special tax give-aways to an entire industry. Would the President be allowed to line-item veto new special interest tax loopholes for any given powerful industry under this language? We need to clarify this confusing provision in the Dole substitute, because on its face it only applies to a very limited number of these tax breaks.

If the President is to be given the power to veto spending provisions, then he should also be given the power to veto certain especially egregious special interest tax breaks, especially those which favor an entire protected industry such as the oil and gas industry. The writers of the Republican Contract With America understood this point, even if the majority party in the other body voted to abandon this section of the contract. We should restore the original contract language, as our amendment would do.

By giving the President the power to line-item veto any new tax expenditure provisions, we could save billions of dollars. For example, do we really need special tax breaks for Mount Rushmore coins, or tax rules that allow people to rent out their homes for 2 weeks each year without paying tax on that income? Both of these tax breaks have been proposed in the past, and the latter actually became law. A line-item veto which at least covers new tax breaks might prevent measures like these from slipping into the Tax Code in the future, where they could go unexamined for years or even for decades.

Our amendment is the latest in a series of legislative initiatives designed to call attention to this problem and to prompt Congress to reexamine tax loopholes. There are many existing special loopholes buried in the current Tax Code which need to be reconsidered. While this measure only subjects new tax breaks to Presidential veto authority, many of us will certainly want to revisit specific tax loopholes that are already in the Tax Code during the reconciliation process. But for now, our amendment provides for a mechanism to cover all new tax breaks in the same way that it covers only new spending. I think we ought to signal today that the standard of fairness we will be applying will include closer scrutiny of these tax breaks.

It is only fair, since these special tax breaks for certain companies and industries force other companies and individuals to pay higher taxes to make up the difference. Some of these tax breaks allow privileged industries such as the oil and gas industry to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. All distort, to one degree or another, economic investment decisions, usually in favor of companies with the highest paid lobbyists in Washington. In many cases, doing away with these special tax breaks for certain industries would allow a more efficient allocation of economic resources.

I think it is a simple question of fairness. If Congress is really going to make the $1.48 trillion in spending cuts and other policy changes that would have to be made to balance the Federal budget by 2002, then those on the other side of the aisle should make sure that wealthy interests in our society, those who have political clout, those who can hire high-priced lobbyists to make their case every day here in Washington, are asked to sacrifice at least as much as regular middle-class folks whom you and I represent. We should represent those who receive Social Security or Medicare or Veterans' benefits, and not just those special interests who can afford to pay high-priced hired guns to lobby for them.

I am amazed to learn that many in the majority party in the other body are proposing expanding corporate welfare tax loopholes at the very same time that they are slashing Government spending on programs for the poor, for children, for education, and for the most vulnerable in our society. They have proposed tax cuts for the wealthy which, according to the Treasury Department, total over $700 billion, and at the same time they refuse to subject a broad range of new tax breaks to potential cancellation by the President. And these are the ones who call themselves deficit hawks?

By refusing to extend the line-item veto authority given to the President under this bill to industry-wide tax breaks and loopholes, members of the majority party are trying to protect their wealthy and well-connected friends. And they are doing so at the expense of principles that they often espouse: economic efficiency and market-based allocations of capital. As I have observed, often these special tax loopholes and tax breaks distort economic decision-making, causing corporations and individuals to shift their resources in order to take advantage of these loopholes.

I think now is the time to put a stop to further massive spending on special interest tax loopholes. We should allow the President to be able to line-item veto these costly special interest tax breaks. A basic standard of fairness requires that we examine special interest tax breaks along with the one-third of all Federal spending which is currently covered by the legislation before us.

Some will charge that by closing tax loopholes and restricting special interest tax breaks we are somehow proposing to raise taxes. But the opponents of covering these tax breaks in the line-item veto legislation need to understand that the current system forces middle class and working people to pay more in taxes than they otherwise would have to pay. While some are paying less than their fair share in taxes because of these special tax subsidies, others are being forced to pay more in taxes to make up the difference. Closing tax loopholes is not raising taxes. Allowing these tax breaks to continue forever without close scrutiny is part of the reason why taxes on the regular middle class taxpayer are higher than they otherwise could be. Of course, these subsidies are hidden in the Tax Code because it would be too hard to get the votes in Congress, in the full light of day, to directly subsidize these industries—especially under current budget constraints.

It is a simple matter of fairness. In our attempts to reduce the Federal deficit, all sectors of our society must make some sacrifices. Specific industries and the wealthy are the ones who often benefit most from the special interest tax breaks and loopholes. If we do not treat tax expenditures the same as direct spending provisions, the wealthy will avoid making any sacrifices as we cut spending programs for the middle class and the poor. Just because some special interest has the means to hire a high-priced tax lobbyist to get a special tax break written into legislation does notgive them the

right to avoid sharing in whatever sacrifices are necessary to reduce the budget deficit.

The General Accounting Office issued a report last year, and have issued several others on tax expenditures. It was titled, ''Tax Policy: Tax Expenditures Deserve More Scrutiny.'' I commend it to my colleagues' attention. It makes a compelling case for subjecting these tax expenditures to greater congressional and administration scrutiny, just as direct spending is scrutinized. The GAO report reminds us that spending through special provisions in the Tax Code should be treated in the same way as other spending provisions.

The GAO noted that most of these tax expenditures currently in the Tax Code are not subject to any annual reauthorization or other kind of systematic periodic review. They observed that many of these special tax breaks were enacted in response to economic conditions that no longer exist. In fact, they found that of the 124 tax expenditures identified by the Budget Committee in 1993, about half were enacted before 1950. Now that does not automatically call them into question. It just illustrates the problem that once enacted, special tax breaks are not looked at in any systematic way. Many of these industry-specific breaks get embedded in the Tax Code, and are not looked at again for years. Giving the President the authority to cancel special interest tax breaks would prevent egregious ones from creeping into the Tax Code in the first place.

This amendment simply says that new tax expenditures should be treated the same as new spending programs for purposes of the line-item veto. It might prompt us to rethink some of our spending priorities. When we begin to weigh, for example, scaling back the special treatment for percentage depletion allowances for the oil and gas industry against cutting food and nutrition programs for hungry children, we may come out with quite different answers than we have in the past about whether we can still afford to subsidize this industry through the Tax Code. CBO estimates that eliminating this tax break would save $4.9 billion in Federal revenues over 5 years.

We must allow the President to veto new special interest tax expenditures, despite the vague and confusing language in the Dole substitute. It looks to me like those who oppose our amendment are saying that they will not ask for much, if any, sacrifice from wealthy corporate and other special interests in our society who have enjoyed certain tax breaks, benefits, preferences, deductions, and credits that most regular middle-class taxpayers do not enjoy.

The Republican contract promised to give the President the authority to line-item veto all these special tax breaks, but that language was deleted by the Senate Budget Committee. That language has also been deleted from the Dole substitute. I think we need to restore the original language of the expedited rescission bill.

At a time when we are talking about potentially huge spending cuts in meat inspections designed to insure against outbreaks of disease; or in higher education aid for middle class families; or in protection for our air, our lakes, and our land; or in highways; or in community development programs for States and localities; or in sewer and water projects for our big cities; or in safety net programs for vulnerable children; or to eliminate the School Lunch Program, we should be willing to weigh these cuts against special tax loopholes that could cost hundreds of billions each year.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the side of the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes and 26 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to go off the amendment for approximately 5 minutes to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Nebraska about the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the subject matter is unrelated to the pending amendment?

Mr. MCCAIN. Unrelated to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would like to yield to my colleague from Arizona. We have had some very brief preliminary discussion to try to expedite and move things along just a little bit.

I propose to him that in order to move things along, I will be a cosponsor of the Bradley amendment. If the Bradley amendment is successful, then there is a backup amendment that I would like to withdraw, but I would like to have it pending in case the Bradley amendment should not prevail.

My amendment simply says—and I will debate it briefly if I may have 5 minutes—basically that if the Bradley amendment fails, I would like to have a backup provision that simply says we should take a look at not just a 5-year but a 10 year-period with regard to what effect any kind of taxation would have on the overall budget proposition. There may be some pros and cons on that. It might be acceptable.

I would simply like to suggest at this time that after we finish debate under the allotted time under the Bradley amendment, if I may have 5 minutes and my colleague maybe 5 minutes, we could make an agreement that we would have a vote on my backup amendment that would be withdrawn if the Bradley amendment prevails.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would also like to find out if your amendment would be acceptable by both sides, to prevent a——

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I will not insist on a rollcall vote. If that is possible, we could maybe voice vote.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to take the remaining minute or 2 to discuss the parliamentary situation as it exists with my friend from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator reserving his right to object?

Mr. MCCAIN. No, Mr. President. I am now on the 5-minute request to discuss the parliamentary situation, not related to the pending amendment.

It is my understanding from my conversations with my colleague from Nebraska that we are in the process of reducing the number of amendments and getting time agreements on those so that we could probably be able to—hopefully, within an hour or 2, or 2 or 3 hours—get some kind of final agreement so that a cloture vote would not be necessary.

Under those circumstances, I urge all of our colleagues to consider their amendments, consider how much time they would require, and hopefully we could move forward so that we do not have to go through a cloture vote and reach cloture on this bill.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to avoid the cloture vote, along with my friend from Nebraska. I think we are now reaching a point where we could get time agreements and perhaps even a time certain for passage.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, if I may for a moment, I thank my friend from Arizona.

I simply use this opportunity to appeal to all Senators on both sides of the aisle to please come to the floor at this time, or sometime within the next hour, to consult with us. It is important, if we are going to expedite matters as I would like to do, and hopefully not have a cloture vote unless that becomes necessary—but I suspect we are going to have to go through the cloture vote unless we can come to some reasonable agreement on the number of amendments—how serious the Senators are in offering them.

I place an appeal at this time to Members on both sides of the aisle who have amendments to please consult with the managers now so that maybe we can have a sense and eliminate some of the amendments that are duplicates, or duplicates to some degree, and maybe have an agreement by 2 o'clock this afternoon that would set a course of as definitive action as is possible with the conflicting debate that still might take place on some of these amendments.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is not clear yet—a pending vote on a Feingold amendment; a possible pending vote on

a Feingold amendment, that is possible; along with a pending vote at the expiration on the previously agreed to time on the Bradley amendment. It is not clear to me yet when those votes will take place.

There is, I understand, a signing ceremony down at the White House on the unfunded mandates bill sometime later this morning. I hope within the next minutes we will get some indication as to when the votes, both on the Feingold amendments and the Bradley amendment, will take place.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the pending amendment, which is the Bradley amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 403 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to say to my friend from New Jersey, I know of no one who is more aware, more knowledgeable, and more articulate on tax issues—along with many others, but especially tax issues—than the Senator from New Jersey. We know of his exemplary record, including the key role he played in the last major tax bill passed by Congress in the 1986 tax reform bill.

It is with some trepidation that I oppose this amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I certainly understand the target and the aim and intent of this amendment. I believe that the amendment sets a different standard for a targeted tax benefit for purposes that are contained in the Dole substitute.

His definition of the targeted tax benefit in this amendment is broader. The amendment defines a targeted tax benefit, I quote from the amendment, as any provision that applies different tax treatment to a limited class of taxpayers. The amendment does exempt from the taxpayers in a limited class, defined by general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

By the terms of the amendment as we understand it, it pulls into the definition of targeted tax benefit, any tax benefit that goes to any other limited class of taxpayers, such as retirees, Americans with physical disabilities such as blindness, survivors of a deceased parent or spouse, disabled veterans, foster parents, farmers, fishermen, students, and homeowners.

A few examples, Mr. President, of potential tax benefits that would be a targeted tax benefit under this amendment and subject to the line-item veto would be, for example: President Clinton's 1996 budget proposal to create a special tax deduction for college education expenses, the reason being, where it would fall under the Bradley amendment, is that students or their parents who pay for college expenses are a limited class of taxpayers.

Proposals in most of the major health care reform bills proposed last year to clarify the tax treatment of long-term care insurance would fall under this amendment because taxpayers who choose to purchase long-term care insurance are a limited class of taxpayers.

The proposal in the Contract With America to increase the amount of money a small business can deduct, expenses for equipment purchases from $17,000 up to $35,000 per year, because the contract proposal is limited to small businesses, which are also a limited class of taxpayers.

The proposal to extend the 25-percent deduction for health insurance costs paid by self-employed persons, and the reason for this is that this proposal is limited to self-employed taxpayers, who are also a limited class of taxpayers.

The distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, has a bill that provides tax relief for farmers who have suffered from the 1993 Midwest floods. This proposal is limited to farmers, a limited class of taxpayers.

Unlike the pending amendment, the Dole substitute definition of a targeted tax benefit looks to a limited group of taxpayers, and whether within the limited group, one taxpayer or group of taxpayers is treated more favorably than other similarly situated taxpayers.

Under the Dole substitute, none of the examples mentioned would be a targeted tax benefit, and under the Dole substitute none of the examples mentioned would be subject to the line-item veto.

Mr. President, under the previous unanimous consent agreement, at the expiration of the time, I will be making a motion to table as was provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use my leader time to speak on this amendment and allow Senator Bradley to use the remaining minutes of his time for his own purposes.

Mr. President, the amendment that is now pending is one that virtually every Member of the Senate ought to be able to support.

Senator BRADLEY's amendment on tax breaks is identical—it is identical—to that contained in the Domenici-Exon bill. It is the very same language that has been cosponsored by many people on both sides of the aisle, including both leaders at this point. Its intent is to make clear what we all say we want: To give the President a strong bill.

We want to allow the President to weed out special interest breaks, whether they are buried in an appropriations bill or buried in a tax bill. We have said that our view of a strong bill is a bill that broadens the scope, that gives the President the greatest opportunity for review of legislative issues, of questions that may arise as he considers the viability of any piece of legislation, giving the President the opportunity, whether it is in taxes or appropriations, is our definition of strength.

Senator BRADLEY's amendment puts tax breaks on an equal footing with wasteful spending. It allows the President to select out and veto provisions that might favor one group over another at the expense of the American taxpayer.

So, Mr. President, it is a bill that certainly Senator DOMENICI, and many of us who cosponsored his legislation, feel is important, and I am very pleased that we have, again, an opportunity to support what we all have indicated we want, and that is a bill that is, indeed, as strong as it can be.

I am gratified that our Republican colleagues agree with Democrats that tax breaks should be on the table and open to review. The current language in the Dole substitute is very broad. Under any reasonable commonsense interpretation of this language, tax breaks are on the table, and that is as it should be.

I am supporting Senator BRADLEY's effort in order to remove any ambiguity in interpretation. I think Senators DOMENICI and EXON had it exactly right the first time, and I hope they will return to their roots and support this amendment when we have the vote later on today.

Senator BRADLEY's amendment is also important because it has another crucial component. It eliminates the incentive that exists under the Dole substitute to shift tax breaks out of the budget window and escape Presidential scrutiny. For example, the House has a provision in the Contract With America called neutral cost recovery. Although this tax provision loses billions of dollars and is a huge drain on the Treasury, it would not come under the President's scrutiny. That is because it does not lose money until after the 5-year budget window.

Instead of inviting budget games, we should allow any tax break that loses money to be subject to Presidential review, and Senator BRADLEY's amendment does that. That is a gimmick. We want to avoid gimmicks. We truly want truth in budgeting. We want the President to have an opportunity to review all budgetary implications, provisions that may be in the law, and that is really what this amendment does.

This amendment would ensure that the President looks beyond 5 years and not be constrained simply to examine a piece of legislation only because it has a 5-year budget estimation. There is widespread agreement in the Senate about the need of Presidential review of wasteful spending. This amendment puts wasteful tax breaks on the table, and I certainly urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, how much time remains on each respective side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). Twelve minutes 46 seconds for the Senator from New Jersey, and 11 minutes for the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding. I think this is an extremely important amendment. Frankly, this line-item veto is not in ideal shape, from my perspective. But what happens when we have a one-time appropriation is we have a one-time wound. If we vote $500,000 to save BILL BRADLEY's birthplace—and I know BILL BRADLEY would oppose such an appropriation—that is a one-time appropriation. But when we put in these little tax favors for people, these little things that provide tax breaks, that is a wound that bleeds year after year after year. I think it is extremely important that we adopt this amendment.

I would like to see a line-item veto that also would give the President, frankly, the authority to reduce appropriations. Apparently, we cannot do that under the present Constitution. I wish we could. I prefer that. But I think if we are going to deal with appropriations in a line-item veto, we also have to deal with tax expenditures in a meaningful way.

The Dole amendment deals with it but in a very narrow sense. This is even more narrowly crafted than I would like to see, but it at least gives us the ability to stop a running wound, and we have created too many running wounds.

Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Bradley amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, again, I would like to, if I can, having listened to some of the comments, try to take a few minutes to clarify what I believe the language means.

Before any tax loophole would be subject to a line-item veto, under the language of the pending bill, it would have to meet two criteria: First, the loophole would have to be estimated by the Joint Tax Committee to lose revenue within the period specified in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

Now, Mr. President, although this provision is subject to budgetary gimmicks, I believe it is clear. It says that if a tax expenditure loses money in the next 5 years, it would be included. What my amendment seeks to do is to broaden this to a 10-year period; to say that you cannot put a tax expenditure in the code and make it effective in year 6, 7, and 8. You cannot put a tax expenditure in the code claiming that it will raise revenue, as some inevitably will in the first couple of years, when in fact it will lose enormous amounts of revenue in the second 5 years.

So I am concerned—and seek to rectify with this amendment—that the budget window here creates a possibility for gaming.

For each tax bill, we receive estimates from the Joint Tax Committee, the detailed revenue gains and losses for each fiscal year covered by the current budget resolution. If a given tax loophole was estimated to lose revenue during any of these years, it would meet this first part of the definition. If it loses revenue in the first 5 years under the bill, it would be included as an item that could be vetoed.

The second criterion is, the loophole would have to have ''the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers.''

While the first part of this part of the test is fairly clear, I think some Members of the Senate have questioned what the phrase ''when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers'' means. My view is that this language makes explicit what was implicit in the earlier versions of this phrase. All tax expenditures are judged relative to a given baseline that applies to all other taxpayers, and this language simply makes this comparison clear.

So, for example, if tomorrow we pass the $10,000 tax credit for all Members of Congress, that loophole would be subject to a Presidential veto.

First, because it would lose revenue in the next 5-year period. And, second, the loophole would provide a limited group of taxpayers; that is, Members of the Congress, more favorable tax treatment; that is, the $10,000 tax credit, when compared to other similarly situated taxpayers; that is, all taxpayers that are not Members of Congress.

As a real example, a few years ago Congress approved a loophole that provided that

> Neither the United States nor the Virgin Islands shall impose an income tax on non-Virgin Islands source income derived by one or more corporations which were formed in Delaware on or about March 6, 1981, and which have owned one or more office buildings in St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

There it is, a tax expenditure. Word has it that this loophole was designed to benefit a single, well-connected, millionaire and his Virgin Islands company. That was his loophole.

Again, this loophole under the bill before us would be subject to a potential line-item veto. First, it would lose revenue in the next 5 years. Second, the loophole would provide a particular taxpayer; that is, the single Virgin Islands company, with more favorable tax credit; that is, forgiveness of tax on all non-Virgin Islands source income, when compared to other similarly situated taxpayers; that is, other taxpayers that either were nonincorporated in Delaware on March 6, 1981, or do not own an office building in the Virgin Islands.

Now, Mr. President, a few Members have suggested—incorrectly, I believe—that the term ''when compared to similarly situated taxpayers'' will cause the definition of ''targeted tax break'' to be interpreted narrowly. This suggestion is based on I think the flawed reasoning that ''similarly situated'' means ''identical.'' Such interpretation would mean that no tax loophole would ever be subject to veto. Instead, loopholes for Members of Congress, loopholes for individual companies in the Virgin Islands, and numerous other loopholes would all be free from a potential veto because all identical taxpayers would get the same benefit.

The debate on this floor evidences the clear intent of the supporters of this bill to subject tax loopholes to a Presidential veto, and therefore it includes the tax loophole for the Members of Congress, it includes the tax loophole for the Virgin Islands corporation, and it includes other new and expanded tax loopholes.

I think that is, frankly, what the bill says. That is what this amendment says. The disagreement is not over that. The disagreement is the budget window. And in the bill before us, there is a big possibility for gaming by saying if there is a tax loophole that will not lose revenue until the second 5 years, it is not subject to veto, and that is what this amendment attempts to correct.

How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes and 13 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to my friend, if my friend from New Jersey will yield, I would be glad to yield 5 minutes of my time to him, if he so wants to use it.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am fine with 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding. I would like to offer a couple of comments to put this line-item veto proposal in perspective.

The Constitution clearly gives Congress the ''power of the purse.'' But, every President since Thomas Jefferson has asserted the executive branch's discretion and right to hold back moneys appropriated by Congress. This tug-

of-war goes to the most basic facet of our democratic system of government: The balance of powers between the executive and the legislative branches of government.

The conflict between the power of the purse and the power of impoundment dates back to the earliest days of our Republic. The first significant impoundment of appropriated funds was made by Thomas Jefferson who, back in 1803, refused to spend $50,000 appropriated by Congress to provide gunboats to operate on the Mississippi River.

The conflict between the legislative and executive branches has been going on now for over 150 years. You may recall, Mr. President, it was back in the early 1970's when this really came to a head. President Nixon challenged Congress' power and withheld over $12 billion in highway funds. This resulted in an attempt to impeach President Nixon because he had trespassed upon the powers of Congress. Congress did not impeach the President—appropriately so—but it did pass the Budget and Impoundment Control Act back in 1974. This act imposed many new restrictions on the President's ability to impound budget authority.

Twenty years have transpired since this act was passed and the tenor of the debate has shifted dramatically. We have gone from a sense of urgency to restrict an imperial President to a sense that the President needs to restrict, if not an imperial Congress, at least a spendthrift one.

I support strengthening the President's ability to veto wasteful spending. In fact, I introduced legislation along with Senator DOMENICI to accomplish this last Congress and did so again this year.

But, I think we ought to be clear about one thing. No matter what type of line-item veto authority is given to the President, assuming it will be given, the overall impact on the deficit is not going to live up to the high expectations of the American people.

Giving the President more power to rescind or veto spending can achieve some positive results. To be able to surgically remove wasteful spending items would be a service to the taxpayers and, in turn, improve the public image of Congress. Every report about a $700 toilet seat or a Lawrence Welk Museum sends the message that Congress is either intoxicated with power or powerless to overcome its spending addiction.

But there should be no expectation that the line-item veto authority can do the heavy lifting in terms of reducing the deficit. Many of the items listed by various watchdog groups in their annual so-called pork lists are astonishing, and would never be supported if they were not embedded in large appropriations bills that are presented to the President on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

I do not suggest that any amount of waste ought to be tolerated, but purging these items, while important, will not alone take us far in reducing the deficit. I support giving the President more authority to line out wasteful spending. But, it should be clear that we have not yet been able to confront the much more difficult task, and more difficult challenge, of getting our deficit under control.

At this point it is not clear, Mr. President, whether there is going to be a filibuster on this measure or whether we will be able to overcome that filibuster. I hope that we can. In the meantime, if this measure is not approved and sent to the President for his signature, there is another way to achieve our goal. Every request made of the Appropriations Committee ought to be made public. Those of us who request that specific items be included in the appropriations bills ought to have those requests published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That would bring some light to this process. If we are unable or unwilling to stand behind the requests that we make to the Appropriations Committee, then obviously we would be unwilling to take to the floor to try to defend them.

Unfortunately, I think we have reached the point of ''Stop us before we spend again.'' The power of the purse is already ours. It is a power we have abused too often, and too often, I might add, to the applause of our constituents. For too long, we have been rewarded for bringing home the bacon while condemning the presence and prevalence of trichinosis in the Congress. We cannot continue to have it both ways.

This measure will indeed force us to defend our requests in the bright light of day. It will make us more responsible if we may be called upon to defend here on the Senate floor what we demand. This measure leads us to a sense of congressional responsibility.

I support the efforts of my colleagues, Senator MCCAIN of Arizona and Senator COATS of Indiana. I support the measure we have brought to the floor.

But, I again want to reemphasize the point that, assuming it passes and the President signs it, this measure will not do the heavy lifting required to reduce the deficit. But, it will be a step forward. It is a measure that has become necessary by virtue of the fact that we have engaged in wasteful spending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COHEN. May I have an additional 30 seconds?

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield as much time as he may consume to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, once again, let me say we could have avoided all of this had we not indulged ourselves in the notion that we can bring home the bacon to our constituents and they will applaud us. We know one person's bacon is someone else's pork. It all depends on who is looking at it. It seems to me we should at least be willing to stand on the Senate floor and identify and defend those requests we have made of the appropriations or authorization committees. If we cannot bring ourselves to do that, the projects are not worthy of support by our colleagues and should not be in the appropriations process.

In closing, I hope this measure does in fact receive the endorsement of enough of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to cut off any filibuster. Absent that, one way we can accomplish the same result is to have these requests published as a matter of record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding me this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask my distinguished colleague from Arizona two brief questions.

One is: The language that is embodied in this amendment, does the Senator intend to fight for this language in the conference?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say to my friend from New Jersey, I believe not only will we fight for it but I believe the House's intentions were exactly the language of this amendment rather than, as the Senator from New Jersey has pointed out, the rather nebulous and amorphous definitions that were in the House-passed bill.

I believe from my conversations with Members in the other body, they would be agreeable to this language as opposed to the present language in the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. And the language in question does, according to the Senator's own reading, yield some tax expenditures being subject to the line-item veto?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say to my friend, absolutely. I believe, again, the egregious examples of the advantages that have been accrued to a few are addressed.

I also concede to my friend from New Jersey that there are other areas, such as was pointed out in the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, which are not covered but which should be covered. I just do not know exactly how we do that. If we expand in order to cover that, what goes along with that I think is something we cannot support at this time.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 22 seconds.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I think this amendment is about the budget window. I think the underlying bill, plus the amendment that is offered, really means the same thing when it comes to similarly situated. I

think to argue it is a narrow interpretation would mean that no tax loophole would ever be subject to veto because similarly situated would have to be identical. Instead, new loopholes for Members of Congress, loopholes for individual companies—such as in the Virgin Islands, as in the example I gave—or numerous other loopholes would all be free from potential veto. I know that is not the intent of the distinguished Senator from Arizona nor of the proponents of this bill.

I thank the Senator. I am prepared to yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 4 minutes and 2 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask if the Senator from New Jersey would like to make any additional remarks out of my time?

Mr. BRADLEY. No. I do not think so. I am prepared to yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the remainder of my time. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I thank my colleague from Arizona. Briefly, for the benefit of the Senator from Arizona—and we have talked about this, and other parties—I clearly state I am a cosponsor of the Bradley amendment which I think is a very good one, a very timely one. But, as is well known, I have a backup amendment at the desk.

The Bradley amendment would ensure that the tax loopholes covered by the bill would be a broad class of tax loopholes. His amendment will also allow the item veto to apply to tax loopholes that lose money after 5 years, and that portion of his amendment and only that is what my backup amendment, that I have just referenced that is being held at the desk, would address. My amendment would apply to the line-item veto to a 10-year window rather than 5.

As I stated earlier, if Senator BRADLEY's amendment succeeds I will not call up my amendment, as his amendment would already have addressed the issue. But if the Bradley amendment fails, then I think the least we should do is to proceed with the consideration of the backup amendment that is at the desk, that I think has probably a pretty broad-based support on both sides of the aisle.

I thank my colleague from Arizona. I reserve the remainder of my time if any and yield it back to him.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I would add as cosponsors Senator KERREY of Nebraska, Senator HARKIN of Iowa, Senator FEINGOLD of Wisconsin, Senator EXON of Nebraska, Senator HOLLINGS of South Carolina, and Senator SIMON of Illinois.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Under the previous unanimous consent agreement I move to table the amendment at this time.

In accordance with the wishes of the Senator from New Jersey, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to stack this along with other votes until the hour of 5 p.m. today.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to that, there has been no clearance of that on this side.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I modify that request? I ask unanimous consent to delay the vote for a short period of time, until there is some agreement on both sides as to when votes will take place.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition to make a suggestion to my friend from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask my friend from Nebraska, since—if, in the case of the defeat of the Bradley amendment he is going to have another amendment, perhaps he and I might debate that amendment now in the event the Bradley amendment does go down?

Mr. EXON. That might be in order. I would not hesitate to do that if the Senator thinks this is the right time to do that.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes to do that now I think it would be appropriate.

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to debate the amendment without calling up the amendment now.

I would simply say I think most of the debate has been covered on this matter.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SIMON. I heard the Senator say he was going to propose this if the Bradley amendment was defeated. I, frankly, think we need this 10-year thing, whether the Bradley amendment carries or not because the Bradley amendment does exempt certain types of tax breaks.

Mr. BRADLEY. If the Senator will yield, the amendment that is before the Senate at this time includes the 10-year window. So, if you are voting for the Bradley amendment you are voting for what would be the Exon amendment.

Mr. SIMON. The time is from the Senator—I do not see that in the amendment from the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. The amendment is not time limited. It would apply to a tax expenditure whenever—it could be 15 years. There is no 10-year limit. It is forever.

Mr. SIMON. But, if I may, what the Bradley amendment says is:

> . . . but such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

Why I favor the idea of the 10-year projection is, even if the Bradley amendment is accepted, if someone wants to get a tax break for divorcees, just as one example, we ought to know what that is going to cost, not just for 5 years but for 10 years.

So I think the Exon amendment still makes sense even though we accept the Bradley amendment. I am strongly for the BRADLEY amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I simply respond to the question posed by my colleague from Illinois—as I said just before I yielded to him, I strongly support the Bradley amendment and most of the arguments that have been made for the Bradley amendment, and I am a cosponsor—that would be taken care of if the Bradley amendment prevailed. Basically the thrust of this—and I will be glad to talk individually with my colleague from Illinois—the Bradley amendment strikes not just a 5-year reference. It strikes any reference whatsoever. That would simply mean that forever we would have to do this. It probably is the right way to go.

My backup proposal would be to extend the 5-year provision to 10 years, and that is what we have been talking about. Therefore, it is a compromise that might be accepted on the other side and, I think, would be much better than the 5-year amendment, not as good as what I think is implied in the Bradley amendment. But mine is a compromise.

I would be very glad to listen to further statements or reasoning on what I am sure are well-intentioned remarks made by my friend from Illinois.

If I might very briefly, I would simply say, as I have talked with my colleague from Arizona, the floor manager on this on the other side of the aisle, it seems to me that all of the basic thrust for doing this has been covered very well on the Bradley amendment. I think it would be repetitious for me to go through a whole new argument on this. I am sure this is fully understood by my colleague from Arizona.

I would simply say that I would incorporate in the support of my amendment all of the arguments that have been made in a very articulate fashion by my colleague from New Jersey on his amendment, and at an appropriate time today, after the majority leader decides after consultation with the minority leader when we should begin voting, my intention is to call up the Exon backup amendment only until a decision is made by the body on disposition of the Bradley amendment,

which would be the first item voted in this area, as I understand it, and we will be glad to take it up at that time.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on this side we are in agreement with the Exon amendment. I believe that it would be accepted if, in the case of the Bradley amendment, there is rejection by this body of the Bradley amendment.

The problem with the Bradley amendment is not the time we are talking about, but it is the broadening of the scope of the targeted tax benefits.

So I want to assure my colleague from Nebraska that unless something unusual happens between now and the time we vote on the Bradley amendment—around here anything can happen—at least speaking, I believe, with some confidence, we would accept by voice vote the Exon amendment and thereby eliminate the requirement for another recorded vote.

Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of my friend from Nebraska while I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, in order to conserve time and move briskly ahead, I would like to make a few brief remarks on an amendment that Senator HOLLINGS of South Carolina will be offering very shortly. I would like to address the Hollings amendment which incorporates the pay-as-you-go system on the Budget Act.

The amendment to be offered by my friend and colleague from South Carolina was offered in the Budget Committee during markup on the measure we are now addressing on the floor of the Senate.

This amendment would codify and strengthen one of the most important provisions of the budget process law—the pay-as-you-go rule. It simply codifies into the Budget Act section 23 of the 1995 budget resolution, which sets forth the 10-year pay-as-you-go rule. This rule has been a resounding success.

The amendment also makes two worthwhile additions to the provisions that exist in the current law. First, it applies the pay-as-you-go rule to budget resolutions. This is a position that the Budget Committee chairman, Senator DOMENICI, advocated in his substitute budget resolution in prior years.

Second, the amendment would require Congress to use a CBO baseline in calculating whether the pay-as-you-go rule has been violated or not. Current law requires us to measure against the budget resolution baseline.

Most years, these two are one and the same thing. However, this year, there is much talk about pumping up the numbers for reasons of the so-called dynamic scorekeeping, or some rosy scenarios regarding the changes in the Consumer Price Index. This amendment would help to ensure that we cannot play games with the baseline, which I think is absolutely critical if we are going to be up front and honest.

The bottom line is that the pay-as-you-go rule has worked extremely well. Under the pay-as-you-go rule, Congress has restrained its appetite for new entitlement programs and has gone without wasteful deficit-increasing tax cuts. Congress can still create entitlements or cut taxes. This rule simply requires that we pay for what we do. This is the essence of sound budget policy.

Mr. President, while awaiting the return to the floor of the Senator from Arizona and, hopefully, the appearance on the floor very shortly of Senator HOLLINGS of South Carolina to offer the amendment I referenced, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table the Bradley amendment has been set aside. Therefore, amendments are in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 404 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To provide that entitlement and tax legislation shall not worsen the deficit)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] proposes an amendment numbered 404 to Amendment No. 347.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

"SEC. . PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

''At the end of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, inert the following new section:

'''ENFORCING PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

'''SEC. 314. (a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

'''(1) ensure continued compliance with the deficit reduction embodied in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and

'''(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

'''(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

'''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct-spending or receipts legislation (as defined in paragraph (3)) that would increase the deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods (as defined in paragraph (2)) as measured pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5).

'''(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the three following periods—

'''(A) the first fiscal year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

'''(B) the period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; or

'''(C) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

'''(3) DIRECT-SPENDING OR RECEIPTS LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''direct-spending or receipts legislation'' shall—

'''(A) include any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to which this subsection otherwise applies;

'''(B) include concurrent resolutions on the budget;

'''(C) exclude full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990;

'''(D) exclude emergency provisions so designated under section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

''(E) include the estimated amount of savings in direct-spending programs applicable to that fiscal year resulting from the prior year's sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if any (except for any amounts sequestered as a result of a net deficit increase in the fiscal year immediately preceding the prior fiscal year); and

'''(F) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, include all direct-spending legislation as the term is interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

'''(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall use the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline, and for years beyond those covered by that Office, shall abide by the requirements of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that references to ''outyears'' in that section shall be deemed to apply to any year (other than the budget year) covered by any one of the time periods defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

'''(5) PRIOR SURPLUS AVAILABLE.—If direct-spending or receipts legislation increases the deficit when taken individually (as a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, as the case may be), then it must also increase the deficit when taken together with all direct-spending and receipts legislation enacted after the date of enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, in order to violate the prohibition of this subsection.

'''(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waives or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

'''(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by,the appellant and the manger of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and

sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

''(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section,the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

''(f) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 1998.'''

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this amendment pertains to budget resolutions. In the budget resolution passed last year, there is a provision that states that:

. . . for the purposes of this applicable time period—

Referring to whether certain legislation is deficit neutral.

and under section 23, on a point of order, 23 (b)(2): For the purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the following periods: The period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, or, (c), the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget. And for the purposes of that particular definition, the term ''direct spending,'' or ''receipts,'' shall include any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, to which this subsection otherwise applies, (b) excluding concurrent resolutions on the budget.

Now, we have a 10-year rule for all legislation save the budget resolution. Specifically, Mr. President, on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, we had a 10-year rule. In fact, it so happened that the President of the United States got this Senator personally on the telephone and asked if we would waive that rule, and I said ''no''. I had gone along with my distinguished chairman, Senator DOMENICI, of the Budget Committee. It was a fundamental issue that we look at revenue losses over a 10-year period.

The reason for that is very apparent once we focus on certain provisions in the Contract With America. I am not just talking politically, because politically, I favor some of the items in the contract. I favor, for example, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, if Republicans would only put in there what they say, that it is against the law to use Social Security funds for the deficit. If they would only put that provision in there, they have myself and four other Senators. We can pass the balanced budget amendment this afternoon, or any time. We are ready to go.

But I want to talk about the line-item veto. I support the line-item veto and have established a record in my efforts over the last 10-years.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my record be printed in the RECORD at this particular point.

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

THE HOLLINGS RECORD: LINE-ITEM VETO

Since 1985, U.S. Sen. Fritz Hollings has pushed for a separate enrollment line-item veto to give the president power to cut wasteful spending. Here is his record:

1995: On Jan. 18, Hollings introduced his separate enrollment line-item veto bill (S. 238) and co-sponsored a similar measure introduced by Bradley (S. 137).

1994: On Oct. 5, Hollings submitted testimony to the Senate Budget Committee that strongly pushed a separate enrollment line-item veto.

1993: On Jan. 24, Hollings introduced his separate enrollment line-item veto bill (S. 92).

On June 24, Hollings and Bradley offered an amendment to the Omnibus Reconciliation Bill that would have extended separate enrollment authority to tax expenditures and appropriations. The amendment failed (53–45) to get the 60 votes needed to bypass a budget point-of-order.

1991: On Jan. 14, Hollings introduced a separate enrollment line-item veto bill (S. 165).

On July 24, Hollings testified before the Senate Rules Committee to support his separate enrollment line-item veto bill (S. 165).

1990: On Oct. 10, Hollings fought to have a separate enrollment line-item veto favorably reported out of the Senate Budget Committee. For the first time ever—and on a bi-partisan basis—the proposal passed in the committee by a 13–6 vote.

1987: On Jan. 28, Hollings was an original co-sponsor of separate enrollment legislation (S. 402).

1985: On Feb. 5, Hollings co-sponsored S. 43, a separate enrollment line-item veto bill by Sen. Mack Mattingly.

In July, Hollings voted twice for cloture on S. 43, but the motions failed twice to get the necessary 60 votes (July 18: 57–42; July 24: 58–40).

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have been in the vineyards for a long time on that line-item veto. I used it 35 years ago when the distinguished occupant of the chair, I think, was the highway commissioner for the State of North Carolina. That was back when we were working in tandem, North and South Carolina, on bringing economic recovery to both of our wonderful States.

I had to use a line-item veto in order to get the triple A credit rating, because I knew nobody was going to invest in Podunk. They were not going to come to a State that was not paying its bills. We used it very effectively then, and I have always thought it is fundamental in fixing responsibility and in creating accountability.

We can look at the Contract With America and get a good sense of what I'm talking about. There is the capital gains tax that we all know about. That has been estimated by the Department of Treasury, of course, in the first 5 years to lose only $28.4 billion, but over the next 5 years, $91.9 billion. So you can see the losses accelerate markedly and that should be considered by those who favor the capital gains tax. We are not talking about rich and poor and who is or isn't getting a tax cut, but rather, to the contrary, whether we have truth in budgeting.

The second item, one that has been favored by the former Secretary of the Treasury and former chairman of the Finance Committee, the former Senator from Texas, Senator Bentsen and others, is the IRA's, the individual retirement accounts. What they term now as the American dream savings account. We are getting now like the Defense Department with the Brilliant Pebbles and Sparkling Light and all these kinds of nonsensical designations. I wish we would cut out our dreaming up here and start work. The American dream savings account, well that is an IRA, an individual retirement account. Yes, for the year 1995 to the year 2000, that would gain revenue. That is a revenue picker-upper. That is income. That is increasing the revenue to the Federal Government by a tune of $3.8 billion. But then you look at the next 5 years, it loses $21.8 billion.

And then they have one with respect to the schedule of depreciation allowances.

The distinguished occupant of the chair, being a very successful businessman, understands depreciation allowances, and how you can get accelerated recovery.

They have a provision that is now before the Ways and Means Committee and before our Finance Committee that is called neutral cost recovery. Whenever they say neutral, look out. That means that it is not neutral, I can tell you that. You just learn from hard experience, when they get these fancy words.

For the first 5 years, 1995 to the year 2000, that picks up revenue at $18.4 billion, but for the years 2000 to 2005, it is scheduled to lose $120 billion.

If we look at the total cost of the Contract With America we can see that the estimated cost over the first 5 years is $188 billion, but for the second 5 years, the Federal Government loses $630.2 billion.

This is not truth in budgeting. That has been the hard experience now of over 20 years of the Budget Act with respect to the measure. We thought last year we had done a good job and we saved money. Then we come up and we say, ''Oops, instead of cutting spending, we have increased it. Instead of recouping revenues, we have cut the revenues.'' And we are all out of balance again. That is how you get $200 and $300 billion deficits on into the next century. It has to stop.

One big way and most assured way, Mr. President, of stopping that would be to get truth in budgeting and adopt this 10-year rule.

Now, I want to refer to the 10-year rule, because I said momentarily that I was not referring to it to score political points. Unfortunately, we have taken to partisanship in this body, and it is unfortunate. We do not have the comity that we used to have when I first came here to the Senate.

But it is important to stress where the idea for my amendment comes from. In the fiscal year 1995 Republican budget resolution that was submitted by the Republicans on the Senate Budget Committee just last March, I refer to their miscellaneous section No. 1 and description and I now read word for word.

Strengthen the 10-year pay-as-you-go point of order. While the 10-year pay-as-you-go point of order that was established by last year's budget resolution is permanent, it does not currently apply to budget resolutions and could be repealed by a subsequent budget resolution. This proposal would make future budget resolutions subject to this point of order.

That was the particular provision of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they submitted.

I tried to offer it in committee. The Budget Committee met and we had discussions, but we were told at the time, ''Let's not take it up on S. 4. Let's not take it up on S. 14, but have it later.''

Well, we have not had a scheduled markup. And I think that this amendment, if offered in reconciliation, would require the 60 votes because of the Byrd rule. But we need it; it would bring truth in budgeting to budgets, as well as other legislation before us.

So I hope that they can join, as they indicated they wanted to and indicated in various sessions that I have been with them. And I know the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee is dedicated to truth in budgeting. This would be a perfect way to make it permanent for all budget resolutions. In the upcoming budget resolution, we are going to need spending cuts, we are going to have to have spending freezes, and we are going to have to close particular loopholes. And in this particular Senator's opinion, it is going to require additional revenues in order to do what we all say we are going to do; namely, in a 7-year period bring us back into the black and put us on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is going to be quite a task.

And do not underestimate the power of Congress to be creative. We can do away with departments, get into capital budgets, get into sale of capital assets, the power grid out west and everything else. But that is just a one-time savings; it does not really bringing us into balance.

They can get into using Social Security. They say they do not want to use Social Security, but, very interestingly, very interestingly, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee said on Tuesday, March 21—and I will quote from page 4 of an article.

Senator PACKWOOD said:

Nothing is sacred including Social Security and other entitlement programs.

If the chairman of the Finance Committee is thinking in terms of using Social Security then we really are in a pickle.

We hear of plans to reestimate the CPI, but if that is to occur, it should be reestimated in a technical fashion and not a political fashion. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reviews the CPI every 10 years. It is my understanding that we are due for another recomputation of the Consumer Price Index in 1998. We can do it in 1995. Suits me, as long as it is done in the same technical fashion, and not done in a political fashion.

The reason I refer to that ''in a political fashion,'' is simply that I have a quote from the distinguished Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH. I refer to a release on January 16, 1995, and I quote:

House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened Saturday to withhold funding from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

which prepares the CPI each month, unless it changed its approach, at a town meeting in Kennesaw, GA. The Reuters News Service reported that GINGRICH said:

We had a handful of bureaucrats who all professional economists agree, have an error in their calculations. If they can't get it right in the next 30 days or so, we zero them out. We transfer the responsibility to either the Federal Reserve or the Treasury and tell them to get it right.

If I was over in Treasury, or wherever, and he transferred it to me because they had not gotten it right, I think I could get it right because, if not, I might get zeroed out.

So let Congress go along with an accurate estimation, a statistical estimation, a professionally done estimation and not a political estimation.

Therein is some of the creativity, whether using the CPI, or the $636 billion from Social Security that they can pick up by using Social Security under the language of House Joint Resolution 1, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

They are just absolutely determined to repeal section 13301 of the Budget Act, that law that was signed into law by President George Bush on November 5, 1990.

If we all sing from the same hymnal and the same sheet music we will get truth in budgeting with this particular amendment.

What we will do is apply the same law that we have applied toward everyone else in the Government. If you are on the Agriculture Committee, you are subject to the 10-year rule. If you are on the Finance Committee with GATT, you are subject to the 10-year rule. If you are a member of the Appropriations Committee, you are subject to the 10-year rule. Interior, Commerce, go right on down the list.

But the very crowd that put in this 10-year rule for everybody else says, ''By the way, not for us.'' I just do not think that is right. I do not think it is honest in that regard. I think we ought to get honesty, get truth in budgeting and put it in there with respect to the budget resolutions, as well as all the other permanent provisions, that 10-year rule was so eloquently endorsed by the Senate Budget Committee Republican alternative just a year ago.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 7 minutes.

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

INTEGRITY OF DEFENSE BUDGET NUMBERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to resume my discussion of the accuracy of defense budget numbers. I have been speaking on the subject of the Defense Department and the issue of our appropriations for the succeeding fiscal years so far this week on two other occasions. I will have two other speeches to make on this subject.

Yesterday, I started discussing the mismatches in the DOD's budget and its accounting books. I want to pick up where I left off yesterday. I want to tick off some of the most glaring disconnects and mismatches that we have in the accounting books.

First, the General Accounting Office says that our Defense Department has at least $33 billion of problem disbursements. That is the latest figure, $33 billion. Just June 30, last year, the Defense Department quantified this problem that they call problem disbursements to be only $25 billion. We have an $8 billion increase in that figure called problem disbursements.

Every time I check, the estimate seems to be higher. It just keeps climbing. Now it is $33 billion. A person might ask, what is a problem disbursement? That is their language. It is primarily a disbursement that cannot be matched with an obligation.

Secretary Perry has $33 billion in unmatched disbursements. He thus has $33 billion in costs that cannot be tracked. I cannot say that we say that that is spent illegally. It is just that we have not matched it up at this point.

But that is a major problem when you consider the fact that there are people in this Congress who want to increase defense expenditures by $55 billion or more over the next 5 years.

Secretary Perry knows that the $33 billion was spent, but he does not know how the $33 billion was spent. He does not know what it bought. All he knows for sure is that the $33 billion went out the door.

Some of it could have been stolen, and I can show you a couple cases of real fraud in a moment.

We are never really going to know how the money was used until all the matches are made. If we cannot make hookups on the $33 billion, then what does that say about the other outlay numbers in the budget? Are they hooked up to the right accounts?

There is a second major disconnect in the accounting books. This is the one between the check writers and the accountants who are supposed to make sure that the work, services, or product was performed and goods or services delivered before payment is made.

A recent spot-check audit by the General Accounting Office produced some very disturbing results: $1.4 billion of overpayments. Contractors, in some instances, voluntarily returned money. It was not earned. It was not due. But we tried to pay it. And they wanted to return it.

The result of a new General Accounting Office audit is just as bad: $820 million in erroneous payments to the top 100 contractors. How many other faulty payments remain undetected or unreturned? I do not think anybody knows. Even the news media and a Pentagon official spoke about it, in reaction to my comments yesterday. People high up say, yes, they know they have major problems.

The Pentagon check-writing machine is stuck on full power. It is on automatic pilot, and the accounting department has gone on a long vacation. In some cases, the Defense Department tells the contractors, ''Don't worry, just hold on to the overpayment until your contracts are reconciled.''

That brings me then to the third big financial disconnect at the Pentagon.

Reconciliation is a detailed examination of contracts with known or suspected problems and is a primary tool of detecting duplicate, erroneous, or illegal payments. Unreconciled contracts—that is another bottomless accounting pit.

The problem has been identified by both the GAO and the DOD inspector general. One of the Pentagon's main contract paying operations, the center in Columbus, OH, has 13,600 unreconciled contracts, including 2,707 contracts that are overdisbursed by $1.2 billion.

The checking account on those 2,707 contracts is overdrawn by $1.2 billion then. Since the records are in such bad shape, the DOD IG and the GAO think it will take 5 million to 10 million man-hours to reconcile these contracts. At $58 an hour charged by a firm like Coopers & Lybrand, it could cost $550 million to make all the fiscal connections and to clean up the accounting mess. And that is the cleanup cost for just one location, Columbus, OH. And there are many others.

At those rates, the total cost of the bookkeeping cleanup operation could approach the cost of the DOD's environmental cleanup operation.

There is a fourth gaping hole in the accounting books. This one may even be worse. This one involves DBOF, which is short for the Defense Business Operations Fund.

DBOF is a $77 billion-a-year operation. DBOF purchases everything from fuel to repair parts to toilet paper and light bulbs. Much of what is bought by DBOF is needed to train the Armed Forces and keep them ready for combat. Unfortunately, DBOF's books are a mess. DBOF's books are in such bad shape that the inspector general had to issue a disclaimer of opinion for the second year in a row.

In the language of accountants, that means the IG could not audit DBOF's books. If you cannot audit the books, you do not know how much money is being spent. We know how much money is being pumped into DBOF, but we do not have any idea what is coming out the other end.

The breakdown of controls within DBOF could help to explain why the Pentagon still cannot relate resources to readiness. DBOF should help us answer this question: If we add $1 billion to the budget to increase readiness, how much more readiness do we get? DBOF cannot answer that issue.

The breakdown of fiscal connections within DBOF alone means that there are no controls or accountability over about 30 percent of the defense budget.

Mr. President, I know that these are harsh judgments on the condition of the Department of Defense's books, but they are based on many years of watchdogging, plus the carefully documented work of the General Accounting Office and the DOD inspector general.

We have a breakdown in the financial controls in four key areas of the defense budget. Unless this mess gets cleaned up, we will not know how DOD is spending the people's money. The breakdown of internal controls makes it easy to steal money from defense accounts. The implications of the defense accounting breakdown were brought home hard recently in two cases: The cases of a Mr. James Lugas and a Mr. James Edward McGill. Both men are in jail for stealing from the taxpayers. Both were able to tap into the DOD money pipe with ease and steal millions of dollars.

They operated undetected for a number of years, and they were not detected because of internal audits or tight controls. They were caught by pure chance. They were caught because of their own outrageous behavior.

One was a low level GS–8 accountant. He was literally living like a king. His neighbors thought he was dealing in drugs, so they turned him in.

The other submitted 32 invoices for payment on a phantom ship that the Navy supposedly had. All he needed to set up shop and do business with the Navy were a rubber stamp, blank invoices, and a mailbox. And the checks just started rolling in. He never did any work. Nor did he ever perform any services.

If the DOD was matching disbursements with obligations as they occurred, then Mr. Lugas and Mr. McGill would have been caught immediately. And that is what worries me, Mr. President. How many others like McGill and Lugas have tapped into the DOD money pipe undetected?

This situation is a disgrace. It tells me we cannot meet our constitutional obligations to the taxpayers of our country to make sure their money is honestly and legally spent. We cannot give the taxpayers an accurate and complete report on how the Pentagon is spending their money.

This is a serious breach of responsibility to the American people. That is over the long haul. But immediately, Mr. President, as we go into the budget process over the next 2 months, both Houses of Congress need to be cognizant of the unmatched disbursements, the stealing of money, before we put $55 billion more in the defense budget.

How can you make that determination in good conscience if you do not have a good accounting system and know from where you are starting?

So I end these remarks on the disconnect between the accounting and budget books.

Tomorrow, I want to turn to the program budget mismatch, which is also a major problem.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the floor leader asked me to make this request.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table the Bradley amendment occur at 2 p.m. today, to be followed immediately by a vote on a motion to table the Feingold amendment No. 362, to be followed by a motion to table the Hollings amendment No. 404.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise to express my opposition to the pending amendment, the line-item veto substitute amendment that is before the body, and in the course of doing that to express some thoughts on the line-item veto issue more broadly.

I am very much concerned that any proposal, unless very carefully developed and worked out, could result in a fundamental reordering of the separation of powers and check and balance arrangements between the legislative and the executive branches.

Unfortunately, there is a tendency to dismiss these kinds of questions, although they were very much at the forefront of the thinking of the Founding Fathers when they devised the Constitution that summer in Philadelphia. A Constitution which has served us well over two centuries of the Republic's history. A very careful balanced arrangement was put together then, and I think when it comes to changing it, we need to be very cautious and very prudent.

It does not take a great deal of skill or vision to have a strong executive. Many countries throughout history

have had very strong executives. In fact, if they are too strong, we refer to them as dictatorships. One of the hallmarks of a free society is having a legislative branch and a judicial branch with some independence and with some decisionmaking authority which can operate as a check and balance upon the executive. I repeat, many countries have had strong executives, but they have not been the examples that we want to follow or to emulate.

The great achievement of the American constitutional system is to have established a National Government with independent branches that check and balance one another, to have not only an Executive but legislative branch with some power and authority. I think we have to be very careful that the proposals which come before us with respect to line-item veto not erode the balance and the arrangement that has served the Republic well for over 205 years.

The danger, of course, is that these line-item veto proposals open up the opportunity for the Executive branch, for the President, to bring to bear enormous pressure upon Members of Congress and, therefore, markedly affect the dynamics between the two branches. What the various forms of the line-item veto would do, unless very carefully restrained, is enable a President to link votes on matters unrelated to the appropriation bill to a specific item in the appropriation measure.

Members may well be confronted with a situation in which the Executive says, ''I see this item in this bill, and it is a good item; everyone has justified it; it makes a lot of sense; it is obviously very important to your State or to your district; and I certainly do not want to exercise my veto over it; but I am very concerned about the position you are taking''—and then he mentions some totally unrelated issue, perhaps a nomination to the Supreme Court, perhaps a foreign policy matter involving very important issues of war and peace, or other issues on the domestic front.

Of course, the Executive then is in position to bring enormous pressure to bear. So the line-item veto tool becomes used not as many have suggested, as a way to delete spending items and address through that deletion the deficit problem, it becomes a tool and a legislative strategy by the White House and by the Executive branch to sway Members in terms of the positions they take on unrelated items. It becomes a heavy weapon of pressure.

Now, the particular provision that is before us was not the subject of any committee hearings or any report. There is no report with respect to this provision. It was a substitute that was simply presented on the floor. It would require individual items in an appropriation bill to be separately enrolled and presented to the President. And as the very distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, demonstrated yesterday, a single appropriations bill could end up as thousands of individual enrolled bills that would be sent to the President to be signed or vetoed.

Senator BYRD indicated yesterday that this dramatic change in our system for enacting legislation raises many significant constitutional issues. First, you have important questions about the role of the enrolling clerk in carrying this forward. What will be sent to the President is not identical with what was passed by the Congress. It will be what we pass subsequently broken up by the enrolling clerk. It is not as though the Senate and the House were asked to pass each of these items and then that was sent to the President. That at least I think would be consistent with existing constitutional arrangements.

With the proposal before us, you will be passing a bill, and then the enrollment clerk is going to divide it up into lots of little bills. I think Senator BYRD referred to them as ''billettes.'' And those would be sent to the President. In fact, I think there is a very strong argument that this scheme would violate the presentment clause in article I, section 7 of the Constitution, which provides:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States.
>
> If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it.

It seems clear to me that what would be presented to the President is not what has passed the House and the Senate. In fact, I understand that the Assistant Attorney General from the Office of Legal Counsel has raised serious concerns about the separate enrollment approach contained in this substitute amendment with the observation:

> On what seems to us to be the best reading of the Presentment Clause, what must be presented to the President is the bill in exactly the form in which it was voted on and passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate rather than a measure or a series of measures that subsequently have been abstracted from that bill by the clerk of the relevant House.

Obviously, this raises a serious constitutional issue, and I hope Members will stop and deliberate about it very carefully as we consider the substitute proposal that is before us.

Under this substitute, the separate enrollment of each item would be the responsibility of the enrollment clerk after the larger bill has passed the Congress. The Congress would never actually vote on the individual so-called bills that would go to the President. Therefore, it represents a dramatic and drastic departure from our constitutional arrangements.

Only this morning there was an editorial in the paper, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SARBANES. This editorial said in part:

> The ''compromise'' line-item veto bill that Republicans have put on the Senate floor is as bad as the bill it would replace, and not a compromise at all. It is sloppily drawn, would greatly complicate the legislative process, invite evasions, and likely do little to accomplish its ostensible purpose of reducing excess spending and the deficit. The main effect would be to disturb the traditional balance of powers by strengthening the President and congressional minorities at the majority's expense.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to reflect on the history of the existing scheme for Presidential rescission of spending items.

Congress enacted the Budget Impoundment and Control Act in 1974 in response to Executive excesses by a President who impounded funds duly enacted into law. I supported that act—as a Member of the House—to restore balance between the executive and legislative branches. And it is quite possible, of course, to further refine the rescissions scheme first put forth in the 1974 act. In fact, there has been legislation which Senators DOMENICI and EXON had been recommending to do exactly that. I understand that the minority leader will be making proposals with respect to so-called expedited rescission that would enable us to move forward on this issue. That would ensure the President that items he picked out of an appropriation bill and said should be rescinded would come to the Congress and would have to be voted on by the Congress.

That is not now the case. The President can pick the items out for rescission, but a vote on them is not actually required. This proposal, the so-called expedited rescission proposal, would ensure that a vote had to be taken. And it provides, of course, that if a majority in both Houses does not agree that the item should be rescinded, then it would not be rescinded.

But, it does provide a way to put a spotlight on the item, if that is what the President wishes to do, and it does require the Members of the Congress to address the issue and to address it directly.

I understand, also, that the proposal that the minority leader may make would include within it so-called tax expenditures as an item also over which the President would have that particular rescission authority, and then would be able to require a direct vote by both Houses of the Congress on that item.

That is a change in procedure, but it is one that I think is worthy of consideration and it does not fundamentally alter the arrangements between the Executive and the legislative branch that are currently contained in the Constitution of the United States.

It is a more restrained and balanced approach, I think, to try to address this issue. It does not represent the

drastic departure from past constitutional practice which is contained in the amendment before us, or indeed in other more sweeping proposals. And it does not shift the balance between the Executive and the legislative branches in a drastic way. It addresses the concerns that have been raised without creating even larger problems—problems which would flow from a fundamental altering of the basic relationship which has existed for more than two centuries between the Executive and legislative branches.

Mr. President, I very much hope this amendment will be defeated when we finally vote on it. I am hopeful that an appropriate alternative can be worked out along the lines of what is called the expedited rescission approach.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1995]

ANOTHER IN THE SENATE

The ''compromise'' line-item veto bill that Republicans have put on the Senate floor is as bad as the bill it would replace, and not a compromise at all. It is sloppily drawn, would greatly complicate the legislative process, invite evasions and likely do little to accomplish its ostensible purpose of reducing excess spending and the deficit. The main effect would be to disturb the traditional balance of powers by strengthening the president and congressional minorities at the majority's expense.

The problem, if there is one, is that presidents now can't pick and choose among the items in appropriations and other money bills. They can only sign or veto them in their entirety. In the Reagan and Bush years, the myth grew up that this was one of the reasons the deficit was so large—not presidential policy, but the inability of (Republican) presidents to curb the (Democratic) congressional proclivity to spend.

Unfortunately, the myth has survived the election returns. The Republicans remain committed to giving the president greater power to single out and block line items, and President Clinton has unwisely said he wants as much such power as Congress is willing to confer. The House passed legislation under which he could sign an appropriations bill, then propose to kill or reduce any item in it. Congress would then have to pass a second bill to block such a proposal, and that could be vetoed, so that two-thirds votes of both houses would be required to sustain even the smallest spending detail to which a president might object.

Some Senators of both parties rightly thought that was too great a cession of power. They proposed instead a system in which Congress would have to reaffirm its support for line items to which a president objected, but majority votes would be enough to prevail. But the Republicans in this group came under party pressure to back off and support the present ''compromise'' instead.

Congress would pass appropriations and other money bills as now, then split them into line items or other designated parts—perhaps thousands per bill—and send each part to the president to be signed or vetoed separately. It's a recipe for writer's cramp. The president plus a minority of one-third plus one of either house would be enough to govern. The rule would also apply to any increase in entitlements and any revenue-losing tax provision ''having the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similary situated taxpayers.'' To what might that not apply?

The line-item veto has become a political symbol. The members of both parties who are so blithely supporting it, including Bill Clinton, need to ask themselves what it means. If the next president doesn't like a particular program for whatever reason—it needn't be the cost—he and a minority of either house can flick it out of the budget and out of existence. It could happen as easily to a new weapons system as it could to the likes of the national service corps. For lack of political will, the legislative branch votes to make itself that much weaker. Who wins from that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, as all know, the Senate is debating a truly fundamental change to our system of Government. We have before us legislation which proposes to reconsider some of the most basic principles of our democracy. For over 200 years the Federal Government has maintained a careful balance between the powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. That balance has stood the test of time and has helped sustain our Nation's cherished liberties for generations. Given that remarkable record, I think we need to be very cautious before altering this historic balance of powers. And it is not something we should do lightly. It is not something we should rush through.

We do, however, have to be prepared to respond to changing conditions and to make needed changes in the way we do business. Despite all that is good about our democratic system we also face some real problems and one of the most important is Government waste and the deep public anger that it provokes.

Almost more than any time in our history, it is critical to reduce waste in Government. We are continuing to load debt on our children and grandchildren. The tax burden is heavy. Americans are losing faith in Government as they are repeatedly bombarded with examples of unnecessary spending from fraud in Government programs to the Lawrence Welk center.

Taxpayers are infuriated, and they have a right to be. They also have a right to demand that we do something about it. And there is broad public support for trying some form of line-item veto. Yet we ought not to exaggerate what a line-item veto can accomplish. It will not eliminate all Government waste nor will it balance the budget. It may result in eliminating unnecessary pork-barrel projects and special-interest loopholes. That is not to say that all narrowly targeted spending or tax provisions are wasteful. We all know that many are. And the most egregious examples get the most publicity and erode public confidence in the Congress and in our Government. Surely that is one reason why the public is so angry with Washington. We need to look for ways to address this problem and the line-item veto might help by giving the President power to eliminate items that are truly indefensible.

Under current law, when the Congress sends the President a broad spending or tax bill, the President's options are pretty limited. He can sign the whole bill into law or he can veto the entire package. Once an appropriation bill is enacted, the President can propose to rescind specific items of spending and send Congress a rescission, a reduction in the original proposal—specifically eliminating one recommendation. But this rescission power is extremely limited.

First of all, it does not apply to tax breaks, those breaks that are given to special interests that cost us money because we lose those revenues. And, in the case of proposed rescissions to appropriations, Congress presently can simply ignore them.

It seems to me that it is worth trying to give the President of the United States additional powers to eliminate waste. But as we move into these uncharted waters, fundamentally changing our form of government, we should build in certain protections against abuse of Executive power. Restraint of Executive power has been the hallmark of our Constitution and has guided our Founding Fathers in its creation.

We can strengthen the President's rescission power by making sure that Congress considers all Presidential rescission proposals and does so on an expedited basis. Once again, that Congress reviews and considers all Presidential rescission proposals would be a significant step forward in the fight against waste.

Currently, if the President sends rescissions to us to eliminate wasteful spending we can simply ignore them, and we often do. Forcing review of wasteful projects is not something that is taken up very readily. And in the glare of public debate, it would be a healthy antidote to our current way of doing business.

We can also build in protections against abuse of this expanded Executive power by retaining the democratic process of majority rule. The pending legislation would permit the President to kill any increases in spending or changes to entitlement programs if he can convince just one-third of one House of the Congress to support him. That is an enormous expansion of Executive power. It would permit the President to nullify what a majority of the people's representatives have already approved.

Finally, we would guard against abuse of power by the executive by requiring the Congress to review the line-item veto of a proscribed trial period. Initially, I think the shorter this trial the better. If the line-item veto works as its authors intend, it will have a salutary affect on our Government, and there will be no problem in extending it.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the proposal before us fails to protect against Executive branch abuses. It

also puts power in the hands of a small minority undermining majority rule by demanding a two-thirds vote to override the President's rescission recommendation. It lets one-third of Congress rule and the President controlling Federal policy on virtually all new spending and entitlement programs. Our Constitution was not written that way. It was not intended that way.

Legislation could also unintentionally hurt smaller States with smaller congressional delegations like mine, like the State of New Jersey. The proposal would lower the deck in favor of bigger States which have a leg up on building the necessary two-thirds vote to override a Presidential line-item veto. In my view, it is unwise. Mr. President, the case for a line-item veto rests largely on the need to eliminate narrowly targeted pork-barrel spending. But the majority leader's amendment goes much further than that. It would allow the President to unilaterally eliminate funding for entire programs. This would give a single individual the power to kill major initiatives in education, law enforcement, health care, veterans programs, mass transit, immigration enforcement, housing, and you name it. All could be at risk.

It would also put Medicare, veterans benefits, and other entitlement programs under the control of a small minority of Congress aligned with the President. I am not suggesting, Mr. President, that President Clinton or any future President would abuse this new power. But we do not really know and we have to guard against it. That is not a Democratic concern or a Republican concern. It is a nonpartisan concern. It is not a liberal concern. It is not a conservative concern. It is a democratic with a small ''d'' concern. It has nothing to do with party or ideology. It has everything to do with the potential for abuse of power and rule by a congressional minority.

Let us take one example of a President of my own party, President Lyndon Baines Johnson. President Johnson was a strong leader who excelled at cajoling and pressing Members of Congress into voting with him. I never experienced it. But the Johnson treatment was something that is legendary. Lyndon Johnson used every tool in his arsenal to make his case, to win his recommendation.

Looking to future, a President with strong leadership skills and strong convictions he could gain enormously in power. With just one-third of one House of Congress he could wipe out essential benefits for ordinary Americans, and a majority in Congress could do nothing to stop him.

Mr. President, I urge against giving a President that unbridled power. I am not willing to risk that. A future President would be able to override a majority in the Congress, and perhaps eliminate all school lunches, or deny middle-class students the opportunity to go to college, or deny working families a chance for child care, or take police officers off the street, or force young children to go hungry, or increase the number of homeless on our streets, or deny veterans the benefits they earned while serving our country, or deny senior citizens needed benefits required under Medicare.

Mr. President, these expenditures and these benefits are not pork. But they would all be vulnerable to the line-item veto under the proposed majority leader's amendment. A President bent on eliminating them could wield a new tool like a meat ax against ordinary Americans. There needs to be some real protections against that, if we are to have a line-item veto.

I am also concerned that a line-item veto could open the door to what some have called political extortion. I use that term to convey how a President would be able in effect hold the gun to the heads of the Members of Congress. This could happen. A President could go to a Member of Congress and say, ''I need support for my favorite new initiative, and, if you do not agree to support it, it is goodbye for that new highway or special program that is so important in your district.'' Mr. President, that kind of political pressure occurs in many States that have a line-item veto, and it can lead to more wasteful spending—not less.

Mr. President, to limit the possibility that a line-item veto will be abused, it is important to keep the Executive on a relatively short leash. One way is to require Congress to reauthorize the line-item veto on a routine basis. Another is to allow a majority in the Congress to overrule the President.

These protections would preserve the constitutional principle of a balance of power and avoid shifting power, extraordinary power, to the executive branch or to larger States at the expense of the medium-sized or smaller States. It would make it less likely that a future occupant of the White House would ride roughshod over the people in the Congress. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the pending proposal does not include adequate protections. It is a serious flaw in the legislation.

I am also concerned about the provisions in the pending amendment related to tax instructions. Those provisions, though drafted ambiguously apparently are intended to provide a loophole that will protect many special interest tax breaks from rescission.

Mr. President, we all know that many special tax breaks that have been included in tax bills over the years exist. There are special rules for the timber industry, for the oil and gas industry, even for cruise liners. In fact, a few years ago we tried to enact a special loophole for the tuxedo industry. Once enacted, most tax breaks enjoy a special status that even the most popular spending programs would emulate. They never have to be appropriated. They never have to be reauthorized. They never have to compete for scarce budgetary resources. Instead, they simply nestle quietly and unobtrusively in the nooks and the crannies of the Tax Code never to be seen nor heard from again. But they cost us substantial revenues, and their costs are made up by imposing extra burdens on ordinary taxpayers.

Mr. President, unwarranted tax loopholes go to the heart of what bothers so many Americans today. Loopholes generally are provided only to special interests and wealthy individuals who have either special connections or enough money to hire a high-priced lobbyist with access to Members of Congress. We have seen a lot of stories on lobbying influence in these recent days and weeks. Meanwhile, ordinary Americans do not have those things. They do not have personal relationships with powerful Senators, and they do not have the lobbyists working for them. So when an ordinary American sees clients of lobbyists getting special treatment in the Tax Code, they really resent it. They resent it very, very deeply.

Mr. President, the pending amendment of the majority leader includes ambiguous language on targeted tax benefits. But according to statements made on this floor, that language is intended to be very narrow. Apparently, if a tax break benefits a particular company, it may be subject to a rescission. But if the loophole benefits two companies or an entire industry, it will get special protection.

Mr. President, that is a loophole law that I cannot support.

In conclusion, let me again emphasize that we are talking about the basic structure of Government that was established over 200 years ago, and we ought to proceed with caution. To help eliminate waste in Government, it is worth trying a line-item veto. But we should not support proposals that are vulnerable to abuse, that fail to adequately protect the public interest and our constituents or that provide for special interest tax loopholes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in light of the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, I think it is very interesting that in the chair we have a former Governor of a State and the author of the amendment that is under consideration. The Senator from South Carolina is also a former Governor. Both of them are strongly in support of the line-item veto. Both of them may have differing opinions on many issues because they are of different party affiliation, but both of them have had the unique experience of being responsible for governing a State and having to balance the budget of that State.

The Senator from South Carolina just related how he took his State from a situation of near fiscal crisis to one of fiscal solvency. He states that with the line-item veto—and I am not trying to parrot the words of the Senator from South Carolina, who is far more eloquent than I—he was able to govern

his State effectively with that very valuable tool.

The Senator from Missouri, a former Governor of his State, who has spoken on the floor here on several occasions—both have talked and talked about the absolute criticality of the ability to exercise a line-item veto; not only exercise it, but having that tool in shaping the budget of their States.

You know, it is interesting, I do not detect in either one of these individuals and other former Governors who are Members of this body this desire to twist arms, threaten, blackmail—and ''extortion'' I have heard used a couple of times—and I cannot believe that the American people would sit by and watch a President of the United States practice extortion or blackmail on Members of the Senate or Members of Congress.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes, I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Does the Senator believe that the only ones who know how to manage an enterprise are Governors? Or does the Senator believe that business experience is of value as well, business experience that developed an entire industry known as the computing industry, which I modestly had a hand in and am a member of the Hall of Fame of Information and Processing. I ran a terrific company with an excellent record, one of the best in the country. I assume the Senator would yield to the fact that someone who has other experience besides Governors can make a contribution; is that not so?

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest, I say to my friend from New Jersey, not only is it a very important and valuable credential to address any issue—especially where the free enterprise system is concerned—I, along with my colleagues, share admiration for the enormous contributions the Senator from New Jersey made to the primary generator of business and employment and commerce not only nationally but throughout the world.

But I do suggest there is some difference in that, as Governors of States, they were required—and I might say a fairly significant size—to administer those States. In fact, they had oversight of the businesses that resided in their States, in a regulatory and other fashion, working in partnership with the legislature.

I suggest that, as the head of a very successful corporation, the Senator from New Jersey had more than a line-item veto. The Senator from New Jersey had a total veto, and there was no chance of his being overridden, except by his board of directors or his stockholders. I view this situation—and I am sure, knowing how gentle the Senator from New Jersey is, from time to time he had to exercise that veto; otherwise, he would not have achieved the pinnacle of success that he reached.

So I do think there is a certain comparability, and I believe that, if there were outrageous expenditures in his company and corporation and if the Senator from New Jersey, then a president and CEO, felt helpless to bring into check those extravagances, I think it would have harmed his ability to achieve the enormous and very laudable degree of success that he achieved.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his question. I also would like to again state that it is of interest that in 43 States in America out of 50, those Governors do exercise the line-item veto.

Again, in response to a very legitimate question from the Senator from New Jersey, when there is a military issue, I try to get the opinion of people who are military experts. When there is an issue of aviation, I try to go to those experts. I try to consult with—due to my narrow experience and knowledge and background—those people who are experts and have had experience in areas where, frankly, I am not as well informed as others. And so it seems to me that it would be logical to consult the Senator from South Carolina, who was judged by many as the most successful Governor in the history of that State. He literally brought it into the 20th century in more ways than one. And there is the Senator from Missouri, who presently occupies the chair, as well as many other Senators who were Governors. Another example is the present Governor of California, who was a Member of this body before he became Governor, who has stated unequivocally, as Governor of the State of California, that without the capacity to exercise the line-item veto, he would have enormous and indeed insurmountable difficulties.

So I have to rely on the judgment and experience of Members of this body and people who are not Members of this body that have actually had the experience of governing. And governing, I think, is a unique challenge and experience. I am very pleased to have the input and the benefit and knowledge and experience of the Senator from South Carolina, as well as the Senator from Missouri, as well as many other Senators.

I read a few days ago, Mr. President, a survey done by the Cato Institute, where approximately 88 percent of the former Governors—it was a very large number of former Governors, of both the Democratic Party and Republican Party—when asked, stated that the line-item veto was a ''very useful tool.'' Those are the people whose judgment I think we not necessarily rely on, but certainly the benefit of their experience cannot be ignored.

I would like to address the issue of the Hollings amendment. Obviously, what the Senator from South Carolina is trying to achieve here is laudable. I just find, however, that it is not germane. This bill is about process reform; it is about separate enrollment—a concept long advocated by the Senator from South Carolina. Additionally, the chairman of the Budget Committee announced that he is going to have a hearing on this amendment in the Budget Committee. We have announced that we are prepared to accept the Exon amendment which affects this bill. The Hollings amendment raises many valid issues, but I believe it would be better offered on more appropriate legislation. I note that the Hollings amendment was defeated in the Budget Committee by a 12-to-10 vote. So the Budget Committee has spoken on this issue, which, by the way, by no means precludes the Senator from South Carolina from bringing this to the floor, as we all know. But I would, at the proper time, make a motion to table the Hollings amendment. I believe that the time for a vote will be established very soon.

Mr. President, I paid attention to the remarks of the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New Jersey. Their concerns have been raised many times in the past and they will be raised again before we finally enact this bill, which I now am feeling some optimism about, although we have a number of wickets to go through before we reach that goal.

Mr. President, in all due respect to my colleagues, I do believe that it is an argument for pretty much the status quo. I do not think that the American people are satisfied with the status quo. I do not believe they are satisfied with a debt that will accumulate to $5.2 trillion. I do not believe they will be satisfied with $200 billion-plus annual deficits.

Mr. President, I do believe that it is important again to restate, as I have over and over and over again, that from 1801 when Thomas Jefferson—which is becoming a famous anecdote, probably far more famous than Thomas Jefferson ever envisioned—in 1801, when Thomas Jefferson impounded the $50,000 that Congress appropriated to purchase gunboats, that a practice for the next 174 years was continued by Chief Executives of this country and that was impounding funds that they did not wish to spend.

Now we all know our history, and that is, in 1974, with a weakened President, who had, in the view of many, and probably accurately, abused the impoundment powers by impounding enormous sums of money for entire programs that had been authorized and appropriated by the Congress, the Congress repealed the Budget Impoundment Act. And we know what has happened since.

I have quoted for the record before rescissions that come over from the President of the United States. They are either ignored or other rescissions are substituted for them so that basically the Chief Executive, the President of the United States, is at the mercy of the whim or the desires, which is more accurate, the desires of the Congress as related to a rescission.

And more and more often since 1974, rescission requests on the part of Presidents of the United States, both Republican and Democrat, have been ignored by the legislative branch.

So when my colleagues argue, as the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New Jersey did, that this is an enormous shift of power, I will agree that it is a shift of power. I also argue that it is a much needed shift of power, but it is not new. It is not new. It is a restoration of, basically, the powers that the Executive had from 1801 to 1974.

(Mr. DEWINE assumed the chair.)

Mr. MCCAIN. I also know, Mr. President, that almost everything that we and the executive branch do is under the scrutiny of the media. The media pay attention and report on almost everything we do. In fact, there is a cottage industry now, as we all know, that describe private conversations that the President had with another individual, that describe the innermost counsels, both in the executive branch, the President of the United States and the White House, and in the Congress of the United States.

If it became known to the people of the United States that the President of the United States was calling the Senator from South Carolina over and said, ''I want you to support my effort to provide housing for Russian officers or I am going to kill a project in South Carolina,'' it would be over. In a New York minute, it would be over. Because the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Ohio would walk out to that group of microphones and cameras in front of the White House and say, ''I have just been blackmailed by the President of the United States.''

And if there is one thing that I think would reassure my reelection, if I sought reelection, it would be to go out and tell the people of Arizona that I stood up to a threat of blackmail by the President of the United States.

So, yes, I admired in many ways the persuasive powers of President Lyndon Johnson, which was referred to in the remarks by the Senator from New Jersey. I admire the persuasive powers of President Reagan. But I do not believe that any President of the United States is going to engage in political blackmail.

And in these 43 out of 50 States where Governors have line-item vetoes, I have yet to hear of a single instance where a Governor—although it may have happened on a rare occasion or two, I just have not heard of it, nor have I ever read or heard it reported—has exercised this kind of extortion or blackmail, as it is described.

Now, I saw a little item today that ever child born in America now has a $13,000 debt. I am not sure how that is computed, Mr. President. I would be interested in knowing how you figure that out.

But I do know this: That with a $5.2 trillion debt, which is the estimate of what this Nation will carry next year, I believe that every child in America is now inflicted with a huge debt burden that they are going to have to pay off sooner or later.

We could, Mr. President, turn down the line-item veto. We could continue these unending debts and annual deficits, I think, for some years. But there is going to come a time where the bill is going to become due.

Some experts attribute the fall of the dollar to the failure of the balanced budget amendment. I do not know if that is the case or not. I do not claim to have that kind of expertise.

But if I were a foreign investor and I was looking around the world where to invest my money and I saw a country that is growing more and more dependent upon foreign investment in order to have the Treasury bills, which are floated quite frequently, in order to secure funds because of the annual deficit we are running, I think I would be less than confident not only in the economy of this country but I would lose some confidence in the validity of its currency.

Now maybe that is too dire a picture. Maybe the strong American economy and the overall strength and economic strength of this country would override that. But I cannot believe, at the end of the day, that it is attractive to invest or hold the currency of a country that forever, forever, which is the case now, is going to be running annual deficits and accumulating an ever larger and larger debt.

And I want to add, again, Mr. President, the line-item veto does not balance the budget. We all admit to that. But I do not see a balanced budget without the line-item veto. I think that is the important part of this discourse.

I have displayed a chart here on several occasions that shows that in 1974, when the President of the United States lost the impoundment power, revenues and expenditures began to diverge and they have continued almost unendingly to diverge for a very long period of time, for the last 21 years, with no end in sight.

I will say that we have had a short period—and I think it is due to the leadership of the President of the United States and efforts that were made—where we have had a temporary reduction in the annual deficit. That is the good news. The bad news is there is no place that anyone envisions where that deficit is zero or that we even begin to pay off the debt we have accumulated.

Mr. President, sooner or later, we are going to have to do that. We are now paying nearly as much on interest on the national debt as we are on national defense. People born a generation ago would find that an incredible and bizarre situation.

I see the Senator from South Carolina on his feet, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Arizona, and the distinguished Presiding Officer.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator KERREY of Nebraska be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask the sincere reconsideration by the distinguished Senator from Arizona on his motion to table our amendment.

What happened, Mr. President, is that we brought it up dutifully before the Budget Committee. It was not approved, as has been pointed out. But, having done that, now is the time.

If we do not do this now, which is relevant to the budget resolution, if we do not do it now, then what we really are going to do is avoid truth in budgeting because the next time we really sit down to consider the budget, we will be considering it under the old rules.

So it is very appropriate and, incidentally, more so than perhaps the underlying amendment.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona said, ''Wait a minute, now; he had his vote and he lost.'' He did not refer to the other vote I lost, namely, the line-item veto. The present bill under consideration is the substitute measure.

On the rationale of my distinguished colleague, we ought to table the whole bloomin' line-item veto.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. McCAIN. Another testimony to the incredible clairvoyance of the Senator from South Carolina. I thank him.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I hope he will stick with me on the line-item veto and not table it under that same logic.

Now, with respect to germaneness, I happen to have a record that was generally respected as the presiding officer at the State level, and having come to the U.S. Senate, I spent my 28 going on 29 years trying to forget parliamentary procedure.

I will never forget when I first presided and I got two Golden Gavel Awards—200 hours. We used to start the Presiding Officer about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse, would get up and characterize the President of the United States, who had just been lauded with respect for his muscle power in getting things done, President Lyndon Johnson. He would refer to him as a murderer, and that would go on from about 5 o'clock until about 9:30 or 10 o'clock each evening, with respect to the war in Vietnam.

But I immediately recognized someone who first rose to be recognized. That is the fundamental parliamentary rule in all bodies in the world, save this one. Here you recognize the majority leader. You could have been out here for 3 hours or 2 days, whatever it is, sitting in your seat, and stand to be

recognized, but the majority leader at that particular time comes to the door, forget about you. Under the rules of the Senate, you recognize him.

In that light, I had the duty of trying to forget rules, but I never forgot the one of germaneness. I refer specifically here to the short title ''The Separate Enrollment and Line-item Veto Act of 1995,'' which I hope to amend.

Under the section 5 subsection (a) I refer, the term ''targeted tax benefit'' means any provision estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation as losing revenue within the period specified in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

Now, that is amending section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974 and specifically the title with respect to within the periods specified.

So, it is a limited one with respect to the overall subject—namely, a line-item veto for the President—but with respect to the general subject of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, it is definitely germane. With respect to ''within the period specified in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution'', that is what my amendment is amending so that budgets hereafter will be subject to that 10-year rule.

So on both points, I will ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to reconsider and rejoin his Republican leadership of approximately a year ago.

I again read from the document ''Fiscal Year 1995 Senate Budget Committee Republican Alternative'', prepared by the Republican staff of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee and presented last year by none other than the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico.

If we turn to the second-to-last page, it has ''Miscellaneous provisions.'' Fiscal year 1995 Republican budget resolution, ''miscellaneous provisions,'' description and the first bullet there, ''Strengthens the 10-year pay-as-you-go point of order while the 10-year pay-as-you-go point of order that was established by last year's budget resolution is determined does not currently apply to budget resolutions and could be repealed by a subsequent budget resolution. This proposal would make future budget resolutions subject to this point of order.''

They talk about partisanship. I am delighted to get bipartisan here today on not only the line-item veto, which I have been trying for 10 years. It was a bipartisan initiative back in 1985, and was rightly quoted as such by the distinguished majority leader said earlier this week. He referred to the Hollings–Mattingly line-item veto, that we had a pretty good healthy vote on in 1985.

Mr. President, let me also ask that the distinguished ranking member of our Budget Committee, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON, also be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, with him being a cosponsor, I go back to that vote.

We had the line-item veto up in the Budget Committee. My particular introduction of the line-item veto already in this session is now resting in the Rules Committee. I have had it before in the Budget Committee. In fact, I had a successful vote in 1990 of the line-item veto out of the Budget Committee by a vote of 13 to 6.

Now, I want to one more time elaborate so it is clearly understood what is happening here with respect not only to the line-item veto and referring to future generations as the Senator from Arizona just previously did, but what we have done in order to try and secure the Social Security of future generations.

Along this line, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a very short title of ''Off-Budget Status of OASDI Trust Funds,'' section 13301(b). I want to print this in the RECORD at this particular point.

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

Subtitle C—Social Security

SEC. 13301. OFF-BUDGET STATUS OF OASDI TRUST FUNDS.

(a) EXCLUSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

(1) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President,

(2) the congressional budget, or

(3) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) EXCLUSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The concurrent resolution shall not include the outlays and revenue totals of the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act or the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in the surplus or deficit totals required by this subsection or in any other surplus or deficit totals required by this title.''.[1831]

FOOTNOTE

[1831] The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the Budget Enforcement Act explains generally the amendments made by subtitle C:

VI. TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Current law

Under current law, the Social Security trust funds are off-budget but are included in deficit estimates and calculations made for purposes of the sequestration process. However, Social Security benefit payments are exempt from any sequestration order.

Section 310(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 prohibits the consideration of reconciliation legislation ''that contains recommendations'' with respect to Social Security. (A motion to waive this point of order requires 60 votes in the Senate and a simple majority in the House.)

House bill

The House bill reaffirms the off-budget status of Social Security and removes the trust funds—excluding interest receipts—from the deficit estimates and calculations made in the sequestration process. The House bill retains the current law exemption of Social Security benefit payments from any sequestration order.

The House bill creates a ''fire wall'' point of order (as free-standing legislation) to prohibit the consideration of legislation that would change the actuarial balance of the Social Security trust funds over a 5-year or 75-year period. In the case of legislation decreasing Social Security revenues, the prohibition would not apply if the legislation also included an equivalent increase in Medicare taxes for the period covered by the legislation.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment also reaffirms the off-budget status of Social Security and removes the trust funds from the deficit estimates and calculations made in the sequestration process. However, unlike the House bill, the Senate amendment removes the gross trust fund transactions—including interest receipts—from the sequestration deficit calculations. The Senate amendment also retains the current law exemption of Social Security benefit payments from any sequestration order.

The Senate amendment also creates a procedural fire wall to protect Social Security financing, but does so by expanding certain budget enforcement provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Senate amendment expands the prohibition in Section 310(g) of the Budget Act to specifically protect Social Security financing, prohibits the consideration of a reported budget resolution calling for a reduction in Social Security surplus, and includes Social Security in the enforcement procedures under Sections 302 and 311 of the Budget Act. The Senate amendment also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide an actuarial analysis of any legislation affecting Social Security, and generally prohibits the consideration of legislation lacking such an analysis.

For more on the budgetary treatment of Social Security under current law and historically, see Senate Comm. on the Budget, Social Security Preservation Act, S. Rep. No. 101–426, 101st Cong. 2d Sess. (1990).

Conference agreement

The conference agreement incorporates the Senate position on the budgetary treatment of the Social Security trust funds, reaffirming their offbudget status and removing all their transactions from the deficit estimates and calculations made in the sequestration process.

Further, the conference agreement provides that the ''fire wall'' procedure proposed by the House shall apply only to the House and that the ''fire wall'' procedures proposed by the Senate shall apply only to the Senate.

H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 101–964, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 1160–61 (1990), *reprinted in* 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2374, 2865–66.

For legislative history of the effort to remove Social Security from the budget, see generally 136 Cong. Rec. 15,777–81 (daily ed. Oct. 18, 1990) (Senate debate on the related amendment to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990); Senate Comm. on the Budget, Social Security Preservation Act, S. Rep. No. 101–426, 101st Cong. 2d Sess. (1990); Congressional Research Serv., Social Security, Medicare, and the Unified Budget, S. Print No. 83, 99th Cong., 1 Sess. (Sen.

Comm. on Budget Print 1985); *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1989: Hearings Before the Senate Comm. on the Budget*, 100th Cong., 2d Sess. 85–160 (1988) (S. Hrg. No. 578, Vol. III) (hearing March 24, 1988, on ''Social Security, Deficits, and the Baby Boomers' Retirement''); *Budget Reform Proposals: Joint Hearings Before the Senate Comm. on Governmental Affairs & Comm. on the Budget*, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. 30–42 (S. Hrg. No. 101–560) (1989) (testimony of Sen. Heinz Oct. 18, 1989, on S. 1752); 129 Cong. Rec. S3587–603 (daily ed. Mar. 22, 1983) (Heinz amendment to remove Social Security trust funds from the unified budget); 135 Cong. Rec. S15,137–47 (daily ed. Nov. 7, 1989) (statements of Sen. Heinz, Majority Leader Mitchell, and others regarding scheduling of legislation regarding Social Security); 136 Cong. Rec. S7935–6, S7949–50, S7956–59, S7974–79 (daily ed. June 14, 1990) (same); 136 Cong. Rec. S8153–56 (daily ed. June 18, 1990) (statement of Sen. Heinz on his amendment requiring Congressional action on Social Security before action on the debt limit); 136 Cong. Rec. S8192–210 (daily ed. June 19, 1990) (debate on the Heinz amendment); S. 2211, 100th Cong., 2d Sess., 134 Cong. Rec. S3038–39 (daily ed. Mar. 24, 1988) (Sen. Sanford); S. 2914, 100th Cong., 2d Sess., 134 Cong. Rec. S16,889–95 (daily ed. Oct. 19, 1988) (Sen. Moynihan); S. 101, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S170, S425–29 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 1989) (Sen. Sanford); S. 219, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S173, S636–37 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 1989) (Sen. Moynihan); S. 240, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S173, S682–84 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 1989) (Sen. Heinz); S. 401, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S1413, S1421–22 (daily ed. Feb. 9, 1989) (Sen. Hollings); S. 852, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S4384, S4419 (daily ed. Apr. 19, 1989) (Sen. Bryan); S. 1752, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S13,297, S13,299–300 (daily ed. Oct. 12, 1989) (Sen Heinz); S. 1785, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S13,893 (daily ed. Oct. 24, 1989) (Sen. Moynihan); S. 1795, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 135 Cong. Rec. S14,129, S14,137–38 (daily ed. Oct. 25, 1989) (Sen. Hollings).

For a general discussion of the removal of Social Security from the budget and its consequences, see David Koitz, Social Security: Its Removal from the Budget and Procedures for Considering Changes to the Program (Jan. 4, 1993) (Cong. Res. Serv. rep. no. 93–23 EPW).

Some have argued that section 13301 conflicts with the listing of discretionary accounts set forth in the joint statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the Budget Enforcement Act. *See supra* p. 466. In a letter to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Chairman of the Budget Committee argued that the congressional intent is plain:

''I am writing to express my concern regarding a possible interpretation of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 with respect to the budgetary treatment of Social Security. I understand that your Office is considering whether the administrative expenses of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall be counted in the deficit and as part of the domestic discretionary caps for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Gramm-Rudman-Hollings). I wish to express in the strongest terms my view that these administrative expenses should not be included in either the deficit or the domestic discretionary cap for purposes of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

''Section 13301(a) of the Budget Enforcement Act states:

* * * * *

''The all-inclusive breadth of this language could not be more clear. The subsection heading speaks of 'exclusion . . . from *all* budgets.' The operative language is unambiguous: 'the receipts and disbursements . . . shall not be counted.' Paragraph (3) specifically mentions the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law as one of the purposes for which Social Security must be excluded.

''The joint statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the legislation that includes the Budget Enforcement Act similarly makes clear the intent of section 13301:

'''The conference agreement incorporates the Senate position on the budgetary treatment of the Social Security trust funds, reaffirming their off-budget status and removing *all their transactions* from the deficit estimates and calculations made in the sequestration process.'

H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 101–964, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 1161 (1990)[,*reprinted in* 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2017, 2865–66] (emphasis added).

''I understand that it may be argued that statement of managers language specifically includes references to the Social Security trust funds as two account items in a 39-page listing of accounts incorporated by reference in the definition of the term 'category' for purposes of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law. It would strain credulity to argue that this reference overcomes the plain language of section 13301(a). Although I conceded that some conflict between these two provisions may exist, that conflict must be resolved in favor of implementing the intent of Congress as evident in section 13301(a).

''The legislative intent to remove Social Security completely from all budgets is clear. The language of section 13301 indicates that it must apply '[n]otwithstanding any other provisions of law.' The Senate debated the removal of Social Security at length. The Senate voted 98–2 in favor of the amendment—sponsored by Senators Hollings, Heinz, and Moynihan, among others—that specifically took Social Security out of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings process. (*See* 136 Cong. Rec. 15,777–81 (Oct. 18, 1990).) Congressional examination of the 39-page listing in the statement of managers is nowhere evident in the debates.

''I urge you to follow section 13301(a) of the Budget Enforcement Act and remove the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds from the budget in their entirety. I recommend that the President use his authority under section 251(b)(1)(A) of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law to recognize any adjustments to the discretionary spending limits that such a position would require as a change in a concept or definition. I believe that this is the approach needed to ensure that all of Social Security is taken off budget.''

Letter from Sen. Jim Sesser to Richard G. Darman (Jan. 4, 1991).

The acting general counsel of the Office of Management and Budget replied to Chairman Sasser as follows:

''You expressed the view that the administrative costs of the social security program should be excluded from the domestic discretionary spending category.

We recognize that the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) contains a provision generally excluding the social security trust funds from the budget as well as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. Social security was previously excluded from the budget, but not from the deficit calculations under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act (GRH).

However, other provisions of OBRA specifically address whether social security administrative expenses are included in the domestic discretionary spending category. The portion of the social security trust funds that are annually appropriated as administrative expenses are specifically identified in the list of domestic discretionary programs that is part of the Joint Statement of Managers Accompanying the Conference Report on OBRA. OBRA expressly provides that discretionary appropriations in each of the three categories ''shall be those so designated in the joint statement of managers.'' Section 250(c)(4)(A) of GRH, as amended by OBRA. Because of this express designation of social security administrative expenses in the list of accounts that are required to be included in the domestic discretionary category identified in the law, we have concluded that the expenses must be so included.

While the OBRA provision excluding Social Security (section 13301(1)) applies as a general matter, it does not directly conflict with the specific OBRA provisions directing the treatment of one element of social security only for certain purposes. For example, Section 13303 of OBRA specifically requires that the congressional budget include social security revenue and outlays for purposes of enforcement of the Senate social security firewall points of order. This specific provision should not be disregarded simply because the general social security exclusion provision states that social security outlays and receipts ''shall not be counted'' for purposes of ''the congressional budget.'' Section 13301 (a). The name is true of the specific provision on administrative expenses. Indeed, even if there were a direct conflict between the general and specific provisions, the result would be the same. It is a basic principle of statutory construction that ''Where there is inescapable conflict between general and specific terms or provisions of a statute, the specific will prevail.'' 2A Sutherland, Statutory Construction Sec. 46.05 at p. 92 (4th Ed.).

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) included social security administrative expenses within the domestic discretionary category in its Final Sequestration Report for Fiscal Year 1991, issued on November 6, 1990. OMB did the same in its Final OMB Sequester Report To The President and Congress for Fiscal Year 1991, issued on November 9, 1990. The Comptroller General of the United States, in his statutorily required report on the extent to which the CBO and OMB reports complied with law, issued December 10, 1990, did not state that OMB or CBO failed to comply with OBRA or committed any error by including social security administrative expenses in the domestic discretionary category. General Accounting Office, The Budget for Fiscal Year 1991—Compliance with the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985'' B–221498 (December 10, 1990).

In view of the specific direction on the subject contained in OBRA, OMB will continue to classify social security program administrative expenses as within the domestic discretionary spending category.''

Letter from Robert G. Damus to Sen. Jim Sasser (Jan. 24, 1991).

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chair.

I will read the opening paragraph (b) here entitled ''Exclusion of Social Security From Congressional Budget.'' Let me repeat that: The law, the law itself, three readings in the House, three readings in the Senate, signed into law on November 5, 1990, by President George Herbert Walker Bush.

It passed in the Senate, incidentally, by a vote of 98 to 2. And they talk about flip-floppers. Here is the law:

Exclusion of Social Security from congressional budget. Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding the following: ''The concurrent resolution shall not include the outlay and revenue totals of the Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance established under title XXII of the Social Security Act and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.''

In other words, not include as part of outlays and revenues.

Along comes the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, voted on in this body just a few weeks ago, and section 7 says:

Total receipts shall include all receipts and shall include all outlays of the United States Government.

A positive, affirmative repeal of section 13301.

Now you go right to how this comes out in the press. In Time magazine, in a summary at the conclusion of a cover article—a March 20 copy, it said:

So long as the crisis is not about to burst next month, Democrats will see political profits in portraying any proposal to change Social Security as a Republican conspiracy to starve the poor and elderly. Republicans will think the only defense is to swear eternal fealty to the system as it is.

They treat it as demagoguery. They treat it as just a political thing. Here is the cover article; never once do they cite section 13301. They never once cite the law.

When we passed those Social Security taxes back in 1983, it was definitely understood that we were not just balancing the Social Security budget, but the affirmative intent was to provide surpluses to make the Social Security fund fiscally sound into the middle of the next century.

At a previous time, I inserted a letter from former Chairman Ball of the Social Security Commission. His letter said the Social Security fund is not in any fiscal trouble, it has surpluses, as it appears by the fund. But as it appears by the political treatment by the news media and by Members of this particular body and by President Clinton and the administration, it is a political slush fund.

I quote the distinguished majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, on ''Face the Nation,'' Senator TRENT LOTT said on February 5:

Nobody, Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, moderate is even thinking about using Social Security to balance the budget.

Do I have to invite him into the Republican caucuses so that he can understand what they are thinking because those thinkings are finally oozing out into the RECORD.

On ''Larry King Live'' around that time, Senator GRAMM said, and I quote:

I think we ought to balance the budget counting Social Security first, and then if we want to balance it without counting it, do it second.

So they are thinking about using it either first or second, according to the Senator from Texas.

I quote again the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI:

You can't leave the biggest American program off budget.

It is off budget. The law says it is off budget. Here is the leader of fiscal responsibility in the U.S. Senate in contradiction to the law saying you cannot leave it off budget when the law requires it be off budget.

And then, of course, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY:

The leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate have promised not to touch the Social Security retirement program for at least 5 years.

Well, 5 years; that means maybe after that then, but they are thinking about Social Security.

Or the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, and I quote:

Without access to the Social Security surpluses, you would create a much higher hurdle in trying to balance the budget.

Mr. President, we are not talking about hurdles, we are talking about truth in budgeting. I remember the saying of Mark Twain. He said that truth was such a precious thing it should be used very sparingly.

Is that the credo that we are going to use in the for budget laws in the U.S. Senate?

Or the distinguished majority leader on February 5, Senator DOLE:

I also believe that we can't keep Social Security off the table forever.

Now, Mr. President, they are thinking about it. And, in fact, yesterday, Tuesday, March 21, reported on page A4 of the Washington Post, Senator PACKWOOD, the chairman of the Finance Committee said:

''But in considering budgets,'' nothing is sacred, including Social Security and other entitlement programs.''

How do you do it? You can do as the Speaker of the House says: If we cannot get what we want out of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we will give it to Treasury, we will give it to Federal Reserve, we will give it to somebody to get it right.

One entity they are going to give it to get it right may be the new Director of the Congressional Budget Office. I do not have the exact quote here, but I know it is accurate. She said she could be using dynamic scoring when she has to. Ah, now you get in a CBO Director who uses dynamic scoring. Added to that, instead of a CPI of, let us say of 4 percent, you get one of 2 percent. But what we should understand, Mr. President, is that any savings in Social Security from changing the CPI should be put back into the reserves, back into the trust fund.

People say it is going to be difficult to really meet the target of reducing spending $1.2 trillion by the year 2002. But that, in and of itself, is an inaccurate figure because they are using Social Security moneys. To really balance the budget you need $1.7 trillion; saying otherwise means that you are contemplating using the surpluses that the trust funds will take in over the next 7 years.

But let me get back to my amendment. You can well see that we are trying to get back to truth in budgeting under this particular Hollings-Kerrey-Exon amendment. It was endorsed last year by the Republican Members of the Budget Committee under the leadership of our distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, when they included that in their Republican alternative.

Now, it all of a sudden becomes untimely this year? I do not know what committees the distinguished Senator from Indiana is on, but you can bet your boots whatever committee, it has a 10-year rule. If you are on Agriculture, if you are on Interior, if you are on Banking, if you are on Commerce, if you are on Indian Affairs, wherever it is. The Finance Committee faced up to it with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; we had a 10-year rule that created a 60-vote point of order requirement on that vote.

But for the budget resolution, you do not have to live under the restrictions of the 10-year rule. I am trying to get truth in budgeting. I am trying to get the very custodians of fiscal responsibility here to come under the same rules. The very first bill that we passed here in January was to make Congress comply with the laws that everybody else has to follow.

It was a very good initiative. Well, why not follow the same logic? The 10-year rule promotes fiscal responsibility. It promotes truth in budgeting. Nevertheless, it was voted down in the Budget Committee on a partisan vote of 12 to 10 and Members come to the floor now to say, ''Let's just go along with the Budget Committee.''

Well, Mr. President, if we are going by that logic I should point out another amendment that I offered in the Budget Committee. In addition to the 10-year rule I offered a separate enrollment line-item veto, the very kind of measure now under consideration, but only got 4 votes, all from Democrats, in the Budget Committee. Under that logic, we would not be voting on the underlying bill.

Let us not table. Let us adopt this amendment. Let us send it to the House and to the President for his signature. The President of the United States favors the line-item veto. I am sure that if he were asked whether he favors truth in budgeting, his answer would be ''yes.'' Then let us give it to him.

If you want to really get it done, let us not think and hide behind procedure and process. Let us get the truth in budgeting and make sure that the 10-year rule applies to the budget resolution as it applies to all other legislation.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to use the remainder of my leader time for a statement unrelated to the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DASCHLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 588 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 3 minutes as if in morning business.

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

THE RETIREMENT ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATOR JIM EXON

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words about my good friend and colleague Senator EXON's announcement on Friday that he would be retiring from the Senate.

As soon as Senator EXON announced his decision, the political pundits were predicting who would run in his place, and which party stands to win or lose the most. There will be plenty of time to survey the political fallout. Instead, today we should lament the loss of a dedicated public servant and the factors that led to his decision. Let me underscore the facts that led to his decision.

I believe the entire institution of the Senate loses when a devoted public servant like Senator EXON chooses to leave. But more importantly, his reasons for leaving signify an even greater loss than his singular contributions.

Citing the ''ever-increasing vicious polarization of the electorate,'' Senator EXON said the ''us-against-them mentality has all but swept aside the former preponderance of reasonable discussions of the pros and cons of the many legitimate issues,'' eroding the ''essence of democracy'' in the process.

Refusing to answer the bell for another race, Senator EXON sent out a warning to the citizens of this country that the democratic process has become seriously flawed—that using the ''hate level'' in attack ads as the ''measurement of a successful campaign,'' can only mean the deterioration of the notion of compromise ''for the ultimate good of all.''

It was a price the statesman in him was no longer willing to pay.

And there can be no doubt that he leaves here a statesman. President Eisenhower once said that ''The opportunist thinks of me and today. The statesman thinks of us and tomorrow.''

I know Senator EXON came to the Senate looking only to do what was in the best interests of his State and country. He knew that his decisions had to pass the test of time, not simply grab attention on the evening news. He spent each day meeting that test, knowing, as he said last week, that he ''never reached a decision that (he) didn't believe to be in the best interests of Nebraska and the United States of America.''

So perhaps the pundits will put aside their political score cards for a moment, and will consider that in his decision to leave, Senator EXON the statesman was again thinking of ''us and tomorrow.''

I certainly hope so, because his intellect, legislative skills, and commitment to service will be sorely missed in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

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

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

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. COATS pertaining to the introduction of S. 589 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 362 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I am unhappy that I have to do so because I have the greatest respect for Senator FEINGOLD and for his dedication to deficit reduction. And though I agree with 99 percent of the substance of this sense-of-the-Senate, I cannot agree with the final statement that ''enacting a * * * so-called middle-class tax cut during the 104th Congress would hinder efforts to reduce the Federal deficit.''

I would like to state for the RECORD that I do believe that deficit reduction is this Congress highest priority. If proposals for tax breaks—such as the $200 billion in tax breaks moving through the House—get in the way of further progress in reducing the deficit, I will oppose them. However, I believe it is possible to both make the Tax Code fairer to low- and middle-income working families and significantly reduce the deficit.

For example, Congress could engage in wholesale tax reform, lowering rates for middle and lower income taxpayers while eliminating wasteful tax loopholes that benefit the rich. Such reform could be designed to reduce the deficit and make the Tax Code more equitable. I do not think the Senate should go on record right now with a sense-of-the-Senate that implies such reform is out of the question.

Though this Congress has discussed in great detail the problems with our Federal budget, we have yet to start the debate on the fiscal year 1996 budget plan. At this early point in the debate, I do not believe it wise to start ruling out options—such as providing some tax relief to working families. Therefore, I will reluctantly oppose the pending sense-of-the-Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to support the amendment offered by my colleague from New Jersey. If adopted, the Bradley amendment will allow the President to eliminate tax loopholes that benefit special interests at the expense of the American people. And while the tax expenditure language in the Dole substitute is a good first step in the right direction, the amendment offered by Senator BRADLEY offers definitive protection against future wasteful tax spending.

Mr. President, when it comes to creative spending, the Federal Government is second to none. And one of the most creative ways that Washington spends money is through special breaks and hidden expenditures in the Tax Code. The Tax Code contains loopholes large and small that benefit every type of special interest, including, among others, an exclusion of income for rentals of 2 weeks or less and deferrals of income of foreign-controlled corporations.

Mr. President, there is not enough time this morning to go through the entire list of loopholes that permeates our tax laws, but you may be assured that there is a credit, break, or write-off for every conceivable purpose. There may have been a time when our country could afford these expenditures, but that time is over. Today, we have the opportunity to begin the process of eliminating this hidden spending if we adopt the clear and unambiguous language offered by my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. President, we are at a critical time in our Nation's history: We can act now to balance our Federal budget or we can pass the buck to our children and leave them a legacy of debt, depression, and continued economic decline. In order to regain control of our financial situation, we need to make tough choices, and the time has arrived for the special interests to pay their dues along with the rest of us. Mr. President, at a time when we are asking the American people to accept sacrifices in the areas of housing, school lunches, and education, I believe we in Congress need to subject tax spending to the same level of scrutiny. So I urge my colleagues to support the Bradley amendment and I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 403

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 p.m. having arrived, under the previous order, the question now occurs on the motion to table amendment No. 403, offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY].

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brown	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Pressler
Campbell	Gregg	Roth
Chafee	Hatch	Santorum
Coats	Hatfield	Smith
Cochran	Helms	Snowe
Cohen	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Packwood
Bryan	Jeffords	Pell
Bumpers	Johnston	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Conrad	Kerrey	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kohl	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Simon
Exon	Leahy	Simpson
Feingold	Levin	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—2

Heflin	Shelby

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 403) was agreed to.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I move to table the pending amendment No. 362 offered by Senator FEINGOLD and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask that the next two votes be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 362 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Frist	Lugar
Ashcroft	Gorton	Mack
Baucus	Gramm	McCain
Bennett	Grams	McConnell
Biden	Grassley	Murkowski
Bond	Gregg	Nickles
Bradley	Hatch	Pressler
Brown	Hatfield	Rockefeller
Burns	Helms	Roth
Coats	Hutchison	Santorum
Cochran	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith
Craig	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kohl	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Lieberman	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Ford	Moynihan
Breaux	Glenn	Murray
Bryan	Graham	Nunn
Bumpers	Harkin	Packwood
Byrd	Hollings	Pell
Campbell	Inouye	Pryor
Chafee	Jeffords	Reid
Cohen	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerrey	Simon
Dodd	Kerry	Specter
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Exon	Levin	

NOT VOTING—2

Heflin	Shelby

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 362) was agreed to.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 404

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I move to table the pending amendment No. 404 offered by Senator HOLLINGS and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 404 offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Chair will advise Senators that this is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Packwood
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Chafee	Hatch	Santorum
Coats	Hatfield	Simpson
Cochran	Helms	Smith
Cohen	Hutchison	Snowe
Coverdell	Inhofe	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	
Feinstein	McCain	

NAYS—46

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Campbell	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	
Exon	Levin	

NOT VOTING—2

Heflin	Shelby

The motion to table the amendment (No. 404) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 373 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To include in the definition of ''targeted tax benefits'' provisions that worsen the deficit in periods beyond those covered by the budget resolution)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 373, which the clerk has at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 373 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, strike lines 14 through 17 and insert:

''(A) estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation as losing revenue for any one of the three following periods—

''(1) the first fiscal year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

''(2) the period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; or

''(3) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and''.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we have debated this amendment already so I will be very, very brief. This amendment would apply the line-item veto to tax loopholes that lost money in the 6th through the 10th years. I believe there is broad bipartisan support for this amendment and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 373) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCAIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the distinguished majority manager if he is ready to proceed with the Feingold amendment regarding emergency spending that I understand has been cleared on both sides. Is that correct?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend, we are just about there. I think in about 1 or 2 more minutes. I think the Senator from South Carolina was waiting to make remarks and I think we will be ready by the time he is finished with his remarks.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his amendment. I think it helps the bill. I am glad we were able to agree on it.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Arizona. I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the able Senators, and the managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Line-Item Veto Act, which is presently before this body. For many years, I have been a supporter of giving authority to the President to disapprove specific items of appropriation presented to him. On the first legislative day of this Congress, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 2, proposing a constitutional amendment to give the President line-item veto authority.

Presidential authority for a line-item veto is a significant fiscal tool which would provide a valuable means to reduce and restrain excessive appropriations. This proposal will give the President the opportunity to approve or disapprove individual items of appropriation which have passed the Congress. It does not grant power to simply reduce the dollar amount legislated by the Congress.

Mr. President, 43 Governors currently have constitutional authority to reduce or eliminate items or provisions in appropriation measures. My home State of South Carolina provides this authority, and I found it most useful during my service as Governor in the late 1940's. Surely the President should have authority that 43 Governors now have to check unbridled spending.

It is widely recognized that Federal spending is out of control. The Federal budget has been balanced only once in the last 34 years. Over the past 20 years, Federal receipts, in current dollars, have grown from $279 billion to nearly $1.3 trillion, an increase of $978 billion. In the meantime, Federal outlays have grown from $332 billion in 1975, to over $1.4 trillion last year, an increase of over $1.1 trillion. The annual budget deficits have risen to over $200 billion each year, with the national debt growing to over $4.8 trillion.

Mr. President, it is clear that neither the Congress nor the President are effectively dealing with the budget crisis. The President continues to submit budgets which contain little spending reform and project annual deficits of nearly $200 billion. I am hopeful that this year Congress will undertake serious efforts to restrain Federal spending by reducing or eliminating funding of ineffective programs.

If we are to have sustained economic growth, Government spending must be significantly reduced. A balanced budget amendment and line-item veto authority would do much to bring about fiscal responsibility. I regret that earlier this year the Senate failed to pass the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, it would be a mistake to fail to pass this measure. It is my hope that this Congress will swiftly approve the line-item veto and send a clear message to the American people that we are making a serious effort to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. Finally, Mr. President, we must get on with the serious business of reducing spending. I thank the Chair.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Nebraska.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed as if in morning business for a short period of time to accommodate the Senator from New Jersey.

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

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Nebraska for yielding the time, and particularly the distinguished Senator from Indiana for interrupting the flow of the discussion, because there are matters of great importance that are under review.

But I would like to talk for a minute about an incident that took place in the last couple of days that has been across the newspapers in this country and through all means of communication—television, radio, and so forth. It is about an incident in Montclair, NJ, which is where my home has been since 1968. My children were brought up in this community, all four of them, and there is still a Lautenberg house in the town. The community is shocked by the turn of events—four people killed, four innocent people, two who worked in the post office, long-time employees, and two residents of the community, one I am told, 38 years of age, and one 59 years of age, customers of the post office. They were on an innocent piece of business, and suddenly carnage broke out. It is established that a 9 mm weapon was used, and the culprit has been captured and is now in custody. This afternoon, the U.S. attorney and other law enforcement people will be making a full statement.

Mr. President, we have seen violence all over this country ourselves, gun violence, people shot randomly. As a matter of fact, unless it gets to be in your neighborhood or your community, or you know someone who is the victim, it is almost greeted with a yawn. We watch the incredible spectacle of Colin Ferguson, the man who murdered and assaulted people on the Long Island Railroad, make a fool out of the system, and he is ready now perhaps this day for sentencing.

But I watched in shock as some of the victims' families addressed this individual, trying to describe their pain and their anguish, including one person that I know, also from New Jersey, a man named Jake LaCicero, who lost his daughter, Amy, on that train. She was in her late twenties, innocently traveling back and forth to work from where she then lived, and she died needlessly.

And not too long ago, at a post office in Richwood, NJ, a quiet, high-income community, principally commuters, people who took pride in their community and people who believed so deeply in America and the American way—the town that I am talking about now, Montclair, NJ, is a fairly high-income

community, a fully integrated community, with a minority African-American portion, about 30 percent, living side by side, house to house, and everybody getting along well.

Mr. President, last weekend, we heard about an incident—and I had the occasion to visit the victim, a woman named Gilespie, 66 years old, who had her car hijacked by two young men who, as she described it to me, is an incredibly courageous woman, fighting back against all odds, because she was shot right almost in the middle of her face just at the eyebrow line. She had a black-and-blue mark. The bullet is still apparently lodged in her head. She will have lost the sight of one eye, but she is going to live. And she is remarkably strong.

I was there to visit a trauma unit at our University Hospital and Medical School in Newark. She said she cannot understand why she was shot. She said, ''I was ready to surrender my car.'' It was in the evening. She went to visit her daughter in the suburbs. She said, ''I was ready to surrender my car. I was ready to surrender my pocketbook.'' She said, ''I did not want to fight with these two fellows.'' She said not a word was exchanged. The only thing that was exchanged was a gunshot, a gun pointed at her head, and the trigger pulled. And she had enough strength and enough courage to get to a telephone and the police, in quick response, from Montclair, NJ, were able to capture two young men. These men, by the way, Mr. President, had no previous record of criminality—young men; one was 17, one was 19. One already finished with high school; the other was in high school. These were not the traditional criminals. These were not the people who we talk about when we say, ''Guns do not kill people; people kill people.''

Mr. President, we are hearing ruminations on this floor about removing the ban that exists on assault weapons—a ban that was fought over day after day, hour after hour before it became essentially a part of the crime bill that was passed and signed last year by the President of the United States. We hear now that that bill is being reviewed, perhaps, with the purpose of removing the ban on assault weapons. It almost is shocking beyond belief that we, at this point in time, could be talking about removal, repeal of a ban on weapons that were designed to kill people, to be used by military and law enforcement people. And we are discussing it because the NRA has a gun at the head of this Congress. The NRA has a gun at the head of this Senate. The gun reaches into the pocketbook, Mr. President. That is where the power comes from. It is the power of the purse used to pervert and to twist the intentions of the American people, and to analyze the second amendment in such a way that it permits every loony in the world, in the States, and in this country of ours to get their hands on a gun. The Brady bill was fought against so hard here. I read in the paper recently, it stopped 45,000 applications for gun ownership from being executed. And we fought tooth and nail here. It was like a battle over whether or not we continue to operate as a democratic society. We fought over that, and—how many escaped we do not know, but 45,000 people were denied applications for gun ownership.

Mr. President, I do not know what it is going to take to stop this gun mad necessary. I hope it does not visit families here. Though, we have had it. The Senator from North Dakota watched his wife being taken away by a man with a gun at her head, not far from the Capitol, where we have multiple police departments. He was powerless because the man had a gun and was able to blow his wife's head off. What is it going to take for our society to respond and say ''no'' to the NRA, that we are not going to let you own this country, we are not going to let you own this Congress. We ought to turn out every Congressman and Senator who supports the NRA, unless there is a change in their attitude.

Mr. President, it is a terrible day, terrible occasion when we have to reminisce about those who lost their lives. Anybody who saw the victims talking to Colin Ferguson this morning, where one woman who lost her husband and her son was shot, to be permanently disabled, this young man weeping uncontrollably because his life had been torn apart. I hope that we do not have to recite in the years ahead those who are victims of gunfire—random gunfire, in many cases, and botched burglaries.

Mr. President, people say that it is not guns, that it is people who do the killing. But if you look at the United Kingdom, look at Japan, countries westernized in their customs like ours, and you see that in our country 13.5 thousand people died from gunshots, and in the other countries just mentioned, the numbers are less than 100. One of those populations is two-thirds of ours—Japan. I believe they had less than 100 people die by gunshot. In the United Kingdom the numbers were less than 100. In Canada they were less than 50. But we here in the United States, who want to protect the rights under the second amendment for people to own guns, are not standing up for people to be able to live freely, to walk down the street. In Los Angeles, it is said that most of the gunshot damage done is done by drive-by, random shootings. If there are no guns around, I assure you that we would not see the damage, because it is awful hard to have a drive-by clubbing or a drive-by stabbing.

It is time that we woke up to the problem that we have here and get rid of this menace for the safety and well-being of our children, our families, our homes, our stores, and our businesses, and get on with letting this democracy perform as it should.

I thank the Senators from Nebraska and Indiana for giving me these few minutes.

A TRAGEDY IN MONTCLAIR

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, yesterday in Montclair, NJ, four people were gunned down and a fifth was wounded when a man entered a postal substation and opened fire. Montclair is a wonderful community. It is like so many other towns in New Jersey where neighbors know each other, care for one another, and are proud of the community spirit that they share. That should not change, even in the wake of this tragedy.

What occurred yesterday also reminds us that there are no town borders around violence. Montclair, West Caldwell, Franklin Township, Piscataway—it finds us all. It is always senseless. It is always painful.

I offer my deepest sympathy to the families and friends and neighbors of each of the victims of yesterday's violence. I have just talked to the mayor and the police chief and they have apprehended the individual they think could be responsible. I applaud them for their action.

My sympathy goes to the families of these victims.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 356 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I brought up amendment No. 356 last night and it was laid aside.

I ask unanimous consent that we return to that now. It is my understanding that the managers have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. Please proceed. I was not aware that this had been cleared now. I have no objection.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I will reiterate that there is no objection on either side to this. It has to do with changing the rules for emergency spending bills. It is making sure that extraneous matters are not attached to them, as has happened in the past. I understand both sides have agreed to voice vote on that.

Mr. COATS. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I just say to the Senator from Wisconsin that we think it is a meritorious amendment. It is consistent with the goals and the intent of the line-item veto legislation before us. We are happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 356) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank the managers and all the people that were involved in this amendment. It is an excellent example of bipartisan cooperation to, in effect, try to prevent the pork from getting over to the President in the first place. The line-item veto is about getting rid of those items after the President has them on his desk. I think this will prove to be a useful tool in eliminating some of the things that have happened in Congress that have been held up really to public ridicule. I am grateful to the Senators who helped move it along.

AMENDMENT NO. 402 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is amendment No. 402.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin for an excellent amendment, well presented. I am very pleased that it has been accepted on the other side.

We are moving along very well now. As I understand it, from conversations I have just had with the Senator from Indiana, the manager of the bill on the other side of the aisle, the lockbox amendment that I presented last night has now been cleared on each side.

What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment No. 402.

Mr. EXON. With that, I would like to call up that amendment for a vote at this time. We have finished debate on the amendment. I believe it has been cleared on each side.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we have had trouble putting our fingers on 402. I want to make sure amendment 402 is the lockbox amendment.

Mr. EXON. I think we can assure the Senator that it is the EXON lockbox amendment.

Mr. COATS. I had just heard a minute ago that it was not. That is why I wanted to verify that.

We are satisfied, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 402) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Indiana, the floor manager, for his help on this.

Mr. President, I believe we have made really good progress. Last night and so far today, we have either adopted or tabled seven amendments. The majority has inquired with regard to three amendments on their side, and we are attempting to work those out.

Beyond that, I think that there are in the neighborhood of only 8 or 10 amendments left that I know of here. So that is excellent progress.

I would simply take this opportunity to once again state what I stated this morning. And after my statement this morning, we had some good cooperation. So I would simply alert all Senators to the fact that we are now moving very, very aggressively and very, very quickly. I urge Senators who have amendments that are outstanding or, if there are any—hopefully, there are not—if there are any we do not know about, I think this would be an excellent time for Senators to come to the floor and offer any amendments that any Senator on either side of the aisle has on the measure before us so we can keep the momentum going and not get slowed down to where we sag back into situations that we have been in before on bills where we think we are moving and all at once we slow down and seemingly never get started up again.

So I certainly urge any Senator, this is a very, very good time to come forward with the 8 or 10 amendments that we believe are serious amendments that are pending. This would be a good time to move on them. Certainly, it is not a time to go to third reading, but this is a time I think for everybody to understand that, with a little cooperation, we can stay away from any consideration of a cloture vote. As far as I know, the cloture vote has not been vitiated yet, has it?

Mr. COATS. It has not.

Mr. EXON. I am advised that the majority leader has not vitiated the cloture vote. That is currently scheduled, I believe, for 5 p.m. I believe we will not need that if the feeling of the majority leader is that we are making sufficient progress. But that is a possibility.

So since it is now about 3:22, this would be a excellent time for someone to come over and offer an amendment. I would be very glad to have someone show up.

I have been advised I was wrong on the 5 o'clock time. The 5 o'clock time was to have been for 1 hour of debate and the vote was scheduled to be at 6 o'clock, as presently scheduled.

We hope somewhere along the line in the next hour or so we might have a chance of going to the majority leader and having that vitiated. But I think it all depends. The first thing the majority leader is going to ask is, ''Well, how are you coming along?'' I suspect my friend from Indiana would agree with that.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would agree with that. We obviously hope to be able to vitiate the cloture vote that is now scheduled for 6 p.m.

We are making excellent progress on these amendments. We hope that Members will come to the floor and continue to offer amendments. Our goal is to expedite the debate and consideration of this bill that is before us.

We have had considerable debate not only on this particular issue but on similar issues for the past several years. I think Members have had an ample opportunity to express their thoughts and opinions.

We now actively encourage those amendments. Obviously, as the Senator from Nebraska said, the more amendments that we can consider before 6 o'clock, perhaps the more favorable consideration the majority leader can give to that vote which is ordered for 6 p.m.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions on the majority leader's amendment be vitiated; that the following be the only first-degree amendments remaining in order to either S. 4 or to Senator DOLE's amendment; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments following a failed tabling motion; that all amendments on this list must be offered by 10 a.m., Thursday, March 23; that upon the disposition of these amendments, Senator DOLE's substitute amendment, as amended, if amended, be agreed to; that the bill be read a third time, and at that time there be 2 hours of debate under Senator BYRD's control; and that upon the conclusion or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on final passage of S. 4, as amended, with the preceding all occurring without any intervening action or debate, and that no motion to recommit be in order.

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

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate the list which I will send to the desk: One amendment by Senator BINGAMAN, two amendments by Senator BYRD, two by Senator DASCHLE, one amendment by Senator MURRAY, one amendment by Senator EXON, one amendment by Senator GLENN, one amendment by Senator LEVIN, one amendment by Senator DOLE, one amendment by Senator ABRAHAM, one amendment by Senator MURKOWSKI, one amendment by Senator HATCH, one amendment by Senator D'AMATO.

These are relevant amendments. One is a substitute, others relate to authorized programs or exemptions, and one is a fencing amendment. We can provide further details if any of our colleagues want details on the amendments.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend many of the Senators whose cooperation was important in receiving this agreement.

We started out with a large double-digit list and we are now down to virtually a single-digit list with as many Republican as Democratic amendments. I am very hopeful that we can work through these amendments.

For the information of colleagues, I intend to offer our substitute this evening, and hope we can have a good debate on that. I am sure we can work through many of these, even with time agreements, but I do appreciate the accommodation by many Senators. I appreciated having the opportunity to work through this agreement with the majority leader.

I think this will allow Members to do what we have indicated we would like to do, and that is reach final passage this week.

I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators, and I look forward to the remaining debate on the amendments that have just been listed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his cooperation. I think he is correct. I think it is in a condition now where it can be passed, maybe late tomorrow night if not sometime early Friday.

I would hope following disposition, as I have not yet discussed it with the Democratic leader, one thing we have to do is the self-employed tax matter. Maybe we could start on that Friday. I will discuss that with the minority leader later. I asked Senator PACKWOOD to check with Senator MOYNIHAN to see if they would be available on Friday.

I would ask my colleagues if they have amendments, certainly, this would be a good time to offer amendments because the Democratic leader has indicated later today he will offer the substitute. I urge my colleagues on either side of the aisle if they have amendments, I am certain that the managers would be happy to engage them in debate. Perhaps we can dispose of four or five additional amendments before late afternoon.

Mr. DASCHLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ACCEPTANCE OF YELTSIN INVITATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, yesterday President Clinton announced his acceptance of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's invitation to participate in Moscow's anniversary of the 50th anniversary of V–E Day.

He has accepted this invitation, despite the fact that I—and many of my colleagues concerned about the foreign policy implications—urged him to seek another time for a summit.

I continue to believe that his participation in this commemoration does not further American interests in Europe and in our relationship with Russia.

First, this commemorative event is morally ambiguous. I recognize the valor and sacrifices of the Russian people in their defense against Nazi aggression. However, it is equally important to remember that the Soviet leaders, through the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact laid the foundation not only for World War II, but also for Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe during the cold war.

Joseph Stalin unleashed Soviet forces against Poland in collusion with the Nazis, and during the first 2 years of World War II the Soviet Union provided the Nazi Reich with strategic war materials as well as with political and propaganda support.

Moreover, the Soviet Union committed war crimes as brutal as those of the Nazis.

One need only to recall the Soviet's massacre of thousands of Polish officers at Katyn; the deportation to concentration camps and murder of thousands of civilians, including Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Tatars, Chechyns, and others. After World War II, the survivors in Eastern Europe did not benefit from freedom and liberty, but were subjected to the brutal hegemony of the Soviet Union.

If the President persists in going to celebrate the end of World War II in Europe with the Russians, I believe he should at least make some reference to the fact that the United States, as a whole, has not forgotten these, or any, crimes committed during the war.

The second reason why we encouraged the President not to accept this invitation is because the commemoration in Moscow will reinforce the growing nostalgia among some Russians for the Soviet past and its imperial ambitions, not to mention the leader who epitomized all this, Joseph Stalin.

The presence of the President of the United States risks further legitimizing such nostalgia, thereby encouraging Russians to concentrate on reacquiring great power status at a time when Moscow should be directing its efforts and energy inward, toward democratic and market reform.

Third, this invitation arrives in the midst of the war in Chechnya. President Clinton's participation in this celebration will convey American indifference to the atrocities committed against the Chechyn peoples.

Indeed, Moscow's management of the Chechyn autonomy movement is depressingly reminiscent of the policies that Stalin, himself, used to terrorize the peoples incorporated into the former Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I strongly support efforts to deepen American-Russian relations. Indeed, this is especially important today as both nations adjust to the post-cold-war era. However, the symbolism associated with the Moscow celebration makes it a poor forum through which to pursue the type of relationship the United States must have with Russia.

But since President Clinton has made his decision, I hope he will emphasize the following themes in the course of his Moscow meetings:

The President should speak forthrightly to the Russian people, not hiding the fact that America condemns the brutal use of military force against Chechnya. Human rights is an international issue. If Russia avows to be a member of the community of democracies founded upon respect for inalienable human rights, it must live up to those standards.

The President should make clear that America is more interested in the future of Russian democracy than in the fate of a single leader. I hope that President Clinton will spend his time not only with government officials and the leadership of the Russian Duma, but also with Russia's leading supporters of democracy.

This must include members of Russia's beleaguered press and those democratically minded legislators—particularly Sergei Kovalyov, the former Human Rights Commissioner who was most recently relieved of his duties because of his courageous criticism of the Russian Government's Chechnyn policy.

In order for a true strategic partnership to evolve between the United States and Russia, Moscow must abandon hegemonic aspirations, particularly those toward the non-Russian nations of the former Soviet Union.

In this regard, I applaud the President's decision to visit Ukraine. A Kiev summit will be an important signal of America's commitment to assist the consolidation of Ukraine's newly attained independence. In light of Ukraine's intertwined history with Russia, the success of Ukrainian independence and integration into the Western community of nations will be a critical determinant of Russia's evolution into a post-imperial state.

Finally, I hope that the President will emphasize that NATO enlargement will contribute to greater peace and stability in post-cold-war Europe.

By further ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, NATO enlargement should allow Moscow to spend more of its energy on the internal challenges of political and economic reform. I hope that our President will underscore the fact that Moscow cannot and will not have any veto over the future membership of NATO.

Mr. President, although I regret President Clinton's pilgrimage to Moscow, I believe that if these three

themes—human rights, democracy, and rejection of empire—prevail, they will help ensure that the Moscow summit is not an exercise in propitiation, but a realistically constructive undertaking.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate so far on the line-item veto, the proposal which is before the Senate, and I have read the compromise language offered by the majority leader. I would like to commend the majority leader and those who worked with him, long-time supporters of the proposal, and the sponsors. This proposal, as is my assessment at least, is much improved over the previous proposals. This improvement comes from the inclusion of new entitlements and targeted tax breaks along with appropriations spending items.

As I have stated in the past, if the Congress is serious about attacking our annual deficits, it must expand its view beyond discretionary spending. Discretionary spending, Mr. President, accounts in 1995 for 36 percent of the total spending of our Government. The Congress cannot balance the budget, let alone reduce the national debt, by focusing on 36 percent of the total budget.

The proposal before us makes great strides by also including in its purview new entitlements and direct spending. Entitlement spending will make up 49 percent of the budget in 1995.

This proposal also includes targeted tax benefits as being subjected to a Presidential line-item veto. According to the Senate Budget Committee, it was projected that the Treasury will lose $453 billion in revenue through tax expenditures in 1995 alone. That number is twice the size of the projected budget deficit.

At a time when our country is fast approaching the debt ceiling limit of $4.9 trillion, which could occur as early as August, according to the Treasury Department, it is important to send the message that, to attack the deficit, there must be a shared commitment from all sectors of the Federal budget including entitlement spending and tax preferences. I commend the authors of this proposal for this improvement over earlier versions.

Now, while this proposal is greatly improved in some respects, it causes me grave concern in other areas. The point which causes me the greatest concern is the impact of the massive shift of power from the Congress to the executive branch which could occur under this bill.

I might say, Mr. President, it is totally contrary to historic Republicanism. This is some strange new doctrine, to suggest that we have to abdicate responsibility to the Chief Executive of this country. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

While many supporters of this legislation have attempted to address this concern during the debate, I must raise this issue again as I believe it should be of grave concern to all the Members of the Congress, the House, the Senate, Republican and Democrat.

Mr. President, the legislation would actually allow the President of the United States, with the support of only one-third of either body, to eliminate funding for myriad Federal spending, departments, and programs authorized and enacted by the Congress.

Supporters of this proposal continually highlight it as a way to get at the so-called pet projects of interest to individual Members or to individual States. I will point out, as I have done in the past, Members can exercise their rights under the rules to raise objections, offer amendments, and round up votes to defeat such proposals.

Members should identify provisions of appropriations bills and reports that they find objectionable and craft amendments to resolve those objections. Members should also encourage the President to come forward with a rescission proposal pursuant to title X of the Budget Act to strip that funding.

We have that power. We have those tools. It must also be highlighted that the line-item veto can also be used to reduce funding or even eliminate completely, funding for projects and agencies that I doubt few would call congressional pork.

Let me remind you, a President with one-third of either Chamber—hardly a majority—could effectively eliminate funding for an entire agency such as HUD, the Interior Department, the Education Department, the EPA—any Department. While some Members may argue in favor of such a move, I doubt that many of us would call these agencies pet projects. Do not forget, we have had Presidents offer and express a desire to abolish such departments. This is not a hypothetical situation—entire departments. President Reagan wanted to absolutely eliminate the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, and others. And we have heard that from other Presidents. That could happen. With a one-third vote of the House and the Senate, the President would prevail to eliminate entire departments. So do not get this idea that somehow what has been identified as pork here or pork there is the only target we have to worry about.

Now, while these examples may be extreme, a similar scenario was described by a Member during this debate. It was mentioned that on an issue such as ground-based missile defenses, a President may disagree on the line of funding, and this line-item veto would allow the President, with one-third of either Chamber, to simply line out all the funding for such a program.

At a time when many Members have raised concerns about funding levels of the military, are those same Members willing to defer to the judgment of whichever President occupies the White House regarding defense spending levels? The same point can be made regarding housing policy, nutrition programs, or spending to combat crime.

That is an awesome shift of power which some may be willing to relinquish to the executive branch of Government, but I am not. I am not as willing to bestow that type of power on the executive branch. The Framers of the Constitution were very concerned about the abuses of an Executive which possesses too much power. That is why the power to spend was placed in the branch of Government which is most accountable to and representative of each citizen, the Congress of the United States. The purse strings are placed here. In my opinion, the Framers were right on target. There are no sound reasons why the legislative branch should shift such an important constitutionally created responsibility to the Chief Executive.

Perhaps I am burdened by history, either by generation or by being a history buff, but I recall when a President of the United States wanted to usurp the power of the Supreme Court, a third coequal branch of Government. It was not just a little line item in an appropriations bill or a tax bill. He wanted to dominate the Supreme Court. That was called the Court-packing plan of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Thank God, there were enough Democrats at that time to join with the corpus guard of 17 Republicans to block that.

Nevertheless, it is illustrative of the kind of power that is a desire of the Chief Executive that has taken place in our history. Now we are going to say the President of the United States and one-third of the membership of this Congress, you make these vital, and important decisions.

And let us not forget when you had 17 Republicans here at one time in the Senate, and they called it the Cherokee Strip because the Democrats could not all sit on that side. They had a whole row, two rows of Democrats on this side, and the Republicans were huddled down here under Senator Charles McNary from Oregon trying to survive. You can imagine the kind of domination that Franklin Roosevelt had of the Congress that first term and part of the second term. Thank God, we had a Supreme Court. It was the only check and balance we had in our governmental system. That is just history, but it also makes me a little leery about ever handing too much power to any branch of Government.

I would also like to take a moment to explain what separate enrollments of bills would entail. While I understand that many Americans support the concept of a line-item veto, I think it is important to explain what that means in the context of separate enrollment.

Separate enrollment would take individual appropriations bills, as passed

by the House and the Senate, and separate these bills into thousands of individual bills for the President to sign or to veto. Apart from a reference to a bill number, these new individual bills would bear no resemblance to the original bill which was voted on by the Congress. I question the soundness of this approach based on practical as well as on constitutional grounds. According to the Constitution, article I, section 7:

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated. . . .

I assume that the supporters of separate enrollment are confident that the courts will uphold the constitutionality of this approach, I however have not yet been convinced that will be the courts' conclusion.

I would also like to mention that while the vast majority of States do have some version of a line-item veto, none of the versions include the separate enrollment language contained in the bill before us. Passage of this bill will send the Federal Government into uncharted legislative waters.

Mr. President, I shall vote ''no'' on the final passage of the line-item veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Oregon, my good friend, for his statement. I, too, have a number of serious concerns and questions about the majority leader's substitute line-item veto amendment, the Separate Enrollment and Item Veto Act of 1995.

I have the same question as has just been stated here on the floor about the constitutional aspects of it, whether it passes constitutional muster. The presentment clause of the Constitution is very clear. The distinguished Senator from Oregon read it into the RECORD, but it is clause 2 of article I section 7. It says:

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal and proceed to reconsider it.

Walter Dellinger, the very well respected constitutional scholar, and Assistant Attorney General, says:

This language mandates a fairly straightforward procedure. After both Houses of Congress have passed a ''Bill'' they must present it to the President, who can either ''approve'' . . . it . . . or ''not . . . .'' In either event, the bill is treated as a single unit; nothing in the text permits the President to approve and sign one portion while disapproving and returning another portion.

I might ask, Madam President, if we have something that raises on its face such a constitutional issue, where is the congressional testimony that explains why this legislative separate enrollment version of a line-item veto is constitutional? I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, as is the distinguished Presiding Officer. There has not been a word of testimony in our committee on that. I think if we adopted something like this, Congress will spend too much time in the court trying to defend separate enrollments, instead of concentrating on reducing the deficit.

Even if it was not unconstitutional, which I am convinced it is, it is, I suspect, unworkable. The enrollment clerk would have to enroll each item in an appropriations or revenue measure as a separate bill. Then the President can either veto or sign it. But this would require the enrollment clerk to enroll hundreds, if not thousands, of separate bills. I thought the new majority wanted to reduce Government paperwork.

(Mrs. HUTCHISON assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. I would suggest, Madam President, that we call this amendment the Tree Cutting and Paperwork Promotion Act. As a tree farm owner myself, I should probably vote for it because of all the extra paper and paperwork we will have around here. We do sell trees to make paper on my farm.

But then I might ask, how is the clerk going to decide what is an item to be enrolled as a separate bill? The amendment defines an item as ''any numbered section, any unnumbered paragraph, or any allocation or suballocation * * * contained in a numbered section or unnumbered paragraph .'' What if you write an appropriations bill that is just one paragraph? It may be 38 pages long, but it could be written as one.

Or I can see Members taking items, a popular and an unpopular item, and put them into a single numbered section or unnumbered paragraph so they would be enrolled together as one item. That protects it from a Presidential veto.

And what is an allocation or suballocation? There is no definition in the amendment. Is that up to the discretion of the clerk? If so, then the unelected enrollment clerk becomes far more powerful than a lot of Members of Congress.

There is no clear answer to this. We have never had hearings on it. The so-called compromise agreement was dug up from the past to break a deadlock that the majority has over two different line-item veto bills, S. 4 and S. 14.

These two bills were debated. They were marked up. They were reported by two different committees—the Budget Committee and the Government Affairs Committee. It would have been helpful if at least one of these two committees had seen this substitute before it hit the floor.

And, like S. 4, the so-called compromise amendment encourages minority rule. It allows a Presidential item veto to stand with the support of only 34 Senators, or 146 Representatives.

If you are from a State that only has a few representatives, like mine, only 1, I do not know how you could possibly vote for something like this. Basically it says your State becomes immaterial—immaterial in any determination. It is not majority rule. We are back to anti-Democratic supermajority requirements. I thought that was dismissed during the balanced budget amendment debate.

By imposing a two-thirds supermajority vote to override a Presidential item veto, the Dole amendment undermines the fundamental principle of majority rule. Our Founders rejected such supermajority voting and I oppose this. I do not care whether we have a Democratic President, as we do right now, or a Republican President. I am sure President Clinton would probably be delighted to have this. I can think of some times when I would probably be delighted as a Democrat that he would have it. But as a principle, I do not want any President to have this. The Congress might as well just pack up and go home.

Maybe some might like that, but I do not think that, as powerful a country as ours is, we want to see a situation where one of the three independent branches of Government is put in a position where they can basically override the other two branches of Government. That is not how we stayed a democracy after we gained that power.

Alexander Hamilton talked of the supermajority requirements as a ''poison'' that serves ''* * * to destroy the energy of the government, and to substitute the pleasure, caprice or artifices of an insignificant, turbulent or corrupt junto to the regular deliberations and decisions of a respectable majority.''

Such a supermajority requirement not only shows a distrust of the Congress but the electorate. As an American, as one who believes in our majority rule in our country—one who believes in our democracy and that our democracy exists because of our three branches of Government, I reject this notion and this basic distrust.

I think it is overkill. Over the course of our history, in 200 years, something we overlook in this—the President has vetoed 2,513 bills.

Congress overrode 104 times out of 2,513. The supermajority veto is an extraordinarily effective executive power. It is not needed to strike wasteful line items. Majority votes are enough to kill any wasteful line item.

In fact, if someone were to hear a number of the Members who stand up here and say how much they want this line-item veto when so many of those same Members have made sure that they have line items in appropriations bills or authorizing bills to help them with their constituents or their State, you would think that a Senator could not require separate votes on items in a bill. But they can. All they have to

do is object to committee amendments to be considered en bloc and then vote on them one by one and have a rollcall vote on them. But some of the same Senators who talk about such wasteful spending do not do that. They do not want to call up these particular items.

Let us not say we are going to muddy up our constitutional form of government by tossing the buck to the President if we are unable to do it, unwilling to do it, ourselves.

Then, of course, we have tax breaks. Now the rubber hits the road. If it is an item that may actually help your State, we could take that out. But if it is an item that might help some wealthy special interest and we do not want the President to ever touch that, the amendment only allows the President to veto a targeted tax benefit.

A ''targeted tax benefit'' is defined as any provision that is estimated to lose any revenue and has ''the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers.''

I am a lawyer. I have looked at that. I have looked at it about 10 different ways. I have asked other lawyers to look at it. Nobody seems to know what this means other than to say they would love to be involved in litigation on it. They could keep the clock running forever on that. It would produce endless litigation over what is a ''practical effect'' and who is a ''similarly situated taxpayer.'' These terms, of course, are not defined in the bill. In fact, the definition of ''targeted tax benefit'' sounds like a tax loophole itself.

Would the President also have a line-item veto authority over the capital gains tax cut described in the House Republican Contract With America? It is going to lose revenue. The bipartisan Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that the Contract With America's capital gains tax cut would lose almost $32 billion from 1995 to 2000.

I have a feeling that is not intended to be touched by the line-item veto. Why not quit this shell game? Just state in plain language that the President has line-item authority over all tax expenditures.

So I have too many problems about this substitute. I think it is just a fix to pick up a vote or two. We saw that during the balanced budget amendment debate. We would pull things out on Social Security, or whatnot, to try to get a vote here or there—no hearings, no discussion of the final effect of it.

I cast a procedural vote for cloture in 1985 to allow an up-or-down vote on a separate-enrollment line-item-veto bill. But that was because there had been hearings on a bill. There was a report on it, and we knew when we were going to vote on it. There have been a lot of changes since then.

There is no need to gamble on a questionable version of a line-item-veto bill. Thanks to the bipartisan leadership of Senators DOMENICI and EXON, we have a better line-item veto—the original S. 14 bill.

I have already said publicly on national television that I find this very appealing. I believe I could vote for it. But we ought to, if we are going to pass a line-item-veto bill, base it on the original bipartisan expedited rescission measure, one that has been carefully studied.

That I am willing to take a chance on. I am willing to take a chance on it with a sunset provision, but also because most of the questions that have been asked have been answered. I am not willing to take a plunge in faith on an amendment that is out here basically just to pick up a few extra votes.

Madam President, I see no one else seeking recognition. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 401 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that we return to the consideration of my amendment No. 401, which I submitted yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] proposes an amendment numbered 401 to amendment No. 347.

The amendment is as follows:

On p. 3, line 17, strike everything after word ''measure'' through the word ''generally'' on p. 4, line 14 and insert the following in its place: first passes both Houses of Congress in the same form, the Secretary of the Senate (in the case of a measure originating in the Senate) or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of a measure originating in the House of Representatives) shall disaggregate the bill into items and assign each item a new bill number. Henceforth each item shall be treated as a separate bill to be considered under the following subsections.

(2) A bill that is required to be disaggregated into separate bills pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) shall be disaggregated without substantive revision, and

(B) shall bear the designation of the measure of which it was an item prior to such disaggregation, together with such other designation as may be necessary to distinguish such measure from other measures disaggregated pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to the same measure.

(b) The new bills resulting from the disaggregation described in paragraph 1 of subsection (a) shall be immediately placed on the calendar of both Houses. They shall be the next order of business in each House and they shall be considered en bloc and shall not be subject to amendment. A motion to proceed to the bills shall be nondebatable. Debate in the House of Representatives or the Senate on the bills shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, which shall be divided equally between the majority leader and the minority leader. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit the bills is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the bills are agreed to or disagreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 401, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam President, I send a modification to amendment No. 401 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 401), as modified, is as follows:

On p. 3, line 17, strike everything after word ''measure'' through the word ''generally'' on p. 4, line 14 and insert the following in its place: first passes both Houses of Congress in the same form, the Secretary of the Senate (in the case of a measure originating in the Senate) or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of a measure originating in the House of Representatives) shall disaggregate the bill into items and assign each item a new bill number. Henceforth each item shall be treated as a separate bill to be considered under the following subsections.

(2) A bill that is required to be disaggregated into separate bills pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) shall be disaggregated without substantive revision, and

(B) shall bear the designation of the measure of which it was an item prior to such disaggregation, together with such other designation as may be necessary to distinguish such measure from other measures disaggregated pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to the same measure.

(b) The new bills resulting from the disaggregation described in paragraph 1 of subsection (a) shall be immediately placed on the appropriate calendar in the House of origination, and upon passage, placed on the appropriate calendar in the other House. They shall be the next order of business in each House and they shall be considered en bloc and shall not be subject to amendment. A motion to proceed to the bills shall be nondebatable. Debate in the House of Representatives or the Senate on the bills shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, which shall be divided equally between the majority leader and the minority leader. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit the bills is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the bills are agreed to or disagreed to.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam President, the purpose of this amendment is straightforward. Rather than deeming the work product of the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate to be separate bills and transmitting them to the President directly, my amendment calls for one last single vote on the entire package of bills by both Houses of Congress after the bills have been disaggregated.

This will not appreciably slow the work of the Congress, since it will only require one vote on the whole package. In addition, the amendment provides for highly expedited procedures that would allow only one hour of debate on the entire package with no other business being in order.

On the other hand, in my view this amendment greatly strengthens the likelihood that this legislation will be upheld by the Supreme Court. Indeed, although I did not know this at the

time I was preparing this amendment, that is the view that the Department of Justice's Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, Walter Dellinger, expressed in advising President Clinton regarding the constitutionality of S. 137, an earlier proposal containing enrollment procedures similar to those in the substitute. His letter states:

> Furthermore, there appear to be ways to refine S. 137 so as to avoid the objection that what must be presented to the President is the ''bill'' in exactly the form voted on by each House. So long as the Houses of Congress have treated each bill subsequently presented to the President as a bill at the time of each of their respective final votes, this objection would not arise. Thus, for example, internal House and Senate procedures that provided for disaggregating an appropriations bill into separate bills and then voting en bloc on those bills would result in the President's being presented with exactly [what was] voted on by each House. The chances of S. 137's being sustained would be improved were the bill amended to incorporate such refinements.

In short, in my view, we stand a much better chance of all the hard work that has been done by our colleagues over the years on this matter not being undone by the courts if my amendment is adopted.

I believe it would directly address, and satisfactorily address, the concerns that were earlier expressed by several Senators on the floor today as to the constitutionality of this legislation with respect to its presentment to the President.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues who support this legislation to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan for offering this amendment. While I do not believe this amendment is necessary, I believe it does address a concern that was raised yesterday relative to the constitutionality of a process which would deem an appropriations bill which was enrolled separately to incorporate all of the provisions of the original bill.

For reasons that I outlined at length yesterday, and on the basis of some respected constitutional scholars, as well as others who have researched this area, we strongly feel and believe that our conclusions that the constitutionality of the Dole substitute, as originally presented, meet constitutional muster, that those provisions are adhered to and that no constitutional question exists.

Nevertheless, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is acceptable to this Senator and to the proponents of the Dole substitute, in that it clarifies any ambiguity that might exist or concerns that might exist among some Members who have questioned the constitutionality of that procedure.

For that reason, I think the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is appropriate and I trust and hope that it will be adopted by this body.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I am pleased that the Senator from Michigan has brought up this particular amendment, which we would like to take a further look at. Senator BYRD is a recognized constitutional scholar, as he demonstrated, I think, very vividly yesterday, and I am sure he will have some questions or comments on this.

I would simply like to say, though, that I am particularly happy that this has been brought up, because it allows me to raise some questions as to why in the world, with all of the other problems that we have had over the years in enacting some kind of an enhanced rescission or expedited rescission or line-item veto—call it what you will, we all know what we are talking about—why in the world are we bringing up matters that I think are extraneous, that I think are not necessary.

I think this whole enrollment proposition is ludicrous from the standpoint that I believe, as much as anything else, it could cause us a great deal of difficulty with regard to the courts.

I still do not understand why, all of the sudden, after S. 4 and S. 14, the two mainline bills in this regard were considered and introduced in the Senate, hearings held on them in the Budget Committee, in the Governmental Affairs Committee, and talk back and forth about which should be advanced and which should not be and in what form—at least in the Budget Committee a number of amendments were offered on a whole series of issues—but never once to my knowledge in any of the committees of the Congress of the United States this year did we ever touch on or think about this enrollment mechanism that has come out of nowhere to be one of the central parts of the bill finally introduced by the majority leader and, as near as I can tell, endorsed and backed by all 54 Members of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle.

I would simply also point out that this enrollment mechanism, regardless of its merits or lack thereof, can be agreed by all to be cumbersome, to be laborious, and I do not see the need for it. Certainly, the House of Representatives did not think this was important. We, in the U.S. Senate, did not think it was important when we introduced S. 4 and S. 14 and had all those hearings. It was not in the Contract With America, as far as I know. And those who wrote and signed the Contract With America, of which the line-item veto or enhanced rescissions or expedited rescissions, call it what you will, they did not think it was important.

It comes over to the U.S. Senate and out of the blue comes this very difficult system that I thought that my friend from Indiana did a pretty good job of trying to explain yesterday. He went to the enrolling clerk. And he said he can do this with computers and it is going to be very easy to do.

Basically, again, I am not a constitutional scholar, I am not even a lawyer, but I listened with great interest to the presentation of one who is, Senator BYRD. When I was listening to Senator BYRD yesterday, I thought, you know, thank God for the people of West Virginia sending us a man of the talent and the intellect with regard to the constitutional problems that might come up.

Basically, it seems to me, if you pass a bill in the U.S. Senate and then you present that to the President of the United States in a different form, at least you are asking for some problems from the courts. It might well be that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan might clarify that somewhat. I would be very much interested in what Senator BYRD and others that have studied this from a constitutional standpoint might feel about it.

Suffice it to say, it seems to me, Madam President, that the fact that we seem to be somewhat concerned about this, at least some on that side of the aisle must be somewhat concerned because they have talked about it a great deal, and now we have an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan that tries to clarify it a little bit more, why clarify it? Why do we not pass the measure before us, which is termed the majority leader's bill or the revision of S. 4? Why do we not pass it and go back to the simple, direct, and understandable form that we had in this regard in S. 4, in S. 14, and in the measure that came over from the House of Representatives? Why do we not go back to that which I do not believe anybody has any objection to if they are for this?

I would think that Senator MCCAIN, the original proponent of S. 4, would feel that he had thought this through quite carefully. I suspect that Senator DOMENICI and this Senator, who combined as original cosponsors of S. 14 and thought about it, we thought that the more simple form with regard to how this was presented to the President would be in the line-item form that Senator THURMOND talked about that he used as Governor, as this Senator has talked about from the time that I have served as Governor of Nebraska. I do not know why that kind of a form and process is not good if we are going to pass some kind of a line-item veto or, once again, call it what you will.

So I simply say that I thank my distinguished friend from Michigan for advancing this thought. But it gave this Senator an opportunity to say, why are we going through all these exercises in futility, when it would seem to me that the main sponsors of the amendment that was offered by the majority leader should recognize it would be to the good of all of us who would like to see some type of a line-item veto passed to go back to a sounder footing that I think we would have both from the standpoint of expediting the process

and from the standpoint of probably not being challenged constitutionally on this particular item, and go back to the way line-item vetoes have generally been handled in the past without some of these special, complicated enrollment procedures that have been thrown into this measure at the last minute for reasons that I do not begin to understand?

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I would just point out to my colleague and friend from Nebraska that the separate enrollment procedure is not something that is new. In fact, it is a procedure which has enjoyed support not only from Republicans but also from Democrats.

Senator HOLLINGS, more than a decade ago, suggested, discussed, proposed the separate enrollment procedure. Senator BIDEN, then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, spoke very articulately in favor of the separate enrollment procedure and its constitutionality.

It is a means by which we attempt to accomplish the end that I think most now are admitting needs to be accomplished. That is, to provide a means by which we can check the unnecessary pork-barrel spending that has come out of this Chamber and the House Chamber and sent to the desk, to the President, in increasing amounts ever since the adoption of the Budget Act of 1974.

It is a practice that Members have used, and I suggest many have abused, of attaching to otherwise necessary legislation that the President needs to sign items that are designed to favor a few or favor a parochial, narrow interest.

So as we have struggled to define the vehicle that will achieve the necessary number of votes to grant a check and balance against this practice of Congress, we have looked at various forms—enhanced rescission is one; constitutional amendment is another; separate enrollment is the third.

Modern technology has allowed us to accomplish separate enrollment in a means and way in which we could not a few years ago. Five or six years ago, it was a valid complaint and a valid objection to say that it would lead to an incredibly difficult and complex process which would require the enrolling clerk to go through all kinds of machinations and additional work in order to accomplish the breakdown of a particular piece of legislation into individual items which could then be enrolled and sent to the President.

Today, computer programs allow that to be accomplished in a matter of hours, if not minutes—depending on the size of the bill. What used to be described as a nightmare of a procedure now is a routine procedure, accomplished both in the Senate and in the House.

Separate enrollment has the advantage of allowing the President to know exactly what is laid on his or her desk, what item constitutes additional spending for a particular purpose.

Rather than the obfuscation and rather than the confusion over how taxpayers' money is going to be spent we now, under separate enrollment, pick up a piece of paper which contains a single item, incorporated in a form which the President can either accept or reject.

No longer will we have the excuse of saying, ''I didn't know what was in that massive bill. I thought we were voting on an emergency appropriation. I thought we were voting on something of national interest. It was only later I discovered, to my horror, that it included all kinds of special tax benefits for single individuals, for limited interests, special breaks for special interests.''

Or, ''I didn't know that the appropriations that went forward provided what is often characterized as embarrassing expenditures of something that can only be described as pork-barrel spending.

''Even had I known it, I'm afraid I would have had to vote for the bill, because it provided emergency funding for our national defense; it provided emergency funding for hurting Americans as a consequence of a hurricane or floods or an earthquake, or necessary spending for essential functions of Government.''

Or, ''I didn't want to shut the whole Government down. We were right up against the deadline.''

Yes, those rascals always slip a few things in there at the end, but we were up against the deadline and we had a massive bill that we had to pass or send to the President.

The President is faced with the choice of either accepting the entire bill or rejecting the entire bill. The President—each President in this century with one exception—has formally asked the Congress, ''Let me have line-item veto authority so that I am not''—as Harry Truman said—''blackmailed by the legislature into either accepting the bill with all of its extraneous, nonrelevant spending, or rejecting the bill and sending it back.''

By the way, you send a lot of these major appropriations up at the very end of the fiscal year with hours to go, sometimes, before the fiscal year runs out, and then you put me in a position of saying if I do not like something in that legislation, I have to send the entire bill back and close every office, and all the horror stories about the essential functions of Government are then raised. That is, as Harry Truman said, legislative blackmail.

Madam President, what we are attempting to do is to fashion a procedure, a process which will allow the President to say ''I'll accept 99 percent of that bill or 94 percent of that bill, but I can't accept it with these dozen items in there that do not have anything to do with the bill, that do not go toward any national interest, that are simply attached because Members knew that this is the way to get their pork-barrel spending through, that I had to accept the bill.''

By the same token, this is a process which will change the way Members behave, the way Members act. Because now, knowing that the President would have the power under line-item veto to single out their particular item, to single it out on one page of paper for everyone to see, and knowing that the only way that item could become law is if this Congress brought it back up and that Member were forced to come to the floor, debate, and explain what was in the bill, what the spending was for, and turn to his colleagues and say, ''I need your support but, by the way, you will have to put your 'yes' or your 'no' on public record so that your constituents understand how you feel about that particular item,'' knowing that, I predict most Members will say, ''I don't think that particular spending item is so important that I want to risk having to debate that or putting other Members on notice.'' Or, ''I don't think I can get the necessary votes to achieve that particular purpose.''

Separate enrollment brings forward into the light of public scrutiny the particular item of expenditure, and no longer will we be able to hide that item.

Madam President, I note that the Senator from West Virginia has arrived on the floor, and I am more than happy to yield.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I just remind my colleague that the Presiding Officer still has the right to decide the floor.

Madam President, I have been listening with great interest to my friend and colleague from Indiana. I would remind him that before he and many other people came to the Senate, former Senator Quayle, former Vice President Quayle, and this Senator, were up appealing on the floor of the U.S. Senate along the same identical lines that the Senator from Indiana just mentioned.

I listened very much to his remarks in response to the suggestion that I had made, but maybe he did not understand what I was talking about. There is nothing wrong in using computers to try to ferret out so that all—including Members of the House, Members of the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate, who has to sign each one of these measures, the Speaker of the House—so that he or she is fully informed, and the President of the United States, so that they are fully informed.

So we are not against the use of computers to furnish information and break down the figure. There is nothing wrong with that.

Much of the excellent remarks that were just made by my colleague from Indiana emphasized the need for a line-

item veto, enhanced rescission, expedited rescission—call it what you will. So I do not think that is the debate that I was trying to enter into, nor do I believe that is the intent of the amendment offered, that we are now on, by the Senator from Michigan.

What we are talking about is whether or not it is wise to use the enrollment procedure that has come out of the blue. I agree with my friend from Indiana. This is new. It has not been talked about before. It has been suggested by Senator HOLLINGS, it has been suggested by Senator BIDEN, as I understand it, and possibly others. But it was just one suggestion that was made somewhere down the line.

I happen to believe that the House of Representatives, which studied this matter, did not feel that the bill was unworkable unless we used the enrollment process that suddenly has been instigated here as a key part. I do not believe that the Budget Committee or the other committee of jurisdiction that considered this matter felt that the measures that were advanced were inoperative or had not been thought through because we did not come through this magical enrollment procedure.

I will simply say that most of the remarks that the Senator from Indiana made were with regard to the merits and why we need a line-item veto of some type. He did not, I think, adequately address the concerns that I was trying to bring up with regard to this enrollment process that I think could cause us some serious constitutional problems, those of us who are now for and have been for a line-item veto of some type for a long, long time.

So I simply want to focus, if it was not understood, on the concerns of this Senator with regard to this cumbersome procedure to carry out the line-item veto.

For the life of me, I have not been able to understand yet how the President pro tempore and the Speaker and the President can carry out their duties by signing something that is on a computer. There is nothing wrong with using a computer to make sure that everybody knows what every item is from 1 cent to trillions of dollars. But I do not believe that that particular enrollment process is the key to success at all. In fact, I think that kind of a process, as I say once again, could cause us some considerable difficulties in the courts. No one knows how they would decide that.

I simply wanted to make it clear, Madam President, that I was not in conflict with what the Senator from Indiana said with regard to the necessity for a line-item veto. I am trying to focus on the fact that I believe that the enrollment process is also causing some concern to Senators on that side of the aisle, as evidenced by the fact that the Senator from Michigan must have some concerns about it or he would not be in here offering his amendment.

So I simply warn and would like to have some consideration given to why can we not pass a cleaner, simpler, more direct line-item veto, a la what was sent to us by the House, a la what was incorporated in S. 4, what was incorporated in S. 14? I do not believe that all of the people that touched those different propositions had not thought through the process to the point that all is forsaken unless somehow we accept this concept that has been brought into this body for the first time, as I know it, under the present consideration of a line-item veto or something akin to it in this current session of the Congress.

I happen to think that it is ill-advised to go that far, but the majority has a right to work its will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Chair in her capacity as a Senator from Texas suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON pertaining to the introduction of S. 592 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield the floor.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 401, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. McCAIN. Now may I ask what the parliamentary situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment at the present time is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM].

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, if there is no further debate on the amendment, I move the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no such motion under the Senate rules.

There is no such motion in the Senate rules, moving adoption of an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does someone seek recognition?

Mr. McCAIN. I move adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no such motion under Senate rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does someone seek recognition?

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

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

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the majority leader has made it quite clear, as has the Democratic leader, that we want to finish this bill tomorrow. We have now 14 amendments pending on the bill. We have spent a long time on the bill. We would like to have debate on this amendment. Any Member of this body can put the Senate into a quorum call if they wish.

I would like to go ahead and debate the Abraham amendment and be able to move on to other amendments, if that is possible. If it is not possible, then obviously we may have to inconvenience Members by staying here very late tonight so that we can keep consonance with the desires of the majority leader and the rest of the Members of the body to finish this legislation tomorrow and not spend 3 and 4 weeks on a single piece of legislation as we did with the balanced budget amendment and other amendments since we have gone into session here.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we can move forward with this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am not ready at this moment to debate the amendment, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I again advise my colleagues that we have 14 amendments pending. We would like to get those done. An amendment is before the Senate. I would like to move forward with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does someone seek recognition for debate on the Abraham amendment?

If not, all those in favor of the amendment——

Mr. BYRD addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not seek to delay action on the amendment, nor do I seek to delay action on the bill. But this is an amendment that has just been called up and the author of the amendment is not in the Chamber. I was hoping to ask the author of the amendment some questions. If Senators want me to begin, I can talk at length, but I do not seek to do that. That is not my purpose. I wanted to ask some questions about the amendment. I wanted to ask some questions of the author.

Now, the Senator from Arizona, of course, is seeking to convey the impression that I am trying to delay the bill. I am not doing that. I am not quite ready yet to discuss this amendment, but I am also not ready yet to allow a vote on it, until I have an opportunity to ask a few questions.

So I will suggest if Senators wish to get on with the amendment, get the author of the amendment over to the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from West Virginia, the Senator from Michigan, who is the author of the amendment, is on the floor now if the Senator chooses to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have noted the amendment by Mr. ABRAHAM to the substitute offered by Mr. DOLE.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be able to ask questions of other Senators, notwithstanding that I have the floor.

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

Mr. BYRD. My first question to the distinguished Senator would be, why does the Senator feel that it is necessary to offer this amendment to the Dole substitute?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I have watched the debate as it has proceeded here. And certainly during the period of time after the compromise version of this legislation was developed, I have heard various Members of the Senate express concerns about its constitutionality and it struck me that the area in which the concerns were primarily focused was, as earlier expressed, I think, by Senator LEAHY, the presentment issues that I have tried to address here.

My feelings were, although I believe as drafted the legislation could sustain a constitutional test, that it was in our interests to make the changes I am proposing in this amendment to try to further address any concerns people might have.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on yesterday I spoke at some length with respect to what I consider to be some constitutional flaws in the Dole substitute. One area which I discussed at some length was that which pertained to the presentation clause; the fact that under the legislation that is before the Senate, each of the bills or joint resolutions that will have been enrolled by the enrolling clerk of the House of origination will not have had action by either House, specifically, on that particular enrolled bill. Consequently, I felt that the legislation was constitutionally vulnerable. The pending legislation deems that each such bill has passed both Houses, when in reality, each such bill would not have passed either House, to say nothing of both Houses.

So I take it that it is that perception of the unconstitutionality of the legislation by Mr. DOLE that has led the distinguished Senator to offer the amendment which is presently before the Senate?

Mr. ABRAHAM. As I said, the concerns that had been expressed in the period of time during which this compromise was worked out and were expressed, I think by you yesterday and by others here today, were concerns I felt could be adequately addressed and resolved in this fashion. So I thought in developing this amendment we could effectively handle the concerns that had been raised, although, as I say, I do not necessarily accept the notion that the legislation would not pass constitutional muster as is. But I thought this would allay fears and concerns that had been brought up.

Mr. BYRD. But I think, Mr. President, that the amendment by the distinguished Senator will have certainly improved the legislation if the amendment is agreed to, and I have no doubt that it will be.

Let me ask the Senator a further question. His amendment reads as follows:

On p. 3, line 17, strike everything after the word ''measure'' through the word ''generally'' on p. 4, line 14 and insert the following in its place:

This is the language, now, that would be inserted by Mr. Abraham:

first passes both Houses of Congress in the same form, the Secretary of the Senate (in the case of a measure originating in the Senate) or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of a measure originating in the House of Representatives) shall disaggregate the bill into items and assign each item a new bill number. Henceforth each item shall be treated as a separate bill to be considered under the following subsections.

And so on.

The amendment of the Senator speaks not only with reference to appropriations bills but also with reference to authorization measures, does it not?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, it does.

Mr. BYRD. And on page 5 of the substitute offered by Mr. DOLE and other Senators, under the section on definitions:

For purposes of this Act:

(2) The term ''authorization measure'' means any measure, other than an appropriations measure, that contains a provision providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits.

Now, would that include a reconciliation bill?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I am sorry?

Mr. BYRD. The definition of authorization measure, on page 5 of the Dole substitute, under section 5 titled ''Definitions,'' paragraph (2):

The term ''authorization measure'' means any measure other than an appropriations measure that contains a provision providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits.

Does that language include a reconciliation bill?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I would defer that interpretation to the manager.

Mr. BYRD. What does the Senator think it means, the Senator who offered the amendment? Does he believe the term ''authorization measure'' includes a reconciliation bill?

Mr. President, I am left alone on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. As I understand it, he is waiting for a response from the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BYRD. That is the first question I have ever asked in the Senate that caused the whole Senate to vanish, other than the Presiding Officer and myself.

What am I to do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator, you have my complete attention.

Mr. BYRD. There was all this great hurry to get on with this bill and I have asked a question, but all Senators have left the floor.

Oh, they are returning now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor and continues to have unanimous consent to proceed with questions to another Senator.

Mr. ABRAHAM. After consultation with the manager of the bill, it is our interpretation that, yes, it would include reconciliation.

Mr. BYRD. It would include a reconciliation bill.

Then, I will read the amendment of the Senator further. According to the amendment of the distinguished Senator, ''the Clerk of the House of Representatives''—in most instances these measures would originate in the House.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives then would disaggregate the bill, meaning a reconciliation bill, would disaggregate the bill into items and assign each item a new bill number. In reconciliation bills there is almost always direct spending. There are targeted tax benefits. With the Senator's

amendment then, I take it that a reconciliation bill that has in it provisions providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits—such bills would have to be disaggregated. Am I correct?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Meaning the whole bill has to be disaggregated. So, if there are direct spending items in the bill, if there are targeted tax benefits, the entire reconciliation bill under the Senator's amendment has to be broken down, disaggregated for all of the items, assigned new bill numbers, and enrolled as separate bills. Am I correct?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes. It would have to be disaggregated.

Mr. BYRD. Is not the purpose of a reconciliation bill the bringing into proper balance spending and the raising of revenues in such a way as to moderate or to reduce the deficit? Am I correct?

Mr. ABRAHAM. That is correct. As I interpret the question, our amendment is designed in a mechanical sense to call for a yes-no vote on the question of all those separately disaggregated portions whether it is a reconciliation bill or other.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. So each of the items in the reconciliation bill would be enrolled separately and be sent to the President. If the President chooses to veto certain items in the reconciliation bill, would this not then have the undesired result of bringing into imbalance the reconciliation bill, rather than balancing the effects of revenue increases and direct spending costs?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I defer on this to the Senator from Arizona. I yield to him at this time.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that this bill effects new spending, new taxes, or new entitlements. If the intention of reconciliation bills are to bring the deficit down, then we should find another vehicle because the deficit has not come down. The deficit has gone up. The deficit has gone up.

So I suggest that we invent a new vehicle. But a reconciliation bill, like any other bill that has new spending, new taxes, or new entitlements associated with it, would be subject to a line-item veto.

Mr. BYRD. But the term ''authorization measure'' under section 5, entitled ''definitions,'' does not confine it to new spending or new targeted tax benefits. The term ''authorization'' means any measure other than an appropriations measure that contains a provision providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits. It does not say anything about new direct spending.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator will turn to the next page, where it says the term ''item'' means with respect to an appropriations measure, any numbered section, any numbered paragraph, any allocation or suballocation of an appropriation made in compliance with section (2)(a) containing a numbered section and an unnumbered paragraph, and with respect to an authorization measure, any numbered or unnumbered paragraph that contains new direct spending or a new direct tax benefit presented and identified in a conformance with (2)(b).

So I ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia to look at next page for the explanation which seems to have eluded him.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator's amendment said that the bill shall be disaggregated. That means broken down. A reconciliation bill shall be separated into all of its distinct parts and enrolled as separate bills and sent to the President.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Whether there is ''new direct spending'' or just ''direct spending.''

Mr. MCCAIN. Only those items in the reconciliation bill which would contain new direct spending or new targeted tax benefits identified in conformance with section (2)(b).

In addition to that, I do not see in light of a reconciliation bill any new entitlement or expansion of existing entitlement would also be covered.

Mr. BYRD. What about a defense authorization bill? Would the entire bill have to be broken down?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say no.

Mr. BYRD. Only if it contained new direct spending or a new targeted tax benefit or an expansion or new entitlement. Defense authorization bills do include direct spending for retirement.

What I am really trying to get at is that it seems to me that this amendment certainly has as its good purpose, the effort to cure what appears to be a constitutional vulnerability. But in the attempt, it raises as many questions as it answers.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I respond to that? If I may ask the indulgence of the Senator from West Virginia to try to respond very briefly to that?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to the Senator from West Virginia that we received from the Congressional Research Service from Mr. Johnny Killian, Senior Specialist in American Constitutional Law, who I know that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is familiar with, and I will not read the entire opinion. I would like to read the last paragraph which I think pretty much sums up the situation in my view.

In conclusion, we have argued that the deeming procedure—

We know what the deeming procedure is.

may present a political question unsuited for judicial review, and, thus, that Congress would not be subject to judicial review.

I will not read the whole thing because there is some ambiguity here, I say to my colleague from West Virginia.

We have considered, on the other hand, that the courts may find they are not precluded from exercising authority to review this proposal. If the proposal is reviewed by the courts, and, even, if it is not, we have presented an argument leading to sustaining the deeming procedure as not in violation of a principle that bill, in order to become law, must be passed in identical version by the House of Representatives and the Senate. Because of the lack of available precedent, we cannot argue that any of the three versions of the argument is indisputably correct. Indeed, there are questions about all three.

I repeat—questions about all three. The arguments concerning the separate enrollment. He concludes by saying: ''In the end, Congress must exercise a constitutional judgment when deciding on passage of a proposal.''

The Senator from Michigan felt, as he stated, that there might be some ambiguities in judging this, and he felt that although it may or may not—the language of the legislation is probably constitutional as presently framed. By his amendment, he could remove some of the ambiguities associated with the constitutional question.

I do understand, and I paid attention yesterday to the very learned exposition of the Senator from West Virginia, about the constitutionality of this issue. I suggest that perhaps one of the conclusions we might reach in this debate would be the final sentence of Mr. Killian's opinion which says: ''In the end, Congress must exercise a constitutional judgment when deciding on passage of the proposal,'' because as the Senator from West Virginia well knows, according to article I, what the Congress deems as a bill has always been taken by the courts as a bill.

Mr. BYRD. Well, Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has just stated. But I think we are missing something; what we are saying is going by one another. I do not think the Senator's response goes to the point I raised. I agree that the distinguished Senator, Mr. ABRAHAM, is seeking to cure the vulnerability of the language from a constitutional standpoint in the Dole substitute, especially as it referred to the presentation clause. He is seeking to get around the deeming feature of that language. That is not what I am questioning here. On that point, I am saying that I think his amendment is an improvement to the legislation.

But what I am trying to find out is whether or not this language contemplates a reconciliation bill. And in one instance under the section 5 definition, it reads: ''The term 'authorization measure' ''—which includes a reconciliation bill—''means any measure other than an appropriations measure that contains a provision providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits.'' That would indeed include a reconciliation bill.

I think Senators ought to be aware of that when they vote on this substitute. It is not just talking about appropriations bills. It is talking about reconciliation bills as well. And Senators need to understand that the language

of the amendment by Mr. ABRAHAM instructs that the bill—the whole reconciliation bill—must be disaggregated if there is one item in it, one provision, that provides for direct spending or targeted tax benefits. The whole bill then must be broken down into several hundred, or perhaps thousands of separate ''billettes.''

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask the Senator from West Virginia if he will yield.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I apologize if I did not directly respond to his question. On March 22, there was a letter sent in to the Honorable TOM DASCHLE, JAMES EXON, and JOHN GLENN in response to a letter that was sent to the majority leader and it had a series of 11 questions. The last question, I say to my colleague from West Virginia, stated:

Finally, would the veto authority provided in the amendment extend to reconciliation measures? The current Byrd rule formulation appears to protect reconciliation titles that meet the Budget Committee's savings instruction, even if the titles contain the deficit increasing measures. Would this bill change that approach?

Does that get to the question that the Senator from West Virginia is asking?

Mr. BYRD. I am not sure that it does. Will the Senator be kind enough to read that again?

Mr. MCCAIN. It says,

Would the veto authority provided in the amendment extend to reconciliation measures? The current Byrd rule formulation appears to protect reconciliation titles that meet the Budget Committee's savings instruction, even if the titles contain the deficit increasing measures. Would this bill change that approach?

I believe that might be the question. Fundamentally, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan basically calls for just an added step in the procedure. But it would not change the fundamental question about a reconciliation bill. Is that an accurate description of what is in the mind of the Senator from West Virginia as to the impact of the amendment from the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BYRD. I am not sure it is. My next question was, if the Senator sees any impact, what impact does this legislation have on the Byrd rule?

Mr. MCCAIN. ''The pending line-item veto bill applies to reconciliation bills only if the reconciliation bill includes new direct spending for a new targeted tax benefit provisions,'' as I have stated before. It goes on to say,

The line-item veto bill is independent of the Budget Act and does not change the application of section 313 of the Budget Act the Byrd rule to reconciliation bills. Compliance with the Byrd rule, section 313 of the Budget Act, or the budget resolutions reconciliation instructions, do not protect the reconciliation bill from separate enrollment. Just as appropriations bills are subject to the line-item veto procedures, even if they comply with the Budget Act, statutory caps, and the budget resolution's budget allocations, reconciliation bills are subject to the line-item veto procedures even if they comply with the budget resolution's reconciliation directives and the Byrd rule.

In other words, what I think the Senator from West Virginia is getting at—and I am hesitant, obviously, to try to articulate what he does far better than I do—is that a reconciliation bill is an attempt by the Congress to balance certain competing priorities.

What the Senator from West Virginia is concerned about is, if you take out part of that, then it destroys the intent of the reconciliation process. I do believe that that would probably be one of the impacts if the line-item veto were misused by a President of the United States.

But I would find it very difficult to believe that Congress would not override a President who would abuse his authority in that fashion. But if that is the point the Senator is trying to make, I think that answers it.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator. I believe that we are focusing on one and the same object now. I would not, however, have that much faith in any President, that he might not veto items that would result in an imbalance of the reconciliation measure.

Another question that I have: I note that the distinguished Senator's amendment provides for 1 hour of debate—not to exceed 1 hour—and that, of course, can be further limited. Suppose that it is discovered after the enrolling clerk has disaggregated the entire bill—remember, it must be disaggregated, and each item is to be assigned a new bill number. Suppose it is found that the enrolling clerk has made some errors, and that is certainly not entirely out of the question. We all make errors.

I note that there could be no motion to recommit, it is not in order to reconsider the vote, and there must be an up or down vote then on the matter; is that correct?

Mr. MCCAIN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. What do we do in instances where the enrolling clerk has made errors in the enrolling of the billettes? Will we have any way to make the corrections or are we left with no choice?

Mr. MCCAIN. If I might respond to the Senator, as the Senator from West Virginia well knows, at the beginning of every session, there is an authorization passed for the enrolling clerk to make ''technical corrections.'' Those technical corrections many times, as the Senator from West Virginia well knows, are pretty interesting. Sometimes we have amendments that are written on the back of an envelope and the instructions to the enrolling clerk are, ''At the proper place shall be inserted.'' It is very standard at the end of the passage of a bill that staff and others will make technical corrections to bring the bill into proper legislative language.

I believe that if the enrolling clerk had made a mistake and it came to light that he or she did that, then that would fall under the technical corrections aspect of the rules of the Senate that are adopted each session.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate ought to have the opportunity to make corrections or to order corrections if such are found in the many hundreds of bills that result from the enrolling clerk's action, yet, the Senate would be deprived of the ability to do so. Which all goes to the point that this is a measure that has been brought to the Senate in a hurry.

The legislation was introduced in the Senate on Monday of this week by the distinguished majority leader. As far as I know, there was no input into it by the minority—none—and immediately a cloture motion was offered.

There was no committee report. There had been no committee hearings. If there were committee hearings, I know of none. They certainly have not been printed and placed on the desks.

But here is a wide-ranging, far-reaching piece of legislation that is being rammed through the Senate without enough time to carefully explore and probe and scrutinize and study and debate and question the various provisions that are in the bill.

I think it is fortunate that the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who has offered this amendment, has had an opportunity to at least get the amendment in before we finally vote on the bill. It certainly, as I have already indicated, is an improvement over the legislation that was ordered.

Now, there may be other improvements needed. But we are going to be expected to vote on this legislation by no later than Friday.

I do not know what will happen to this measure in conference. It will certainly undergo or can undergo many changes in conference. The House may hold out for the version of the bill that passed that body. What we get back from conference may be a blending of the two measures, or it may be one or the other, or it may not have a great resemblance to either.

I think it is unfortunate that the situation has developed whereby we cannot take more time and study and amend. This is an instance in which there is an effort to clarify and treat one of the rather glaring flaws in the legislation. I compliment the Senator on his offering of the amendment. I think that much has to be said for taking some time to examine the measure and debate it. But I still think that the legislation has many problems.

I hope that Senators will take a look at the RECORD and questions that have been raised today about this amendment. And there may be other questions that will occur to other Senators. I doubt that I have explored this matter to its fullest extent. But I hope it will cause other Senators to at least have a better understanding of what we are about to pass here.

This is going to be a first-class mess, where we break down the bill into hundreds of little bills and have them enrolled by the clerk of the originating body. They do not go through the usual procedures of having each bill or joint resolution read three times. We do not, indeed, debate each of the bills or have an opportunity to amend each of the little billettes.

And when they are vetoed by the President, as many as may be vetoed by the President, is it the opinion of those who are managing the bill that the several billettes that are vetoed by the President, will they come back to the Congress all at once within a 10-day period, or will some come the first day, some the second day, some the third day? And if there are three or four appropriations bills that happen to hit the Senate and the House for passage and are sent to the President about the same time, will the originating body be expected to vote on each of these little vetoed measures, or will the originating body have an opportunity to collect them, put them into one package to be overridden or not?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from West Virginia that, first of all, as to how those bills might come over, as the Senator knows, the President has a certain number of days in order to consider a veto, so it would be strictly up to the President as to how he would want to do that. He might want to send some over early and some over later on. Of course, as the Senator knows, since each, as he calls them, ''billettes'' are viewed as a separate bill, they would be considered separately by the originating body.

I would like to make one additional comment about the problem if the enrolling clerk made a mistake. I would remind the Senator, as he well knows, it happens from time to time around here that the enrolling clerk makes an error. By concurrent resolution we correct those technical errors in both Houses, and I envision we could do that.

I think, again—and I hesitate to put words into the mouth of the most knowledgeable person in the Senate on these issues—I think the argument of the Senator from West Virginia is that if they came over in certain ways, separate or staggered, then perhaps the body that has to consider them would be deprived of the ability of considering them as a whole, as they did on the initial passage of the bill.

I think that, again, is a valid concern. But I would also hope that in coordination with the President of the United States, he would inform those bodies as to which bills he was going to veto and in what context. I think the communications are good between here and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Again, as the Senator from West Virginia did yesterday, those are valid concerns that I think need to be addressed, and I also believe that this kind of exposition of these aspects of the bill is very important for the record as far as the illumination of our colleagues.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I like to believe, too, that this kind of debate is informative and illuminating and helpful. I think it does generate additional thinking, which in turn may generate some additional amendments if such could be offered. I suppose the list has now been completed.

But in any event, it seems to me it is going to be a massive undertaking for the enrolling clerks. They have not been accustomed to anything like this, I do not believe. The idea of breaking down, for example, the bill that I mentioned yesterday, energy-water bill, breaking that down into 2,000 pieces, and each of the other 12 appropriations bills—which include the legislative branch, I assume, so the President could have an opportunity to line item out some parts of the legislative appropriation bill that either or both bodies might jealously want to guard. This is quite a load to put on the enrolling clerks. In all of the 13 appropriation bills, as I indicated yesterday, my staff estimated something like 10,000 little billettes that would accrue from the disaggregation of the 13 fiscal year 1995 appropriations bills. Now, that is quite an additional burden over and above what the enrolling clerks, I think, usually have to contend with.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator allow me to make a response to that, even if it is not totally adequate?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, first of all, I went down to see the enrolling clerk here in the Senate, who is equipped with a computer system which basically cranks these things out about every 30 seconds. The computer can be programmed in such fashion.

I do agree with the Senator from West Virginia that this does increase the legislative load considerably. From my perspective—and I know it is not the perspective of the Senator from West Virginia—what I am exactly seeking is separate bills that can be examined separately so that there is no doubt as to what the Congress of the United States has passed.

Again, I know that the Senator from West Virginia does not agree with this viewpoint because we have had many hours of debate on this very issue. I believe that one of the problems is that we pass these massive bills which perhaps only the Senator from West Virginia is thoroughly familiar with and the rest of the body is not.

What happens is, we find—all too often, in my opinion—that we pass an appropriations bill, especially, and many times an authorization bill or even a reconciliation bill, and tucked away somewhere in there is—or a tax bill. I think the Senator from West Virginia would agree that some of the most egregious offenses as far as special interests are concerned occur in the consideration and passage of tax bills around here. There are items that are tucked in there that we do not know about, and weeks, months or years may pass by before the American people and we as a body who have passed this legislation are aware of it.

I certainly understand what the Senator is saying about the large amount of paperwork, but at the same time, we are also trying to cure what many Americans believe is an unhealthy habit of putting things into bills—though they be authorization, or in the case of new entitlements, et cetera, or appropriations bills or tax bills—that are not for the good of all Americans but are for the good of special interests.

Now, whether that is actually true or not, the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia is obviously different from mine.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there is undoubtedly a great deal of truth in what the Senator is saying. No question of that.

I personally favor the approach that is envisioned in the substitute that is being offered by Mr. DASCHLE, the distinguished minority leader. I intend to vote for something along that line.

I do not see in the original Domenici-Exon approach a shifting of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch. I do see in the Domenici-Exon approach which has been built upon by the distinguished majority leader in his substitute, I do see an opportunity for the President to register his opinion by rescinding certain items in appropriation and having a vote up or down on those items that he proposes to rescind.

It is a majority vote, that is true, and I am sure the distinguished Senator from Arizona prefers a two-thirds supermajority. But I favor that approach. I have no problem with giving the President another opportunity to select from appropriation bills certain items which he feels, for his reasons, whatever they may be, they may be political or for whatever reasons, I have no problem with his sending them to the two Houses and our giving him a vote.

I see in this, I say to the Senator, I see a shifting of the legislative power to the Executive. I think that power over the purse is so clearly vested in the legislative branch by the Constitution that we ought to be hesitant to enact legislation the effect of which will be to expand the President's powers. There is no question but the President's powers are somewhat expanded. To that extent, whatever the expansion of the President's powers are, the powers of the legislative branch are thereby decreased.

I also, as I said yesterday, am concerned about the breaking down of the balance between the two Houses under any of these measures which we are likely to pass.

I hope the measure that the distinguished minority leader introduces will be the one that will pass, but that remains to be seen. I kind of have my doubts. But under the other measures, it seems to me that the Senate, to a considerable extent, loses. It no longer remains an equal partner in the decision.

The Senator well knows that the Senate adds a lot of amendments to appropriation bills, and those amendments, when they are enrolled separately, they go to the President. The President vetoes them. They actually originated in this body. But if they are vetoed, they are going to be sent back to the other body, and the other body will have the option of trying to override or not trying to override. If the other body chooses not to attempt to override, then the Senate has no voice at all. So to that extent I think the Senate is subordinated to the other body.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I respond without interrupting?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will let me know when I am interrupting.

On the first point that the Senator from West Virginia makes about the majority versus two-thirds, I, first of all, have engaged in that debate with the Senator from West Virginia. But I also think that if we are going to call it, if it is going to be a veto by the President, that the Constitution is clear on what a veto is—a two-thirds majority. So I would even have a constitutional problem with the majority override.

My second response is that it only took a majority of both Houses to put the measure into one of these bills, so it seems to me it would not be very difficult to get a majority of both Houses to override that veto.

Now, I understand the argument that if a bill were given, under this scenario, the light of day and it was improper, then a majority of both bodies would probably not support such a thing, if it were wasteful or irrelevant. But I am not so sure of that. I think that it would be much more appropriate for a two-thirds override.

When the distinguished Senator from West Virginia talks about a shift in power, which was what he spoke about initially, I know that the Senator from West Virginia knows, because he was one of the few who was around here when the President of the United States had basically impoundment authority, when the President of the United States basically could say, ''I don't care what the Congress of the United States appropriates. I'm not going to spend that money.''

That, as the Senator well knows, goes back to Thomas Jefferson, in 1801, who impounded $50,000 that was appropriated for gunboats.

So it is my view, as I have stated to the Senator from West Virginia many times in the past, that when that impoundment act power disappeared, there was that shift, a significant shift from the executive to the legislative branch and consequently, in my opinion—and I know it is not shared by the Senator from West Virginia—the revenues and expenditures began to grow apart in a rather dramatic fashion.

Mr. BYRD. When was this?

Mr. MCCAIN. In 1974.

Mr. BYRD. They actually started the big increase in 1981 after the election of Mr. Reagan. That is when the precipitous increases began.

Mr. MCCAIN. I do have a chart I think that shows a very steady increase. And I can bring it out. I think it is a valid chart.

Mr. BYRD. I have seen it. I think it is an excellent chart. I think he very adroitly and expertly——

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Describes it.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I just finally respond to the aspect as far as which House might have some advantage.

Again, I think there is some validity to that argument. I think our Founding Fathers said that all revenue bills would begin with the other body. And although we are obviously allowed to amend those bills, the primary responsibility was placed in the other body, as responsibility for approval of treaties, confirmation of nominees, et cetera, was different. So the responsibility in the view of our Founding Fathers did lie in the other body, in my view.

And also, if there are amendments that are passed on this side and attached to the bill, they are accepted in conference, I believe that that acceptance in conference puts the stamp of approval on both bodies.

Now, in reality would a vote in the other body be as fervent or as committed to an amendment that originated in this body? Perhaps not. But I would also suggest that it would be a quick way of retaliation if they started doing that in the other body. Even though it originated there, it would still have to come here, and there might be less enthusiasm for overriding the President's veto when those that originated in that body got over here. So it is my view that it would probably balance out in the long run.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. I am not so sure progress is always the end result when retaliation is taken by one body against another. That works both ways. And the first thing we know the other body retaliates.

With respect to the approach that is being utilized by Mr. DASCHLE and which was envisioned in S. 14, I believe it was, that did not contemplate a veto. That contemplated the rescissions of items by the President, and it was not a matter of overriding rescissions by two-thirds vote. It was a matter of rejecting the proposed rescissions by a majority vote.

On an override of the veto, I agree, that should be a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. One final point and then I am going to yield because Senator GLENN is waiting.

The other point I wish to make here is that under this proposal, under this substitute whereby each subsection, paragraph, item, allocation, suballocation, and all these things are enrolled separately, will it not be possible for the President to strike a section or a paragraph that imposes a condition on the expenditure of certain sums?

Suppose we appropriate certain amounts of money to the Department of Defense with a condition that it not send troops to Somalia, or that if troops are sent to Somalia the Senate and House decide that there should be a condition included that they be withdrawn no later than 60 days. Would it not be possible for the President simply to strike the condition and leave in the amounts, thereby deciding policy which would not have as its purpose the saving of moneys or the reduction of the deficit? Would we not be handing the President a policymaking tool which would be exceedingly difficult for us to correct if he chose to line item out that condition?

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to my colleague from West Virginia that that would not be possible. What the Senator is referring to is what we normally call fencing language, which is commonplace. The money would stay with the fencing language. He could not veto out the money and leave the language in, or vice versa. They would be attached to one another. And that will be clarified.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for his response. I feel I must disagree with him. I am sure the Congress could so provide the language that they would stay together, but Congress could also provide the language in such a way that would make it possible for the President to strike out the conditioning, the conditioning proviso, I believe. And that gives me cause for concern.

I have no desire to keep the floor any longer. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I thank the Senator who is the author of the amendment.

I thank all Senators and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 405 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To provide for the evaluation and sunset of tax expenditures)

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 405 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . EVALUATION AND SUNSET OF TAX EXPENDITURES

(a) LEGISLATION FOR SUNSETTING TAX EXPENDITURES.—The President shall submit legislation for the periodic review, reauthorization, and sunset of tax expenditures with his fiscal year 1997 budget.

(b) BUDGET CONTENTS AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(30) beginning with fiscal year 1999, a Federal Government performance plan for measuring the overall effectiveness of tax expenditures, including a schedule for periodically assessing the effects of specific tax expenditures in achieving performance goals.''.

(c) PILOT PROJECTS.—Section 1118(c) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking ''and'' after the semicolon in paragraph (2);

(2) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) adding after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) describe the framework to be utilized by the director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Joint Committee on Taxation, for undertaking periodic analyses of the effects of tax expenditures in achieving performance goals and the relationship between tax expenditures and spending programs; and''.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.—Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''TAX EXPENDITURES

''SEC. 409. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains a tax expenditure unless the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report provides that the tax expenditure will terminate not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of the tax expenditure.''.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I believe this amendment has been accepted, cleared on both sides. It has three major parts. It requires the President in next year's budget to submit legislation for an orderly sunset or reconsideration of existing tax expenditures; No. 2, it requires the administration to conduct performance reviews of tax expenditures just as they do now with regular discretionary spending; and three, it makes it out of order to consider a new tax expenditure if it does not consider a sunset or reconsideration, of course before that sunset time.

The amendment will increase scrutiny of tax expenditures and help make the line-item veto more effective.

I am happy that the Dole substitute to S. 4 provides the President with the authority to item veto some new tax breaks. There seems to be some disagreement about the scope of authority under the current language. I believe that it should be interpreted quite broadly.

However, regardless of how broadly you read the language, it still does not include the $453 billion in existing tax expenditures which still remain off limits. Now if you divide up the budget pie, tax expenditures are a huge slice.

Tax expenditures are growing at a rate six times faster than discretionary spending. And unlike discretionary spending, these tax expenditures generally do not receive regular scrutiny. Since the first corporate tax law of 1909, special provisions have been placed in the Code and generally forgotten. In fact, many would be surprised to learn that nearly half of the revenue losses from these expenditures stem from provisions placed in the Code before 1920.

I do not believe that all of these expenditures are unnecessary. In fact, I support many of them. But I believe that—after some of them have been in the Code for the better part of a century—it is time we set up a review process to determine whether budget savings and program improvements are achievable.

My amendment utilizes a concept that we have mandated for discretionary spending—performance review. It would require the President to determine just how well these programs are achieving their goals. Are we getting our money's worth? We have spent a lot of time talking about instituting cost-benefit analyses for Federal regulations. Would it not make sense to have a similar process for programs that cost $453 billion this year.

This was first suggested in Governmental Affairs Committee report language that accompanied the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. the distinguished chairman of the Governmental Affairs, the senior Senator from Delaware, was the father of that important law which for the first time established measurable objectives for agency programs. My amendment codifies report language of that bill to include expenditures.

While providing a better understanding of the effectiveness of current tax expenditures, it will also help the President to determine when it may be advisable to item veto new tax expenditures and even new spending. Under performance review, the President will be able to better identify where current tax expenditures overlap or duplicate newly proposed tax expenditures. And it will help him to identify whether new spending programs are unnecessary because existing tax expenditures are adequately achieving the same policy goals.

My amendment also requires the President to submit legislation to Congress which lays out an orderly schedule for the sunset and reauthorization of current tax expenditures. Just because something was placed in the code at the beginning of the century does not mean that it should be exempt from any congressional review. We might be surprised with what we find if we are forced to sit down and reauthorize many of these programs.

The President would not have to propose the sunset off all tax expenditures. There may be some that he will suggest remain permanent. But it will provide us with a roadmap for more comprehensive congressional review of tax expenditures. The tax expenditures that the Congress determines should come under a reauthorization process, will also be subject to the President's veto pen in the future.

In addition, under my amendment, it would be out of order to consider new tax expenditures that did not include a sunset date at least within 10 years. I don't think we should go through another century before the taxes we enact today are reviewed.

I think this merely sets forth a good Government approach on tax expenditures. It is high time we shed some light on this area of the budget. I understand that my amendment has been cleared by both the minority and majority leaders and I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this amendment.

Madam President, I think it has been accepted on the other side. I ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arizona, if he has any comments? I would be prepared to urge the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, we are prepared to accept the amendment on this side. I think it is a good amendment and one which I think will be very helpful.

Madam President, may I say for the information of all Senators, I have been asked by the majority leader to state there will be no further votes today. However, I hope Members who have amendments will remain this evening to offer them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for offering the amendment. The amendment provides for a process for periodically assessing the effects of tax loopholes and requires that all new loopholes have sunset provisions.

As I understand it, the language of his amendment has been negotiated, it has been agreed to on both sides. I urge its adoption at this time.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I urge the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 405) was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. EXON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the record show that the pending Abraham amendment was set aside in order to consider the Glenn amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Abraham amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 406 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To clarify the definition of items of appropriations)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 406 to amendment No. 347.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 5(4)(A), strike ''; and'' and add the following: ''but shall not include a provision which does not appropriate funds, direct the President to expend funds for any specific project, or create an express or implied obligation to expend funds and—

''(i) rescinds or cancels existing budget authority;

''(ii) only limits, conditions, or otherwise restricts the President's authority to spend otherwise appropriated funds; or

''(iii) conditions on an item of appropriation not involving a positive allocation of funds by explicitly prohibiting the use of any funds; and''.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, under the substitute before us, the line-item veto authority is not limited to appropriations. That may come as a surprise to many of us, but that is the way the substitute is now worded. The line-item authority in the substitute, which is effectively given to the President, is not limited to appropriations. That is because a line item in an appropriations bill would be separately enrolled and would be subject to a veto. That would include not only the appropriations themselves but also all limits on appropriations, conditions on appropriations, rescissions of appropriations. They would all be treated in the same way as appropriations themselves. The purpose of this bill is to try to reduce the add-ons of Congress that cannot in some minds be justified. The purpose of the bill is to reduce spending, not to increase spending. But if we treat limits on appropriations and rescissions of appropriations in the same way as we treat appropriations which are added by the Congress, we are effectively going to be increasing spending and not reducing spending.

The rescissions that the Congress adds and puts into an appropriations bill, the limitations on appropriations that we put in appropriations bills, the conditions that we place on appropriations are all going to be treated as separate items from the appropriations themselves. This process in the substitute is going to splinter the condition on an appropriation into a separate bill. It will not be in the same bill as the appropriations. So the President would be able to veto the limit on the appropriation and leave the appropriation itself thereby saving no money, indeed quite the opposite frequently, and giving himself more authority in the process.

If the President can veto the limitations and the conditions placed on appropriations without vetoing the appropriations itself, we have had the exact opposite effect, I believe, of what was intended by this bill, and we have ceded great power to the President, without any gain, in terms of cutting spending. He can veto a rescission that we add to a bill and spend the money. He can veto a limitation on spending that we put in the bill and spend all the money.

Why should we give this special veto authority to the President when the provisions of the bill that he would be vetoing cut spending instead of adding to spending?

Let me give some examples. Suppose we put in a provision, as we have, which states that none of the funds appropriated shall be spent to keep American troops in a particular country after a specified date? The President can veto that provision and then continue to spend the appropriated funds for the purpose that Congress voted to prohibit. Suppose we put a provision into a bill, as we have, which says none of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale of tobacco or tobacco products? The President could veto that restriction and limitation and spend the money as he pleases, for the prohibited purpose. We would not have saved any money, but the President would be given the power to spend money for a purpose that we explicitly prohibited—no savings to the Treasury and loss of congressional authority at the same time. Suppose we put a provision into a bill, as we have, stating that none of the funds appropriated shall be spent to provide an incentive for the purpose of inducing a company to relocate outside the United States? The President could veto the provision and continue to spend money on the program that Congress intended to prohibit.

Say we put a provision into a bill, as we have, which says that of the large appropriation, no more than *x*-million dollars can be spent on consultants? We put a lot of provisions in like that. The Senator from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, has been a leader to limit appropriated funds spent on consultants. The way the bill is currently written, without this amendment, the President could veto that limit on spending for consultants and then use the larger amount for any purpose he wanted, including all the money, if he wanted, for consultants. We will not have saved any money. We will have lost the power to restrict the spending of money, with no gain to the Treasury.

We have put restrictions on entertainment. We have put restrictions on travel, first-class travel. And if, again, those restrictions are put in separate bills, as they are under the current version of this substitute, and the President can veto those restrictions, the Treasury gains nothing, the taxpayers are out money that we did not want them to be out, for instance, for first-class travel, and we will have lost the power of the purse, for no gain to the Treasury.

As I said, Madam President, almost more remarkable than the power that would be yielded to the President under the version before us, without this amendment, is the fact that there would be no purpose served in terms of saving money. And in the many cases I have given, and in many other cases, as a matter of fact, we would be losing and spending money that otherwise would not be spent.

Last night on the floor, I gave a few examples from a real appropriations bill—State, Commerce, and Justice. I want to give one of those examples again to show how this would work since I did bring this up on the floor last night.

We had a provision in last year's appropriation bill for State, Commerce, Justice, that no more than $11 million would be spent on furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects. That is a limitation on spending. That says the President cannot spend more than that. That is part of a larger appropriations bill, a $2.3 billion appropriations bill. But it says that out of that $2.3 billion, the maximum that can be spent for that new furniture is $11 million. I had a chart up here on the floor last night. If the President could veto the ''not to exceed $11 million,'' which would be in a separate enrolled bill, he would have then vetoed the restriction on the spending, leaving himself the $2.3 billion appropriation of which he could spend all he wanted on furniture, without any limit. We would not have saved the money. It would have been spent on something we did not want it to be spent on. The Treasury does not gain a dime, but instead, something that we did not want because we did not think it was a high enough priority, would happen.

The Defense supplemental appropriations bill that we passed just last week contained 20 separate paragraphs of Defense rescissions and 18 paragraphs of rescissions of nondefense funds, for a total of roughly $3 billion in spending cuts. This was in an appropriations bill, but these are spending cuts, rescissions. For instance, the bill contained provisions that would cut spending for

FAA facilities by $35 million. It cut spending for highway projects by $140 million. But under the substitute before us, unless this amendment is adopted, each of these provisions would be enrolled as a separate bill and sent to the President for signature. Each could be vetoed by the President, and if he exercised that authority given to him by the substitute, the result would be more Government spending rather than less.

Madam President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk on behalf of myself, and Senators MURKOWSKI and EXON, addresses this issue the best that we can in this bill. In my opinion, it can be addressed far better in an expedited or enhanced rescission bill. But that is not the issue before us. The issue before us is this substitute which, in all likelihood, is going to pass. We should avoid having in this substitute language which I believe has the unintended consequence of eliminating all of the restrictions and the limits on spending, and the rescissions of spending that we put in appropriations bills.

So while I do not think that all of the problems I see in the substitute are cured, at least this would prevent the President from using this separate enrollment power to increase spending, or to avoid congressional restrictions and limitations on spending. And it is my hope that this amendment will be adopted because, again, I think it does address some of the unintended consequences of this substitute.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 407 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To exempt items of appropriation provided for the judicial branch from enrollment in separate bills for presentment to the President)

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 407 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after ''separately'' insert '', except for items of appropriation provided for the judicial branch, which shall be enrolled together in a single measure. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'items of appropriation provided for the judicial branch' means only those functions and expenditures that are currently included in the appropriations accounts of the judiciary, as those accounts are listed and described in the Department of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 104–317).

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, as I understand it, I now have that amendment pending, and it can be set-aside and we will vote on it tomorrow sometime?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 406 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to congratulate the Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, and the Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, on working out this, I think, very important agreement. It is well thought out. The amendment reaffirms that any and all provisos or fencing language, including all limitations on spending, such as caps, be tied to dollar amounts and not be enrolled freestanding.

The bill, as currently drafted, would not cause policy provisos to be separately enrolled. However, if the Congress were to place caps on spending within an allocation, such language might be separately enrolled. This amendment clarifies that it would not. It is a good amendment and we are prepared to accept it on this side.

I understand from my friend from Michigan that there may be concern by a Member or Members on his side of the aisle. So we will not seek its adoption until such time as it is either resolved or those who are in disagreement call for further debate and ensuing vote.

But again, I want to say to the Senator from Michigan—this is probably not the appropriate time—whenever there is an issue, the Senator from Michigan goes into it in depth. He understands the legislation. He find areas that need to be improved, and he is willing to reach accommodation with those who have similar but sometimes slightly differing views, as has just happened between Senator LEVIN and Senator MURKOWSKI.

That is one of the reasons why it is a pleasure to work with him in this body, as I have for many years on the Armed Services Committee and on the Governmental Affairs Committee.

I believe there may be additional amendments by the distinguished Democratic leader coming up, so I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, let me thank the Senator for his comments, which are very reciprocal on my part in terms of working with him over the years on the Armed Services Committee. We have had a very good relationship. I thank him for the support of the amendment.

There is, indeed, as I mentioned, perhaps a Member on this side who may oppose the amendment. We are not sure. We want to clarify that. It would be better, therefore, that any vote on this be delayed until we can ascertain whether there is objection on this side or not.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am pleased to join Senator LEVIN in offering this amendment that would clarify the extent and scope of the President's ability to veto items in appropriations bills. This amendments ensures that when Congress imposes a condition that prevents spending in a particular area, or imposes conditions on such spending, such a restriction will not be considered an item that can be separately vetoed.

All of us recognize that approval of the Dole substitute line-item veto amendment or any other line-item veto proposal including S. 4, represents an historic shift of authority from Congress to the President. We are providing the President with very broad authority to pick and choose which individual items in appropriations bills he deems an improper use of taxpayer funds. He will have the authority to veto those items of spending that he disapproves of.

The substitute also gives the President authority to item veto authority in spending authorization bills and in tax bills. However, the only tax items that the President can item veto are a narrow range of provisions that affect only a limited group of taxpayers. More importantly, the tax-item veto can only be used if the provision loses revenue. A tax increase that targets a narrow class of taxpayers cannot be item vetoed.

I believe the tax item veto represents an appropriate restrictions on the President's ability to item veto because it is restricted to measures that lose revenue. The reason that I support the whole concept of the item-veto is that Congress has demonstrated an inability to control spending both through the Tax Code and the appropriations process. Today we are more than $4.8 trillion in debt. Unless we take drastic action, our national debt will double in the next 10 years.

Part of the reason our debt is nearly $5 trillion is because appropriators in both the House and Senate have devised ingenious ways to bury wasteful pork barrel spending in legislation designed to maintain the operations of Government. Weeks and months after the President has signed an appropriations bill we learn that buried in the bill are tens of millions of dollars of wasteful spending programs. My colleague from Arizona has already identified many of these wasteful spending programs. And under the current Presidential veto power, the President must approve these wasteful programs if he is to keep the Government running.

So the predicate, Madam President, for the line-item veto is to give the President the authority to veto spending programs that waste the taxpayers' money.

However, just as the President only should be able to veto tax provisions

that lose revenue, I believe the President should not be permitted to item-veto congressional prohibitions on appropriations spending. As all Senators know, Congress routinely includes prohibitions on particular spending as a check on unrestricted and arbitrary spending by the President. Most often, such prohibitions represent a conscious policy choice by Congress explicitly restricting the President's discretion.

For example, last year's foreign operations appropriations bill contains more than a dozen such restrictions. These restrictions prevent the President from providing money to an international organization that supports programs for ''coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.'' Another provision prevents funds from being used for assistance to a country that is not in compliance with the U.N. Security Council sanctions against Iraq.

These are just two of hundreds of examples of the legitimate power of the Congress to prevent the President from spending money on programs and policies that the Congress disapproves of. These restrictions do not increase the deficit. They do not represent pork barrel politics. They are legitimate congressional checks on the President that are consistent with the intent of the Founding Fathers when they created our constitutional system of separated powers and checks and balances.

Madam President, our amendment is intended to make clear that when Congress imposes a condition that prevents spending in a particular area, or conditions spending, that restriction will not be considered an item that can be separately vetoed. It ensures that a condition restricting or prohibiting the use of funds must be enrolled with the item of appropriation to which the condition applies.

Madam President, this amendment preserves congressional power to restrict the President from acting contrary to the wishes of the majority of Congress on important policy issues. I believe it is fundamentally necessary that we retain this authority and I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan. This amendment only makes good sense.

It would keep rescissions and cancellations of spending from being transmitted to the Presidents as separate items. Thus it would make it more difficult for the President to veto items that help to reduce the deficit.

As well, the amendment would ensure that limitations on spending stay together with the spending provisions that they limit. To do otherwise would allow the kind of nonsensical divisions of items that the Senator from Michigan so eloquently described yesterday evening.

I support the amendment and urge my colleagues to join in voting for it when it does come to a vote.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah, I ask unanimous consent that he be added as an original cosponsor of the Abraham amendment.

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

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that the pending Levin amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Hatch amendment will be set aside.

Mr. McCAIN. The Levin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, both amendments will be set aside.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, the Hatch amendment, for purposes of complying with the unanimous-consent agreement, was presented and the debate and vote will be held on it probably tomorrow.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield, our friend from Alaska has additional materials which I would like to ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, if available, tonight. If not, we will make that same unanimous-consent request tomorrow.

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

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, if that is available tonight, it would be inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. McCAIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I wish to make some brief remarks with regard to support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, but at this time I yield the floor because I believe Senator BYRD would like to make some remarks not on the matter at hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. EXON.

SPRING RETURNS TO THE WEST VIRGINIA MOUNTAINS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, 2 days ago, the first day of spring officially came to Washington. Here in Washington, the change from one season to another is often dramatic. One morning, D.C. temperatures might be in the freezing range, while the following day might find young men and women out on the Mall playing volleyball in shorts and tee shirts. Here, tulips and magnolias burst forth from nowhere, and the cherry blossoms transform the city as if by overnight magic.

But a few miles west of us—among the peaks and plateaus of the high Appalachians in West Virginia, spring dawns like a beautiful young woman awakening from a long sleep.

If the geologists are correct, spring has awakened in the same fashion in West Virginia for millions of years.

High on Alpine West Virginia ridges—once, we are told, the equivalent in altitude of some caps among the Himalayas today—crystal ice and deep-packed snow begin their melt, the run-off seeking the sea first as droplets, then as rivulets, next as springs and brooks, then as creeks and streams, and finally as flooding branches that find their routes either into the widening Potomac on the eastern slopes of the Alleghenies and the western sides of the Blue Ridge, or into the mighty Ohio and Mississippi farther west—dependable flows of water of that helped to create the shores of Tidewater Virginia and Maryland's Eastern Shore through the millennia, on one hand, and that has built up the Mississippi Delta since before the bison crossed into North America, on the other hand.

But more subtle changes accompany spring's approach in West Virginia—changes too often observed only by the sparkling eyes of squirrels and of the first adventurous rabbits out of their winter burrows—changes such as tiny blossoms in greening meadows, minuscule leaves emerging on bare maple branches, cardinals, and robins announcing in concert the impending arrival of a new season, and graceful deer grazing on tender blades of new grass—and all proclaiming the marvels of the Creator's bounty and brilliance.

Oh, to be a child once again in West Virginia—a child who, on his or her way to school in the cool of the morning air, can perhaps feast his or her senses on the dawning spring as most adults can no longer—a child who catches the first perfume of cherry blossoms on young fruit trees or who pauses to listen to the symphony of the songbirds or who savors the gentle breezes on his or her cheek, where but days before the cruel winter wind bit and chapped.

And soon, Mr. President, the mountains and hills of West Virginia will again be enfolded in new foliage from base to summit, and the sunrises and sunsets will put even the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel to shame with their incandescent colors and shafts of spun gold streaking across the early morning and evening vault of the West Virginia firmament.

There we may see,

The marigold that goes to bed wi' the Sun,
And with him rises weeping . . . daffodils,
That come before the swallow dares, and take
The winds of March with beauty; violets dim,
But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
Or Cytherea's breath; pale primroses,
That die unmarried, ere they can behold
Bright Phoebus in his strength. . . .

Mr. President, I invite all of our colleagues to visit West Virginia at any time, but particularly during this special season of rebirth among the mountains, down the valleys, and across the

whole Appalachian Plateau. But if anybody accepts my invitation, I suggest that they visit West Virginia in a recapturement of their childhood—with the open eyes and trusting heart of a child, with the pure hearing of a child, and with the joy and wonder with which we were born—all of these things that permit children to listen, perceive, and relish the beauties and mysteries of life that the Creator shares every year with all of his offspring, but that, too often, as hardened and sometimes insensitive men and women, we lose the capacity to enjoy, much less to appreciate.

The year's at the spring
And day's at the morn;
Morning's at seven;
The hillside's dew-pearled;
The lark's on the wing;
The snail's on the thorn:
God's in his heaven—
All's right with the world.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, if the Senator would withhold, I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I have listened with care in the last few days to the debate on the so-called line-item veto. I have not heard all of it, but I have heard, I think, enough to understand the parameters we are talking about. And we are now debating the proposed substitute—the Separate Enrollment and Line-Item Veto Act of 1995.

The sponsors have claimed that this bill will provide the means to remove, among other things, a particular focus on what is known around the country as pork-barrel spending from appropriations bills. The language of the proposal, however, does not live up to the sponsors' claims.

I am going to raise several questions tonight that I hope can be clarified or answered. Although the sponsors have aimed at certain expenditures, as I see it, they have missed.

In fact, this proposal provides the President with significantly less authority to control pork-barrel spending than would have been provided under either the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal or the McCain enhanced rescission proposal.

Madam President, I see at least five serious problems with the proposed substitute. First, it contains loopholes so large that the proponents of pork will be able to insulate whole barrels of pork from a Presidential veto if they choose to do so. Second, the separate enrollment procedures would allow the President to veto funding limitations as well as funding amounts, which would inhibit the ability of Congress to address legitimate policy differences with the President.

Third, this proposal permits the President to increase, as well as decrease spending, by allowing him to sign into law those portions of an appropriation bill that increase spending, and to veto those portions of an appropriation bill that rescind or reduce spending.

So, in other words, if a President chose to, under this authority, he could take an appropriation bill that had been passed by the Congress and he could basically increase the amount in that appropriation bill by doing away or vetoing the rescissions in that bill that reduce funding.

So just the opposite of what the sponsors have intended could occur. This is just saying to the President, we think you are a whole lot better at this than we are, so we give you the authority. You make the decisions—increase or decrease. You do whatever you want. I do not think that is what is intended, but that is what the proposal does.

Fourth, the proposed substitute, if not undermined by the use of loopholes—and I do not assume that these loopholes would be used by people with good faith, but I think that we have to assume that at some point they will be—if not undermined by the loopholes, this substitute will lead to what Senator ROTH and the Republican members of the Governmental Affairs Committee describe as ''undesirable rigidity'' in the management of the executive branch and the legislative process.

Finally, the proposed substitute does nothing to enhance the ability of Congress to address the real problems here—that is, the legislative practices such as unauthorized appropriations, legislative earmarks, and adding items in conference even though they have not been approved by the House or the Senate.

Those are the abuses in the process. This proposal does nothing to get at those abuses. Those are the problems, but the target here has been missed.

Madam President, to place my concerns in context, I would like to briefly summarize the current appropriations process. There are two types of documents that are produced by Congress in the appropriation process, and I really do not believe a whole lot of our Members understand this.

The first document is an appropriation bill which is passed by both Houses of Congress. It is signed into law by the President. Last year's defense appropriation bill, for example, was 61 pages long. The bill is legally binding upon the executive branch.

The second type of document is the reports issued by the appropriation committees and the House-Senate conferees. The three reports issued in connection with last year's defense bill are 853 pages, covering over 2,300 different line items.

The policy directions in these reports is not binding on the executive branch. There is no requirement in law or Senate rule that an appropriation bill or report contain any specific level of detail. Most appropriation bills, particularly in the defense arena, set forth large lump-sum amounts that are not tied to specific programs, projects, or activities.

Looking at an example from last year's Department of Defense Appropriation Act, the Act provides a specific sum for Army aircraft procurement, $1,063,164,000. The text of the act does not require the Army to spend that money on any particular type of aircraft.

The detail is set forth in the committee and conference reports which specify the amounts for production or modification of a dozen different types of aircraft. Those report items are not legally binding on the Department of Defense. The Department, as a matter of law, can spend that $1 billion on any type of army aircraft selected by the Army or the Department of Defense, regardless of the types that are specified in the Appropriations Committee reports.

Any restrictions, earmarks, or other special conditions that are in the committee report are not binding on the Department of Defense. As a matter of comity and custom, the Department of Defense generally, but not always, follows the guidance in the committee reports, but it is not required to do so.

The Department of Defense routinely reprograms funds between various lines in the Appropriations Committee reports without any congressional involvement. Above certain thresholds, however, for example, operation and maintenance reprogrammings that exceed $20 million, there is a custom of obtaining prior approval for reprogrammings from the congressional defense committees.

That is, when they shift funds from one account to the other. In the Department of Defense this happens hundreds of times in a year because there are certain programs that get behind schedule—they cannot be completed on time. Therefore, the money is not needed as originally anticipated. The money is needed somewhere else. They shift back and forth, back and forth. Over certain thresholds, they have to come back here for informal approval.

There is nothing binding about reprogramming. They do not even have to come to us for reprogramming approval as a matter of law. That also is a matter of comity. Moreover, if Congress were to insist on such prior committee approvals, it would likely constitute an unconstitutional legislative veto.

In summary, Madam President, there is no requirement for an appropriation bill or report to contain any specific level of detail. And the material in the committee and conference reports is not legally binding on the executive branch. Much—not all—but much of the pork, perhaps most, but at least much of the pork identified in the news media that we dwell on in here and that disturbs all members—and I know the Senator from Arizona has been particularly vigilant in that respect and I

think over the years I have, also—that pork, much of it, is not binding on the President but is spent as a matter of comity between the two branches.

I am often amused when Presidents are talking about how their hands are bound and they can not do certain things because of Congress, and a whole lot of things they complain about are not binding on the Presidents of the United States.

As a matter of comity, if they disregarded the reports year in and year out, they would be jeopardizing some of their own programs, but in my opinion we have had several Presidents who have basically talked about the line-item veto because they wanted to give the appearance that they had to accept things beyond their control, when they knew they had control, if they wanted to do something about it. Most of them do not want to do anything about it because they want their own pet projects. And it ends up being spent as a matter of comity between the two branches of Government.

I know that is not going to change people's minds here, but that is the way the system works. We need to understand that we are trying to correct something and we are shooting at a target that is not really a target.

In summary, Madam President, there is no requirement for an appropriation bill or report to contain any specific level of detail, and the material in committee and conference reports is not legally binding on the executive branch. Much of the pork identified in the media is not binding on the President but is spent as a matter of comity between the two branches.

Now, committee reports that explain legislative provisions are legislative history, and they do have an effect. But what we are talking about now is committee reports that talk about expenditures and how that money would be spent, and that is not binding.

Madam President, with that background, I would like to turn to the loopholes in the proposed substitute. The supporters of the proposed substitute assert that it will require pork-barrel projects to be set forth in the text of appropriation bills and enrolled as separate enactments. There is no such requirement in the proposed substitute. As drafted, the substitute merely provides that—I am quoting directly from it—''The committee on Appropriations of either the House or the Senate shall not report an appropriation measure that fails to contain such level of detail on the allocation of an item of appropriation proposed by that House as is set forth in the committee report accompanying such bill.''

The first defect is there is no requirement in current law, Senate rules, or the proposed substitute that the Appropriations Committee provide any specific level of detail in the committee report. The committee report does not have to have any specific level of detail in it. So the very heart of this proposal ties it to details in the committee report, but the detail does not have to be in there. If we enact the proposed substitute, the Appropriations Committee, if they choose to, can easily avoid a line-item veto by providing lump sum appropriations and then setting forth the detail in separate documents other than the committee report. These documents could include a floor statement by the managers of the bill, an agreed joint statement of the managers of the conference which is placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in lieu of or in addition to the formal conference report, or a simple letter from the leadership of the committee to the head of an agency.

And I assume and I believe, based on previous practice and observations, that within a year or two that will begin to happen.

In other words, there is no requirement that the committee report or a conference report contain a specific level of detail. No line-item detail is required, and there is no requirement that there be anything for the President to veto beyond a lump sum appropriation.

(Mr. GRAMS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. NUNN. Using the example I discussed earlier, the appropriation bill could simply provide $1 billion for army aircraft procurement. It could set forth minimal descriptive material in the committee report and then provide all the details, including a pork-barrel earmark, in a floor statement or a letter to the Department of Defense.

Alternatively, the committee could include all noncontroversial materials in the committee report and then address a pork-barrel earmark in a floor statement or letter to the DOD. In either case, Mr. President, the President of the United States under the proposed substitute would have nothing to veto except the big lump sum procurement. That is all he would have to veto. He would not have the detail in there.

The substitute appears to be based on the mistaken premise that the only way Congress can earmark a pork-barrel project is through bill or report language. Mr. President, that is naive and ignores both legislative history and precedent. Unlike report language that interprets a legislative provision, a line item in a committee report which sets forth a committee's policy direction on expenditures has no legal standing. It has no more legal effect than a speech in the Chamber, a letter from a committee, or a phone call from a committee chairman. Therefore, those who want to earmark or add pork do not need report language. They can use any other form of communication to the executive branch.

The likely effect of the substitute will be to drive the pork into underground shelters where it will be hidden from scrutiny. If the substitute is enacted, the really egregious earmarks no longer will be set forth in committee reports. The earmarks will be described in floor statements, letters from committees, or even phone calls from committee chairmen to the heads of agencies. The proposed substitute will not eliminate pork. It will drive it underground.

A related loophole is the failure of the substitute to cover floor amendments. It is not unusual for an amendment to be offered in this Chamber to increase a lump sum appropriation by a specified amount without stating the purpose in legislative language. The purpose is often set forth in the statement of a sponsor.

Under the proposed substitute, an amendment that increased a lump sum appropriation would not be enrolled as a separate bill even if the sponsor stated that the purpose of the increase was to earmark funds for a pork-barrel project. Once the amendment is adopted by the Senate, there is no requirement that the purpose of the amendment be discussed even in the conference report.

Mr. President, let us look at how a pork-barrel earmark would fare under the proposed substitute as compared to how it would fare under the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission bill or under the original McCain bill.

Under the proposed substitute, if the earmark is set forth in a floor statement or committee letter, there is no requirement that the item be set forth separately in the bill or separately enrolled. Unless the item is set forth in the bill, the President could not veto it.

Under the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal or under the McCain original proposal, however, the President would not be limited to items expressly set forth in the bill. The President could propose rescission of a specified amount of money for a specified purpose. The President would be guaranteed a vote in the House and the Senate in a specified period of time. That would not only serve as improvement in the current law in the case of the Domenici-Exon proposal, but it would also be a great improvement over the proposed substitute, which has enormous loopholes.

Ironically, the proposed substitute would enable the President to veto items that reflect legitimate policy differences between the President and the Congress. When we have major disagreements on matters of policy, we must express our requirements in legislation in order to ensure that the President carries out the will of Congress.

Let us take, for example, an item that both of my colleagues in the Chamber, the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Arizona, are very familiar with, the V–22 aircraft. The 3sprey, or the V–22 aircraft, has been a controversial item for several years. The V–22 has had strong bipartisan support in the Congress, yet the Bush administration wanted to cancel it. Congress insisted on authorizing and appropriating funds for the V–22 because we believed the funds were genuinely

necessary for a strong national defense. We had to include specific legislative provisions to ensure that the program was not canceled.

Under the proposed substitute, however, the President could have vetoed the V–22. He could have vetoed the strategic sealift program that Congress initiated. He could have vetoed congressional increases for weapons systems that had not been in the President's budget but which made a crucial difference in Operation Desert Storm, such as Stealth fighters and the Patriot missile. He could have vetoed the $1 billion LHD–6 ship that was added by the Congress even though it was not in the President's budget. Many of our colleagues want to increase and restructure our missile defense program. That is another item ripe for a Presidential veto under the proposed substitute.

The separate enrollment proposal allows the President to veto any paragraph of the appropriation bill. The proposal is not limited to provisions containing pork-barrel earmarks. In fact, it is not limited to funding items. The proposal applies to any numbered section or any unnumbered paragraph.

That means the President can veto funding limitations as well as funding amounts. In doing so, he could approve the appropriation bill but he could veto conditions under which the appropriation was provided.

The President, for example, could veto a provision such as section 8135 of last year's appropriation bill. And I believe Senator LEVIN has been talking about that, the Senator from Michigan. That provision stated, ''None of the funds appropriated by this act may be used for the continuous presence in Somalia of United States personnel, except for the protection of United States personnel after September 30, 1994.''

That provision was strongly supported by many of those who now back separate enrollment. The President did not want the provision. I am sure he would have loved to have had the ability to veto that provision without affecting the underlying DOD appropriations.

Have any of the supporters of the proposed substitute, especially those who opposed the operations in Somalia or Haiti, considered the war powers implications of the drastic new restrictions on the congressional power of the purse?

The power of the purse is the only thing we have to deal with. The War Powers Act does not work. Everybody over here knows it. The power of the purse is the only way that Congress has to enforce restrictions on foreign troop deployments. That power under this bill as now drafted in my opinion will be largely gone.

Another part of the DOD appropriation bill, section 8008, last year provided:

> Funds appropriated by this act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Those special access programs, as other programs, are very highly classified programs that I will not discuss here on the floor. But I have no doubt the President, any President, would welcome the ability to veto that provision. This was a limitation on Presidential expenditures, saying you cannot spend this money except under certain limited conditions. The President could keep the money, veto the conditions, and off we go—more expenditure, not less, as people want when they say they want a line-item veto.

Under the substitute there is just as much chance, over a period of years, that the President, any President, would veto a restraint on spending as well as an increase in spending. This is not what the public has in mind when they say they support a line-item veto.

In my opinion, there is just as much chance this provision, this bill, will cause an increase in spending as there is a decrease. That does not even take into account the ability of the President under this new power to basically take certain provisions in a Senator's State and say, ''You have these five provisions and if you do not vote with me on, for instance, health care, my proposal on health care, I am going to make sure these proposals do not go into law unless you can produce two-thirds of the vote in both bodies to do so.''

It is a huge power shift to the President. But I am not even dwelling on that in this speech today. It is a huge power shift to the President. And any President that has a pet project—health care, or whatever they want to get through—will have a very greatly enhanced ability to do that. Not by saving the public money, which is what they want, but by threatening to veto those provisions in exchange for Senators and Members of the House basically voting to increase spending on one of the President's proposals. It could be billions of dollars.

In my opinion what we are setting up here, the way we are heading—we are setting up provisions which give the President of the United States a chance to threaten millions of dollars in exchange for getting votes for billions of dollars. That is not what the public intends. That is exactly where this proposal is headed.

Mr. President, to take another example, the President could veto the so-called Hyde amendment restricting the use of Federal funds for abortion that has been included in the Labor-HHS appropriation bills over the years because it would be enrolled as a separate bill under the proposed substitute.

The Hyde amendment was included as section 509 of the fiscal year 1995 Labor-HHS appropriations bill, and reads as follows:

> Section 509. None of the funds appropriated under this act shall be expended for any abortion except when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this act that such procedure is necessary to save the life of the mother or that the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

I wonder if the people who are so enthused about this amendment, and this proposal, have really thought through what they are doing.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator will yield, I will be happy to answer that question.

Mr. NUNN. I will go ahead and yield, yes, sir.

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes, we are. Fortunately, a substantial part of the Senator's argument against this legislation has been taken care of by the Levin-Murkowski-Exon amendment. I will be glad to quote it to him. It adds:

> * * * but shall not include a provision which does not appropriate funds, direct the President to expend funds for any specific project, or create an express or implied obligation to expend funds and
>
> (i) rescinds or cancels existing budget authority;
>
> (ii) only limits, conditions, or otherwise restricts the President's authority to spend otherwise appropriated funds; or
>
> (iii) conditions on an item of appropriation not involving a positive allocation of funds by explicitly prohibiting the use of any funds.

Basically what that does, I would say to the Senator from Georgia, it prohibits most of the scenarios that the Senator from Georgia just described about being able to separate language from funds, funds from language, and being able to so-called fence other areas.

I would like to let the Senator from Georgia finish, but I did want to point out this amendment, which I believe is going to be accepted, does address some of the major concerns the Senator raised.

Mr. NUNN. I thank my friend from Arizona. It is my understanding that has not yet been adopted. Has that been adopted?

Mr. MCCAIN. It is my understanding it has not been adopted. As well, I have no doubt it will be.

Mr. NUNN. I am speaking of the proposal we now have before us. I thank my friend. I am glad the authors are considering that, because I can assure you, if we debate this bill another 2 or 3 days, another 3 or 4 days, there are going to be a lot of other things that people are going to point out because this has not been thought through.

I believe the original proposals, the rescission proposals, have been thought through by the authors. I did not agree with the McCain proposal because of the two-thirds vote, but I think it had been thought through, the rescission part. This proposal has not been thought through. You are going to find one problem after another with this.

For it to come on the floor of the Senate of the United States with a cloture motion at the same time, bypassing committees, bypassing the rescission proposals that had come out of the

Governmental Affairs Committee and Budget Committee, and come up as a compromise with the threat of a cloture motion—this proposal has not been thought through. It is riddled with loopholes.

I am glad that particular amendment is being strongly considered, but it has not been adopted and of course I have no way of knowing what is going to be adopted so my remarks have to be addressed to the bill, the underlying bill as it now stands. But I thank my friend from Arizona. I hope there will be that clarification as well as others that take place.

The rescission proposals would not have that problem. The President would send up rescissions on money items. He would not be sending up language revisions. Those are totally different animals than what we have here on the floor. This hybrid that has been put together as a compromise has injected whole new areas that were not contemplated in the rescission bill and present totally different problems. For us to pass this bill in a week or 4 or 5 days to me is very bad legislative procedure and will come back to haunt us if we continue to legislate this way on these things that are this important. It is obvious this matter has not been thought through.

In short, Mr. President, the proposed substitute is likely to give us the worst of both worlds. It does not subject to veto the earmarks that are buried in floor statements, committee letters, and phone calls to Cabinet Members. Those could be addressed in rescission bills. They will not be able to be addressed in this bill.

It does subject to veto legitimate policy disagreements between Congress and the executive branch that have to be addressed in statute. I hope my friend from Arizona is correct on that, that policy disagreements are going to be addressed in an amendment. I have not had a chance to study the amendment and I do want to study that.

I believe the impact of the substitute proposal will be almost the opposite of what the Members of Congress and the American public had in mind when they said—and say in polls and in their letters and phone calls—they want a line-item veto.

Mr. President, I think it is also important to note, as I mentioned earlier in my summary remarks, that the substitute we have before us and that we may vote on even as early as tomorrow night, permits the President to increase Federal spending. The proposed substitute has been justified as a means to decrease Federal spending. This claim overlooks the fact that the substitute as drafted also permits the President to increase Federal spending.

As Members will recall, we acted last week on a defense supplemental bill to address urgent readiness problems.

That bill not only contained increases in spending for readiness, it also contained rescissions—decreases in spending—to minimize the impact on the deficit. A number of those offsets, were strongly opposed by the President, such as the reductions in environmental spending and reductions in the Technology Reinvestment Program.

Under the proposed substitute, each paragraph in the supplemental would be enrolled as a separate bill, including the rescissions. As a result, the President would be free to sign into law all the increases in spending and to veto any or all of the rescissions. In other words, the President could increase the deficit by hundreds of millions or billions of dollars without congressional approval. Only a two-thirds vote of both Houses could override these actions. Is it any wonder that any President would desire to have this power?

Obviously, any President would want these powers because he can take a rescission and an appropriations bill that decreases an expenditure, veto the rescission, and keep the appropriations. What are we doing here? Do we really know what we are doing in this proposal?

In that regard, the proposed substitute is clearly inferior to the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal. Under an expedited rescission, the President could only propose decreases in spending.

I must say I believe that is also the way the amendment of the Senator from Arizona would have worked.

The President could not obtain any increases under the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission procedure. Why do those who support reductions in Federal spending want to give the President the authority, under the proposed substitute, to increase Federal spending instead of restricting his power to reductions in spending? I can only conclude that this proposal has not been carefully thought through.

The proposed substitute if implemented in good faith, if none of these loopholes is taken advantage of by this Congress or a future Congress, will, in my opinion, result in rigidity, inflexibility, and in some cases chaos in the management of the Government's fiscal affairs in the executive branch.

Mr. President, the problem with the proposed substitute is that if it is administered in good faith with line-item appropriations, and if no loopholes are used by the Appropriations Committees—and I have already described the gigantic loopholes that could be used—I believe it will cause chaos in the management of Government's fiscal affairs.

The most telling critique of the proposed substitute comes from the Republican majority on the Governmental Affairs Committee.

This was the report that came out with the rescission bill that had been brought out of the Governmental Affairs Committee just about 10 days ago.

In explaining why it was better to have lump sum appropriations rather than line-item appropriations. Senator ROTH and the Republican majority on the Governmental Affairs Committee made the following observations in their report on S. 4, which was the original proposal before this substitute came in.

Quoting from that majority report in the Governmental Affairs Committee:

> Congress and the executive agencies are in broad agreement that lump-sum financing is an effective way to manage the Federal Government. Because of lump sum appropriations, federal agencies are able to shift funds within large appropriations accounts and therefore adjust to changing conditions during the course of a fiscal year. By making these shifts inside the account, the overall dollar figure for the activity is not violated and therefore there is no need to seek remedial legislation from Congress. Fund shifting takes place under established reprogramming procedures, with agencies notifying designated committees of the shifts and in some cases seeking the advance approval of those committees. * * *
>
> This flexibility is important for the agency and for Congress in its oversight capacity.
>
> It is possible, although not desirable, to apply the state budgeting system to the Federal Government and give Presidents the kind of line-item veto available to governors. To maximize item-veto authority for the President, the details in conference reports, agency justification materials, and other nonstatutory sources could be transferred to appropriations bills * * * .

At this point I am not quoting. This majority report is describing the problem exactly with the substitute we have before us. Back to the quote:

> * * * However, placing items in appropriations bills would produce an undesirable rigidity to agency operations and legislative procedures. If Congress placed items in appropriations bills, agencies would have to implement the bill precisely as defined in the individual items. In cases where the specific amounts detailed in the appropriations statutes proved to be insufficient as the fiscal year progressed, agencies could not spend above the specified level. Doing so would violate the law. Agencies and departments would have to come to Congress and request supplemental funds for some items and rescissions for others, or request a transfer of funds between accounts. Neither Congress nor the agencies want this inflexibility and added workload for the regular legislative process.

If we want further argument against this substitute, let us turn to what the Republican majority on the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight said in making similar observations in their report on the line-item veto legislation that they passed, which I must say is totally different from the substitute we have before us now.

Quoting from the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, Republican majority:

> We do not itemize appropriation bills and see no reason to do so. . . . The details do not appear in the law. . . . We could take the details from nonstatutory sources and place them in appropriations bills, but that would add an undesirable rigidity to agency operations. Executive officials would have to implement highly detailed bills no matter the magnitude of change that occurs over the course of [a] fiscal year. Their only opportunity for relief would be to come to Congress and request legislation to increase

funds for some items and eliminate them for others. Agencies would be forced to seek large numbers of statutory amendments to the original appropriations bill. No one in either branch wants that.

Item-veto authority, as practiced at the state level, would require the Federal Government to itemize appropriations bills. Such a step would disrupt and undermine effective agency management.

What we have, Mr. President, is both the Republican majority on the Senate side in Governmental Affairs, and the Republican majority on the House side in Governmental Affairs, have written reports in connection with line-item veto that directly critiques and criticizes and describes as rigid and unworkable, in my words, the proposal that we are now about to vote on and will probably pass. It is an amazing legislative performance.

I have never seen anything quite like it to have a committee report by the majority come out and basically to decry and criticize a later proposal that is on the floor as a substitute for the ones brought out of committee.

Let me illustrate the problems described by the Republican majority on the Governmental Affairs Committee. Assuming the Appropriations Committee set forth all the line items for defense in the defense appropriations bill, this would mean that a single defense appropriations bill, as we now know it, would be enrolled as over 2,300 separate public laws. Reprogrammings between these public laws would no longer be possible. Reprogramming could not take place because each item would be in a separate law. As a result, fiscal managers would no longer be able to move funds from a program that is in trouble to a program that is ahead of schedule. Overseas pay and benefits shortfalls caused by devaluation of the dollar could not be addressed through reprogramming in the defense arena.

To the extent that Congress requires an agency to eat a pay raise—or absorb the cost by shifting funds from other programs—the agency would be unable to provide for the pay increase through reprogrammings.

Increases in operational tempo in time of international tension could not be funded through a reprogramming from lower priority programs.

Readiness shortfalls would go unaddressed because money could not be moved from lower priority O&M accounts into training activities.

We know how long it takes us to get through a supplemental appropriations bill. We are going to have to have supplemental after supplemental after supplemental based on this legislation, if we pass it. There is going to be no end to the number of supplementals that we are going to have just in the Department of Defense alone.

The legislative activity load is going to just go up astronomically if we pass this legislation.

If military personnel accounts experienced temporary shortages—as they did last year in the Air Force Reserve just before Christmas—funds could not be reprogrammed to meet payrolls.

In other words, Mr. President, the executive branch would be faced with fiscal gridlock. Like Gulliver, they would be bound by Lilliputians in the form of thousands of minute appropriation bills.

Our fiscal managers would be unable to make reasonable adjustments during the course of a year to spend the money wisely, and would be forced to delay actions needed to obtain savings or meet other critical military needs. Moreover, because they could not move the money between line items, there would be a great incentive to spend all of the funds appropriated to a particular line, even if the money could be used more wisely in another program—just exactly the opposite of the incentives we want to give the managers in DOD, or any other department. They would know that they could not move it because they could not reprogram. They would know if they come to the Congress, they might have to wait sometimes months, maybe even before the fiscal year is over, to be able to come up here and get another law passed so they could spend the money in some other category. Are they going to be great managers and turn it back in? We all know what happens when people have money to spend in agencies. It is a problem every government faces. They spend it or lose it. Usually, unfortunately, they spend it. That is what is going to happen here, multiplied by thousands of line items.

In other words, Mr. President, a proposal that started out to try to save the taxpayers money, to try to delete waste, fraud, abuse, and pork out of all sorts of legislation—a worthy objective and I think one that could be achieved with something like the Domenici-Exon proposal—is now in the form of a substitute that we are about to vote on. That is a formula for delay, inefficiency, and waste. That is how this process has evolved—an amazing process.

Mr. President, the final comment on this proposal that I will make is that the substitute we will probably vote on tomorrow does not address the main problems criticized by its supporters. I must say, these are legitimate criticisms of our current process. I am not a defender of the current process. I think for us to have rescissions come from the President and, by doing nothing over here, allow those rescissions to have no meaning at all, is unacceptable. We must change that. But the way to change it is not this proposed substitute. It is to require us to put the spotlight on and to vote again, as is provided in the Domenici-Exon proposal. That should be what we are really voting on here.

I hope we are going to have a chance to vote on that. I hope some people will change their minds, because we still have a chance to pull this ox out of the ditch. Anybody who does not believe these are real problems has not studied this very seriously, in my view. The substitute does not address a lot of the problems that really need addressing in the Congress.

Proponents of the substitute really hope the President will use it to correct the problems in the legislative process. I do not mind the President correcting problems in the legislative process under the right kind of proposal. Why do we not try to correct our own problems? Why turn it all over to the President and say, Mr. President, we have all these problems and we do not handle this right, we are pretty sloppy, we have a lot of pork in legislation, and we have unauthorized appropriations and earmarks, we cannot solve it. We will send it down for you to solve it. As a consequence, we will shift a lot of power from one branch to the other. I suggest we ought to address the problems ourselves.

Unauthorized appropriations, for instance, are a significant problem. Why do we not establish an effective point of order against unauthorized appropriations? I know the Senator from Arizona would agree with that. Earmarks that avoid the competitive process are wrong. Why do we not establish an effective point of order against earmarks that avoid merit-based selection procedures?

Adding a project in conference that was not included in either bill, House or Senate, is another significant problem. I think it is a terrible practice. Why do we not establish an effective point of order against projects added in conference that were not in either bill?

Conference reports that are not available for review prior to debate are a further problem. This particularly happens at the end of the session on appropriations bills. Why do we not require conference reports to be available 2 or 3 days before debate? The proposed substitute addresses none of these problems. On the contrary, the substitute presumes that Congress will continue to employ procedures that fail to constrain unnecessary spending.

Mr. President, we are putting the cart before the horse. Before we ask the President to exercise our own responsibilities, we need to make every reasonable effort to clean up our own act. This is not just a matter of congressional prerogative. If we fail to restrain ourselves, we can hardly expect the President to do it for us. And if we give him these tools, we are going to be surprised over the years—I am not talking about President Clinton, and I am not talking about any specific President, but there is going to be a tremendous disillusionment with the American public, because they are going to find over the years that we are going to convert pork that costs millions of dollars into strong-arm tactics by some President down the line that is going to cost the country billions of dollars—threatening to take out millions in order to get people to vote for billions. Believe me, it is going to happen.

It would be the height of cynicism for Congress to continue to earmark funds for pork barrel projects and then blame the President if he does not veto the very projects we approve.

Mr. President, I know that many who support the proposed substitute do so out of strong conviction that something must be done to control Federal spending, and I agree. I agree with that point. But in our zeal to control spending, we must not lose sight of our duty to exercise our constitutional legislative responsibilities with care. The history of this legislation is not particularly edifying. The committees of jurisdiction, the Budget Committee and Governmental Affairs Committee, have marked up bills based on the use of a rescission process, not a separate enrollment process. I will repeat that. These bills brought out of committee, at least with committee deliberation, are totally different from what we have before us now that is a substitute.

Mr. President, the proposed substitute may be written on tablets of stone in terms of the way the votes are around here, but that does not make it good legislation. As I have pointed out, it has enormous loopholes that will permit continued pork barrel earmarks—the very earmarks that we could capture if we use the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal. The proposed substitute gives the President the authority to increase spending by vetoing rescissions, a power that he would not have under the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal, or under the McCain proposal. Again, I do not favor the McCain proposal because of the enormous shift of power to the President. But it would certainly not have the defects we have out here today. This substitute creates the potential for chaos in Federal fiscal management, a problem that would not arise under the Domenici-Exon expedited rescission proposal. It does nothing to address the legislative problems that encourage earmarks such as unauthorized appropriations, additions in conference reports, and conference reports that are not available in advance of debate for examination.

Mr. President, there are numerous other problems with the proposed substitute which have been pointed out by others. My friend from West Virginia pointed out numerous problems. These include the constitutionally questionable practice of delegating legislative power to the enrolling clerk and the enormous burden placed on the President of having to sign nearly 10,000 separate appropriations acts. I visualize in the future where we will have candidates seeing who can sign the most pieces of paper the fastest, because that is going to require an enormous amount of Presidential time. We are going to have thousands and thousands of signing ceremonies, I suppose, and a lot of pens. It is going to be good for the fountain pen industry but not for Government.

Presidential time management is a serious problem. I would rather have a President working on correcting abuses in Government rather than signing 10,000 or 12,000 bills a year. Mr. President, we have a choice in this debate. We can give the President and the Congress the tools needed to effectively address wasteful spending, or we can vote for a bill that is an invitation for Congress to exploit loopholes as well—if that does not happen—as an invitation to fiscal gridlock in the executive branch. We should reject the proposed substitute and work in a bipartisan fashion, which is entirely possible here in this bill. I think both the majority of the House, the majority of the Senate, Republicans as well as Democrats, really want an effective tool here. But, Mr. President, this is not it.

This substitute should be rejected, and we should work together on an effective rescission bill that gives the President the authority to address wasteful appropriations and unnecessary tax expenditures but does not cause the kind of mess that is going to be caused by this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I was intrigued and somewhat amused by the thoughtful remarks of the Senator from Georgia. I was amused by his prospect that if the pork barrel spending or egregious appropriations were somehow brought to the attention of the Members of this body, we would rise up in righteous indignation and vote those down.

Well, apparently the Senator from Georgia has not been around when I have come to this floor time after time after time after time with amendments to do away with pork that was put in in conference reports, with earmarks, with the most outrageous and egregious abuses of the system and been voted down time after time after time.

And I will tell the Senator from Georgia why. Because there is an iron rice bowl around here that if you take care of your pet project, I will take care of mine, and we will all vote down any attempt to do away with these because then that might start this whole system to unravel.

I can show the Senator from Georgia a record of vote after vote where I have come down here and clearly identified, including highway demonstration projects to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, including earmarks for universities. I will provide him with the record of outrageous appropriations that have taken place, many of them stuffed in in conference, stuffed in in conference, which neither body sought, and I sought a majority vote to overturn them and could not do it, time after time after time.

So if the Senator from Georgia thinks that a simple majority vote will be sufficient around here the way business is done, then he has not had the same experience that I have.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to yield on that.

Mr. NUNN. I do not remember using the word the Senator attributed to me, because I do not think it would be easy. But I think it will be a lot easier if the Senate sent up a rescission bill. And I think if we stuck to either the Domenici-Exon bill or the McCain bill on rescissions, that is the way to go about it.

I do not question what the Senator is trying to do. I agree. I do not question the problem you have identified. I agree.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I might reclaim the floor, the fact is, then, that the Senator cannot support a simple majority vote to override because that has been tried. I tried it specifically. I tried it specifically on numerous occasions and it has failed. And I can provide the Senator from Georgia with ample evidence of that—hundreds of millions of dollars in highway demonstration projects which have no relation whatsoever to the needs of the States, but are put in. And I showed in the debates the direct relation between those highway demonstration projects and people who happen to be on the relevant committee. We attempted to overturn those. We failed time after time after time.

So then I do not understand what would lead the Senator from Georgia to the conclusion that if they came over here vetoed by the President a simple majority override would do the job. It would not. It would not.

So even if the Senator from Georgia thinks that it would, I have evidence by standing on this floor hour after hour, day after day, week after week trying to do away with these egregious pork barrel projects and failing to do so, just as we would fail to do it if it was not brought up by me but it would be sent over by the President of the United States.

So I soundly reject the thesis on the part of the Senator from Georgia that a simple majority vote would somehow put a brake to the egregious practices which the American people, at least on November 8, said they were sick and tired of—sick and tired of.

As far as comparing letters and phone calls to the Pentagon from committee chairmen, I do not see how any legislation prevents that. I do not see how you stop that. I do not do it. I do not believe in it. I do not think it is appropriate to do so. And I am sorry to hear from the Senator from Georgia that it is such a common practice.

But the fact is that the real crux of this issue, as I have said many times on this floor, is whether it is going to take a real veto, a real veto which is a two-thirds vote, as opposed to a majority vote. All the rest I felt was very negotiable. But I have had the experience, I have the experience and I will provide for the RECORD the actual number of times I came down here and sought to draw an amendment to kill particular projects that were put in in

the conference report which had no relation whatsoever to national security needs and lost those votes.

I would also like to remind the Senator from Georgia that the Congressional Research Service identified for me—the Congressional Research Service—$62 billion in 5 years that was put in in defense appropriations bills which had nothing to do with defense; not any relation whatsoever.

Now, I understand, as chairman or a senior member of the committee, that you have a lot of latitude and a lot of power. And I know what reprogramming is about, too. It is a phone call to a chairman or a ranking member, or both, sometimes just to one person, and millions of dollars are reprogrammed.

I do not believe in that, either, I will tell the Senator from Georgia. I do not believe that is appropriate. And if we are going to do away with that, then hooray, I am all for it, because too much of that goes on. If we put some rigidity in how many of our departments of Government spend their money, then I am very happy about that.

As far as us now encouraging people to spend money, that this legislation would encourage departments to not to give money back because they would be feel it is incumbent upon them to spend the money, I would ask the Senator from Georgia when is the last time the Department of Defense gave any money back to the Treasury under the present system? I am not aware of any occasion in which that was the case.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MCCAIN. I did not interrupt the Senator.

Go ahead.

Mr. NUNN. That is OK.

Mr. MCCAIN. Go ahead.

Mr. NUNN. I would say it happens all the time. We have all sorts of programs that are either in trouble one way or the other that we go through reprogramming.

Mr. MCCAIN. Did any of the money ever go back to the Treasury?

Mr. NUNN. The money is spent on other Defense Department needs.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator from Georgia put his finger right on it. None of it goes back in the Treasury, but they find a way to spend it. With this, they would not be able to spend it because of a veto and the money would go back to the taxpayers of America rather than them deciding to find another place to spend it, which is the case today.

So perhaps the Senator from Georgia believes that it is a good idea that if a program is not worthwhile and the money is not spent that it go to another project without the knowledge of a majority of the Congress. Maybe with the knowledge of the Senator from Georgia when he was chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but not with the knowledge of this Member, who I felt had an equal voice in what the decision should be as the expenditure of America's tax dollars.

So if, as the Senator from Georgia states, this would stop this reprogramming, then I say I am very, very glad to hear that information that it would stop the reprogramming.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NUNN. As the Senator knows, on reprogramming, the reprogramming comes up by written request. It goes to four different committees. It is examined by the committees. All the members of the committees have access to that information if they want it.

The reprogramming is not done by telephone. And if the Senator wants to prevent reprogramming, the Senator is going to actually basically have the Department of Defense come up with one bill after another all year long. There will not be time for anything else.

I do not think the Senator has thought through this proposal.

I think the Senator has thought through the problem and I think he has thought through it very carefully and I admire him for his fights on that. I think he will find I voted with him on his amendments most of the time. And I think he would recall the challenge to the appropriations earmarks. I started that on the floor of the Senate. We actually won a majority vote on three different occasions. We have had the money taken out of the earmarks on the Senate side. In the final analysis, it usually gets put back in at the end of the conference.

So I agree with the Senator's frustration. But the problem is every time you see a problem around here, that does not mean whatever solution you throw at it is going to be the answer. I am saying that there is a problem. The Senator is right, there is a problem. There are ways to address that problem. But these solutions are going to create a whole other set of problems that are worse than the problems that the Senator is describing. That is my case.

Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, and he would be welcome to interrupt again.

As far as this issue not being examined sufficiently, I would remind the Senator from Georgia that a former colleague of his from Georgia brought this bill, this very same bill, with a few changes to it in 1985 to the floor of the Senate. I know that the Senator from Georgia was then in the Senate. I am sorry that he did not take part in the debate and become illuminated on the issue at that time.

It was passed a couple years ago as a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. NUNN. It was a different proposal. I examined that proposal. It was the Mattingly proposal. It did not have anything like the level of lines required in this one. It was a different proposal.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is fundamentally the same, and the Senator knows it as well as I do.

The fact is the Mattingly amendment, plus a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that was passed not too long ago, I believe it was in 1993, basically said the same thing. So this is not a new issue. It is not a new item and it is not a new problem.

It is not a new problem. The fact is that if we do not address this problem, then the American people's confidence will be far more eroded than it is today, if that is possible.

I am convinced that if we adopt the so-called now Exon—since Senator DOMENICI no longer supports that proposal and supports this proposal—that it will fail. And the Senator from Georgia probably knows that, too, because in the other body, the line-item veto, what he knows of as the Domenici-Exon, was defeated by an overwhelming number, and it was defeated because it only required a majority to overrule the line-item veto.

Most of our colleagues on the other side, and I hope most of my colleagues here, understand that a simple majority does not do it. And it does not do it for the reasons I cited earlier to my colleague from Georgia.

These items have been exposed to the light of day. Votes have been taken, and they have been rejected. Even though those provisions may have been snuck in, in a covert fashion initially, even when they were exposed, we still could not get a sufficient number of votes to remove them through the amending process, which is basically what the President of the United States said.

I am amending this bill in order to take out what I find objectionable, and then there is a vote. I am convinced if it is a majority vote that overturns it, it is business as usual in this body, and in the Congress, and our colleagues on the other side, clearly—as the Senator from Nebraska has stated very accurately quite often—is very different from this body.

Our Founding Fathers meant for that to be the case. But they feel very strongly, and perhaps it is because they have had more bitter experience than we have had over here, that a two-thirds majority is required.

Now, Mr. President, I will not talk too much longer. I know the Senator from Nebraska wants to speak, and the Senator from Indiana is here.

This issue is well-known. This issue is not brand new. Separate enrollment goes back as far as 1985. The issue of line-item veto goes back in the last century. There have been debates and discussions of different forms of line-item veto for years. I have been part of many of them.

To convey the impression that this is a brand new thing that Members of this body have not considered, frankly, I believe, is an inaccurate depiction of our knowledge of this issue of the line-item veto.

Any members that go home, who have a town hall meeting, not an hour goes by without someone standing up and saying, ''Why can't we have the line-item veto, Senator or Congressman?'' Obviously there is a discussion at that time because the American people feel that we are spending too much of their dollars that they send to Washington in a wasteful fashion.

I would like to say the Senator from Georgia made an excellent point: Why not solve the problems ourselves? I think he made an excellent point there, and I have seen effort after effort after effort to solve the problems ourselves. We cannot. We do not show the political courage to do so.

I have sought, as the Senator from Georgia has, to attempt to not allow appropriations to be put in conferences. I try to have criteria set up for military construction projects, which are one of the most egregious areas where pork shows up all the time. We tried to do away with highway demonstration projects. We tried to do away with the land transfers that are done—directly related to the influence of certain Members of this body. I tried to do away with outrageous courthouse costs.

We have not been able it do it, and we have run up a $5 trillion debt and laid it on few generations of Americans. There are very few people in this body that I respect more than the Senator from Georgia. There are times when he and I are in disagreement. This is one of them.

He contributes to the debate, as always. I feel that the points that he raised, as well as the points raised by the Senator from West Virginia earlier, are very important ones. I am glad we are having this opportunity to debate these points on the floor prior to passage of the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would like to compliment my friend and great colleague from the State of Georgia. I think that all Members who have known and worked with SAM NUNN know that he is historically one of the most thoughtful Members of our body, and I think that that statement would be agreed to by most people on either side of the aisle.

Senator NUNN, unfortunately, brought forth his carefully thought out, well-researched speech tonight to a U.S. Senate where only four Members were on the floor. It was after it had been announced that we would have no more votes. Therefore, as of this moment there are many people outside of the U.S. Senate who know much more about the reasoned arguments made by the Senator from Georgia than is known by most U.S. Senators. For the most part, I suspect that as usual, when we announce there are no more votes, there are not a large number of Senators in their offices listening to the debate, as is frequently the case.

I just wish that every Senator would read the statements made by the Senator from Georgia tonight, tomorrow. I do not know how much press we will pick up on the statements made by the Senator from Georgia.

I am looking in the press gallery and I see one person, maybe somebody else is hiding up there. I suppose that maybe some of the press may be watching on television, but unfortunately the tremendously throughtful remarks of the Senator from Georgia which were critical of what we are trying to do here may fall on deaf ears.

I have been closely associated with him for the 16 years that I have been here. I sit next to him on the Armed Services Committee. I simply know that SAM NUNN takes the time and effort to do the research as he has done on this measure. I hope it will give some pause and some consideration to those that may not have studied the proposition, clearly, as much as Mr. NUNN of Georgia.

I think that the Senator from Georgia clearly was not trying to pick on anyone. Clearly, he was not trying to destroy anything. Clearly, as is his nature, SAM NUNN was saying to Members, ''Stop, look, and listen before you leap at the proposal offered by the majority leader, without hearing any discussion.''

What Senator NUNN brought out are some shortcomings in the measure that I think we should take a look at. There might not be total agreement on every point that Senator NUNN made. But I notice that during his discussion, the main argument that was made, some of the salient points he was making, was an amendment to the Dole substitute that was not in the Dole substitute, probably never had been thought of by those who put the Dole substitute together. In fact, they were offered by the Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN.

I just hope, therefore, that we would not jump to a conclusion that SAM NUNN does not care. I think no one could say that with any great understanding. No one has said that yet.

I think that SAM NUNN has made a very excellent point. I think he summed it up best by saying he supported the substitute amendment that is basically S. 14, the Domenici-Exon proposal that has been made, and will be offered by the democratic leader in just a few moments. We will have an opportunity to vote on that.

It has been said that Senator DOMENICI no longer supports the Domenici-Exon proposal. Well, that might be. But I believe that after listening to the remarks by a man whom Senator DOMENICI has stood with time after time after time on many matters, including matters to try and straighten out the fiscal policies of the United States of America, I am not sure that Senator DOMENICI would dismiss out of hand the Domenici-Exon proposal. A commitment has been made by the Republicans meeting in caucus and everything necessary was done to get the commitment of 54 solid votes—at least on cloture, and I assume 54 votes for the measure. But perhaps my colleagues have listened to some of the debate that has been going on, if we would listen to SAM NUNN, if we would reflect on the thoughtful comments that have been made by Senator BYRD, whom most would recognize as a scholar and a historian and certainly a very well read and accepted critic and expert on the Constitution, we can still correct ourselves.

I hope that at least with the actions that have taken place today we would take another look at the Democratic leader's proposal that is back to Domenici-Exon—maybe it is only the Exon amendment now, but I still think it is a good amendment, worthy of consideration.

I would also add that I think it is very clear Senator NUNN was supportive of either Domenici-Exon, which was S. 14, and prefers S. 4, which was the McCain amendment to the separate enrollment substitute. I listened very carefully to Senator NUNN, and while Senator NUNN clearly favored the Domenici-Exon S. 14, he clearly indicated that the McCain S. 4 was far superior, far, far superior to the substitute amendment that was offered by the majority leader. So I think SAM NUNN, as usual, was trying to say let us stop and think about this.

This new gimmick that I have criticized and Senator BYRD has criticized and others have criticized, known as the enrollment procedure, is an absolute disaster, if people will stop and take a look at it, they will see it is a disaster for lots of reasons. I do not think there is any question but that if we incorporate the enrolling clerk in this measure we will open ourselves up to a challenge by the courts that might sink a line-item veto that this Senator has been working on for a long, long time—as I said earlier, prior to the time that many people came here. I believe one of the first times that I remember doing anything about this was in consort with then Senator Dan Quayle of Indiana. Dan Quayle, of course, was later the Vice President of the United States.

I simply say it is not fair, in my opinion, since I know something about the Mattingly amendment, to say that the Mattingly amendment was essentially the same thing as the enrollment today. The Mattingly amendment clearly called for a division by section and paragraph. In contrast, the Dole substitute amendment calls for a division by section, paragraph, allocation, or suballocation. The Dole amendment calls for far greater detail than the Mattingly amendment, and therein lies some of the concern, and I think legitimate concern, offered by our distinguished colleague from Georgia.

One other point or two. It has been said that, oh, the House of Representatives would never go for anything like Domenici-Exon, and maybe now just Exon, about to become Daschle-Exon—call it what you will, they would never

go for anything like it. I submit, Mr. President, that H.R. 4600 passed July 14, 1994, on a vote of 342 to 69 in the House of Representatives was essentially the Domenici-Exon bill, the Exon bill, the Daschle-Exon bill, the bill that Senator NUNN recommends that we take a look at. That happened last year. Now, it is true that there has been a change in the makeup of the House of Representatives since that time but not enough of a change to make that much difference in the vote that I have just outlined.

I just hope that we could also understand—and I congratulate my friend from Arizona. It is true that he has been here time and time again trying to point out pork barrel spending. I salute him for that, and many, many times I have been with him, and I think that I have cosponsored some of these measures with him. And he said but he has not gotten anywhere, and that is why you have to have more than a majority vote as provided in the bill that I will refer to as S. 14 so I will not have to mention all those names over and over again.

Well, I can understand his frustration and I share in that frustration. I would simply say to Members of the Senate that S. 14 does not call for one Member of the Senate—and as big and as important as we sometimes think we are, to begin to wield the same influence and the spotlight as the President. We do not have the bully pulpit of the President of the United States. So I think I should assure all that if the President of the United States under S. 14 would highlight, would veto, call something pork and send it back over here, with that kind of a spotlight shining on it, rather than the spotlight of only one or two or three Senators spotlighting it. It would be well known around the United States of America, and I daresay that with the spotlight of the President of the United States exercising a veto as in S. 14, I do not think there would be the courage or lack thereof in this Chamber or the House of Representatives to override it as easily as they have in the past.

I would simply say, Mr. President, in closing that we can still have a good line-item veto, but I share and have spoken previously on what Senator NUNN outlined again tonight. Some of the things that Senator NUNN outlined would be a disaster for the United States of America.

Here a measure came forth out of a Republican caucus without any consultation with Democrats, without any hearings, without ever being discussed in the committees let alone holding hearings.

It is brought forth, it has been draped in a mantle of gold that cannot be touched because, if you touch it, you scratch it, and if you scratch it, you destroy it.

I do not think that is a very good way to legislate in the United States of America. There is a better way, and the better way that I hope we will take another look at is in the form of the amendment that the Democratic leader will be introducing tonight. I do not think the Democratic leader is going to say this is sacrosanct. I do not think the Democratic leader is going to say that there can be no changes made in it. I believe the Democratic leader will outline something tonight that I hope we will further discuss tomorrow and invite the Republicans in to see if we can come up with something that is more workable, that overcomes the constitutional objections that Senator BYRD, a constitutional expert, has outlined; to overcome the objections and concerns that have been highlighted by the Senator from Georgia. We can work it out.

I think there is no pride in authorship. We are trying to pass a line-item veto that, as best as we can fashion it, can reduce unnecessary pork-barrel spending. I think that is what the Republicans want to do, and I think that is what the Democrats want to do. But I, for one, have been raising concerns about the process, concerns about the majority leader and his actions of bringing forth this that had never been discussed with the Democrats, never had any hearings held on it, and immediately to file a cloture petition on it. That is a railroading type of thing that I think does not bode well for what is generally considered to be the most deliberative body in the world.

Now, rather than being accused of being too deliberative and too talkative, I yield the floor and hope, if there is no one seeking recognition, the Democratic leader could rise to introduce the bill that he is going to introduce, and call it what you will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 348 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To propose a substitute amendment)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], for himself, Mr. EXON and Mr. GLENN, proposes an amendment numbered 348 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Line Item Veto Act''.

SEC. 2. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS OF BUDGET ITEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 1012 the following new section:

''EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS OF BUDGET ITEMS

''SEC. 1012A. (a) PROPOSED CANCELLATION OF BUDGET ITEM.—The President may propose, at the time and in the manner provided in subsection (b), the cancellation of any budget item provided in any Act. An item proposed for cancellation under this section may not be proposed for cancellation again under this title.

''(b) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

''(1) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the time limitations provided in subparagraph (B), the President may transmit to Congress a special message proposing to cancel budget items contained in an Act. A separate special message shall be transmitted for each Act that contains budget items the President proposes to cancel.

''(B) TIME LIMITATIONS.—A special message may be transmitted under this section—

''(i) during the 20-calendar-day period (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) commencing on the day after the date of enactment of the provision proposed to be rescinded or repealed; or

''(ii) at the same time as the President's budget for any provision enacted after the date the President submitted the preceding budget.

''(2) DRAFT BILL.—The President shall include in each special message transmitted under paragraph (1) a draft bill that, if enacted, would cancel those budget items as provided in this section. The draft bill shall clearly identify each budget item that is proposed to be canceled including, where applicable, each program, project, or activity to which the budget item relates.

''(3) CONTENTS OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Each special message shall specify, with respect to the budget item proposed to be canceled—

''(A) the amount that the President proposes be canceled;

''(B) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget item is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

''(C) the reasons why the budget item should be canceled;

''(D) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect (including the effect on outlays and receipts in each fiscal year) of the proposed cancellation; and

''(E) all facts, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the proposed cancellation and the decision to effect the proposed cancellation, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the proposed cancellation upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget item is provided.

''(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—

''(A) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS AND ADJUSTMENT OF COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of a bill containing the cancellation of budget items as provided under this section, the President shall—

''(i) with respect to a rescission of budget authority provided in an appropriations Act, reduce the discretionary spending limits under section 601 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the budget year and any outyear affected by the rescission, to reflect such amount; and

''(ii) with respect to a repeal of a targeted tax benefit, adjust the balances for the budget year and each outyear under section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reflect such amount.

''(B) ADJUSTMENT OF COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 5 days after the date

of enactment of a bill containing the cancellation of budget items as provided under this section, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise levels under section 311(a) and adjust the committee allocations under section 602(a) to reflect such amount.

''(c) PROCEDURES FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) INTRODUCTION.—Before the close of the second day of session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, after the date of receipt of a special message transmitted to Congress under subsection (b), the majority leader or minority leader of each House shall introduce (by request) the draft bill accompanying that special message. If the bill is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence in either House, then, on the third day of session of that House after the date of receipt of that special message, any Member of that House may introduce the bill.

''(B) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—The bill shall be referred to the appropriate committee or (in the House of Representatives) committees. The committee shall report the bill without substantive revision and with or without recommendation. The committee shall report the bill not later than the seventh day of session of that House after the date of receipt of that special message. If the committee fails to report the bill within that period, the committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) FINAL PASSAGE.—A vote on final passage of the bill shall be taken in the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before the close of the 10th day of session of that House after the date of the introduction of the bill in that House. If the bill is passed, the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, shall cause the bill to be engrossed, certified, and transmitted to the other House within one calendar day of the day on which the bill is passed.

''(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

''(B) MOTION TO STRIKE.—During consideration under this subsection in the House of Representatives, any Member of the House of Representatives may move to strike any proposed cancellation of a budget item if supported by 49 other Members.

''(C) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the House of Representatives on a bill under this subsection shall not exceed 4 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the bill. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to recommit a bill under this subsection or to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill is agreed to or disagreed to.

''(D) APPEALS.—Appeals from decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a bill under this section shall be decided without debate.

''(E) APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES.—Except to the extent specifically provided in this section, consideration of a bill under this section shall be governed by the Rules of the House of Representatives. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill introduced pursuant to the provisions of this section under a suspension of the rules or under a special rule.

''(3) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate shall be nondebatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to.

''(B) MOTION TO STRIKE.—During consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate, any Member of the Senate may move to strike any proposed cancellation of a budget item if supported by 11 other Members.

''(C) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a bill under this subsection, amendments thereto, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith (including debate pursuant to subparagraph (D)), shall not exceed 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(D) APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a bill under this subsection shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

''(E) MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a bill under this subsection is not debatable.

''(F) MOTION TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a bill under this subsection is not in order.

''(G) PLACED ON CALENDAR.—Upon receipt in the Senate of the companion bill for a bill that has been introduced in the Senate, that companion bill shall be placed on the calendar.

''(H) CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE COMPANION BILL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Following the vote on the Senate bill required under paragraph (1)(C), when the Senate proceeds to consider the companion bill received from the House of Representatives, the Senate shall—

''(I) if the language of the companion bill is identical to the Senate bill, as passed, proceed to the immediate consideration of the companion bill and, without intervening action, vote on the companion bill; or

''(II) if the language of the companion bill is not identical to the Senate bill, as passed, proceed to the immediate consideration of the companion bill.

''(ii) AMENDMENTS.—During consideration of the companion bill under clause (i)(II), any Senator may move to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as passed. Debate in the Senate on such companion bill, any amendment proposed under this subparagraph, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall not exceed 10 hours less such time as the Senate consumed or yielded back during consideration of the Senate bill.

''(4) CONFERENCE.—

''(A) CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS.—Debate in the House of Representatives or the Senate on the conference report and any amendments in disagreement on any bill considered under this section shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority leader and the minority leader. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit the conference report is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report is agreed to or disagreed to.

''(B) FAILURE OF CONFERENCE TO ACT.—If the committee on conference on a bill considered under this section fails to submit a conference report within 10 calendar days after the conferees have been appointed by each House, any Member of either House may introduce a bill containing only the text of the draft bill of the President on the next day of session thereafter and the bill shall be considered as provided in this section except that the bill shall not be subject to any amendment.

''(d) AMENDMENTS AND DIVISIONS PROHIBITED.—Except as otherwise provided by this section, no amendment to a bill considered under this section shall be in order in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. It shall not be in order to demand a division of the question in the House of Representatives (or in a Committee of the Whole). No motion to suspend the application of this subsection shall be in order in the House of Representatives, nor shall it be in order in the House of Representatives to suspend the application of this subsection by unanimous consent.

''(e) TEMPORARY PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO CANCEL.—At the same time as the President transmits to Congress a special message under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) proposing to cancel budget items, the President may direct that any budget item or items proposed to be canceled in that special message shall not be made available for obligation or take effect for a period not to exceed 45 calendar days from the date the President transmits the special message to Congress. The President may make any budget item or items canceled pursuant to the preceding sentence available at a time earlier than the time specified by the President if the President determines that continuation of the cancellation would not further the purposes of this Act.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) The term 'appropriation Act' means any general or special appropriation Act, and any Act or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations.

''(2) The term 'budget item' means—

''(A) an amount, in whole or in part, of budget authority provided in an appropriation Act except to fund direct spending programs and the administrative expenses social security; or

''(B) a targeted tax benefit.

''(3) The term 'cancellation of a budget item' means—

''(A) the rescission of any budget authority provided in an appropriation Act; or

''(B) the repeal of any targeted tax benefit.

''(4) The term 'companion bill' means, for any bill introduced in either House pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(A), the bill introduced in the other House as a result of the same special message.

''(5) The term 'targeted tax benefit' means any provision which has the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a different treatment to a particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is limited by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers. Such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.''.

(b) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''and 1017'' and inserting ''1012A, and 1017''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''section 1017'' and inserting ''sections 1012A and 1017''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for subpart B of title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1012 the following:

''Sec. 1012A. Expedited consideration of certain proposed cancellations of budget items.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—The amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) apply only to budget items provided in Acts enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) cease to be effective on September 30, 1998.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me begin by calling it what it ought to be called. This is the Domenici-Exon amendment. It is on the basis of the expertise of the two most able budgetary leaders in this body at this time that we bring forth this amendment with some confidence.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska, our ranking member, has very capably and eloquently characterized the remarks made earlier by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. In both cases, the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and certainly those made by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, lay out precisely why this amendment is necessary and why we bring it forth with the best intentions this evening.

I will have more to say about this tomorrow, but I would like to begin this evening by talking about our motivation and about why we view this to be a superior alternative to the substitute which was laid down by the majority leader on Monday night.

As I have said, and as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has reiterated on many occasions, the debate all week long has not been about a line-item veto. There is no debate among most Senators in that regard. Most Senators would agree that a line-item veto in concept is something we ought to have. Forty-three States have it. Democrats and Republicans have recognized for years it would be a good thing for us to have as well.

The question really is, What is our most effective approach? What in concept would work the most effectively? It is really on the basis of that desire—to bring forth the most practical and the most prudent approach—that I am sure Senator DOMENICI and Senator EXON originally proposed S. 14.

The chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking member of the Budget Committee, who have looked at all the options, and have studied this issue, as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, for years and years. On the basis of their considered judgment, and on the basis of their expertise, concluded some time ago that S. 14, the proposal that they introduced earlier this year, is by far and away the single most appropriate approach to something we all say we want. And they were so compelling in their reasons earlier this year that the majority leader cosponsored S. 14.

There must have been a time at some point this year that the majority leader looked at the options as well and came to the conclusion that they were right; that, indeed, having looked at all the different alternatives, S. 14 made the most sense.

There has been a good deal of discussion in recent weeks about Democrats who voted one way for a balanced budget amendment and then voted a different way this year. Obviously, going from one Congress to the next on an issue of some importance, changing one's position is understandable. It happens here all the time. But to go from a cosponsored measure, one which enjoyed broad-based bipartisan support, and in the same Congress decide even though it was cosponsored, even though publicly one is associated with it as the author, and then to vote against it would require a good deal of explanation, it would seem to me.

Regardless of what may ultimately come as a result of our debate over the course of the next day, what S. 14 is appropriately described as is expedited rescission, because it forces Congress to vote on spending cuts proposed by the President.

An almost identical proposal was passed in the House last year on a totally bipartisan basis. That vote was 342 to 69. Every one of the 169 Republican Members of the House at that time supported it. So the history of S. 14 is very clear. Republicans by wide margins in the past—in the past Congress as well as in the past months—have demonstrated their conviction that this is a very appropriate way with which to achieve what we all say we want—line-item veto.

The proposal gives the President authority to force Congress to vote on both spending and tax provisions that he considers wasteful. I will go into that in a little while. Under current law, Congress can ignore the President. We do not have to deal with rescissions the President sends to us. The current process is obviously very inadequate. It has not worked. Current law is clearly too weak.

Overwhelmingly, I think, colleagues on both sides of the aisle would come to that conclusion. So our amendment requires that Congress not ignore the President. It creates a fast-track procedure which forces Congress to deal with the President's proposed cuts in a very limited period of time. It is not enough for the President to send something back. We could continue to ignore it and, in the waning days of a Congress, come to some conclusion about dealing with the President's rescission and technically, avoid having to make the tough decisions. But what this measure says is that within 20 days the President must notify the Congress, after passage of a spending or a tax bill, what he wants to see cut. Twenty days is all he has. Then, 2 days later, a bill with the President's proposals has to be introduced and 10 days later the Congress votes.

So, Mr. President, within little over one month's time the entire process must be complete. The President has 20 days to notify the Congress of whatever changes he wants to make. Two days later, a proposal has to be made within the body to ensure that the President's recommendations are considered, and then Congress must act within 10 days after that to make it happen. That is it. It is over. Within a month, it all has to happen.

There are no filibusters because we limit debate, once it comes to the floor, to 10 hours.

Mr. President, there is a locked-in procedure here requiring from the very beginning of the process all the way to the end the certainty that Members of Congress must take action once the President makes his decision. Both Houses are forced to act. Both Houses would ensure an open public debate to place huge pressures on Congress itself to cut wasteful spending.

Mr. President, that is the process. I do not know how it can get much simpler than that. I do not know how it can be any less complicated, any more certain, and any more streamlined a process as we consider legislative proposals in this body.

So our amendment, in my view, has four main advantages over the pending Dole substitute. I want to address those with a little more elaboration. But let me just articulate them first.

It is more practical. We will not see the legislative process tied up in knots, as I foresee the Dole substitute doing.

It is clearly constitutional. It would not be challenged in court. We know that. Senator NUNN made quite a point of talking about the concerns he has in that regard.

Third, it protects majority rule, a central principle of democracy. It does not permit a minority in Congress, as the Dole substitute would, to hold the majority hostage. It protects the balance of power between the President and the Congress. We all want review. We all want the opportunity to ensure that in an expedited process we can be forced to deal with the proposals made by the President with regard to rescissions. But we also recognize how important it is that majority rule be maintained and protected during the legislative process.

Finally, it clearly and unambiguously puts tax breaks on the table subject to Presidential review. There is no question here. I am going to get into that in a little more detail tomorrow. But there is no question with regard to the Exon proposal. Tax breaks

are on the table, as spending measures are in all other cases.

Let me go back to the issue of practicality. Our amendment, as I said, would be so much easier to administer. I have described it in as simple a way as I can. I do not know that anyone would have any difficulty understanding what happened; 20 days, 2 days, 10 days. That is it. It is over.

The Appropriations Committee last year estimated that the 13 appropriations bills would ultimately be split into nearly 10,000 separated minibills under the Dole amendment. Let me repeat that.

The Appropriations Committee estimates that last year's 13 appropriations bills, which would be subject under the Exon approach to a simple process of reconsideration when the President sends them back, if he would choose to do so, would be changed from 13 bills to nearly 10,000 separate minibills under the Dole amendment.

I do not have the paper to adequately represent the stacks, the truckloads of paper we are going to need to do what the Dole substitute would require. But coming on the heels of the Paperwork Reduction Act, for the life of me, I do not understand how anybody can advocate going from 13 bills to 10,000. Here we are just talking about the appropriations process. We are still trying to determine the degree to which we will have scope on taxes. But on appropriations bills alone, that is the question, do we want to go from 13 to 10,000?

As I indicated in an earlier speech on the Senate floor, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act is a pretty good example. That act was about 30 pages. The 30 pages, if we use that bill as an example this year, would be split into 1,746 separate bills—1,746 separate bills.

So on the basis of prudence or practicality, does it make sense for any of us who voted for and have advocated paper reduction to take a simple measure, and provide the complicated extraordinary burdensome process of going from 13 to 10,000 or in this case 1 page to 1,700? I do not think so, Mr. President.

Second, let me address the issue I raised with regard to constitutionality. We have not had the chance to properly evaluate the constitutionality of this approach because it has not been considered by any committee, as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has indicated. But the last time a separate enrollment proposal was considered was 1985. It was voted out unfavorably by unanimous vote in the Rules Committee, then chaired by a Republican.

Several witnesses at the hearings held by the Rules Committee in 1985 raised serious questions as to the constitutionality of separate enrollment. The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia has spent a good deal of time on the floor over the course of the last several days talking about this issue, so I will not elaborate.

But let me just say how pleased I am that the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, was adopted in order to expedite the judicial review of this bill. That is important. Certainly with judicial review, we will cut to the heart and go right to the question of constitutionality at some point in the not too distant future.

While we will not know until the courts finally determine the constitutionality of this legislation, it would certainly be better to enact our amendment which raises no questions at all. On the one hand, we have a question of taking a chance, rolling the dice with regard to constitutionality. On the other hand, with this amendment, there is no roll of the dice. There is no question of constitutionality. We know it is constitutional. We have that confidence.

So beyond the practicality of going from 13 to 10,000, then we question the constitutionality and say, look. On that side there is a doubt. On this side, there is none.

If this legislation is struck down by the courts, what do we have? We go back to ground zero. We probably enact the Exon bill. But why should we go through that process? Why should we go back to step one?

Mr. President, based upon that, I would say that Senators ought to give pause before they come to any final conclusions on the Dole substitute, which while it has merits, is not as good of a solution as the amendment we have offered. I would certainly hope that they will take a close look at what the chairman of the Budget Committee himself proposed earlier this year along with the ranking member.

Third, I indicated that majority rule and the balance of power is a concern of many of us. Our amendment would require that a majority of Congress approve cuts that are proposed by the President using the principle of majority rule which has been in existence for 200 years. For 200 years we have said majority rule ought to be our modus operandi, our approach to passing laws in this country. We would not allow a supermajority to hold hostage legislation that otherwise deserves fair consideration.

Under the alternative, the President wins, if he gets the support of just one more than a third of either House of Congress. It is all over with. A President wins if he can convince one more than one-third of either body of the propriety of his action. That is all it takes and it is over.

Do we really want to move that much power to the White House? Do we want to see that kind of an imbalance between the executive and legislative branches? Mr. President, I do not think so. That is not a partisan issue. Obviously, we have a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. The roles could be reversed some day. But regardless of who dominates either branch, I really question whether we want to push that kind of power, that kind of an imbalance, created now after over 200 years. I would hope that Members, too, would give a great deal of careful thought to allowing the President to use that kind of influence.

I can recall so many occasions over the course of the last 16 years where Presidents have called me to urge my vote on a specific issue. They have called me saying, ''It is in the national interest for you to do something, Senator DASCHLE,'' or ''Congressman DASCHLE, that I know you do not want to do.'' There have been times when I have had a fundamental philosophical disagreement with my own President, sometimes, with a Democratic President, not to mention a Republican President, and I have had to tell the President, ''No, I am not going to support you.'' But I wonder whether anybody could ever imagine—hopefully, it will never happen, but I wonder if a President might some day say, ''Senator DASCHLE, you have some water projects in South Dakota that I am going to line-item veto unless * * *''—God forbid that it happens. I hope it will not. But putting the power of the President in the position it will be in, under that substitute, gives me pause. If I know that I can convince the majority of my colleagues of the appropriateness of a given line item, I am going to be safe and say, ''Mr. President, you can do anything you want to. I can convince my colleagues of the merit of this particular position, so go ahead and veto it.'' I will convince the majority. But if all he needs is a third, if that is all he needs, I am not sure I will ever get anywhere with issues of great importance to this Senator or to anybody else.

Mr. President, the final issue has to do with tax breaks and the language that the Exon proposal provides, as opposed to the language provided in the Dole substitute. I must say I am very pleased that the Republican majority has come a long way in meeting many of our concerns with regard to adopting a provision which allows the President to veto special interest tax breaks. While I am pleased with this progress, the language in our amendment is much clearer and freer of ambiguity. That is what we really want. It says clearly and forcefully: Tax breaks are on the table, period; no questions asked, no doubt at all about where we stand with regard to putting tax breaks on the table, in the same way that appropriations bills are offered. That is a given.

But I must say, I am hopeful that Republicans and Democrats can come to some closure on this issue of tax expenditures. It is gratifying that the tax expenditure language that Republicans now propose is similar to language that Senator BRADLEY has introduced and has made very clear is his No. 1 priority with regard to the line-item veto. I am very pleased that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has made that

point in a colloquy with Senator BRADLEY. I will just read into the RECORD what he had to say about this issue, because I think it confirms what we have been hoping we can accomplish. Quoting now, Senator COATS on March 21, in a colloquy with Senator BRADLEY. He says:

I say to the Senator from New Jersey, our goal, I believe, is the same—to address the same items that he attempts to address. I hope that as we debate through this and work through this, we can clarify so that Members know exactly what we are after. It is hard to get the exact words in place so that we understand just exactly how this applies to tax items. But I believe that the targeted tax expenditures which are targeted in the Dole amendment very closely parallel what the Senator from New Jersey has tried for so long to accomplish.

Mr. President, that clarification is very helpful. I commend the Senator from Indiana for making it. Republicans would subject a tax break to potential veto, and it provides more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers ''when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers.'' The only way a tax expenditure would not be subject to potential veto under this language is if we define ''similarly situated'' as meaning identical. Our Republicans colleagues have assured us that that is not their intent.

Suppose we proposed a $500 tax credit for all employees of Senate offices. Everyone would agree that this proposal should be subject to a Presidential veto. But if we define ''similarly situated'' as all employees of Senate offices, then we would have the ridiculous result that the proposal would not be subject to any line-item veto. What if we provided a tax deduction to all businesses in Fairfax County, VA. We would agree that the President should have the authority to review the provision for possible line-item veto. If we only compare the taxpayers who benefit from this deduction to businesses in Fairfax County, then we end up with a nonsensical result that the deduction would not be subject to the line-item veto.

So, Mr. President, as these examples show, defining ''similarly situated taxpayers'' to mean the identical group of taxpayers leads to a ridiculous result. But applying common sense to the term ''similarly situated'' leads inevitably to a broad interpretation of that term, which is what I am sure our Republican colleagues have intended.

They have confirmed and assured us that it is not their intent to have the line-item veto operate in the manner I just described with these examples. Thus, similarly situated taxpayer should be interpreted broadly, thereby subjecting a wide range of tax breaks to a Presidential veto.

Again, Mr. President, that is the question. Why should we have to go through an interpretation of broad or narrow scope with regard to tax breaks? Why not put all tax breaks on the table? Why not recognize that a tax break is an expenditure, an expenditure that has to be offset, an expenditure that ought to be treated just like an appropriation? That is what the Democratic substitute does, very clearly.

So, in closing, Mr. President, let me just say that we will have more of an opportunity tomorrow to talk about these issues. But we need to go back to the original Domenici-Exon language, cosponsored by the majority leader. We appreciate very much that Republicans have come toward our view on tax breaks. Now they should come back to their own language that is part of our substitute. We support giving the President new authority to compel consideration of cuts in spending and tax breaks, and the best way to do it is to adopt this amendment. It is workable, it is constitutional, it protects majority rule, and it clearly puts special interest tax breaks on the table.

I hope that in the spirit of bipartisanship, recognizing that the origin of this legislation came from Republicans and Democrats, and not only just any Republican or Democrat, but it came from the chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking member of the Budget Committee, people who know this issue better than the rest of us, I hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle can recognize the wisdom of that approach and support it tomorrow when we have the rollcall vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, in one very real sense, I welcome the remarks of the minority leader and welcome the support that the minority leader and others have offered on this floor for the concept that we are attempting to advance; namely, how do we make it harder to spend the taxpayers' dollars? And how can we end a practice which most of us recognize as not a practice that brings credit to this institution, but one which annually causes us significant embarrassment?

The disclosure of certain types of spending, certain types of tax benefits to the public severely undermines their confidence in us as an institution, severely enhances their criticism and their cynicism toward this institution, as they regularly see expenditures for items that are not considered to be in the national interest or in any sense of the measure a broad interest, but are targeted to just a few.

And it is a time honored, some would say—I would say time dishonored—process that we have engaged in over the years to slip those little provisions in, sometimes in the back room, sometimes in conference, when there really is no chance to amend a bill that we know the President has to sign.

And so we are encouraged that our colleagues from across the aisle have recognized that this is a practice that needs to be limited or stopped.

But for the past 6 years, during my service in the Senate, I have been part of an effort led by Republicans to attempt to address this issue. And we failed each time. Really, going all the way back to 1985, there have been six separate efforts to address line-item veto in which we had votes. And in each one of those efforts, the number of Democrats supporting Republicans or supporting the effort in general can be counted generally on one hand. We have failed again and again and again. We have failed because we have not had support from across the aisle.

Oh, it is wonderful now to hear all these statements about how Democrats support line-item veto; how they support enhanced rescission; how they are trying to work toward the same goals as we are. Well, we welcome their support. It is a little late, but it is not too late. And we hope that that translates into finally arriving at a measure which will get at this practice of tax pork and spending pork.

In 1985, when the measure was offered by Senator Mattingly, Republican from Georgia, only seven Democrats supported the effort. And in 1990, when I offered not the line-item veto or a separate enrollment, but when I offered enhanced rescission, only four Democrats supported the effort and we failed, as did Senator Mattingly in 1985.

We failed because the effort was filibustered. We failed because points of order were raised forcing us to achieve 60 votes to even get to debate. We did not even get to the debate of the issue.

In 1990, my colleague and partner in this effort, Senator MCCAIN, also offered enhanced rescission and he only got four Democrat votes. And in 1992, Senator MCCAIN offered it again and this time he got seven. So there was some movement in our direction.

But then a year later, in 1993, I offered it, the same bill, enhanced rescission—the rescission process that the Democrats are now talking about as the alternative and the substitute to what we are attempting to do—and we only got five. So I must not have been as persuasive as Senator MCCAIN because we lost two Democrats.

And even in 1993, when Senator BRADLEY changed his position on this issue from being opposed to it but recognizing that something had to be done, something had to be done to stop this runaway spending and this runaway deficit and this runaway national debt, even then Senator BRADLEY, as a Democrat, could only secure 13 Democrats and the measure fell once again.

And so we have had a decade of resistance—a decade of efforts to block our attempts to pass rescission, enhanced rescission, separate enrollment, line-item veto. And every one of those efforts has been defeated not by the votes of Republicans but defeated by the votes of Democrats.

So it is a little difficult to sit here through this debate and hear the protestations that, ''If Republicans would just cooperate. If they would just lean a little more our way and see the bill as we see it, we could have line-item veto or we could have enhanced rescission. And somehow the Republicans are

blocking a measure to give the President this authority.'' When the fact of the matter is that it is only the persistence of Republicans, the persistence of those who continue to offer this year after year after year, that finally has translated into an election last November which gave us the necessary new Members to have a chance at succeeding on this item.

Now a great deal has been said about why do we not take the Domenici-Exon package; that the chairman of the Budget Committee at one time sponsored a provision which is being offered now as an alternative, and it must have been a pretty good effort in putting that bill together because both the chairman and the ranking member supported it.

Well, Senator DOMENICI did offer that alternative to the McCain-Coats enhanced rescission. He offered expedited rescission. And it was pointed out that expedited rescission really was not a major change from the status quo. It was a modest improvement, but it did not really have the strength of fundamentally changing the way we do business in this body and it lacked the two-thirds vote necessary to override the President's decision. As such, the conclusion was the same 51 votes that passed the appropriation in the first place, that voted for the appropriation, could overturn the President's decision and retain the very items that raised the questions about pork-barrel spending in the first place.

And so, it was Senator DOMENICI who said, ''Why don't we look at an alternative that will be even stronger, that will expand the scope?''

In fact, Senator DOMENICI said, ''My problem with the McCain-Coats effort is that it only focuses on the appropriated items. And the appropriated items, once you separate out defense, amounts to less than 20 percent of the budget.'' He thought that was unfairly targeted to a certain segment of spending and it would ignore other areas. That is the reason he crafted the alternative bill.

And so we sat down with Senator DOMENICI and said, ''Well, let's examine some ways that we could expand this and address the question that you raised because that is a legitimate question.'' And Senator STEVENS weighed in on it and he had the same concerns.

Out of that came the product that we are now debating that has been offered by Senator DOLE, the majority leader, as the Dole amendment, the product around which we have secured the support of nearly every Republican because it was expanded to include additional items and not just the appropriated items.

And it was Senator DOMENICI, right after the introduction of the DOLE amendment, the separate enrollment provision, that came to the floor and made a lengthy statement as to why the Dole amendment was so superior to his own product and why he was withdrawing his amendment that had been reported out of the Budget Committee, his bill, his product, why he was withdrawing support for that in favor of a much better version, a much more effective version, a much tougher version, a version with real teeth. He outlined that, and I want to quote from his remarks.

As my colleagues have said, the alternative that they are providing must be a good one because it was Senator DOMENICI's original proposal. Yes, it was his original proposal, in response to a measure that he did not think was strong enough because it did not include enough categories.

As a result of that, we met and we crafted a much stronger version, and Senator DOMENICI came down here and said, ''This is what I was really looking for and this is a much superior product.''

I quote from him where he said, reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1995, Senator DOMENICI said ''I support the objective of Senator MCCAIN's bill,'' enhanced recision, ''but I felt the McCain bill shifted too much power over the budget of the President and focused too much attention on just the appropriated accounts, which excluding defense, represents less than 20 percent of total spending. The Dole amendment provides a less cumbersome process to overturn Presidential rescissions.''

The McCain-Coats bill has a two-stage process where Congress would have to vote two times if the President vetoed the first effort. He said the new Dole amendment offers a one-hurdle process, and for that reason it is superior to the product that he had originally sponsored.

Second, he said, ''The Dole amendment applies to all spending. It applies to new spending and legislation, not just appropriations legislation. In addition, it applies to any new very narrow targeted tax benefit legislation and new entitlements.'' Third, he says, ''It provides for congressional review. It contained a sunset in the year 2000.'' I quote again, ''I congratulate Senator DOLE. He has found an approach that significantly expands the President's authority over spending, without unduly disrupting the delicate balance of power.''

The minority leader suggests this evening that this is some kind of a surprise because it is a substitute to the previously reported bills. The truth of the matter is that every provision in this has either been voted on by the Senate or discussed thoroughly in committee. And he goes on to state why it is not a surprise, and I will get to that in a moment.

I will conclude Senator DOMENICI's remarks by quoting one more time: ''This product,'' referring to Senator DOLE's amendment, ''is as close as we will ever get to a fair line-item veto that has a chance of working and that is broader than we originally conceived but fair in that respect. It is fair. I will suggest that if there are some who think that the old bill which I introduced should be revisited, and perhaps the President supports it, let me set that one aside.''

Let me repeat that. Senator DOMENICI, the one who wrote the bill along with Senator EXON, that was his initial effort, came to this floor and said, ''I will suggest that if there are some who think that the old bill which I introduced should be revisited, let me set that one aside,'' and he withdrew that bill and signed on to the Dole bill because it was a much superior, much tougher, much broader, much more effective, and as Senator DOMENICI said, fairer to a line-item veto that has a chance of actually working.

We have talked a lot about the practicality of this bill and it seems that the opposition—Democrats opposing this bill—keep using the question of process and mechanics, and how this is going to complicate the effort.

Well, the President of the United States does not think it will complicate the effort. They worry about sending too many pieces of paper down to the White House. The President of the United States said in his statement released on March 20, ''I urge the Senate to pass the strongest possible line-item veto.'' He did not say, ''I urge the Senate to pass expedited rescission.'' Expedited rescission does not begin to resemble a line-item veto. Veto means two-thirds override. It does not mean majority vote. It does not mean the same votes that pass the appropriation in the first place are necessary to overturn what the President has vetoed. It means two-thirds. Give me the line-item veto, the President said, in his letter.

This is about closing the door on business as usual in Washington. Business as usual in Washington is 51 votes to pass tax benefits, which I call tax pork, that go to certain individuals or specialized interest that do not apply to broad classes. And it is spending pork which go to special individuals, special interests, and do not apply to the broad, public interest.

The President wants the real thing because he knows the real thing is the only thing that will make a difference. He knows if we will change the spending habits of Congress, if we are going to change the process of blackmail in sending him—what I should call ''legislative blackmail''—in sending him bills, where it is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, he knows that he has to have some tool that will have some teeth in it, and some authority that has some clout in it. That is what the President understands. That is what he has asked for.

We Republicans do not give him very much of what he asks for or do not like to give him very much that he asks for, but this is something we have been trying to support, and trying to give him for a very considerable amount of time.

The fact of the matter is that the Dole substitute grants the President

true veto authority. It requires a two-thirds vote by Congress to continue spending. Short of an amendment to the Constitution, which we are not able to secure enough votes to pass —I wish we could—it is the strongest tool we can grant the President. It is similar to the authority that 43 other Governors currently enjoy.

The Exon expedited recision package does little to restore the President's authority to withhold spending that he enjoyed prior to 1974. At that time, Congress decisively grabbed the absolute power of the purse. The only thing they gave the President was the power to propose rescissions. Most of those recissions that the President and subsequent Presidents proposed, never saw the light of day.

In 1974, the President sent up recissions and Congress ignored every one of them. One hundred percent. They said, ''No thank you, Mr. President. Everything we passed, stands.'' In 1976, 86 percent of the President's rescissions were ignored. In 1983, 100 percent of the President's recissions were ignored. In 1986, 95 percent. In 1987, 97 percent.

Now, the Exon legislation, the expedited rescission just offered by the minority leader, is a modest improvement because it says that at least the President's rescissions are going to get a vote. But it is only going to get a vote of the same people who passed it in the first place, and it is hard to see how that will change what Congress had previously done.

If we are ever going to reverse spending trends in this body, we do not need modest improvements. We need fundamental change. To continue spending under the substitute or appropriately, under the amendment offered by the minority leader, the only standard they are proposing is that Congress needs a simple majority, and if it fails to enact a bill within 45 days, the funds are automatically released.

What is being offered as a poor substitute, a weak substitute, to the closest thing we can get to line-item veto is, simply put, too little too late.

It does nothing to restore that healthy tension necessary between the legislative and executive branch necessary to impose fiscal discipline on Members of the Congress. Some have said that the veto standard, the two-thirds is too high a standard, that it is too difficult to muster the numbers to override it.

To those, I would say that the greater challenge today is to reduce our Nation's debt and balance our Nation's books. In this day, it should be tougher. It should be a formidable challenge to continue to spend money. It is time for a higher standard.

If we get the job done by the year 2000, then maybe we will want to revisit this. Maybe we will want to look at this and see whether or not it has been abused, this new authority of the President has been abused as some say that it might be. I do not think it will. It certainly has not been at the State level. There are no State legislators calling for repeal of the line-item veto power that their governors have.

It sets up a healthy tension, a healthy tension, a necessary tension that can restore some discipline to this body.

The Dole bill is the strongest line-item veto bill. It presumes that funding is rescinded unless the elimination of spending is specifically disapproved. It requires a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate to override a subsequent veto.

Let us show the American people we are serious about fundamentally changing the way this Congress does business. Let us show them that we intend to present appropriations bills and tax bills without embarrassment. Let us show them that we intend to send a message to the taxpayers that under our guidance their dollars will not be wasted. Let us act boldly to eliminate the dual deficits of public funds and public trust and let us resist the urge to continue business as usual.

The alternative offered by the minority leader is essentially business as usual. The Dole amendment is a real meaningful, fundamental change in the way this Congress spends taxpayers' dollars. It makes it tougher. It makes it a lot tougher. It ought to make it tougher because we have abused the privilege that we have had as Members of this body by being irresponsible in the way we spend those dollars, by running up a debt and by sending to the President items which we in our hearts know do not deserve to be in those appropriations or in those tax bills.

So while I urge my colleagues to reject the proposal offered by the minority leader, we welcome their support for the concept. What they have offered is too little too late.

Let us pass something that will make a difference.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I am going to be very brief because we have been at it a long time today, and I am sure that I am not going to score very many points at this time of the night and we will start again tomorrow.

I would just like to briefly sum up if I can. Although it has not been mentioned in the lengthy debate tonight, I believe that any objective Republicans, if we can find one up in this Chamber this time of night, would probably concede that the Senator from Nebraska has been one of those with a pretty strong career of voting for line-item veto matters in this Chamber. So all of us cannot be accused of being Johnny-come-latelies.

What has happened in the past, though, is not nearly as important as what we are doing here tonight. And I would simply say that Senator NUNN in a remarkable, well thought out speech, that could in no way could be considered a partisan statement at all, outlined some concerns.

Regardless of the intent of the Dole amendment—and it may be described correctly as what came out of a meeting of the Republican caucus, this was the product that came out of it—that does not necessarily guarantee the product is not faulty and probably should receive some further corrections.

I wish to thank my colleagues on that side of the aisle who on more than one occasion today have agreed to amendments that I thought were absolutely critical and essential, and we have had them to come our way. I hope they would agree we are trying to be constructive and not destructive in trying to fashion something in the form of a line-item veto that would be as safe as it possibly could be from a court challenge that I am certain will follow if we eventually pass the Dole substitute amendment.

I happen to feel that with the comments again tonight about the constitutionality problem and the operational problems manifold outlined by Senator NUNN, many of which I think had obviously not been considered when this product was put together, we must continue to reason together if we can and keep this as nonpartisan as possible and try and pass a piece of legislation that is not going to be thrown out by the courts.

If that happens, it will not be an exercise, indeed, in futility. And since I have indicated I have had more than my share of futility on this very matter time and time again before with many of the key able players in this line-item veto we are talking about tonight, I just hope we can get something done rather than one more exercise in futility and disappointment.

That is why I appeal, I appeal once again to let us reason together and not stick by the basic principle that what came out of the Republican caucus—because I think the Republicans would even admit it—just because it came out of a Republican caucus of the majority party in the Senate is a guarantee it is perfect.

Let me appeal once again, Mr. President, that on tomorrow when the sun comes up, as it will, when we will be back here again, let us see if debate and reason and sound statements on the floor of the Senate mean something and they are not going to be automatically shunted aside on a strictly party line Republican vote, 54 people marching in lockstep because the product which came out of their caucus is somehow sacrosanct and must not be tampered with.

AMENDMENT NO. 350 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of savings achieved through lowering the discretionary spending caps to offset revenue decreases subject to pay-as-you-go requirements)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on another matter, on behalf of the senior Senator

from West Virginia, I call up amendment No. 350, which the clerk has at the desk, and ask for its report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 350 to amendment No. 347.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . USE OF THE REDUCTIONS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.

(A) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.—

(1) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS AND LEGISLATION.—Section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) USE OF REDUCTIONS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that decreases the discretionary spending limits unless the concurrent resolution on the budget, bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report provides that such decrease may only be used for deficit reduction and may not be used to offset all or part of an increase in direct spending or decrease in receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1974.''.

(2) SIXTY VOTE POINT OF ORDER.—Subsections (c) and (d) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are amended by inserting ''301(j),'' after ''301(i),''.

(b) GRAMM-RUDMAN.—Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) USE OF REDUCTIONS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—A decrease in the discretionary spending limits may only be used for deficit reduction and may not be used to offset all or part of an increase in direct spending or decrease in receipts under this section.''.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this amendment would prohibit the use of cuts in the appropriation caps to pay for tax cuts. The Senator from West Virginia has asked me to call up this amendment to ensure that it will qualify for consideration under the unanimous consent agreement governing consideration of the main proposition before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that now that this has been called up, the pending amendment be temporarily set aside.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of the Daschle substitute on which there be the following time limitation prior to a motion to table: 2 hours to be equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. EXON. There is no objection here.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

THE SOARING TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the numbers are now in for the trade deficit for January, and they are not good. In fact, we set a new deficit record for a single month. The trade deficit surged over 68 percent, to a highest ever mark of $12.2 billion.

Mr. President, I never have met two economists who agree on everything. Some say you should not pay too much attention to trade deficit numbers. But most economists will tell you that continuously rising deficits in merchandise and services trade, year upon year, are unsustainable. Last year's overall merchandise trade deficit reached a record high $166 billion. The figures just released for January of this year indicate that the growth is not slowing. The growth in our trade deficit is in fact accelerating. This is deeply troubling.

Mr. President, the soaring trade deficit is not just a matter of the volume of imports from abroad. A ballooning trade deficit affects the strength of the dollar, interest rates, the stock and bond markets, and the long-term attractiveness of the U.S. as a destination for investment. In other words, it threatens the standard of living of every American.

Despite the potential enormity of this problem, the administration has yet to focus on it as a real threat to working Americans. I am reminded that in the months and weeks leading up to the Mexico crisis, it seemed that no one in the administration was minding the store. We do not yet know the full extent of the fallout from that catastrophe. Mr. President, I hope we are not today headed down the same road with regard to our growing trade deficit. I hope those in the administration charged with watchfulness are not asleep a the witch.

Mr. President, we must not place our economic stability at risk. We must not allow warning signs to go unheeded. No single month's figures are conclusive, but when the bad numbers pile up month after month, they must not be ignored.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN LAHR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, yesterday's edition of the Montana Standard contained an article that I especially enjoyed reading. Let me share part of this article with my colleagues:

A special passenger train ran from Helena to Garrison and back Sunday to honor retiring Montana Power Company lobbyist John Lahr, a train buff * * *. Montana Rail Link furnished the engines; Burlington Northern provided several refurbished passenger cars * * * and the engineers union furnished the engineers for what was billed with banners on the engines as the ''John Lahr Special.''

When I read this I could not help but think how appropriate this tribute is; a special train to honor a very special man.

We hear a lot of bad talk about lobbyists these days. And, both in Helena and in Washington, there are some bad lobbyists; some who use strong-arm tactics; some who urge elected representatives to vote against the public interest.

But anybody who knows John Lahr has seen living proof that lobbying can be a noble profession. He is a class act. He's a Montanan through-and-through. And he wants what is best for our State.

For almost 30 years, John has represented Montana Power Co. Legislative session after legislative session, John has been there in Helena working tirelessly. And, while he has always been an advocate for Montana Power, he sticks to the facts; he's honest; he levels with people; and he's got what may be the best—and certainly the driest—sense of humor in all of Montana.

So perhaps it is not surprising that John—though a lifelong Democrat—enjoys universal respect from both Republicans and Democrats in Helena.

While John may be retiring from the power company, I have no doubt he will continue to play an important role in the life of our State. He has too many friends; he has too much talent and he cares too deeply about Montana to quietly retire.

I wish both John and his wife, Beverly, the best of luck as they begin a new chapter in their lives. And I feel very fortunate to count them as friends and trusted advisers.

TRIBUTE TO JEFF GRIFFITH

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tribute to Jeff Griffith, one of my former staffers who died recently here in Washington, DC be printed in the RECORD.

Jeff was one of the original members of my Senate staff, and I was deeply saddened by his death. While I know his family, friends and former colleagues will miss him terribly, as I will, I hope we will also remember his many accomplishments, and his passion for justice.

The tribute was offered on my behalf at the funeral service this past weekend.

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

TRIBUTE TO JEFF GRIFFITH

My name is Colin McGinnis, and I am a staffer for U.S. Senator Paul Wellstone. I was a friend and colleague of Jeff's. Paul was very sad that he wasn't able to be with Jeff's family and friends here because of several longstanding commitments in Minnesota, and has asked me to be here to represent him and my Wellstone staff colleagues. Paul asked me to read a message to you from him. He writes:

''While I cannot be with you today, I send my prayers and my heartfelt sympathies to Jeff's family and friends. Jeff was one of the first members of my Senate staff. I had known him for several years, and had worked with him on the Reverend Jesse Jackson's Presidential campaign and on the Rainbow Coalition's other important work for justice, so I knew that when the chance came to bring him on to my staff, I should jump at the chance. I did.

''He was talented, energetic, and creative in his work, and was admired and respected by his colleagues on staff, who often came to him for advice. He was also a fierce advocate for social justice.

''As one of my press assistants, Jeff did a wonderful job under often difficult circumstances. During the sometimes chaotic days of the Gulf War crisis, Jeff helped to establish our press operation; no easy task. He was also instrumental in the founding of my ''First Friday'' radio show. Thanks to his hard work in laying its foundation, it has been very successful. It still provides one of the most important ways that I communicate directly with Minnesotans.

''It is not by chance that this was Jeff's idea. The direct and participatory nature of this live radio program was a hallmark of his style, which always sought to bring people, real people, into the political process, and to make sure they were heard, even above the din and background static that often passes for political debate in our country.

''Jeff had a unique gift for hearing and amplifying the voices of regular people, and lifting up those voices for people in the wider community to hear.

''He knew instinctively that communication, if it is authentic, is always two-way, that his job was not just to sell my ideas and programs and policies to those whom I represent, but also to make sure I heard what the people were saying, to heed their voices and be accountable to them—especially those who are at society's margins. He never lost sight of these people, and always struggled to do what he could to bring them in toward the center. That was one of his life's most important missions: to bring those at the margins of our society back toward the center.

''As we celebrate Jeff's life and accomplishments today, and mourn his death, my wife Sheila and I, and the members of my staff, extend our deepest sympathy and condolences to his mother, Mrs. Ella Evans, his other family members, and to all his many friends who cared so much for him. We will miss Jeff very much, and keep you all in our prayers.''

I'd like to add a short personal note to Paul's letter, from my own experience working with Jeff. he was a strong, thoughtful, decent man, a person of integrity, and real commitment to people. He had a quiet grace and wisdom that was often striking. And because he had lived through his own struggles, he was always willing to listen to his friends and colleagues, in our struggles. He'd packed a lot of living into his young life, and was not unscarred by it. But that's just the point.

He knew suffering, and yet could look beyond it, redeem it, and get others to do the same. He was a wounded healer. A wounded healer whose life reminds us of how careful we must be with one another. And this concern for people translated from Jeff's personal life into his political life. In fact, people were at the center of his vision.

He was once asked, during a particularly stressful period, why he had decided to work in the political arena, and why he was willing to put up with all the long hours and struggles and stress that sometimes accompanies political life.

Without skipping a beat, he said simply, ''Because I build bridges. And Lord knows we need bridges now.'' I will remember him as a bridge-builder, with a warmth, generosity of spirit, sense of humor and passion for justice that is rare. I hope you will, too.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let's do that little pop quiz again. Today's question, again, is: How many million dollars are in $1 trillion? When you arrive at an answer, bear in mind that it was Congress that ran up a debt now exceeding $4.8 trillion.

Now then, to be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, March 21, the total federal debt—down to the penny—stood at $4,843,694,087,008.02—meaning that every man, woman and child in America now owes $18,386.75 computed on a per capita basis.

Mr. President, back to that pop quiz question, How many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion; and you can thank the U.S. Congress for the monstrous Federal debt exceeding $4.8 trillion.

TRIBUTE TO HELEN KAMM HATCH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I pay tribute today to an extraordinary woman. She was not famous. She was not wealthy. She was not formally educated. She won none of the coveted awards or accolades that we usually associate with achievement.

And yet, by anyone's measure, she was a rare and successful individual. She looked at life, both the good and the bad, and chose to shape her existence around the possible. She married and raised children in relative poverty, but taught her family what the wealth of love and hope means. She educated herself in life's classroom, constantly reading and absorbing. She reached out to those in need and gave kindness where none was expected.

Four of her nine children met early and untimely deaths. Still she looked forward. She expanded not only her mind but her many talents. She overcame challenges and embraced life's opportunities as they came, no matter what her age.

She was a woman of devout faith. Small in stature, she was large of heart and warm in spirit. Her home was a haven for friends and family.

Earlier this month, at the age of 89—and independent till her very last day—she completed her mortality. She is survived by 5 children, 39 grandchildren, 92 great-grandchildren, and 3 great, great-grandchildren.

Her name was Helen Kamm Hatch. And she was the mother of my friend and fellow colleague from Utah, Senator ORRIN G. HATCH. I am proud to be able to honor her memory. She will be sorely missed.

AN AUSPICIOUS ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week, friends of Ireland celebrated St. Patrick's Day in an atmosphere of hope. The guns have been silent in Northern Ireland for 6 months and it appears that the people of that conflict-torn land may at long last be on the irreversible road to peace.

Today, the British Government's Minister of State at the Northern Ireland Office, Michael Ancram, met with Loyalist paramilitary representatives, and Sinn Fein representatives and the British Government appear close to an agreement on an agenda for Ministerial talks to begin soon.

Most important, the people of Northern Ireland themselves are hopeful that this peace will last. The vast majority believe it is time to get on with talks. Irish citizens from Dublin and other parts of Ireland are traveling to Belfast in greater numbers because the fear of violence is disappearing. The people of Northern Ireland are going out in the evenings without fear of terrorist attacks. Peace is pervasive, and each day makes it harder for violence to return.

The United States has played a significant role in achieving this emerging peace, and great credit for it goes to President Clinton. He has taken risks for peace in Northern Ireland. He has embraced all those in Ireland who are willing to do the same. His foresight and judgment have been vindicated. Irish Americans congratulate him—but most of all, we thank him, and so do the people of Ireland, Protestant and Catholic alike.

The President and Mrs. Clinton hosted a reception on St. Patrick's Day at the White House which was an historic occasion itself. John Hume, John Alderdice, Gerry Adams and Gary McMichael—four men representing vastly different political views in Northern Ireland—were all in attendance. The evening was brought to a close when John Hume and Gerry Adams sang the poignant song, ''The Town I loved So Well.'' The final verses of the song, which is about John Hume's home town of Derry in Northern Ireland speaks to everyone who cares about this issue:

Now the music's gone but they carry on,
For their spirit's been bruised, never broken.
They will not forget, but their hearts are set
On tomorrow and peace once again.

For what's done is done, and what's won is won;
And what's lost is lost and gone forever.
I can only pray for a bright, brand new day
In the town I love so well.

Mr. President, only time will tell whether the bright, brand new day is finally here. But several recent articles verify the new optimistic mood and praise President Clinton for the role he has played. I ask unanimous consent that excellent articles by James F. Clarity in the New York Times, David Nyhan in the Boston Globe, Mary McGrory in the Washington Post, and Patrick J. Sloyan in Newsday, as well as the lyrics to ''The Town I Loved So Well,'' and an ad thanking President Clinton which appeared in the New York Times on St. Patrick's Day, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1995]

THE I.R.A.'S POLITICAL STRONGMAN

GERRY ADAMS SEEMS ABLE TO SUSTAIN TRUCE AND ADVANCE AIMS

(By James F. Clarity)

DUBLIN, March 21.—As a result of his delicate and much-publicized visit last week to New York, Washington and the White House, Gerry Adams appears to have strengthened himself considerably as the political leader of the Irish Republican Army, the man most Irish people think has great influence in sustaining the I.R.A. cease-fire now in its seventh month.

And Mr. Adams, back in Dublin, also seems to have achieved significant success on a number of tactical goals of Sinn Fein, the I.R.A.'s political arm.

At home, in the military council of the I.R.A., Mr. Adams, the president of Sinn Fein, has shown once again that his political efforts are bringing the Republican movement benefits and concessions it could not even dream of if the I.R.A. re-started the guerrilla warfare in Northern Ireland.

In addition to gaining the right to raise funds for political purposes in America, Mr. Adams was invited to meet and chat with the President of the United States, to talk and have his picture taken with Senator Edward M. Kennedy, to attend a White House party in a tuxedo, all proud signs that he and his movement have come a long way from the days when he led the I.R.A.'s Belfast Brigade and was interned by the British for his trouble. On television screens all over the world he achieved the major Republican goal of getting international attention for his argument that the British should relinquish power in their Northern Ireland province.

Perhaps the most significant result of all this, according to Irish officials and independent experts, is that Mr. Adams' influence with the I.R.A. has probably never been stronger, and that he seems to be easily strong enough in army councils to sustain the cease-fire, at least for several months. Tim Pat Coogan, a historian whose writings on the I.R.A. are standard reference material, said Mr. Adams and his No. 2 in Sinn Fein, Martin McGuinness, who also has a guerrilla background, now have effective control of the military organization.

Mr. Adams' diplomatic victories, the experts say, have made it more difficult for any I.R.A. commanders who may still be restless with the peace effort to gain support among their fighters for a resumption of attacks on military and civilian targets in the North. While the I.R.A. reportedly keeps going through the training motions of selecting putative targets, the Roman Catholics in the North, particularly in Belfast, press for continuing the talks, for trying to negotiate the early release of I.R.A. prisoners and for the reform of the overwhelmingly Protestant Royal Ulster constabulary, the police force.

Mr. Coogan, who has many friends in Sinn Fein, and other experts said that Northern Catholics and Protestants want negotiations that could bring their imprisoned fathers, husbands and sons home rather than military operations that risk more death and imprisonment. And, among politicians, the need to keep talking also reflects the rarely spoken fear that a particularly heinous violation of the cease-fire, one that killed several civilians or British police or soldiers, could still collapse the peace effort.

Mr. Coogan and Irish officials said that Mr. Adams was compelled to make a worth-the-price concession to the British in order to gain Mr. Clinton's approval of his visit: his agreement to discuss I.R.A. disarmament with British ministers. Asked this week if he was still ready to discuss I.R.A. disarmament at such talks, Mr. Adams said, ''Absolutely,'' but he declined to say how soon that might happen. Previously, Mr. Adams had insisted that disarmament could only be discussed at all-party talks, including Northern Ireland's Protestant leaders, as part of a final peace settlement.

Two weeks before he left for America, Mr. Adams said, ''Republicans are fairly patient,'' and would not expect to be included in all-party political tasks on disarmament, for three or four months.

Politically, outside the I.R.A., Mr. Adams has also won concessions. Until he and John Hume, the influential leader of the Catholic-dominated Social Democratic Labor Party, began a secret peace initiative two years ago, Sinn Fein was banned from the United States as a front for a terrorist organization.

Now Mr. Hume, once a political enemy whose candidate defeated Mr. Adams in the 1992 British Parlimentary election, has personally introduced Mr. Adams to Mr. Clinton in Washington. And Mr. Adams can visit America, raise money, and, most important, he was achieved an old Sinn Fein objective: pulling the White House directly and openly into-a mediator's role between the I.R.A. and the British. American pressure on London delights Sinn Fein and the I.R.A. because it influences, and sometimes vexes, the British Government.

Mr. Adam's agreement, under White House pressure, to discuss disarmament with British ministers was followed in a matter of days by a British concession on the issue Mr. Adams calls ''demilitarization'': the promised withdrawal of 400 British troops from the North.

And Mr. Adams has held on to the political support of the Irish Government of Prime Minister John Bruton, support that seemed weakened when Mr. Bruton replaced Albert Reynolds three months ago. Mr. Reynolds had urged Britain and the United States to trust the I.R.A.'s stated good intentions, to keep the cease-fire going even though they refused to renounce forever the option of returning to violence.

Mr. Reynolds welcomed Mr. Adams to Dublin to discuss peace at an open Government forum. Mr. Bruton had long been accused of being more sympathetic to the Protestants in the North who want to remain part of Britain than to the I.R.A. goal of a united Ireland free of British control.

Mr. Bruton has continued to nudge Mr. Adams on disarmament and on a categorial renunciation of violence, and he has emphasized that the Protestant unionist majority in the North has a right to reject a united Ireland in a referendum.

But Mr. Bruton has also given Mr. Adams a symbolic hand-shake and talked with him privately, and he urged the White House to let him visit last week. Some experts, invoking the Nixon-and-China principle, see Mr. Bruton as the Irish leader who has the best chance of gaining trust among Protestant unionists and persuading them to talk to Sinn Fein, eventually.

And Prime Minister Bruton, with the approval of all sides, seems willing to continue to play the role of referee in the sparring match between Sinn Fein and Britain, making sure that the predictable but sometimes sharp jabs are not struck too low and, with most of the audience hoping anxiously for a draw, that neither side tries for a knockout.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 22, 1955]

IRISH EYES SMILE ON CLINTON'S PEACEMAKING

(By David Nyhan)

But when I returned, Oh how my eyes did burn
To see how a town could be brought to its knees
By the armored cars and the bombed-out bars
And the gas that hangs on every breeze. . .
''The Town That I Love So Well''

President Clinton put it as plainly as it can be put Friday night: ''Those who take risks for peace are always welcome under this roof.''

The largely Hibernian crowd in the East Room for the White House St. Patrick's Day bash erupted. While some of the Ulster Orangemen may fulminate and Britain's John Major keeps Clinton's phone call on hold and the British papers go berserk, Clinton's daring little Irish play is working, and the crowd gave the boyish president his due.

The president was straight-faced, but you knew he had to be winking inside, when he said: ''The Irish knew then (in Thomas Jefferson's day) how to back a winner (the fledgling United States).'' But no one missed the irony: Major's Tory party had bet big on a George Bush victory, and Clinton's overture to the Irish Republican Army and its political mouthpiece, Gerry Adams, was a longshot that paid off handsomely.

It was John Hume who prevailed upon Ted Kennedy and his sister, Jean Smith, the U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Ireland: Convince Clinton to lift the visa restriction on Adams, the Sinn Fein spokesman, and allow him into the United States to raise money and visibility—and to hell with the British. Because Ted Kennedy is arguably Clinton's biggest bulwark on the left, Hume's initiative prevailed, Adams arrived here a year ago, and the pace was set for the cease-fire that now obtains.

Any president, who can, with some dextrous diplomatic jujitsu, end a 25-year-old, guerrilla war deserves some credit. And this crowd gave it to him. Irish Prime Minister John Bruton, a veteran back-bencher who suddenly emerged to lead the government, lavished gratitude upon Clinton ''for the role you have played personally, Mr. President.''

Four times as many Dubliners now travel north to Ulster every day to shop and spend and renew kinship ties, he said. ''There's a whole weight lifted off our shoulders,'' said Bruton. ''We're a happy land now.''

And it was the United States and ''the stand for decency the United States has taken on so many occasions'' that made the difference, Ireland's leader testified. ''The courage of the US has been the key factor in preserving the peace (in Europe) over 50 years. Thank you again for the tremendous good you have done for our country.''

Ireland may be grateful; Britain is hopping mad, if last weeks' London newspapers were any indication. To Britons, Adams' is the bearded visage of terrorism, the voice defending heinous bombers who killed kids, civilians, contractors, cab drivers, who blew up Harrods and Airey Neave and tried to kill Thatcher and did kill Mountbatten. Would

America like it if Britain's ruler invited the Lockerbie bombers to 10 Downing St. for tea? Not hardly.

But Clinton's gamble paid off. And he was toasted for it by a crowd that included plenty from around here. There were three O'Neills, enough Dunfeys to fill a bus and pairs of the following: Bulgers (the Senate president and son Bill), Flynns (Ambassador to the Vatican Ray and son Eddie), Kings (administration personnel czar Jim and son Patrick) and at least two Jesuits (BC President J. Donald Monan and former US Rep. Robert F. Drinan).

But the real pair of the evening came late, when many had left, and after Mark Gearan, the top Bay Stater on Clinton's staff, prevailed upon Bill Bulger Sr. to give us a tune. He responded with, ''I come from the County Kerry; I'm a typical Irish-man.'' But then, Bulger said yesterday, ''I saw John Hume give me the sign he had a song. So I called him up, and he did ''The Town I Love So Well.'' That tune is the traditional lament for Derry, Hume's battle-scarred hometown in the North.

Bulger: ''So then I gave Gerry Adams the sign to come up, and they did it as a duet.'' The sight and sound of Hume and Adams singing under Bulger's benign tutelage in the East Room, with the cease-fire holding, is all due to Clinton.

Bulger, back in Boston, said: ''This is a real success. It's incredible. Everyone had said 'no' to Adams. It was a real bold thing to do. The president broke that stalemate.''

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1995]

(By Mary McGrory)

IRISH EYES HAVE REASON TO SMILE

Bill Clinton had a grand moment in the East Room at his second St. Patrick's Day party. The Prime Minister of Ireland, John Bruton, said to him, ''We're a happy land now, thanks to the stand and courage that you and your colleagues have shown, Mr. President.'' He further told his host that he had been right and Dublin had been wrong about taking a chance on Sinn Fein. It was the kind of ungrudging, overflowing approval and vindication Clinton seldom hears. It was the stuff of ethnic campaign commercials.

But he missed a moment of triumph, a tableau of Irish unity and harmony that sent the audience into roaring raptures and left them with a memory for the generations.

The Clintons had left. The guests lingered. The Clintons, who forgot that the Irish rarely ''go gentle into that good night'' from a good party, sent down instructions for music to say good night to. Communications director Mark Gearan went to the piano, Billy Bolger, the little Caesar of the Massachusetts Senate and an eager tenor, was easily recruited and ''When Irish Eyes Are Smiling'' was heard once again. Suddenly Bolger stopped. ''I think we should hear from John Hume,'' he said.

Hume, the valiant leader of the Catholic party in Northern Ireland, came up and began to sing his theme song, ''The Town that I Love So Well.'' He was into the second or third verse when a dark, bearded figure joined him on the stage. It was Gerry Adams, and with arms around each other, they finished the song. The audience went wild. As soon as they recognized Adams, they began cheering, and as the pair continued, they stood up applauding. Adams's smile, for once, was not mocking or supercilious. 'History,'' they told each other, a settlement in song in the Clinton White House.

''Those who take risks for peace are always welcome under this roof,'' Clinton had said in his welcome to the prime minister. No one took a greater chance than Hume, the bright, careworn favorite of Irish-American politicians, who sought out the spokesman and Sinn Fein, the political arm of the terrorist IRA, was discovered, harassed, threatened to the point when he spent weeks in a hospital with a bleeding ulcer and a bad case of despair. Hume convinced our ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith and her brother, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, that Adams was the key. Kennedy prevailed upon the president, and a year ago February, while the British raged, Clinton gave Adams a visa for a 48-hour U.S. stay.

Adams maddens many because he insists on talking about Sinn Fein as if it were a stamp club. When arms and bombs and kneecappings and hideous murders of parents before the eyes of their children come up, he looks pained and recoils. What would he know about all that? But last August, he came through. A cease-fire came into effect, the Catholics and Protestants of Ulster began to breathe. The shadow of the gunman disappeared from the streets of Belfast. Plans for Anglo-Irish talks were resumed.

It's still a long way to Tipperary, but another milestone was passed when Clinton again leaned into the wind from London, and not only let Adams come to Washington and the White House, but let him raise money for Sinn Fein. Britain saw it as a cheap bid for the votes of America's 40 million Irish. Outrage led the British press. Adams raised $80,000 at one New York lunch, and the British boiled over with warnings that the money would go to buy arms to replace those that are supposed to be ''decommissioned.'' Not a farthing, Adams promised. John Major refused to take Clinton's calls.

But everyone at the White House gala was happy and hopeful, particularly the Bostonians, who outnumbered all others. Ray Flynn, Boston's erstwhile mayor and now Clinton's envoy to the Vatican, was telling people the good news that while on a confidential political mission to Pennsylvania, he had found out that Reagan Democrats had put aside their differences on gays in the military and such, and are coming home.

A number of nervous Irishmen seemed to have checked their misgivings at the door. They were delighted to be able to give their views in the splendors of the Executive Mansion. Gary McMichael of the Ulster Democratic Party had a good chat with Sen. Kennedy. Outside a handful of members of the Families Against Intimidation and Terror picketed and leafletted passersby. They were protesting the 46 beatings that have been administered by both sides, Unionists and IRA, since the cease-fire. Iron bars and clubs with nails are used. The protesters had hoped to be invited in, they were not but were assuaged by a visit to the Security Council the following morning.

On Sunday, Major resumed speaking to the president and expressed the hope of putting it all behind. Adams landed in Dublin and said, with his usual surprise that anyone would ask, that no one had pressured him on decommissioning arms.

[From Newsday, Feb. 27, 1995]

SINN FEIN BALKS AT DISARMING

(By Patrick J. Sloyan)

DUBLIN.—A plump dove, white on a purple backdrop, flew over the conference, streaming the Irish tricolor wrapped around the slogan: ''Create Peace: Unite Ireland.''

''Does anyone want to speak?'' Gerry Adams, president of Sinn Fein, asked delegates to its annual conference. ''We welcome your criticism.''

As the meeting of the Irish Republican Army's political wing droned to a close yesterday, Adams seemed miffed over news accounts of grumbling delegates. Some were dismayed by the tepid tone of freedom fighters turned peacemongers.

Owen Bennett stalked to the Mansion House microphone. ''No one can promise some future generation will not resort to arms to win self-determination,'' Bennett said. He was from south Armagh, a hotbed of IRA warfare for the past quarter of a century. A roar filled the hall.

Until the IRA ceasefire last August, many of the delegates lived by nationalist-intellectual Patrick Pearse's slogan: ''Life springs from death. And from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations.'' It was on a banner set discreetly to one side in the conference hall and was decorated not with doves but crossed rifles, a revolver and a pike.

Only a few blocks away is the Dublin post office seized on Easter 1916 by Pearse and comrades determined to end England's rule of Ireland. Now, 79 years later, Adams and the heirs to that uprising were closer than ever to that goal.

But handling doves, as Adams is learning, is far trickier than wielding a pike. The next step toward a permanent peace in Northern Ireland and the beginning of an eventual union between Irish north and south could be a difficult one for the IRA.

Before starting negotiations on the Belfast framework announced last week, British Prime Minister John Major wants the Sinn Fein to give up thousands of IRA rifles, rocket launchers, pistols and grenades and tons of hidden explosives.

''There has to be substantial progress made on the decommissioning of arms,'' Sir Patrick Mayhew said yesterday. He is the British government's Secretary of Northern Ireland and has refused to talk with Sinn Fein. Instead, his staff conducted preliminary talks on Mayor's behalf with Sinn Fein emissaries.

''We have told the British that Sinn Fein does not have any weapons,'' said Martin McGuinness, who represented the organization in talks with Mayhew's staff. Most delegates at Mission House will wink at that one. McGuinness is reputed to be military commander of the IRA, succeeding Adams in directing attacks in Northern Ireland.

But McGuinness drew applause with a reminder that it was Sinn Fein's unilateral initiative that produced the cease fire that has sparked the peace process.

''We told them, just in case the reality had escaped them, that the British government and the British army had not defeated the IRA; that the IRA had not surrendered and that the British government could not even remotely expect Sinn Fein to deliver that surrender for them,'' McGuinness said to cheers.

Adams has a counterproposal: decommission British and Unionist guns as well as IRA weapons. And demilitarize the province by eliminating 13,500 Royal Ulster Constabulary police at 161 stations and removing 19,000 British troops at 135 forts.

London is inching toward Sinn Fein demands. Border checkpoints have become largely unmanned traffic snarls. British army patrols have decreased dramatically, and soldiers have vanished from some areas. Some British government officials say troops could be withdrawn as security needs subside.

Dublin government officials see a precedent for Sinn Fein disarmament. When the 26 counties of the south won independence in 1937, the IRA turned over many of their weapons to help equip a new Irish army. ''But it would be difficult now,'' said an aide to Deputy Irish Prime Minister Dick Spring. ''Gerry Adams has to deal with the 'hard men' [extremists] in the Sinn Fein.''

One possible compromise would be the release of an estimated 600 IRA prisoners in Ulster and British prisons coinciding with a Dublin decommisssioning of IRA weapons.

In the meantime, Adams and Major's demand for IRA weapons is merely a dodge to stall the start of all-party talks, including Sinn Fein and Unionist paramilitary leaders as well as government officials from Dublin, Belfast, and London.

In response to Mayhew's statement yesterday demanding progress on disarmament, Adams said: ''He wants to make up his mind. It is a precondition of talks or it's not a precondition.''

The Sinn Fein leader was daring Major to obstruct an Irish peace process that has revived his slipping political fortunes in Britain. A Gallup Poll financed by the London Telegraph showed 92 percent of Britain voters supported the Belfast framework and 68 percent believed Ulster Unionists were wrong not to participate in the talks.

Another poll, commissioned by British television among Northern Ireland's Unionist voters, approved the plan. Ulster Marketing found 81 percent of the more moderate Unionist party members favored the framework, which also was supported by 61 percent on the more conservative Democratic Unionist Party.

''The British government position [on IRA disarmament] is untenable,'' said Sinn Fein's McGuinness. ''It has to change.''

THE TOWN I LOVED SO WELL

(Words and Music by Phil Coulter)

In my memory, I will always see
The town that I have loved so well,
Where our school played ball by the gas yard wall
And we laughed through the smoke and the smell.
Going home in the rain, running up the dark lane,
Past the jail and down behind the fountain—
There were happy days in so many, many ways
In the town I loved so well.

In the early morning the shirt factory horn
Called women from Creggan, the Moor and the Bog;
While the men on the dole played a mother's role,
Fed the children, and then walked the dog;
And when times got tough, there was just about enough;
And they saw it through without complaining:
For deep inside was a burning pride
In the town I loved so well.

There was music there in the Derry air
Like a language that we all could understand;
I remember the day that I earned my first pay
When I played in a small pick-up band.
There I spent my youth, and to tell you the truth,
I was sad to leave it all behind me:
For I'd learned about life, and I'd found a wife
In the town I loved so well.

But when I've returned how my eyes have burned
To see how a town could be brought to its knees;
By the armoured cars and the bombed-out bars,
And the gas that hangs on to every breeze:
Now the army's installed by that old gas yard wall
And the damned barbed wire gets higher and higher;
With their tanks and their guns, Oh my God what have they done
To the town I loved so well.

Now the music's gone but they carry on
For their spirit's been bruised, never broken;
They will not forget, but their hearts are set
On tomorrow and peace once again.
For what's done is done, and what's won is won;
And what's lost is lost and gone forever:
I can only pray for a bright, brand new day
In the town I love so well.

[From the New York Times, March 17, 1995]

IRISH EYES ARE SMILING

PRESIDENT CLINTON—THANK YOU VERY MUCH

(National Committee on American Foreign Policy, Inc.)

For the first time in a generation, 44 million Irish Americans can celebrate peace in Ireland.

This ''emergent vision of peace,'' as the poet Seamus Heaney has called it, allows us to celebrate St. Patrick's Day with a pride in our heart and warmth in our soul.

Many brave men and women, Protestant and Catholic, Irish and British, helped bring about this peace process.

So did their respective governments.

Countless Americans of all traditions and from every walk of life, worked so hard to make this miracle happens.

Moreover, the important role played by the men and women of the United States Congress, from both parties can never be forgotten.

Above all, Mr. President, we celebrate your role in making this peace possible.

Since your first day in office, you have shown a rare commitment to bringing peace to that ancestral land of your mother's roots.

Your involvement in encouraging all the political parties in Northern Ireland to come together was crucial.

Your vision in granting U.S. visas to leaders of the Republican and Loyalist communities, who now wish to take the gun forever out of Irish politics, was vital.

Your overall encouragement of the British and Irish governments as they signed their historic Joint Framework Document was inspiring.

By your actions, you have made clear how much the United States wants to help create the conditions for peace, justice and reconciliation in Ireland.

By your words, you have made clear your personal commitment to the framework for an agreed Ireland that can allow all of its people to live in peace.

By your support, you have inspired your fellow Irish Americans who will now redouble their efforts to ensure that the peace continues.

Another great Irish American, President Kennedy, stated that peace must be ''dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenges confronting it, for peace is a process, a way of solving problems.''

With your help, Mr. President, we can keep that peace and that process moving forward.

We salute you for your concern and for your caring.

And we thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

William J. Flynn, Chairman.

Dr. George D. Schwab, President.

We, the undersigned, wish to add our voice to that of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy.

Tom Barton, President, Marz Inc.

Charles J. Boyle, Executive Director, Ireland Chamber of Commerce in the USA, Inc.

Hon. Hugh L. Carey, former governor, State of New York, Executive Vice President, W.R. Grace & Co.

Stanley Q. Casey, Richardson, Mahon & Casey.

William J. Chambers, Chairman, Eirlink International.

Ed Cleary, AFL–CIO.

Elliot H. Cole, Esq., Partner, Patton Boggs, LLP.

John J. Connorton, Jr., Partner, Hawkins, Delafield & Wood.

Frank D. Cooney, Jr., Treasurer, County Asphalt, Inc.

John T. Cooney, Sr., Vice President, County Asphalt, Inc.

Robert A. Cooney, Associate Dean, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, CA.

Gerald Cummins, Chairman, Mancum Graphics, Inc.

Joanne Toor Cummings, Sr. Vice President, NCAFP

John T. Dee, President, Service America Corporation.

Thomas J. Degnan, President, In Progress Environment.

Roy E. Disney, Vice Chairman of the Board, The Walt Disney Company.

Robert J. Donahue, President, Patrons of the John F. Kennedy Trust, Inc.

Thomas R. Donohue, Secretary-Treasurer, AFL–CIO.

Cornelius (Connie) S. Doolan, Director, Trade Relations North America, Guinness Import Co.

Eamonn Doran, Restauranteur, New York/Dublin.

John A. Doyle, President, the Doyle Group, Inc.

Raymond G. Duffy, Vice President, Jefferson Smurfit Corporation.

Hon. Angier Biddle Duke, Chairman, Appeal of Conscience Foundation.

John R. Dunne, former US Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights

Seymour Maxwell Finger.

Hugh P. Finnegan, Partner, Siller, Wilk, & Mencher LLP.

John Fitzpatrick, CEO, North America, Fitzpatrick Family Group of Hotels.

Peter J. Flanagan, President, Life Insurance Council of New York.

Adrian Flannelly, President, Adrian Flannelly Irish Radio.

Edward T. Fogarty, President & CEO, Tambrands Inc.

Richard R. Fogarty, CEO & President, Labatt.

Michael J. Gibbons.

William P. Gibbons, Attorney at Law, Cleveland, Ohio.

Claire Grimes, CEO, Irish Echo Newspaper Corporation.

Dr. Os Guinness, The Trinity Forum.

Martin Hamrogue, General Manger, Operation Control, TWA.

Peter Hanrahan, partner, Keegan Hanrahan Architects, PC.

Patricia Harty, Editor-in-Chief, Irish America Magazine.

Margaret M. Heckler, former US Ambassador to Ireland.

John F. Henning, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO.

Hon. Alan G. Hevesi, Comptroller, City of New York.

Ray Hogan, Hogan Fragrances.

Peter J. Hooper.

Abassador F. Hoveyda, Executive Committee, NCAFP.

Carl F. Hughes, Chairman President & CEO, Fahey Bank.

Tom Ivory, CEO, Baker Street Bread.

Richard R. Joaquim, President, International Conference Resorts.

Philip M. Keating, Esq., David & Hagner.

Kevin Keegan, partner, Keegan Hanrahan Architects, PC.

Martin P. & Mary Kehoe.

Denis P. Kelleher, CEO, Wall Street Investor Services.

Michael P. Kelley, Vice President, Sales, Norcom Electronics.
Daniel J. Kelly, Group Managing Partner, Deloitte & Touche.
Patrick J. Keogh, President & CEO, Ireland Chamber of Commerce in the USA, Inc.
Herbert Kurz, Chairman, Presidential Life Insurance Company.
Michael J. Larkin, Executive Vice President, The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc.
Dr. Thomas J. Ledwith, Executive Director, United States Program, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
Edward S. Lewis, President, SPK/Lewis Inc.
Rev. Dr. Franklin H. Littell, Temple University.
Edmund E. Lynch, National Coordinator, Lawyers Alliance for Justice in Ireland, Inc.
Jack MacDonough, CEO, Miller Brewing Company.
Shirley Whelan MacRae, President, S.W. Management.
Edward G. Maher, Patrick J. Maher, President, Business Insurance Agency, Inc.
Annette Mahon, President, Belvedere Public Relations, Inc.
John F. X. Mannion, Chairman & CEO, Unity Mutual Life Insurance Company.
Edward I. Masterman, Esq., Masterman, Culbert & Tully.
John McCabe, Account Manager, Corporate Express.
Sean McCabe, Account Manager, Corporate Express.
James F. McCann, President, 1–800–Flowers.
William C. McCann, President & CEO, Allied Junction.
Jerome R. McDougal, President & CEO, River Bank America.
Gerald W. McEntee, President, The American Federation of State, County, & Municipal Employees.
Paschal McGuinness, 1st Vice President, International Brotherhood of Carpenters & President, Irish-American Labor Coalition.
Denis McInerney.
Mark P. McInerney, President, L.P. Cook Government Securities Inc.
Andrew J. McKenna, Chairman, President & CEO, Schwarz Paper Company.
William A. McKenna, Jr., Chairman & CEO, Ridgewood Savings Bank.
Hon. Timothy Connor McNamara, Columbia Consulting Group.
Thomas J. Moran, President & CEO, Mutual of America.
Bruce A. Morrison, former Member of Congress, Partner, Morrison & Swaine.
Sheillagh Mulready, Secretary/Treasurer, Patrons of the John F. Kennedy Trust, Inc.
James C. Nicholas, Executive Director, Connecticut World Trade Association, Inc.
Brian Nolan, Executive Vice President, Blarney Wollen Mills.
James J. O'Connon, President & CEO, The Annamor Group Ltd.
Niall O'Dowd, Publisher, Irish America Magazine.
Michael M. O'Driscoll, President, Cash's of Ireland.
John A. O'Malley, President, Executive Benefits Group. Inc.
Tice O'Sullivan, President, Diversified Management Services.
Joan Peters, Writer, Historian & Lecturer, Exec. Comm. Member & Trustee, NCAFP.
Ann Phillips, Member of the Board of Trustees, NCAFP.
William Pickens III, President, Bill Pickens Associates, Inc.
Edward J. Quinn, President, Worldwide Educational Services, Inc.
James L. Quinn, Law/CPA Offices of James J. Quinn.
Bryan Reidy, General Manager, Gallagher's Steak House, NYC.
Alan Richards.
Michael J. Roarty, President, Ireland-US Council for Commerce & Industry.
William J. Rudolf, Vice President, NCAFP.
Dennis G. Ruppel, President, MTD Technologies, Inc.
Dankwart A. Rustow, Distinguished Professor, City University of New York.
David L. Ryan, Vice President, The Doyle Group.
Kathleen Schmacht, Executive Vice President, E.C. Services, Inc.
Elizabeth Shannon, Writer, Boston University.
John T. Sharkey, New York City.
Stanley Shmishkiss, Chairman Emeritus, American Cancer Society Foundation.
John R. Silber, President, Boston University.
Richard Blake St. Francis.
Robert E. Sweeney, President, Robert E. Sweeney Co., L.P.A.
James D. Walker, Managing Director, VAT America.
Kevin J. Walsh, Partner, Kelley Drye & Warren.
Michael J. Walsh, President, Walsh Trading Company.
Stephanie Whiston.
Use of Organization name is solely for identification purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:39, a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Schaeffer, one of its clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1158. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1158. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–644. A communication from the Director of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–645. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's administrative and enforcement actions under the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–646. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to material violations of regulations relating to Treasury acutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–647. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction with the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–648. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction with the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–649. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the refunds of offshore lease revenues where a recoupment or refund is appropriate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–650. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Land and Minerals Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to compensatory royalty agreements for oil and gas for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–651. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the awarding of specific watershed restoration contracts within the range of the northern spotted owl; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–652. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the CFO's annual report relative to Federal Facility Compliance; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–653. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a fiscal year 1993 report relative to overweight vehicles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–654. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to volatile organic compound emmissions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–655. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to worker adjustment assistance training funds; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–656. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1994 report relative to the Treasury Forfeiture Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–657. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report required under the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimincation Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–658. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for activities under the Peace Corps Act for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–659. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the public diplomacy activities of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–660. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the revenue estimates with respect to the Mayor's budget's for fiscal years 1995 and 1996; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–661. A communication from the Chairman, Cost Accounting Standards Board, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual report for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–662. A communication from the from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Managing Federal Information Resources: Twelfth Annual Report Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–663. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of its administrative responsibilities during calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–664. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Board required under the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–665. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report required under the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–666. A communication from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to functional literacy requirements for inmates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–667. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the conversion of closed military installations into federal prison facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–668. A communication from the Chairperson of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Commission on Civil Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–669. A communication from the Chairman of the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to modifications to the program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–670. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's 1993 annual report; to the Committee on Small Business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North-South dialogue on the Korean Peninsula and the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework.

S. Con. Res. 3. A concurrent resolution relative to Taiwan and the United Nations.

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Jacquelyn L. Williams-Bridgers, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of State.

Philip C. Wilcox, Jr., of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Coordinator for Counter Terrorism.

Ray L. Caldwell, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Burdensharing.

Gloria Rose Ott, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1996, vice Weldon W. Case, term expired.

Harvey Sigelbaum, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1996, vice Carolyn D. Leavens, term expired.

George J. Kourpias, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1997.

John Chrystal, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1997.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I also report favorably three nomination lists in the Foreign Service which were printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1995, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar, that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The following-named persons of the agencies indicated for appointment as Foreign Service Officers of the classes stated, and also for the other appointments indicated herewith:

For appointment as Foreign Service Officers of Class Two, Consular Officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Luis E. Arreaga-Rodas, of Virginia

For appointment as Foreign Service Officers of Class Three, Consular Officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Jeanne F. Bailey, of the District of Columbia

For appointment as Foreign Service Officers of Class Four, Consular Officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Richard K. Bell, of Pennsylvania
Robert Emilio Gianfranceschi, of Florida
Steven Scott Giegerich, of New York
Russell W. Jones, Jr., of Illinois
Douglas David Jones, of Maryland
Robert Pearce Kepner, of Pennsylvania
Woo Chan Lee, of California
Duke G. Lokka, of California
Helen Osborne Lovejoy, of Virginia
Marcus Robert John Micheli, of Connecticut
Kimberly Haroz Murphy, of Texas
Michael J. Murphy, of Virginia
Christine M. Osage, of Virginia
Thomas C. Pierce, of Oregon
Debbie Lynn Potter, of Washington
Christopher John Rowan, of Tennessee
Leo Francis Voytko, Jr., of Virginia
Robert B. Waldrop, of Illinois
Amy P. Westling, of Wyoming
Craig Michael White, of Virginia
Elizabeth Moberly Wolfson, of Texas

The following-named Members of the Foreign Service of the Departments of State and Commerce to be Consular Officers and/or Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, as indicated:

Consular Officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

John Lowell Armstrong, of Minnesota
James L. Barnes, of the District of Columbia
Sharon E. Betzner, of Virginia
Deborah L. Bienstock, of Maryland
David Mark Birdsey, of New Jersey
Philip C. Bishop, of Virginia
Robert Allan Blum, of Maryland
Gary D. Brooks, of Virginia
Darryl J. Carson, of Virginia
Thomas Hartwell Carter, of New York
Daniel L. Chase, of Virginia
Ann Elizabeth Cody, of Virginia
David L. Cornelius, of Maryland
James M. Corr, of the District of Columbia
Richard R. Craig, of Connecticut
Glenda Cunningham, of Virginia
Philippa L. DeRamus, of Virginia
Eve M. Derrickson, of Maryland
David J. Dolaher, Jr., of Virginia
Katherine O'Brien Duffy, of South Carolina
Kyle Mark Dunlap, of Virginia
Joel Ehrendreich, of Wisconsin
Silvia Eiriz, of New York
Laura Evelyn Ewald, of Virginia
Herbert Ford, of Virginia
Thomas Fox, of Virginia
Thomas P. Gallagher, of California
Gregory Lawrence Garland, of Florida
Nicholas Joseph Giacobbe, Jr., of Virginia
Joseph Gionfriddo, of Virginia
Gordon R. Goetz, of Virginia
Christopher T. Griffin, of Virginia
Ronald C. Hammond, Jr., of Virginia
Keith A. Hansen, of Virginia
Bonita G. Harris, of Texas
Lawrence A. Hatch, of Virginia
Patrick Michael Heffernan, of New Hampshire
Kristi D. Hendricks, of Virginia
Donald K. Hepburn, of Virginia
G. Kathleen Hill, of Texas
Alan Rand Holst, of Minnesota
John W. Holton, Jr., of Virginia
Howell Hoffman Howard III, of Washington
Ty D. Hudson, of Virginia
Clarence Edward Hunt, of Virginia
Victor J. Huser, of Texas
Marc C. Johnson, of the District of Columbia
Joseph B. Kaesshaefer, of Florida
Tina S. Kaidanow, of Virginia
Thomas Alexander Kelsey, of Florida
Peter Kiemel, of Virginia
In Kuk Kim, of Virginia
Jessica Erin Lapenn, of New York
Dean LaRue, of Washington
Timothy Kent Lattig, of Virginia
Mark W. Libby, of Connecticut
John David Lippeatt, of California
Jennie S. Liston, of Virginia
Bruce A. Lohof, of Montana
Joe Bernard Lovejoy, Jr., of Texas
Michael Peter Macy, of Wisconsin
Larry W. Magnuson, M.D., of Virginia
Joseph L. Malpica, of Virginia
William L. Marshak, of Washington
Stephen P. McKeon, of Virginia

Karen Sue Miller, of Michigan
Elizabeth J. Mirabile, of Virginia
Robert A. Montgomery, of Virginia
John S. Moore, of Maryland
Michael K. Morris, of Virginia
Gerald Nau, of Virginia
Phillip Roderick Nelson, of Virginia
Elisha Edward Nyman, of Massachusetts
Peter B. Nyren, of Virginia
Mary J. Osborne, of Virginia
Joyce Ann Park, of Virginia
Benjamin Perez, Jr., of Virginia
Patricia Ellen Perrin, of California
Lynne G. Platt, of the District of Columbia
Michael F. Podratsky, of Virginia
Teresa St. Cin Podratsky, of Virginia
Jennifer Austrian Post, of Virginia
Timothy Joel Pounds, of Virginia
David Matthew Purl, of Alaska
Michael E. Quigley, of Delaware
Joel Richard Reifman, of Texas
Susan Longino Reinert, of California
Judith D. Russ, of Maryland
Mark M. Schlachter, of Nebraska
Jeffery D. Schoeneck, of Virginia
Mary Drake Scholl, of Oklahoma
Robert Kenneth Scott, of Maryland
Eric A. Shimp, of Iowa
Paul S. Silberstein, of Maryland
Fredric W. Stern, of California
Robin D. Stern, of California
Nan Forsyth Stewart, of Oregon
Thomas P. Teifke, of Virginia
Carolyn E. Tholan, of Virginia
Donn-Allan G. Titus, of Florida
Lynne M. Tracy, of Georgia
John C. Vance, of Montana
Kurt Frederick van der Walde, of Virginia
Elizabeth Walsh, of Virginia
William James Weissman, of California
Mark Lawrence Wenig, of Alaska
Edward A. White, of Georgia
Burke Alan Wiest, of Virginia
Anita D. Wilson, of Virginia
Scott R. Wright, of Virginia
Jeffrey A. Wuchenich, of the District of Columbia

The following-named Career Members of the Senior foreign Service of the United States Information Agency for promotion in the Senior Foreign Service to the classes indicated:

Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Minister—Counselor:
John Thomas Burns, of Florida
Carl D. Howard, of Maryland
Thomas Neil Hull III, of New Hampshire
William Henry Maurer, Jr., of Virginia
Robert E. McCarthy, of Virginia
Marjorie Ann Ransom, of the District of Columbia
Stanley N. Schrager, of Virginia

The following-named Career Members of the Foreign Service of the United States Information Agency for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service as indicated:

Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Counselor:
Michael Hugh Anderson, of Minnesota
William R. Barr, of Maryland
James L. Bullock, of Texas
Anne M. Chermak, of California
Patrick J. Corcoran, of Virginia
Donna Millons Culpepper, of Virginia
Albert W. Dalgliesh, Jr., of Michigan
Carol Doerflein, of Florida
John Davis Hamill, of Ohio
Hugh H. Hara, of Maryland
Joe B. Johnson, of Texas
Katherine Inez Lee, of California
Jack Richard McCreary, of California
Lois Winner Mervyn, of Arizona
William M. Morgan, of California
Eugene A. Nojek, of Virginia
Helen B. Picard, of Virginia
Stephen R. Rounds, of New Hampshire
Craig Butler Springer, of Connecticut
Louise Taylor, of Virginia
Francis B. Ward III, of Virginia
Van S. Wunder III, of Florida

The following-named Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the Department of Agriculture for promotion in the Senior Foreign Service to the classes indicated:

Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Career Minister:
Christopher E. Goldthwait, of New York

Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Minister-Counselor:
Franklin D. Lee, of Virginia
Richard T. McDonnell, of Virginia

The following-named Career Member of the Foreign Service of the Department of Agriculture for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service to the class indicated:

Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Counselor:
William L. Brant II, of Oklahoma

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 103–25 Treaty Convention on Conventional Weapons (Exec. Rept. 104–1).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. REID, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 587. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Old Spanish Trail and the Northern Branch of the Old Spanish Trail for potential inclusion into the National Trails System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 588. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to rules governing litigation contesting termination or reduction of retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LUGAR, and Mrs. KASSEBAUM):

S. 589. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to permit Governors to limit the disposal of out-of-State solid waste in their States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. 590. A bill for the relief of Matt Clawson; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Ang Tsering Sherpa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 592. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and the National Labor Relations Act to modify certain provisions, to transfer certain occupational safety and health functions to the Secretary of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. COATS):

S. 593. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the export of new drugs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 594. A bill to provide for the Administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 595. A bill to provide for the extension of a hydroelectric project located in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow deductions for advertising and promotional expenses for tobacco products; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 597. A bill to insure the long-term viability of the medicare, medicaid, and other federal health programs by establishing a dedicated trust fund to reimburse the government for the health care costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise taxes on tobacco products, and to use a portion of the resulting revenues to fund a trust fund for tobacco diversification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 599. A bill to eliminate certain welfare benefits with respect to fugitive felons and probation and parole violators, and to facilitate sharing of information with law enforcment officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. REID, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 587. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Old Spanish Trail and the northern branch of the Old Spanish Trail for potential inclusion into the National Trails System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

OLD SPANISH TRAIL DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I'm sending legislation to the desk to designate the Old Spanish Trail and the northern branch of the Old Spanish Trail for study for potential addition to the National Trails System.

The Old Spanish Trail has been called the ''longest, crookedest, most arduous pack mule route in the history of America.'' Linking two quaint pueblo outposts, Villa Real de Sante Fe de San Francisco—now known as Santa Fe; and El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora La Reina de Los Angeles—present day Los Angeles—this 1,200 mile route was a well worn path 150 years ago as annual caravans traded woolen blankets from New Mexico for California horses and mules.

According to an early historian, the trail:

* * * Headed Northwest from Santa Fe * * * eased over the Continental Divide in northern New Mexico, cut through a spur of the Rocky Mountains into Colorado, forded two swift rivers (the Colorado and the Green above their junction), circled northward to avoid the Grand Canyon's sculptured country, dipped over the rim of the Great Basin into Utah, and crept southwest through desert stretches of Nevada and California to Los Angeles * * * Hoofs of pack animals leave but fleeting imprints. As soon as the last mule train and left the Trail, nature closed in to obliterate marks of human intrusion. Matted brush sprang up to hide the mountain paths. Flash floods gullied the gravel courses beside the streams. Chalky gypsum surfaced the dry lake bottoms, so welcome to the hoofs of foot-sore mules. Wind-born sand drifted over the shallow trace through the wastelands. Even the dry bones that marked the toll of an insatiable desert's greed crumbled to dust.

The trail entered present day Colorado south of Pagosa Springs and proceeded northwesterly past today's settlements of Arboles, Ignacio, Durango, Mancos, Dolores, and Dove Creek. This is essentially the route used by Fathers Dominguez and Escalante in 1776. Unlike Dominguez and Escalante, the trail continued to the northwest toward the site of present day Monticello and crossed the Grand (Colorado) River at Moab and the Green River, 5 miles north of today's settlement of Green River. It continued westerly and passed the present settlements of Castle Dale, Salina, Sevier, Parowan, Newcastle, and St. George in Utah.

Another historic trade route, known as the northern branch of the Old Spanish Trail, was used by trappers and traders to access northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah. This route followed the east side of the Rio Grande river northward to Taos and into Colorado to the area near the present town of Alamosa. Another route of the northern branch followed the west side of the Rio Grande northward to Tres Piedras, New Mexico, and to Antonito, Colorado, and joined the other branch near Monte Vista. From the vicinity of Monte Vista, the trail continued northwesterly and passed the present day settlements of Saguache, Gunnison, Montrose, Delta, and Grand Junction. From Grand Junction, the trail followed the Grand (Colorado) River for some 50 miles through Fruita and Loma to near Dewey, UT, and then struck out northeast across the desert and joined the main Spanish Trail approximately 20 miles southeast of the Green River crossing.

The northern branch was less used than the main Spanish Trail and very little is recorded concerning its use. Antoine Robidoux's trading fort, near Delta, was a principal outpost on the trail.

The first person to record his journey from Santa Fe to Los Angeles was Antonio Armejo, who went on a trading expedition in 1829. His route had never been properly documented until 10 years ago when a historian from the University of Nevada began a study of the origins of the trail for her masters thesis. Much of what we know about the trail comes from recent scholarship and there is obviously much left to learn.

A journey over the Spanish Trail and the northern branch in 1848 was later recorded by Lt. George B. Brewerton. The young lieutenant accompanied a party of some 30 men which included the noted scout, Kit Carson. Carson was carrying mail from Los Angeles to the East Coast. The party left Los Angeles on May 4 and reached Santa Fe via Taos on June 14, 41 days later. Carson proceeded east, reaching Washington, DC in mid-August, bringing news of the discovery of gold in California, and the great gold rush was on.

Another description of the northern branch of the Old Spanish Trail in Colorado is told in the report of the Gunnison Expedition. In 1853, Capt. John Williams Gunnison, of the U.S. Corps of Topographic Engineers, was commissioned by the War Department to find a route for the railroad across the Colorado Rockies along the 38th Parallel. The party of 31 men and 32 U.S. Army Dragoons left Fort Leavenworth, KS, on June 23, 1853. Among the civilians were a topographer, an artist-topographer, an astronomer, a botanist, a geologist-surgeon, and a wagon master and his crew to manage the 18-unit wagon train.

After crossing the Sangre de Cristo Range, north of La Veta Pass, the Gunnison Expedition came upon the northern branch of the Spanish Trail in the San Luis Valley. Captain Gunnison followed this existing trade route of the northern branch of the Spanish Trail into eastern Utah where it joined the main Spanish Trail. The Gunnison Expedition came to a tragic end on October 26, 1853, when Gunnison and four of his men and three soldiers were killed in a skirmish with Indians near the present site of Delta, UT.

The Old Spanish Trail played a part in all the cultures that occupied the West: the Utes, Navajos, Spaniards, Mexicans, and American settlers, including the mormons. The trail's period of use, from 1830 to the 1880's spans the development of the West, from the Spaniard on foot to the great railways. Few routes, if any, pass through as much relatively pristine country as the Old Spanish Trail, particularly in northwest New Mexico, western Colorado, central Utah, southern Nevada and southern California. A number of independent scholars and various researchers have begun separate studies of different segments of the trail, and an Old Spanish Trail Assoc. was recently founded in Colorado to study and preserve this trail, and raise the public awareness of our country's diverse cultural heritage in this region. Some of the members of the association have already located wagon ruts and other vestiges of the trail's heyday, and a proper study is certain to produce more such exciting echoes of our shared heritage.

These is a groundswell of support for a study of the Old Spanish Trail. I've received resolutions to designate the trail as historic from over 20 municipalities in Colorado, as well as the Colorado General Assembly. There are also a number of volunteer groups along the trail who are anxious to offer their services, expertise and assistance to this very exciting and long overdue endeavor.

The time has come to acknowledge the national historical importance of the Old Spanish Trail. Mr. President, this bill to designate the Old Spanish Trail for study for potential addition to the National Trails System promotes the recognition, protection and interpretation of our history in the West. By introducing this legislation today, we pay tribute to the cultures of the West, and to an important period in American history.

I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(36) The Old Spanish Trail, beginning in Santa Fe, New Mexico, proceeding through Colorado and Utah, and ending in Los Angeles, California, and the Northern Branch of the Old Spanish Trail, beginning near Espanola, New Mexico, proceeding through Colorado, and ending near Crescent Junction, Utah.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 588. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to rules governing litigation contesting termination or reduction with respect to rules governing litigation contesting termination or reduction of retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last week on the floor of the Senate I spoke about the struggles of the 1,200 retirees

of the John Morrell meatpacking plant in Sioux Falls, who, along with over 2,000 other company retirees around the country, found out in January that their health benefits—benefits they believed they would have for life—were being abruptly terminated. These retirees, many of whom had accepted lower pensions in return for the promise of lifetime health benefits, were suddenly faced with the prospect of paying up to $500 a month per couple for health insurance or losing the benefits that they had assumed would be available during their retirement years.

Today I am introducing legislation to help these retirees and their families; legislation that would restore their health benefits as they seek redress in court and establish protections against such arbitrary behavior by employers in the future.

My bill would protect retirees' health benefits in two ways:

First, it would require employers to continue to provide retiree health benefits while a cancellation of benefits is being challenged in court. Anyone who has dealt with our legal system and its long waiting periods and delays knows the importance of this measure.

Why should anyone who has worked for 20 or 30 years be forced to spend his or her life savings on health insurance—or go without health insurance entirely—while their pleas for simple justice wind through the courts?

Second, my bill would eliminate the surprise nature of employee health benefit cancellations by requiring employers to prove they had warned workers in advance, before they retire, that their future benefits could be canceled at some time in the future. That seems only fair.

This legislation recognizes that health benefits are not charity. Many workers give up larger pensions and other benefits in exchange for them. It never occurs to these workers that their benefits could be taken away, with no increase in their pensions or other benefits to compensate for the loss.

Many workers stay with the same company for dozens of years, perhaps all of their adult lives. They believe that a company they help build will reward their loyalty, honesty, and hard work.

Unfortunately, this is not always the case, as the 3,300 retirees of John Morrell & Co. found out only a week before their benefits were terminated.

In this particular case, Morrell retirees received a simple, yet unexpected, letter stating their health insurance plan was being terminated, effective midnight, January 31, 1995—only a week later. The benefits being terminated, the letter said, included all hospital, major medical, and prescription drug coverage, Medicare supplemental insurance, vision care, and life insurance coverage.

For those retirees under 65, this action poses a particular problem. While Morrell gave them the option of paying for their own coverage for up to 1 year, few can afford the $500 monthly premium for a couple. And many cannot purchase coverage at any price, because of preexisting conditions like diabetes or heart disease. Medicare beneficiaries would have to buy expensive supplemental insurance on their own.

Morrell's decision was all the more painful to the retirees because it was so unexpected. These retirees believed they worked for a fair company; that a fair day's work resulted in a fair day's pay. Part of a fair day's pay is the retirement income and benefits employees earn through their service.

These retirees found out the hard way that the company they had helped to build had turned its back on them.

They also found out that the court system was not sympathetic to their cause. An Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling allowed the company to take this action. The union representing the retirees plans to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court.

Sadly, some of the retirees won't live long enough to benefit from a possible reversal.

These proud and hard-working people now worry that high medical costs will impoverish them or force them to rely on their children or the government for financial help. Each day they live in fear of illness and injury because they have no health insurance.

Because this legislation is not just for the Morrell retirees, because what happened to these workers is not an isolated situation—it could happen to any of the 14 million retired workers who believe they and their families have life-long health insurance coverage through their employers.

Two-thirds of American companies surveyed recently had plans to reduce retiree health benefits or to shift more costs to retirees.

The Morrell dispute is one of 35 cases nationwide in which retirees are suing their former companies for slashing those benefits, or cutting them altogether.

As I have said repeatedly, the long-run solution is comprehensive health reform that guarantees every American—and employer—access to affordable health care.

I have fought over the years for this kind of comprehensive reform and was deeply disappointed when the 103d Congress was unable to pass legislation addressing some of our health care system's most serious problems. If we had passed health reform, the Morrell retirees would not be facing this loss of their health benefits today.

Clearly, the problems we talked about in last year's health reform debate did not solve themselves when the session ended.

And some of these problems, like the one the Morrell retirees face, cannot wait for the long-run. These retirees cannot wait for the resolution of the health reform debate.

The new majority in Congress seems to believe the solution to all our problems—economic, social, moral, you name it—is passing their so-called Contract With America.

I believe the solution is restoring the old contract between workers and employers. The contract that said if you work hard, you can get ahead. The contract that said if you give a company 20 or 30 years of loyal service, you can retire with dignity. The contract that said if you give someone your word, you will keep it.

Restoring that contract must be our ultimate aim.

In the meantime, I am determined to work with my colleagues in Congress to make sure retirees can keep their health insurance while they wait for their day in court, and to be sure that no other retirees get an unexpected letter in the mail, similar to the one the Morrell retirees received.

That is the goal of the legislation that I am introducing today.

I hope we can pass this measure expeditiously, to end the injustice of the Morrell situation, and so that others never have to face the problem Morrell retirees are grappling with today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Retiree Health Benefits Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. RULES GOVERNING LITIGATION INVOLVING RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 5 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 516. RULES GOVERNING LITIGATION INVOLVING RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS.

''(a) MAINTENANCE OF BENEFITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

''(A) retiree health benefits or plan or plan sponsor payments in connection with such benefits are to be or have been terminated or reduced under an employee welfare benefit plan; and

''(B) an action is brought by any participant or beneficiary to enjoin or otherwise modify such termination or reduction,

the court without requirement of any additional showing shall promptly order the plan and plan sponsor to maintain the retiree health benefits and payments at the level in effect immediately before the termination or reduction while the action is pending in any court. No security or other undertaking shall be required of any participant or beneficiary as a condition for issuance of such relief. An order requiring such maintenance of benefits may be refused or dissolved only upon determination by the court, on the basis of clear and convincing evidence, that the action is clearly without merit.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action if—

''(A) the termination or reduction of retiree health benefits is substantially similar to a termination or reduction in health benefits (if any) provided to current employees

which occurs either before, or at or about the same time as, the termination or reduction of retiree health benefits, or

''(B) the changes in benefits are in connection with the addition, expansion, or clarification of the delivery system, including utilization review requirements and restrictions, requirements that goods or services be obtained through managed care entities or specified providers or categories of providers, or other special major case management restrictions.

''(3) MODIFICATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall preclude a court from modifying the obligation of a plan or plan sponsor to the extent retiree benefits are otherwise being paid by the plan sponsor.

''(b) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In addition to the relief authorized in subsection (a) or otherwise available, if, in any action to which subsection (a)(1) applies, the terms of the employee welfare benefit plan summary plan description or, in the absence of such description, other materials distributed to employees at the time of a participant's retirement or disability, are silent or are ambiguous, either on their face or after consideration of extrinsic evidence, as to whether retiree health benefits and payments may be terminated or reduced for a participant and his or her beneficiaries after the participant's retirement or disability, then the benefits and payments shall not be terminated or reduced for the participant and his or her beneficiaries unless the plan or plan sponsor establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the summary plan description or other materials about retiree benefits—

''(1) were distributed to the participant at least 90 days in advance of retirement or disability;

''(2) did not promise retiree health benefits for the lifetime of the participant and his or her spouse; and

''(3) clearly and specifically disclosed that the plan allowed such termination or reduction as to the participant after the time of his or her retirement or disability.

The disclosure described in paragraph (3) must have been made prominently and in language which can be understood by the average plan participant.

''(c) REPRESENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee representative of any retired employee or the employee's spouse or dependents may—

''(1) bring an action described in this section on behalf of such employee, spouse, or dependents; or

''(2) appear in such an action on behalf of such employee, spouse or dependents.

''(d) RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'retiree health benefits' means health benefits (including coverage) which are provided to—

''(1) retired or disabled employees who, immediately before the termination or reduction, have a reasonable expectation to receive such benefits upon retirement or becoming disabled; and

''(2) their spouses or dependents.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 515 the following new item:

''Sec. 516. Rules governing litigation involving retiree health benefits.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions relating to terminations or reductions of retiree health benefits which are pending or brought, on or after March 23, 1995.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LUGAR, and Mrs. KASSEBAUM):

S. 589. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to permit Governors to limit the disposal of out-of-State solid waste in their States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Interstate Transportation of Municipal Solid Waste Act of 1995. For the past 5 years, I have fought to give all States and local communities the right to say ''No'' to out-of-State trash. I am convinced that interstate waste legislation is necessary so that States and communities can intelligently plan their waste disposal needs.

As interstate waste legislation has traveled through the Senate and the House, we have learned important principles in the effort to protect importing States while allowing exporters sufficient time to adjust to new rules. My bill incorporates these important principles.

First, my bill allows the importing States to ratchet down the amount of trash they receive. Beginning in 1997, landfills and incinerators that receive more than 50,000 tons of trash may reduce the amount of out-of-State trash they import.

Second, my bill requires the exporting States to reduce the amount of trash that they export by certain target dates. This provision allows for a gradual adjustment on the part of the large exporting States.

Third, my bill allows all States to choose between 1993 and 1994 freeze levels. This provision ensures flexibility without sacrificing protection from flow levels that fluctuate.

Finally, my bill will provide additional backup authority to limit waste flows by allowing the State planning and permitting process to take into account local need when siting new capacity. Under this provision, a State could deny a permit for construction or operation of a new landfill based on the fact that there is no local or regional need.

The flow of waste across State lines is not a new problem. States like Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Indiana have suffered under the tremendous volumes of out-of-State waste. States have tried to stop the growing shipments of interstate waste by enacting legislation that restricts the flow. Yet, courts have held many of these laws in violation of the commerce clause and therefore unconstitutional. In order to address the constitutional question, Congress must legislate the issue.

During the past 5 years, Congress has come close to giving the States the power to enact interstate waste legislation. Many of my colleagues have worked very hard to see that this is finally accomplished. We have had to give and take on both sides. I am hopeful that this is the year that Congress can complete the task.

This legislation issues a simple plea for each community, each State, to be responsible for the environment, and accountable for the trash they generate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 589

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Interstate Transportation of Municipal Waste Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL WASTE.

Subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL WASTE

''SEC. 4011. (a) AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT OUT-OF-STATE MUNICIPAL WASTE.—(1)(A) Except as provided in subsection (b), if requested in writing by an affected local government, a Governor may prohibit the disposal of out-of-State municipal waste in any landfill or incinerator that is subject to the jurisdiction of the Governor or the affected local government.

''(B) Prior to submitting a request under this section, the affected local government shall—

''(i) provide notice and opportunity for public comment concerning any proposed request; and

''(ii) following notice and comment, take formal action on any proposed request at a public meeting.

''(2) Beginning with calendar year 1995, a Governor of a State may, with respect to landfills covered by the exceptions provided in subsection (b)—

''(A) notwithstanding the absence of a request in writing by the affected local government—

''(i) limit the quantity of out-of-State municipal waste received for disposal at each landfill in the State to an annual quantity equal to the quantity of out-of-State municipal waste received for disposal at the landfill during the calendar year 1993 or 1994, whichever is less; and

''(ii) limit the disposal of out-of-State municipal waste at landfills that received, during calendar year 1993, documented shipments of more than 50,000 tons of out-of-State municipal waste representing more than 30 percent of all municipal waste received at the landfill during the calendar year, by prohibiting at each such landfill the disposal, in any year, of a quantity of out-of-State municipal waste that is greater than 30 percent of all municipal waste received at the landfill during calendar year 1993; and

''(B) if requested in writing by the affected local government, prohibit the disposal of out-of-State municipal waste in landfill cells that do not meet the design and location standards and leachate collection and ground water monitoring requirements of State law and regulations in effect on January 1, 1993, for new landfills.

''(3)(A) In addition to the authorities provided in paragraph (1)(A), beginning with calendar year 1997, a Governor of any State, if requested in writing by the affected local government, may further limit the disposal of out-of-State municipal waste as provided

in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) by reducing the 30 percent annual quantity limitation to 20 percent in each of calendar years 1998 and 1999, and to 10 percent in each succeeding calendar year.

''(B)(i) A State may ban imports from large exporting States if the volumes of municipal solid waste exported by those States did not meet reduction targets.

''(ii) A ban under clause (i) may prohibit imports from States that export more than—

''(I) 3,500,000 tons in calendar year 1996;

''(II) 3,000,000 tons in calendar year 1997;

''(III) 3,000,000 tons in calendar year 1998;

''(IV) 2,500,000 tons in calendar year 1999;

''(V) 2,500,000 tons in calendar year 2000;

''(VI) 1,500,000 tons in calendar year 2001; or

''(VII) 1,500,000 tons in calendar year 2002;

''(VIII) 1,000,000 tons in any calendar year after 2002,

excluding any volume legitimately covered by a host community agreement.

''(4)(A) Any limitation imposed by the Governor under paragraph (2)(A)—

''(i) shall be applicable throughout the State;

''(ii) shall not discriminate against any particular landfill within the State; and

''(iii) shall not discriminate against any shipments of out-of-State municipal waste on the basis of State of origin.

''(B) In responding to requests by affected local governments under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(B), the Governor shall respond in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular landfill within the State and does not discriminate against any shipments of out-of-State municipal waste on the basis of State of origin.

''(5)(A) Any Governor who intends to exercise the authority provided in this paragraph shall, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, submit to the Administrator information documenting the quantity of out-of-State municipal waste received for disposal in the State of the Governor during calendar years 1993 and 1994.

''(B) On receipt of the information submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall notify the Governor of each State and the public and shall provide a comment period of not less than 30 days.

''(C) Not later than 60 days after receipt of information from a Governor under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall determine the quantity of out-of-State municipal waste that was received at each landfill covered by the exceptions provided in subsection (b) for disposal in the State of the Governor during calendar years 1993 and 1994, and provide notice of the determination to the Governor of each State. A determination by the Administrator under this subparagraph shall be final and not subject to judicial review.

''(D) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish a list of the quantity of out-of-State municipal waste that was received during calendar years 1993 and 1994 at each landfill covered by the exceptions provided in subsection (b) for disposal in each State in which the Governor intends to exercise the authority provided in this paragraph, as determined in accordance with subparagraph (C).

''(b) EXCEPTIONS TO AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT OUT-OF-STATE MUNICIPAL WASTE.—The authority to prohibit the disposal of out-of-State municipal waste provided under subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to—

''(1) landfills in operation on the date of enactment of this section that—

''(A) received during calendar year 1993 documented shipments of out-of-State municipal waste; and

''(B) are in compliance with all applicable State laws (including any State rule or regulation) relating to design and location standards, leachate collection, ground water monitoring, and financial assurance for closure and post-closure and corrective action;

''(2) proposed landfills that, prior to January 1, 1993, received—

''(A) an explicit authorization as part of a host community agreement from the affected local government to receive municipal waste generated out-of-State; and

''(B) a notice of decision from the State to grant a construction permit; or

''(3) incinerators in operation on the date of enactment of this section that—

''(A) received, during calendar year 1993, documented shipments of out-of-State municipal waste;

''(B) are in compliance with the applicable requirements of section 129 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7429); and

''(C) are in compliance with all applicable State laws (including any State rule or regulation) relating to facility design and operations.

''(c) DENIAL OF PERMITS ON GROUND OF LACK OF NEED.—

''(1) DENIAL.—A State may deny a permit for the construction or operation of a new landfill or incinerator or a major modification of an existing landfill or incinerator if—

''(A) the State has approved a State or local comprehensive solid waste management plan developed under Federal or State law; and

''(B) the denial is based on the State's determination, pursuant to a State law authorizing such denial, that there is not a local or regional need of the landfill or incinerator in the State.

''(2) UNDUE BURDEN.—A denial of a permit under paragraph (1) shall not be considered to impose an undue burden on interstate commerce or to otherwise impair, restrain, or discriminate against interstate commerce.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

''(1) The term 'affected local government' means—

''(A) the public body authorized by State law to plan for the management of municipal solid waste, a majority of the members of which are elected officials, for the area in which the landfill or incinerator is located or proposed to be located; or

''(B) if there is not such body created by State law, the elected officials of the city, town, township, borrough, county, or parish selected by the Governor and exercising primary responsibility over municipal solid waste management or the use of land in the jurisdiction in which the facility is located or proposed to be located.

''(2) The term 'affected local solid waste planning unit' means a political subdivision of a State with authority relating to solid waste management planning in accordance with State law.

''(3) With respect to a State, the term 'out-of-State municipal waste' means municipal waste generated outside the State. To the extent that it is consistent with the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the term shall include municipal waste generated outside the United States.

''(4) The term 'host community agreement' means a written, legally binding document or documents executed by duly authorized officials of the affected local government that specifically authorizes a landfill or incinerator to receive municipal solid waste generated out-of-State.

''(5) The term 'municipal waste' means refuse (and refuse-derived fuel) generated by the general public or from a residential, commercial, institutional, or industrial source (or any combination thereof), consisting of paper, wood, yard wastes, plastics, leather, rubber, or other combustible or noncombustible materials such as metal or glass (or any combination thereof). The term 'municipal waste' does not include—

''(A) any solid waste identified or listed as a hazardous waste under section 3001;

''(B) any solid waste, including contaminated soil and debris, resulting from a response action taken under section 104 or 106 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9604, 9606) or a corrective action taken under this Act;

''(C) any metal, pipe, glass, plastic, paper, textile, or other material that has been separated or diverted from municipal waste and has been transported into the State for the purpose of recycling or reclamation;

''(D) any solid waste that is—

''(i) generated by an industrial facility; and

''(ii) transported for the purpose of treatment, storage, or disposal to a facility that is owned or operated by the generator of the waste, or is located on property owned by the generator or a company with which the generator is affiliated;

''(E) any solid waste generated incident to the provision of service in interstate, intrastate, foreign, or overseas air transportation;

''(F) any industrial waste that is not identical to municipal waste with respect to the physical and chemical state of the industrial waste, and composition, including construction and demolition debris;

''(G) any medical waste that is segregated from or not mixed with municipal waste; or

''(H) any material or product returned from a dispenser or distributor to the manufacturer for credit, evaluation, or possible reuse.''.

SEC. 3. TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.

The table of contents of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D the following new item:

''Sec. 4011. Interstate transportation of municipal waste.''.

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. 590. A bill for the relief of Matt Clawson; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PRIVATE RELIEF FOR MATT CLAWSON

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation on behalf of Matt Clawson of Pocatello, ID. Mr. Clawson has been required to pay dearly for mistakes made by his Government. His plaintive appeal for help is a proper place for Congress to begin redressing and reforming profligate regulatory excesses, abuses, and injustices by this Government against its citizens.

Mr. Clawson obtained from the U.S. Forest Service all of the required approvals for his mining claim and plan of operations on the Middle Fork of the Salmon River near the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness in Idaho. He spend what was for him an enormous sum of money to develop and begin working the claim according to Forest Service requirements. Shortly thereafter, however, and before he could recover any of his investment, he was required to cease operations. The reason was a lawsuit and subsequent court rulings that found the Forest Service had erred in granting the approvals.

This bill simply reimburses Mr. Clawson's expenses with interest

added. It does not attempt to provide compensation for any purported value of the claim. He has exhausted all of his legal remedies, necessitating this private relief bill. I believe the compensation is more than warranted. Moreover, U.S. Claims Court Judge Wiese commented on the record that Mr. Clawson's case had ''been a very troubling case'' for him and he believed ''this man should be given some relief somewhere.'' That somewhere can only be, and must be, here.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 592. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and the National Labor Relations Act to modify certain provisions, to transfer certain occupational safety and health functions to the Secretary of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REFORM ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, one issue about which all of us have heard from our constituents, over and over again, is the need for fundamental reform of the tortured and increasingly tangled web of Federal overregulation. Perhaps more than in any other area of Federal Government regulation, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] has come to symbolize what is wrong. Today I offer a bill to reform the laws that were originally intended to ensure workplace safety.

I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on numerous occasions in recent months on examples of Federal Government overregulation, of the unintended consequences of regulatory excess that puts Americans out of work, usurps our constitutional rights, and saps our productivity and economic competitiveness. OSHA problems are always at the top of my constituents' concerns.

For example, in my home State of Texas, an OSHA compliance officer from the Corpus Christi area office, stated under oath that OSHA area directors are under enormous pressure to produce high numbers of citations and penalties—that OSHA employees' job performance evaluations apparently depend on meeting de facto quotas. This same OSHA compliance officer also testified that his supervisor directed him to cite companies, even when both the supervisor and the inspector knew full well a company did not violate any regulation and did not warrant a citation. In the words of this conscientious officer, his supervisors told him to hit the employer.

In otherwords, Mr. President, one regulator can carry on a vendetta against an innocent business, thus jeopardizing that business and everyone who depends on that business to support themselves and their families. This sort of thing is not supposed to happen in America, and it is Congress' job to make sure it does not.

Congress originally established OSHA to protect Americans from the threat of injury in the workplace. OSHA was charged with investigating and, if necessary, penalizing businesses that willfully endangered its workers. Businesses and workers have a mutual interest in promoting workplace safety. No responsible businessman or businesswoman would intentionally put another human being at risk. Furthermore, accidents reduce productivity and cost money; they deprive businesses of their most important, hard-working, productive employees. No business prospers when its employees are ill or injured.

Congress founded OSHA with the hope and expectation that the Federal Government could encourage businesses and employees to work together to resolve problems and to foster safer working environments. Mr. President, this hope has been dashed—dashed by the congress' failure to update Federal safety laws to keep pace with changes in the workplace, dashed by the emergence of a culture of regulatory excess that eats away at the vitality of our economy.

Therefore, I introduce a bill today to restore what Congress intended 25 years ago, when OSHA was created, and to inject into our regulatory agencies some common sense and sound objective criteria. My bill aims to foment real cooperation between employer, employee and the Federal Government, and to ensure that OSHA's resources are focused on the safety issues the American people want to have protected—not on vendettas against certain businesses, not on quotas for Federal inspectors to meet, not on tearing down labor-management cooperation we must have if we are to continue as the world's most productive and dynamic economy.

A safe worksite is everybody's responsibility, but today that is not the case. Laws are enforced so that the responsibility rests exclusively on the employer. Employers must be held accountable, but the frivolousness manner in which safety laws are applied in many cases does nothing to improve safety and does incalculable harm to American's confidence in their Government.

Not long ago, the Indiana OSHA found the owner of an Indiana Handy Mart liable for not providing a safe workplace after an armed bandit robbed and killed an employee of the store. In other words, it is the store owner's fault that there are armed criminals on our streets. By this same logic, it is every robbery victim's fault, for not having taken sufficient precautions.

Mr. President, we all know how serious the problem of crime and violence are. But does anyone think the fault for this crisis and the responsibility for overcoming it lies with the victims?

This case highlights the way that regulatory excess has been allowed to drift into absurdity. Indeed, the absurd is becoming the norm, as millions of Americans who operate businesses and work for a living know. It is Congress that has refused to acknowledge how long overdue are the fundamental reforms needed to restore common sense.

My bill will also stop OSHA from citing an employer, even when he or she has provided the proper training and equipment to prevent an accident, and taken every conceivable step to assure safety.

In east Texas, after two workers—a supervisor and his assistant—died of asphyxiation after entering a confined space against strict company policy, originally OSHA concluded that there was no violation, and OSHA closed the case. However, OSHA reopened the case and issued several citations after a civil lawsuit was filed. The employer's insurance company panicked and settled the suit for $1.5 million. Subsequently, OSHA dropped the citations. But the harm was done.

This kind of case sets a very dangerous precedent. The mere fact that OSHA has cited a company is often enough to convince a jury of employer wrongdoing, and in many jurisdictions a citation is admissible as per se negligence. An employer has no choice but to challenge very OSHA citation for fear of civil liability if he or she complies. We must change that, and my bill does—by making OSHA citations and abatement efforts inadmissible as evidence in any private litigation or enhancement of recovery under worker's compensation law.

My bill also changes current OSHA practice of conducting wall-to-wall inspections of a business whenever an employee files a complaint about a specific workplace issue. Congress didn't intend for Federal regulators to tear a business apart every time a complaint is filed. OSHA's current policies threaten every business with a disgruntled employee.

To encourage more labor-management cooperation, my legislation also asks that an employee first notify his or her employer of a potential workplace hazard. Any responsible business operator will take steps to rectify problems before an accident occurs. If not, OSHA can step in and take action. Common sense, Mr. President, just plain common sense.

Another provision of my legislation borrows from the TEAM Act, introduced by my friend from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, who chairs the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. Federal regulators currently prohibit employers and employees from forming employer-employee groups to discuss issues like workplace safety. The legislation I introduce today, just like the TEAM Act which Senator KASSEBAUM has authored—which I cosponsored—would permit such legitimate workplace cooperation.

Businesses, especially small businesses, are finding it increasingly difficult to endure the current regulatory environment. The same small business

sector that has always been the engine of economic growth, the creator of most new jobs in our country, is increasingly stifled and hamstrung by a rising tide of Federal overregulation.

But as I speak, OSHA is readying a gigantic expansion of its regulatory authority. Its so-called ergonomics rules will give OSHA authority to control virtually every aspect of a business' operations. Under the proposed new rules, OSHA would be able to set limits on employee productivity, to limit work shifts and overtime, to re-design machinery, even entire production lines, and to prohibit innovation.

At best, these proposed rules are based on the shakiest of scientific justification. But there is no doubt of the harm they will do. Initial estimates put the costs of compliance at $21 billion a year. Eventually, however, these new rules would guarantee our businesses and our workers would lose ground steadily in the vital areas of productivity and innovation, thus doing incalculable harm to our economy.

According to the Clinton administration's 1995 regulatory plan, OSHA is also working on eight other significant new regulations. I bureaucratic parlance, a significant action is one that will cost at least $100 million annually. It's no wonder the administration is requesting a more-than-10 percent increase in OSHA's budget. Enforcing all of these new regulations will require thousands of new inspectors, supervisors, and bureaucrats.

The administration also is fighting to maintain funding for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, which I propose to end. NIOSH costs nearly $133 million this year, with no appreciable benefits for workplace safety or the national welfare.

Twenty-five years ago, this body helped to create a new agency, OSHA, to pursue a worthwhile goal—protecting American workers from avoidable injury in the work place. The idea was based upon a partnership between employers, employees and the Government. That experiment has not worked. The very legislation that was meant to free people from the everyday threat of accidental injury is now threatening to remove our freedoms.

Mr. President, we have the responsibility of averting threats to our freedoms. We can do so merely by doing what Congress intended to do in the first place. Through the application of common sense tests for Federal involvement and return to cooperation, we can make worksites both safer and better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 592

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Occupational Safety and Health Reform Act of 1995''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).

SEC. 2. USE OF OSHA IN PRIVATE LITIGATION.

Section 4(b)(4) (29 U.S.C. 653(b)(4)) is amended by adding before the period the following: '', except that an allegation of a violation, a finding of a violation, or an abatement of an alleged violation, under this Act or the standards promulgated under this Act shall not be admissible as evidence in any civil action or used to increase the amount of payments received under any workmen's compensation law for any work-related injury''.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Section 5 (29 U.S.C. 654) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) On multi-employer work sites, an employer may not be cited for a violation of this section if the employer—

''(1) has not created the condition that caused the violation; or

''(2) has no employees exposed to the violation and has not assumed responsibility for ensuring compliance by other employers on the work site.''.

SEC. 4. STANDARD SETTING.

(a) STANDARDS.—Section 6(b)(5) (29 U.S.C. 655(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) The development of standards under this section shall be based on the latest scientific data in the field and on research demonstrations, experiments, and other information that may be appropriate. In establishing the standards, the Secretary shall consider, and make findings, based on the following factors:

''(A) The standard shall be needed to address a significant risk of material impairment to workers and shall substantially reduce that risk.

''(B) The standard shall be technologically and economically feasible.

''(C) There shall be a reasonable relationship between the costs and benefits of the standard.

''(D) The standard shall provide protection to workers in the most cost-effective manner and minimize employment loss due to the standard in the affected industries and sectors of industries.

''(E) Whenever practicable, the standard shall be expressed in terms of objective criteria and of the performance desired.''.

(b) VARIANCES.—Section 6(d) (29 U.S.C. 655(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''No citation shall be issued for a violation of an occupational safety and health standard that is the subject of a good faith application for a variance during the period the application is pending before the Secretary.''.

(c) STANDARD PRIORITIES.—The second sentence of section 6(g) (29 U.S.C. 655(g)) is amended to read as follows: ''In determining the priority for establishing standards dealing with toxic materials or the physical agents of toxic materials, the Secretary shall consider the number of workers exposed to the substance, the nature and severity of potential impairment, and the likelihood of such impairment based on information obtained by the Secretary from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, and other appropriate sources.''.

(d) REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—Section 6 (29 U.S.C. 655) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(h) In promulgating an occupational safety and health standard under subsection (b), the Secretary shall perform a regulatory flexibility analysis described in sections 603 and 604 of title 5, United States Code.

''(i) In promulgating any occupational safety and health standard under subsection (b), the Secretary shall minimize the time, effort, and costs involved in the retention, reporting, notifying, or disclosure of information to the Secretary, to third parties, or to the public to the extent consistent with the purpose of the standard. Compliance with the requirement of this subsection may be included in a review under subsection (f).''.

SEC. 5. INSPECTIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—Section 8(a)(2) (29 U.S.C. 657(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) to inspect and investigate during regular working hours and at other reasonable times, and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, any such place of employment and all pertinent conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment, and materials in such place of employment.

In conducting inspections and investigations under paragraph (2), the Secretary may question any such employer, owner, operator, agent or employee. Interviews of employees may be in private if the employee so requests.''.

(b) RECORDKEEPING.—

(1) GENERAL MAINTENANCE.—The first sentence of section 8(c)(1) (29 U.S.C. 657(c)(i)) is amended to read as follows: ''Each employer shall make, keep and preserve, and make available upon reasonable request and within reasonable limits to the Secretary or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, such records regarding the activities of the employer relating to this Act as the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of this Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational accidents and illnesses.''.

(2) RECORDS OR REPORTS ON INJURIES.—Section 8(c) (29 U.S.C. 657(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) In prescribing regulations under this subsection, the Secretary may not require employers to maintain records of, or to make reports on, injuries that do not involve lost work time or that involve employees of other employers.

''(5) In prescribing regulations requiring employers to report work-related deaths and multiple hospitalizations, the Secretary shall include provisions that provide an employer at least 24 hours in which to make such report.''.

(c) INSPECTIONS BASED ON EMPLOYEE COMPLAINTS.—Section 8(f) (29 U.S.C. 657(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f)(1)(A) An employee or representative of an employee who believes that a violation of a safety or health standard exists that threatens physical harm, or that an imminent danger exists, may request an inspection by giving notice to the Secretary or an authorized representative of the Secretary of such violation or danger.

''(B) Notice under subparagraph (A) shall be reduced to writing, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice, and shall state that the alleged violation or danger has been brought to the attention of the employer and the employer has

refused to take any action to correct the alleged violation or danger.

''(C)(i) The notice under subparagraph (A) shall be signed by the employees or representative of employees and a copy shall be provided to the employer or the agent of the employer no later than the time of arrival of an occupational safety and health agency inspector to conduct the inspection.

''(ii) Upon the request of the person giving the notice under subparagraph (A), the name of the person and the names of individual employees referred to in the notice shall not appear in the copy or on any record published, released, or made available pursuant to subsection (i), except that the Secretary may disclose this information during prehearing discovery in a contested case.

''(D) The Secretary may not make an inspection under this section except on request by an employee or representative of employees.

''(E) If upon receipt of the notice under subparagraph (A), the Secretary determines that the employee or employee representative has brought the alleged violation or danger to the attention of the employer and the employer has refused to take corrective action, and there are reasonable grounds to believe such violation or danger still exists, the Secretary shall make a special inspection in accordance with this section as soon as possible. The special inspection shall be conducted for the limited purpose of determining whether such violation or danger exists.

''(2) If the Secretary determines either before, or as a result of, an inspection that there are not reasonable grounds to believe a violation or danger exists, the Secretary shall notify the complaining employee or employee representative of the determination and, upon request by the employee or employee representative, shall provide a written statement of the reasons for the Secretary's final disposition of the case.''.

(d) TRAINING AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 8 (29 U.S.C. 657) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsections:

''(g) Inspections conducted under this section shall be conducted by at least one person who has training in, and is knowledgeable of, the industry or types of hazards being inspected.

''(h)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall not conduct routine inspections of, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under this Act with respect to—

''(A) an employer who is engaged in a farming operation that does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 100 or fewer employees; or

''(B) an employer of not more than 100 employees if the employer is included within a category of employers having an occupational injury or a lost workday case rate (determined under the Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published) which is less than the national average rate as most recently published by the Secretary acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics under section 24.

''(2) In the case of an employer described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), such paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the Secretary from—

''(A) providing under this Act consultations, technical assistance, and educational and training services;

''(B) conducting under this Act surveys and studies;

''(C) conducting inspections or investigations in response to employee complaints, issuing citations for violations of this Act found during an inspection, and assessing a penalty for violations that are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period;

''(D) taking any action authorized by this Act with respect to imminent dangers;

''(E) taking any action authorized by this Act with respect to health standards;

''(F) taking any action authorized by this Act with respect to a report of an employment accident that is fatal to at least one employee or that results in hospitalization of at least three employees and taking any action pursuant to an investigation of such report; and

''(G) taking any action authorized by this Act with respect to complaint of discrimination against employees for exercising their rights under this Act.''.

SEC. 6. VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

''SEC. 8A. VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation establish a program to encourage voluntary employer and employee efforts to provide safe and healthful working conditions.

''(b) EXEMPTION.—In establishing a program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, in accordance with subsection (c), provide an exemption from all safety and health inspections and investigations with respect to a place of employment maintained by an employer, except inspections and investigations conducted for the purpose of—

''(1) determining the cause of a workplace accident that resulted in the death of one or more employees or the hospitalization of three or more employees; or

''(2) responding to a request for an inspection pursuant to subsection (f)(1).

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTION.—In order to qualify for the exemption provided under subsection (b), an employer shall provide to the Secretary evidence that—

''(1) the place of employment or conditions of employment have, during the preceding year, been reviewed or inspected under—

''(A) a consultation program provided by any State agency relating to occupational safety and health;

''(B) a certification or consultation program provided by an insurance carrier or other private business entity pursuant to a State program, law, or regulation; or

''(C) a workplace consultation program provided by any other person certified by the Secretary for purposes of providing such consultations; or

''(2) the place of employment has an exemplary safety record and the employer maintains a safety and health program for the workplace that—

''(A) includes—

''(i) procedures for assessing hazards to the employees of the employer that are inherent to the operations or business of the employer;

''(ii) procedures for correcting or controlling the hazards in a timely manner based on the severity of the hazard; and

''(iii) employee participation in the program including, at a minimum—

''(I) regular consultation between the employer and nonsupervisory employees regarding safety and health issues; and

''(II) opportunity for nonsupervisory employees to make recommendations regarding hazards in the workplace and to receive responses or to implement improvements in response to such recommendations; and

''(B) provides assurances that participating nonsupervisory employees have training or expertise on safety and health issues consistent with the responsibilities of the employees.

A program under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) shall include methods that ensure that serious hazards identified in the consultation are corrected within an appropriate time.

''(d) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may require that an employer in order to claim the exemption under subsection (b) give certification to the Secretary and notice to the employees of the employer of the eligibility of the employer for an exemption.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 3 (29 U.S.C. 652) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(15) The term 'exemplary safety record' means that an employer has had, in the most recent annual reporting of the employer required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, no employee death caused by occupational injury and fewer lost workdays due to occupational injury and illness than the average for the industry of which the employer is a part.''.

SEC. 7. EMPLOYER DEFENSES.

Section 9 (29 U.S.C. 658) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) No citation may be issued under subsection (a) to an employer unless the employer knew or with the exercise of reasonable diligence would have known of the presence of the alleged violation. No citation shall be issued under subsection (a) to an employer for an alleged violation of section 5, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6, any other regulation promulgated under this Act, or any other occupational safety and health standard, if such employer demonstrates that—

''(1) employees of such employer have been provided with the proper training and equipment to prevent such a violation;

''(2) work rules designed to prevent such a violation have been established and adequately communicated to employees by such employer; and

''(3) the failure of employees to observe work rules led to the violation.

''(e) A citation issued under subsection (a) to an employer that violates the requirements of any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6 or any other regulation promulgated under this Act shall be vacated if such employer demonstrates that employees of such employer were protected by alternative methods equally or more protective of the safety and health of the employee than the methods required by such standard, rule, order, or regulation in the factual circumstances underlying the citation.

''(f) Subsections (d) and (e) shall not be construed to eliminate or modify other defenses that may exist to any citation.''.

SEC. 8. THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) PROCEDURE FOR ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) NOTIFICATION.—The first sentence of section 10(b) (29 U.S.C. 659(b)) is amended to read as follows: ''If the Secretary has reason to believe an employer has failed to correct a violation for which a citation has been issued within the period permitted for the correction of such violation, the Secretary shall notify the employer by certified mail of such failure and of the penalty proposed to be assessed under section 17 by reason of such failure, and that the employer has 15 working days within which to notify the Secretary that the employer desires to contest the notification of the Secretary or the proposed assessment of penalty. The period described in the first sentence shall not begin to run until the time for contestation has expired or the entry of a final order by the Commission in a contested case initiated by the employer in good faith and not solely for delay or avoidance of penalties.''.

(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—Section 10 (29 U.S.C. 659) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) In all hearings before the Commission relating to a contested citation, the Secretary shall have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence—

''(1) the existence of a violation;

''(2) that the violation for which the citation was issued constitutes a realistic hazard to the safety and health of the affected employees;

''(3) that there is a likelihood that such hazard will result in employee injury;

''(4) that the employer knew or with the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known of the hazard and violation; and

''(5) that a technically and economically feasible method of compliance exists.''.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 11(a) (29 U.S.C. 660(a)) is amended by inserting after ''conclusive.'' at the end of the sixth sentence the following: ''The court shall make its own determination as to questions of law, including the reasonable interpretation of standards, and shall not accord deference to either the Commission or the Secretary.''.

SEC. 9. DISCRIMINATION.

(a) COMPLAINT.—Section 11(c)(2) (29 U.S.C. 660(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A)(i) Any employee who believes that such employee has been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by the employer of such employee in violation of this subsection may, within 30 days after such violation occurs, file a complaint with the Secretary alleging such discrimination.

''(ii) A complaint may not be filed under clause (i) after the expiration of the 30-day period described in such clause.

''(B)(i) Upon receipt of a complaint under subparagraph (A) and as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation.

''(ii) If upon such investigation, the Secretary determines that the provisions of this subsection have been violated, the Secretary shall attempt to eliminate the alleged violation by informal methods.

''(iii) Nothing said or done, during the use of the informal methods applied under clause (ii) may be made public by the Secretary or used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

''(iv) The Secretary shall make a determination concerning the complaint as soon as possible and, in any event, not later than 90 days after the date of the filing of the complaint.

''(C) If the Secretary is unable to resolve the alleged violation through informal methods, the Secretary shall notify the parties in writing that conciliation efforts have failed.

''(D)(i) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary notifies the parties under subparagraph (C) in writing that conciliation efforts have failed, the Secretary may then bring an action in any appropriate United States district court against an employer described in subparagraph (A).

''(ii) The employer against whom an action under clause (i) is brought may demand that the issue of discrimination be determined by jury trial.

''(E) Upon a showing of discrimination under subparagraph (D)(ii), the Secretary may seek, and the court may award, any and all of the following types of relief:

''(i) An injunction to enjoin a continued violation of this subsection.

''(ii) Reinstatement of the employee to the same or equivalent position.

''(iii) Reinstatement of full benefits and seniority rights.

''(iv) Compensation for lost wages and benefits.

''(F) This subsection shall be the exclusive means of securing a remedy for any aggrieved employee.''.

(b) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—Section 11(c)(3) (29 U.S.C. 660(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) Any records of the Secretary, including the files of the Secretary, relating to investigations and enforcement proceedings pursuant to this subsection shall not be subject to inspection and examination by the public while such inspections and proceedings are open or pending in the United States district court.''.

SEC. 10. INJUNCTION AGAINST IMMINENT DANGER.

Section 13 (29 U.S.C. 662) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c);

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following new subsection:

''(a)(1)(A)(i) If the Secretary determines, on the basis of an inspection or investigation under this section, that a condition or practice in a place of employment is such that an imminent danger to safety or health exists that could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm or permanent impairment of the health or functional capacity of employees if not corrected immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated through the enforcement procedures otherwise provided by this Act, the Secretary—

''(I) may inform the employer, and provide notice by posting at the place of employment to the affected employees of the danger; and

''(II) shall request that the condition or practice be corrected immediately or that the affected employees be immediately removed from exposure to such danger.

''(ii) A notice under clause (i) shall be removed by the Secretary from the place of employment not later than 72 hours after the notice was first posted unless a court in an action brought under subsection (c) requires that the notice be maintained.

''(B) The Secretary shall not prevent the continued activity of employees whose presence is necessary to avoid, correct, or remove the imminent danger or to maintain the capacity of a continuous process operation to resume normal operations without a cessation of operations or where cessation of operations is necessary, to permit the cessation to be accomplished in a safe and orderly way.

''(2) No employer shall discharge, or in any manner discriminate against any employee, because the employee has refused to perform a duty that has been identified as the source of an imminent danger by a notice posted pursuant to paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 11. SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 16 (29 U.S.C. 655) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' after ''16.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(b) The Secretary shall publish and make available to employers a model injury prevention program that if completed by the employer shall be deemed to meet the requirement for an exemption under section 8A or a reduction in penalty under section 17(a)(2)(B).

''(c) The Secretary shall establish and implement a program to provide technical assistance and consultative services for employers and employees, either directly or by grant or contract, concerning work site safety and health and compliance with this Act. Such assistance shall be targeted at small employers and the most hazardous industries.

''(d) This subsection authorizes the provision of consultative services to employers through cooperative agreements between the States and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The consultative services provided under a cooperative agreement under this subsection shall be the same type of services described in part 1908 of title 39 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

''(e) Not less than one-fourth of the annual appropriation made to the Secretary to carry out this Act shall be expended for the purposes described in this section.''.

SEC. 12. PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 17 (29 U.S.C. 666) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (a), (b), (c), (f), (i), (j), and (k);

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), and (l) as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after ''17.'' the following:

''(a)(1) Any employer who violates the requirements of section 5, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 6, or any other regulation promulgated under this Act may be assessed a civil penalty of not more than $7,000. The Commission shall have authority to assess all civil penalties provided for in this section, giving due consideration to the appropriateness of the penalty with respect to—

''(A) the size of the employer;

''(B) the number of employees exposed to the violation;

''(C) the likely severity of any injuries directly resulting from such violation;

''(D) the probability that the violation could result in injury or illness;

''(E) the good faith of the employer in correcting the violation after the violation has been identified;

''(F) the extent to which employee misconduct was responsible for the violation; and

''(G) the effect of the penalty on the ability of the employee to stay in business.

''(2) In assessing penalties under this section the Commission shall have authority to determine whether violations should be classified as willful, repeated, serious, other than serious, or de minimus. Regardless of the classification of a violation, there shall be only one penalty assessed for each violation. The Commission may not enhance the penalty based on the number of employees exposed to the violation or the number of instances of the same violation.

''(3)(A) A penalty assessed under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by 25 percent in any case in which the employer—

''(i) maintains a written safety and health program for the work site at which the violation for which the penalty was assessed occurred; or

''(ii) shows that the work site at which the violation for which the penalty was assessed occurred has an exemplary safety record.

''(B) If the employer maintains a program described in subparagraph (A)(i) and has the record described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the penalty shall be reduced by 50 percent.

''(4) No penalty shall be assessed against an employer for a violation other than a violation previously cited by the Secretary or a violation that creates an imminent danger or has caused death or a willful violation that has caused serious injury to an employee.''.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 17(c) (29 U.S.C. 666(c)) (as so redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''No employer shall be subject to any State or Federal criminal prosecution arising out of a workplace accident other than under this subsection.''.

SEC. 13. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH FUNCTIONS.

(a) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS; REPEAL.—

(1) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH.—The functions and authorities provided to the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health under section 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 671) are transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

(2) SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The responsibilities and authorities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services under sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 669, 670, and 671) are transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

(3) REPEAL.—Section 22 (29 U.S.C. 671) is repealed.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out the functions transferred under subsection (a), the Secretary of Labor shall take such actions as are necessary to avoid duplication of programs and to maximize training, education, and research under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 671 et seq.).

(c) REFERENCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to—

(A) the head of the transferred office, or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with regard to functions transferred under subsection (a), shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Labor; and

(B) a transferred office with regard to functions transferred under subsection (a), shall be deemed to refer to the Department of Labor.

(2) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this subsection, the term ''office'' includes any office, administration, agency, institute, unit, organizational entity, or component thereof.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this Act, if the Secretary of Labor determines (after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) that technical and conforming amendments to Federal statutes are necessary to carry out the changes made by this section, the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and submit to Congress recommended legislation containing the amendments.

SEC. 14. PREVENTION OF ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act is amended—

(1) by striking sections 28 through 31;

(2) by redesignating sections 32, 33, and 34 as sections 29, 30, and 31, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 27, the following new section:

''SEC. 28. ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever there exists the reasonable probability that the safety or health of any employee could be endangered because of the use of alcohol or a controlled substance in the workplace, the employer of such employee may establish and implement an alcohol and substance abuse testing program in accordance with subsection (b).

''(b) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall establish standards under section 6 for substance abuse and alcohol testing programs established under subsection (a) as follows:

''(1) The substance abuse testing program shall conform, to the maximum extent practicable, to subpart B of the mandatory guidelines for Federal workplace drug testing programs published on April 11, 1988, by the Secretary of Health and Human Services at 53 F.R. 11979 and any amendments adopted to such guidelines.

''(2) The alcohol testing program shall include an alcohol breath analysis and shall conform, to the maximum extent practicable; to any guidelines developed by the Secretary of Transportation for alcohol testing of mass transit employees under the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992.

''(c) TESTING PRIOR TO EMPLOYMENT.—This section shall not be construed to prohibit an employer from requiring an employee to submit to and pass an alcohol or substance abuse test—

''(1) prior to employment by the employer;

''(2) on a for cause basis or where the employer has reasonable suspicion to believe that such employee is using or is under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance;

''(3) where such test is administered as part of a scheduled medical examination;

''(4) in the case of an accident or incident involving the actual or potential loss of human life, bodily injury, or property damage; or

''(5) during and for a reasonable period of time (not to exceed 5 years) after the conclusion of an alcohol or substance abuse treatment program.''.

SEC. 15. ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS.

The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a continuing comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits of each standard in effect under section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. The Secretary shall report the results of the analysis to Congress upon the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter.

SEC. 16. LABOR RELATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (5) of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The term does not include a safety committee that is comprised of an employer and the employees of the employer and that is jointly established by the employer and the employees of the employer, or by the employer and a labor organization representing the employees of the employer, to carry out efforts to reduce injuries and disease arising out of employment.''.

(b) UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.—Section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(2)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ''*Provided, further,* That it shall not constitute an unfair practice under this paragraph for an employer and the employees of the employer, or for an employer and a labor organization representing the employees of the employer, to jointly establish a safety committee in which the employer and the employees of the employer carry out efforts to reduce injuries and disease arising out of employment;''.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. COATS):

S. 593. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the export of new drugs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

FDA EXPORT REFORM AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, almost 10 years ago, the Congress had a good idea.

In 1986, we approved legislation which took the unprecedented step of allowing pharmaceutical manufacturers to export their products to 21 foreign nations, without prior FDA approval.

Many though it was a bold step at the time.

It turned out to be a good idea which worked well.

Today, 9 years later, I rise to introduce legislation to take another step in that process. I am joined in cosponsorship of this legislation by Senator GREGG, and by Senators KASSEBAUM, ABRAHAM, FRIST, and COATS.

Let me at this time recognize the outstanding leadership that our House colleague, Representative FRED UPTON, has shown in both drafting and marshalling considerable support for this legislation. This bill would not be possible without Mr. UPTON'S leadership.

Undoubtedly some will also consider this legislation bold. But I submit to my colleagues that it will also turn out to be a good idea which works well. Even better than the 1986 law, which I authorized.

The Hatch-Gregg legislation, the FDA Export Reform and Enhancement Act of 1995, has a simple premise: that the Food and Drug Administration cannot continue to be the traffic cop for world trade in medical goods.

Current Food and Drug Administration regulations significantly restrict the ability of U.S. manufacturers of human and animal drugs, biological, and medical devices to export their products to world markets.

Under section 801(e) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, exporting a medical device that is not commercially distributed in the U.S. is subject to FDA receipt of the receiving country's approval of the device and FDA determination that the export would not be contrary to the public health and safety of the importing country.

The FDA requires an export permit for unapproved, class III devices, those requiring pre-market approval [PMA's]. Many countries also request a certificate of free sale from the United States indicating that the product has been approved in the United States. This is basically a rubber stamp provided by the FDA on a voluntary basis.

The irony in this situation is that a manufacturer cannot export certain unapproved medical devices, even if they have been approved by the foreign country with an established regulatory system.

Also under section 801(e) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, pharmaceutical companies are only free to export unapproved drugs to 21 countries delineated in the law. Those countries are; Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Prior to 1986, there was no authority for manufacturers of FDA-regulated

products to send those products overseas unless they were first approved by the FDA. The Pharmaceutical Export Act of 1986, allowed, for the first time, manufacturers to export their products to the above list of countries, provided the sponsor is pursuing a new drug application [NDA] in the United States.

Our experience since that time has shown that the law is still too rigid. The list of countries is too proscriptive, and the regulatory requirements unnecessarily burdensome.

For example, the list does not include Israel. It does not include Eastern European countries or most of the Pacific rim. There is near universal agreement this needs to be rectified.

Although the 1986 act represented a good step forward, it has led to the development of a patchwork quilt of bureaucracy that has forced U.S. manufacturers to establish and maintain facilities outside the United States.

For example, prior approval of export plans by FDA is required to ship products overseas. To ship bulk or finished products, companies must apply for prior approval from FDA, be granted approval, and ship the products. This process takes 3–12 months plus transportation time, creating costly delays that reduce market access and penetration by U.S. firms.

It is important to note that market conditions in importing companies may dictate the sale of products utilizing dosage strengths, e.g., 250 milligrams versus 125 milligrams, formulations—caplet, tablet, etc.—or inert ingredients different from those approved or being pursued in the U.S. export of similar, but not identical, products is currently prohibited.

Another problem is that FDA labeling requirements mandate that packaged exports be labeled in English for the FDA-approved indications, regardless of the linguistic or regulatory requirements of the importing country.

At the same time, the law imposes time-consuming requirements on FDA, whose resources should be better directed to reviewing new, life-saving medicines and technologies.

It is clear that FDA is making progress in speeding up review times for drugs and devices, although there still are problems.

For example, FDA says that its average processing time for export permits for medical devices has moved from 65 days in 1993 to 16 days in 1994. For export certificates, the FDA says its processing times have declined from 51.5 days in 1993 to 10 days in 1994.

I must commend the Center director, Dr. Bruce Burlington, and the Office of Device Evaluation Director, Dr. Susan Alpert, for that progress. Their work has really made a difference.

But the FDA statistics don't tell the whole story. These are average review times. In 1993, in some cases, it took the FDA over 270 days to approve export permits, and still up to 150 days for approval in 1994. In 1994 they processed 756 permit applications, and 1,469 certificates.

Not only can FDA review be time-consuming, but using it is a measure of export delays is misleading. Manufacturers have to compile the data to send to FDA requesting export. And, they have to go to the importing country and get a letter proving that the country has approved the device for import. This, too, adds substantial time to the process upfront.

Another concern we have is about the potential for FDA reprogramming its resources away from this activity to another. We have no assurance that the statistics will stay at the current rate.

But I feel compelled to raise the larger point.

I think we have to ask ourselves if this export review is how we want to be spending Government resources in this day and age. If other nations wish to receive the benefits of our technology, why must we insist on approving that technology first?

In a time of unprecedented harmony in worldwide trade, as reflected by recent passage of GATT, our laws relating to the export of foods, drugs, medical devices and cosmetics should reflect that comity as well. The paternalistic approach evidenced in our current law is no longer compatible with today's world marketplace.

The Hatch-Gregg bill remedies this situation by allowing manufacturers to export their products in any countries belonging to the World Trade Organization [WTO]. A second provision allows export to non-WTO countries unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that the possibility of the reimportation of the device or drug into the United States presents an imminent hazard to the public health and safety of the United States and the only means of limiting the hazard is to prohibit the export of the device or drug.

The products to be exported must accord to the specifications of the foreign purchaser. They must not be in conflict with the laws of the country to which they are intended for export. They must be labeled for export on the outside of the shipping package. They must not be sold or offered for sale in domestic commerce. And they cannot have been ''banned,'' or turned down for approval here in the United States.

This is not a health bill, Mr. President, S. 593 is about exports and jobs. It is about U.S. competitiveness abroad.

The U.S. drug manufacturing industry accounts for about $60 billion in annual production, with a trade surplus of $800 million in 1993. Last year, U.S. drug companies accounted for about a third of total world production.

There are approximately 11,000 medical device companies in the United States which make between 60,000 and 80,000 different brands or models. Most of these companies are small. Two-thirds of the companies have fewer than 50 employees.

In Utah, we have over 100 device manufacturing companies, some of the finest in the Nation, and they are really feeling the pinch of our restrictive export policies.

The U.S. medical device manufacturing industry accounts for more than $50 billion in production and had a trade surplus in 1994 of $4.9 billion.

Last year, U.S. companies accounted for 46 percent of global production. Moreover, this industry has been a major source of employment and export growth in recent years.

Between 1988 and 1993, 32 percent of production growth for this industry went to serve strong overseas demand for medical technology. During the same period, employment grew by more than 4 percent a year in this industry.

In June 1944, the Gallup Organization surveyed 58 medical electronics manufacturing companies which—based on their estimates—serve as many as 76 million patients around the world with their products.

These companies indicated the following:

Eighty-three percent said they experienced excessive delays by FDA for approval of new products;

Forty percent said they reduced the number of employees in the United States due to FDA delays;

Twenty-nine percent said they increased their investment in non-U.S. operations; and

Twenty-two percent said they moved U.S. jobs overseas.

This provides compelling evidence that U.S. regulatory policies are driving medical device manufacturing companies offshore. The same thing is happening with pharmaceuticals.

Manufacturers experience so much red-tape in sending their products overseas, that they prefer to make them overseas. The United States is a net loser: in jobs and productivity.

We should not allow this to continue.

Mr. President, almost a week ago, the administration announced it was undertaking several FDA reforms, including a review of its export policy.

I am hopeful that the administration will seriously consider our legislation so that we may work together to see these needed changes in the law are made.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the bill we are introducing today is designed to address a number of problems that currently prohibit American companies from competing in the international marketplace: the Food and Drug Administration's [FDA] export policies on the overseas sale of drugs, biological products, and medical devices. The FDA has repeatedly stated that export issues are not within their realm of expertise, and that they would not oppose a new standard as put forth by Congress.

We are here to submit that new standard. This bill does not call for radical measures that would jeopardize

the safety of citizens of other countries. This bill does not simply allow unapproved products to be randomly shipped around the world. It does not allow export products to be sold domestically.

What this bill does do is recognize the authority of our international trading partners by acknowledging that WTO [World Trade Organization] members have an evolved import system to control what products are being brought into their country, a step up from general GATT signatories. It permits WTO countries to decide for themselves whether or not they want to approve a product to be available to their citizens, and specifies a notification process by U.S. manufacturers to the FDA for those nations that are not WTO members. Our bill specifies that a device which is banned in the United States by the FDA cannot be exported. This legislation provides recourse to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prohibit exports if she judges there to be an ''imminent hazard'' that the product would be shipped back into the United States, threatening to the health or safety of consumers.

These are all critical components and appropriate to promoting U.S. manufacturers in the international marketplace. The bill is designed to allow U.S. medical technology and products, the best in the world, to compete fairly with foreign manufacturers. And it allows autonomy among our trading partners.

I as pleased to hear the President address FDA reform in his speech on March 16 as part of ''Reinventing Government.'' This is a positive step in dealing with a number of issues that stem from the current regulatory climate at this, and many other, Federal agencies. I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues here on the Hill to reform the policies and procedures of this important agency.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 594. A bill to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PRESIDIO TRUST ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to minimize the costs to the taxpayer of the newest addition to our National Park System, the Presidio of San Francisco.

In 1972, Congress recognized the park potential of the Presidio. At that time Congressman Phil Burton's legislation creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area [GGNRA] was drawn to include the Presidio, and provided that the Presidio would become a national park when it was no longer needed by the Army. Thus when the Army vacated the base last September, the Park Service assumed responsibility for administering the Presidio as part of the GGNRA.

It is projected that the new park will attract 10 million or more visitors a year. Those visitors will enjoy one of the most beautiful and historic urban open spaces in the world. The park offers spectacular vistas of the Pacific Ocean, the Golden Gate, the Marin Headlands, San Francisco Bay, and the skyline of San Francisco.

The Presidio also offers over 200 years of military history, from its founding in 1776, through the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II. Presidio architecture represents a remarkable collection of structures dating from the days of Mexican sovereignty over California. The entire Presidio was declared a national historic landmark in 1962.

The bill we introduce today will establish the Presidio Trust, a public entity modeled on the successful Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

The Trust will help us put the Presidio's buildings to work for the park. Rents and other revenues will be retained to restore and conserve the Presidio's extraordinary natural and historic resources.

The Trust will manage the facilities at the Presidio which are not of the type normally administered by the National Park Service. It will be responsible for leasing, maintenance, and property management—consistent with the park management plan and the legislation creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The open space, forests, and recreational land will be managed by the Park Service as they are doing in other parts of the GGNRA.

Critical to the success of this undertaking will be the Presidio's ability to generate revenues to offset the costs of operation and capital improvement. The Trust will have the flexibility necessary to negotiate terms of leases and other contracts, to leverage lease revenues, and to utilize a staff qualified in financial management. It will be accountable to the public through a public-private governing board of directors, annual auditing and reporting requirements, and a requirement to adhere to the publicly approved general management plan for the Presidio and the GGNRA authorizing legislation.

According to expert analysis, the Presidio Trust established by this bill would produce savings of 20 to 30 percent when compared to the cost of total Federal management of the Presidio. The Presidio is an example of defense conversion that will be cost effective while serving an important national purpose.

The Presidio is one of the Nation's great treasures. If we act now, we can ensure its successful transformation from a military base into one of the world's outstanding urban parks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 594

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Presidio, located amidst the incomparable scenic splendor of the Golden Gate, is one of America's great natural and historic sites;

(2) the Presidio is the oldest continuously operating military post in the Nation dating from 1776, and was designated as National Historic Landmark in 1962;

(3) preservation of the cultural and historic integrity of the Presidio for public use recognizes its significant role in the history of the United States;

(4) the Presidio, in its entirety, is a part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, in accordance with Public Law 92–589;

(5) as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the Presidio's outstanding natural, historic, scenic, cultural, and recreational resources must be managed in a manner which is consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management, and which protects the Presidio from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and historic and natural character of the area; and

(6) the Presidio will be managed through an innovative public/private partnership that minimizes cost to the United States Treasury and makes efficient use of private sector resources that could be utilized in the public interest.

SEC. 2. INTERIM LEASING AUTHORITY.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') is authorized to negotiate and enter into leases, at fair market rental and without regard to section 321 of chapter 314 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b), for all or part of the Presidio of San Francisco that is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary until such time as the property concerned is transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust. Notwithstanding sections 1341 and 3302 of title 31 of the United States Code, the proceeds from any such lease shall be retained by the Secretary and used for the preservation, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair and related expenses incurred with respect to Presidio properties. For purposes of any such lease, the Secretary may adjust the rental by taking into account any amounts to be expended by the lessee for preservation, maintenance, restoration, improvement, repair and related expenses with respect to properties within the Presidio.

SEC. 3. THE PRESIDIO TRUST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a body corporate within the Department of the Interior to be known as the Presidio Trust (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Trust'').

(b) TRANSFER.—(1) The Secretary shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Trust those areas commonly known as the Letterman/LAIR complex, Fort Scott, Main Post, Cavalry Stables, Presidio Hill, Wherry Housing, East Housing, the structures at Crissy Field, roads, utilities or other infrastructure servicing the properties and such other properties that the Secretary deems appropriate, as depicted on the map referred to in this subsection. The Trust and the Secretary shall agree on the use and occupancy of buildings and facilities necessary to house and support activities of the National Park Service at the Presidio.

(2) Within 60 days after enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare a map identifying properties to be conveyed to the Trust.

(3) The transfer for administrative jurisdiction shall occur within 60 days after appointments are made to the board of Directors.

(4) The Secretary shall transfer, with the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over any property, all leases, concessions, licenses, permits, programmatic agreements and other agreements affecting such property and any revenues and unobligated funds associated with such leases, concessions, licenses, permits, and agreements.

(c) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers and management of the Trust shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of the following 5 members:

(A) The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee.

(B) 4 individuals, who are not employees of the Federal Government, appointed by the President, who shall possess extensive knowledge and experience in one or more of the fields of city planning, finance, and real estate. At least 3 of these individuals shall reside in the region in which the Presidio is located.

(2) TERMS.—The President shall make the appointments referred to in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) within 90 days and in such a manner as to ensure staggered 4-year terms. Any vacancy under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made, and any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his or her predecessor was appointed. No appointed director may serve more than 8 years in consecutive terms. No member of the Board of Directors may have a financial interest in any tenant of the Presidio.

(3) ORGANIZATION AND COMPENSATION.—The Board shall organize itself in such a manner as it deems most appropriate to effectively carry out the authorized activities of the Trust. Board members shall serve without pay, but may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Trust.

(4) LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS.—Members of the Board of Directors shall not be considered Federal employees by virtue of their membership on the Board, except for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(5) PUBLIC LIAISON.—The Board shall establish procedures whereby liaison with the public, through the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, and the National Park Service, shall be maintained.

(d) DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES.—In accordance with the purposes set forth in this Act and in section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes'', approved October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92–589; 86 Stat. 1299; 16 U.S.C. 460bb), the Trust shall manage the leasing, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair and improvement of property within the Presidio which is under its administrative jurisdiction. The Trust may participate in the development of programs and activities at the properties that have been transferred to the Trust. In exercising its powers and duties, the Trust shall act in accordance with the approved General Management Plan, as amended, for the Presidio (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Plan'') and shall have the following authorities:

(1) The Trust is authorized to manage, lease, maintain, rehabilitate and improve, either directly or by agreement, those properties within the Presidio which are transferred to the Trust by the Secretary.

(2)(A) The Trust is authorized to negotiate and enter into such agreements, leases, contracts and other arrangements with any person, firm, association, organization, corporation or governmental entity, including without limitation entities of Federal, State and local governments (except any agreement to convey fee title to any property located at the Presidio) as are necessary and appropriate to finance and carry out its authorized activities. Agreements under this paragraph may be entered into without regard to section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 303b).

(B) Except as provided in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), Federal laws and regulations governing procurement by Federal agencies shall apply to the Trust.

(C) The Secretary may authorize the Trust, in exercising authority under section 303(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 253(g)) relating to simplified purchase procedures, to use as the dollar limit of each purchase or contract under this subsection an amount which does not exceed $500,000.

(D) The Secretary may authorize the Trust, in carrying out the requirement of section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416) to furnish the Secretary of Commerce for publication notices of proposed procurement actions, to use as the applicable dollar threshold for each expected procurement an amount which does not exceed $1,000,000.

(E) The Trust shall establish procedures for lease agreements and other agreements for use and occupancy of Presidio facilities, including a requirement that in entering into such agreements the Trust shall obtain such competition as is practicable in the circumstances.

(3) The Trust is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation and duties of an executive director and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may pay them without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, title 5, United States Code (relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates).

(4) To augment or encourage the use of non-Federal funds to finance capital improvements on Presidio properties transferred to its jurisdiction, the Trust, in addition to its other authorities, shall have the following authorities:

(A) The authority to guarantee any lender against loss of principal or interest on any construction loan, provided that (i) the terms of the guarantee are approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, (ii) adequate guarantee authority is provided in appropriations Acts, and (iii) such guarantees are structured so as to minimize potential cost to the Federal Government.

(B) The authority, subject to available appropriations, to make loans to the occupants of property managed by the Trust for the preservation, restoration, maintenance, or repair of such property.

(C) The authority to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, but only if the Secretary of the Treasury agrees to purchase such obligations after determining that the projects to be funded from the proceeds thereof are credit worthy and that a repayment schedule is established. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such chapter are extended to include any purchase of such notes or obligations acquired by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection. The aggregate amount of obligations issued under this subparagraph which are outstanding at any one time may not exceed $150,000,000. Obligations issued under this subparagraph shall be in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. No funds appropriated to the Trust may be used for repayment of principal or interest on, or redemption of, obligations issued under this paragraph. All obligations purchased under authority of this subparagraph must be authorized in advance in appropriations Acts.

(D) The Trust shall be deemed to be a public agency for the purpose of entering into joint exercise of powers agreements pursuant to California government code section 6500 and following.

(5) The Trust may solicit and accept donations of funds, property, supplies, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations and other private or public entities for the purpose of carrying out its duties. The Trust shall maintain philanthropic liaison with the Golden Gate National Park Association, the fund raising association for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

(6) All proceeds received by the Trust shall be retained by the Trust without further appropriation and used to offset the costs of administration, preservation, restoration, operation, maintenance, repair and related expenses incurred by the Trust with respect to such properties under its jurisdiction. Upon the request of the Trust, the Secretary of the Treasury shall invest excess moneys of the Trust in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Trust.

(7) The Trust may sue and be sued in its own name to the same extent as the Federal Government. Litigation arising out of the activities of the Trust shall be conducted by the Attorney General, as needed; the Trust may retain private attorneys to provide advice and counsel.

(8) The Trust shall have all necessary and proper powers for the exercise of the authorities invested in it.

(9) For the purpose of compliance with applicable laws and regulations concerning properties transferred to the Trust by the Secretary, the Trust shall negotiate directly with regulatory authorities.

(e) INSURANCE.—The Trust shall procure insurance against any loss in connection with the properties managed by it or its authorized activities as is reasonable and customary.

(f) BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE.—The Trust shall ensure that all properties under its jurisdiction are brought into compliance with all applicable Federal building codes and regulations within 10 years after the enactment of this Act.

(g) TAXES.—The Trust shall be exempt from all taxes and special assessments of every kind in the State of California, and its political subdivisions, including the city and county of San Francisco to the same extent as the Secretary.

(h) FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND REPORT.—(1) Financial statements of the Trust shall be audited annually in accordance with section 9105 of title 31 of the United States Code.

(2) At the end of each calendar year, the Trust shall submit to the Secretary and the

Congress a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments for the prior fiscal year. The report also shall include a section that describes in general terms the Trust's goals for the current fiscal year.

(i) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary from exercising any of the Secretary's lawful powers within the Presidio.

(j) LEASING.—In managing and leasing the properties transferred to it, the Trust should consider the extent to which prospective tenants maximize the contribution to the implementation of the General Management Plan and to the generation of revenues to offset costs of the Presidio. The Trust shall give priority to the following categories of tenants: tenants that enhance the financial viability of the Presidio thereby contributing to the preservation of the scenic beauty and natural character of the area; tenants that facilitate the cost-effective preservation of historic buildings through their reuse of such buildings, or tenants that promote through their activities the general programmatic content of the plan.

(k) REVERSION.—In the event of failure or default, all interests and assets of the Trust shall revert to the United States to be administered by the Secretary.

(l) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities of the Trust.

(m) SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—If any provisions of this Act or the application thereof to any body, agency, situation, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other bodies, agencies, situations, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 595. A bill to provide for the extension of a hydroelectric project located in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXTENSION OF FERC LICENSE FOR GRAFTON, WV

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senator ROCKEFELLER, a bill to grant the city of Grafton, WV, a 4-year extension of its Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] license to begin construction of a hydroelectric power project at Tygart Dam in Taylor County. This project is to be financed entirely by the city of Grafton and its investors through nonpublic equity and debt. This extension is necessary because the license expires during the current year and over $3 million has already been invested in this project. The hydroelectric project takes advantage of the existing dam on the Tygart River in order to generate power and will also include the development of recreational facilities. Extensive environmental studies on the project have been conducted in coordination with interested regulatory agencies. Without any contribution from the Federal Government, the city and its investors will finance the project, which will include fishing piers, walkways, picnic facilities, and a parking area.

The city and its investors anticipate that the project would employ 200 staff during the peak of construction, with a $1 million monthly payroll. The total construction payroll for the project is expected to be $15 million. The Grafton hydropower project will provide substantial taxes and other payments to various governmental entities during construction and operation. The Federal Government will benefit from this project since it will receive annual payments of $200,000 from the hydroelectric project. The Federal Government also will receive income tax from the project, as it will be privately financed. It is hoped that the license extension made possible by this bill will bring significant economic development to the Taylor County region of West Virginia.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow deductions for advertising and promotional expenses for tobacco products; to the Committee on Finance.

ELIMINATION OF DEDUCTIBILITY OF TOBACCO ADVERTISING

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation that addresses a very serious problem in a commonsense way. During the budget debate in 1992 I offered an amendment to limit the tax deductibility of tobacco advertising. It didn't pass. And, because it didn't pass, the American taxpayers are still coughing up billions to promote smoking.

The legislation I am introducing today would eliminate the taxpayer deductibility of tobacco advertising and promotion.

These days we hear a lot of talk about cuts in school lunches, cuts in the WIC Program, cuts in investments to improve the health of Americans.

I believe there's a better way to go—with commonsense cuts that promote the health of our economy and the health of our people.

It's time for tobacco companies to quit blowing our tax dollars up in smoke with their big tobacco advertising campaigns. It's time for them to stop luring our kids into their deathtraps.

According to the Federal Trade Commission the tobacco industry spent $5.2 billion in 1992 to advertise and promote cigarettes. But that's not just their money, it's ours, too. Because all of those expenses are tax deductible.

In fact, American taxpayers are coughing up nearly $2 billion a year in tax subsidies and serving as a silent partner in helping big tobacco companies peddle their products and hook our kids.

This taxpayer-subsidized multi-billion-dollar effort includes ads in magazines and newspapers, and outside advertising such as billboards, advertising at supermarkets and convenience stores, use of gifts, and sponsorship of sporting events.

And all of this is designed to convince people that smoking is cool—necessary for social acceptance and helps make one attractive to the opposite sex. It is deliberately designed to keep people smoking, but more importantly, to attract a new generation to the smoking habit.

Every day, another $5 million of taxpayer money is used to promote a product that—when used as intended—causes disease, disability, and death.

Every day, another 3,000 of America's children get hooked on smoking.

Consider what the taxpayers receive for their money. We get Old Joe Camel. If you don't know who Joe Camel is just ask any first-grader.

According to a study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, more 6-year-olds can identify Old Joe Camel than adults. In fact, just as many 6-year-olds can identify Old Joe Camel as they can Mickey Mouse.

And his name recognition has really paid off—since the introduction of Old Joe, sales of Camel cigarettes to children under 18 went from $6 million to over $476 million a year.

But that's not all. Joe is branching out. And so are some of his competitors. They have all started what I call merchandising clubs in which you can smoke your way to all sorts of gifts.

A study in this month's Consumer Reports magazine found that 11 percent of children between the age of 12 to 17 owned at least one tobacco industry promotional item.

And it only gets worse, cigarette companies not only know what kids like, they know where they live. The same poll in Consumer Reports found that 7.6 percent of teens received cigarette company mail at home addressed directly to them. If you carry those figures nationwide, that means 1.6 million children are on the tobacco mailing list.

These campaigns are outrageous and they violate the industry's own cigarette advertising code. The industry has adopted a code that states that ''cigarette advertising shall not represent that cigarette smoking is essential to social prominence, distinction, success, or sexual attraction.

But how does that square with these ads? How does that square with the Marlboro Aventure Team? How does that square with Joe Camel? It simply doesn't and we ought not subsidize it.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to join Senator LAUTENBERG in legislation he is offering today to allow American taxpayers to recover Medicare, Medicaid, and other Federal health program costs associated with tobacco-related illnesses. For too long the tobacco companies have been raking in profits while the American taxpayers have been coughing up billions in health care costs attributable to tobacco related illness.

The Medicare and Medicaid share of these costs total over $15 billion per year and the costs to other Federal health programs are nearly $5 billion.

The Columbia University Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse has estimated that tobacco-related illnesses

will cost the Medicare program $800 billion over the next 20 years. At that rate, Medicare will go bankrupt.

It is unconscionable that the tobacco industry has profited while the taxpayer has been left with the devastating and widespread costs associate with tobacco use.

The legislation introduced by Senator LAUTENBERG would hold manufacturers accountable for the damage they do. Manufacturers of tobacco products would pay for the cost of tobacco-related illness incurred by Government through the Medicaid, Medicare, and other health programs.

I am also pleased that Senator BRADLEY is introducing legislation to further the effort to decrease cigarette smoking. An increase in the tobacco tax is one of the most effective methods for significantly reducing tobacco use among children and adults. We know that for every 10 percent increase in the price of tobacco products, there will be approximately a 4-percent decrease in tobacco consumption, and possibly even greater decrease in tobacco use among children.

Mr. President, we must take every possible opportunity to convince people to stop smoking and prevent children from ever taking up the habit. As former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop stated:

> Smoking is associated with more death and illness than drugs, alcohol, automobile accidents, and AIDS combined.

U.S. Public Health Service figures tell us that over 430,000 Americans will die from cigarette smoking this year. That is more than the number of Americans who died in all of World War II. Over 1,000 Americans will die today from smoking. That is more than the equivalent of two fully loaded jumbo jets crashing with no survivors—every day.

The medical data on the health effects of smoking are well established. Since 1964, when the first Surgeon General's ''Report on Smoking and Health'' was issued, some 50,000 scientific studies on the relationship between smoking and disease have been conducted. Smoking has been shown to be a major case of heart disease, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema; cancers of the lung, larynx, mouth, esophagus, pancreas, and bladder; pneumonia and stomach cancers.

Mr. President, as we look for way to tackle the budget deficit we should not be cutting initiatives that help people and investment in our future. Instead we should close the corporate tax loopholes. And let's start by eliminating special breaks that help big tobacco corporations and hurt our kids.

Passage of the Harkin, Lautenberg, and Bradley bills would be a triple play for our economy and our Nation's health.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS FOR ADVERTISING AND PROMOTIONAL EXPENSES RELATING TO TOBACCO PRODUCT USE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2801. DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION FOR TOBACCO ADVERTISING AND PROMOTIONAL EXPENSES.

No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for expenses relating to advertising or promoting cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, or any similar tobacco product. For purposes of this section, any term used in this section which is also used in section 5702 shall have the same meaning given such term by section 5702.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding after the item relating to section 280H the following new item:

''Sec. 280I. Disallowance of deduction for tobacco advertising and promotion expenses.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1995.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senator HARKIN, to introduce legislation that would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to forbid tobacco companies to deduct their advertising and promotional expenses when calculating their taxes.

I have already discussed the huge toll—in both economical and human terms—which tobacco wreaks on this country. And I have already introduced a bill increasing the tax on all tobacco products by a factor of five. Mr. President, the Harkin-Bradley bill complements my earlier bill by ensuring that Federal Government acts consistently when it comes to tobacco.

Why do I say the Government acts inconsistently with regard to tobacco? Because on the one hand, it allows tobacco companies to deduct their advertising and promotional costs on their taxes. These tax exemptions are the equivalent of direct Government payments. In terms of lost revenues to the Federal Treasury, they are no different from cash payments to AFDC recipients. And we're not talking a small amount of money—in 1992, these deductions were worth approximately $1.7 billion a year to tobacco companies.

On the other hand, the Government spends millions and millions of dollars to try to offset the harmful effects caused by tobacco use. We are giving more than $1.7 billion to the National Cancer Institute for research this year alone; this includes $114 million specifically for lung cancer. We require warning labels to be placed on cigarette packages to inform our citizens of the direct links between tobacco use and respiratory and lung diseases and possible birth defects. We provide millions of dollars for public health campaigns to warn people of the danger of tobacco, and to help them to quit.

These are directly contradictory policies. First, we give the tobacco companies a tremendous tax incentive—a Government handout—essentially encouraging them to advertise and promote tobacco products. Then, we turn around and spend a billion or two trying to unravel the harm that we have helped to cause, to reduce the health devastation we have contributed to, by funding research on tobacco use and to fund campaigns to discourage and end its use.

And think about those advertising and promotional campaigns which we are helping to finance. Many of them are targeted at our youth, who often may ignore well-intended and wise warnings about mortality, and instead obey the behavior of their own peer groups who believe that smoking is cool. Approximately 90 percent of all smokers begin in their teens or younger. The tobacco companies know this and specifically target younger age groups in their advertising. And the Federal Government helps to pay the bill for them to do so.

Mr. President, virtually all of the health care bills which were considered last session placed great emphasis on prevention. We know we can reduce health care costs if we encourage our citizens to avoid unhealthy choices, and to exercise regularly, to eat right, and design our health care system to focus on preventive care and not wait until someone is sick to treat them. Yet cigarette smoking is the single most preventable cause of death in the United States. This bill takes action now to put meaning into all the rhetoric about prevention. And at the same time, it will save the Federal Government an estimated $1.7 billion a year in foregone tax expenditures, once it is fully implemented.

Mr. President, this bill is health care reform that is right on target. It doesn't control prices, limit choices, or require any new Government intervention in health care. It addresses only those who are directly responsible for the largest preventable cause of death in the United States—the tobacco companies themselves.

Mr. President, the Government should speak with one voice on this problem, and that voice should unequivocally say: ''Tobacco use will harm you.'' We will not subsidize the seller; we will not underwrite the smoker; we will support efforts to stop; and we will dedicate our resources to preventing Americans from ever starting. I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that we speak with one voice by supporting this bill.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 597. A bill to insure the long-term viability of the Medicare, Medicaid, and other Federal health programs by

establishing a dedicated trust fund to reimburse the Government for the health care costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE/MEDICAID SOLVENCY ACT

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicare/Medicaid Solvency Act of 1995. This legislation will require the tobacco industry to reimburse the Federal Government for Medicare, Medicaid, and other Federal health care program costs for diseases attributable to tobacco products.

Deliberations on the budget will soon begin and it looks like the Congress is serious about undertaking real, meaningful, and significant deficit reduction. My bill will do just that.

Any serious attempt at deficit reduction must consider health care, particularly the Medicare, Medicaid, and the other Federal health care programs. Federal expenditures for these programs have skyrocketed in recent years and current HCFA projections indicate that the Medicare trust fund, which pays for Medicare part A costs, will become insolvent shortly after the turn of the century. Medicare part B, Medicaid, and other Federal health programs have no dedicated trust fund and contribute with increasing severity each year to the deficit spending about which we here in Congress complain so vehemently. It is now clear to everyone that changes in our Federal health care programs are inevitable if we wish to control and reduce the deficit.

My Republican colleagues have proposed to cut Medicare and Medicaid by $255–$275 billion over the next 5 years. As much as I admire the Republicans' commitment to reducing Government waste and inefficiency, I do not believe we should seek to reduce the deficit by cutting health care for our most vulnerable citizens: seniors, children, and the disabled.

And so I now proposed a better idea. The Centers for Disease Control tell us that Federal health care expenditures for diseases attributable to tobacco products are currently about $20 billion per year. While tobacco companies receive approximately $100 billion in annual revenues and earn huge profits from the sale of their deadly products, taxpayers are forced to pay the health care bills for the diseases those products cause. This is outrageous and is exactly backwards from what logic and justice tell us it ought to be. We need to turn this system on its head. We should be sending the Federal health care bills for tobacco-related diseases to the tobacco companies rather than to the taxpayers.

It is time to get serious about reducing the deficit. And the right way to reduce the deficit is not to reduce health care programs for people in need; rather it is to insist that the tobacco industry accept financial responsibility for the problems it knowingly causes. My bill does this.

My message to the Republican leadership is simple: The tobacco industry must be a part of any deficit reduction package. Much has been said in this Chamber about the need to reduce the Federal deficit, and the need for individuals to take responsibility for their actions. Now it is time for the tobacco industry to accept responsibility for its actions. No member of this body who wishes to remain credible on deficit reduction can continue to ignore the extraordinary impact of this one industry on Government spending. There is no choice: either we vote to make the tobacco industry part of the solution to the deficit problem, or we abandon any pretense of being serious on this issue.

My bill will reduce the deficit by $100 billion over 5 years. That is approximately $1,000 for every taxpayer in the country. It does this by directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to annually determine the amount of Federal health care expenditures for diseases attributable to tobacco products and then authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to bill each tobacco company for its share of those expenditures, based on each company's share of the market for tobacco products. My bill does not penalize smokers nor does it restrict smoking in any way. It simply demands that those tobacco companies whose products are the direct and immediate cause of many billions of dollars of Federal health care costs pay their fair share of those costs.

The real question is: Who will pay for the Federal health care costs for diseases attributable to tobacco products? Will it be the American taxpayers who are drowning in our national debt, or will it be the tobacco companies who are swimming in profits? With this legislation, I choose to side with the taxpayers and I hope my Senate colleagues will do so as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this bill, a fact sheet, and a letter of support from the Coalition or Smoking or Health printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Medicare/Medicaid Solvency Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) illnesses and diseases that result from the use of tobacco products cost Federal Government health care programs billions of dollars, including $10,200,000,000 in the medicare program, $5,100,000,000 in the medicaid program, and $4,700,000,000 in other Federal health programs in fiscal year 1993;

(2) in April 1994, the trustees of the medicare trust funds concluded that such funds may be insolvent in 2001;

(3) such insolvency would severely affect the ability of the medicare trust funds to continue to protect the health of America's senior citizens; and

(4) the medicare population has a significantly higher risk of contracting illnesses and diseases that result from the use of tobacco products than younger age groups.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to insure the long-term viability of the medicare, medicaid, and other federal health programs by establishing a dedicated trust fund to reimburse the government for the health care costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products.

SEC. 3. TOBACCO PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS CONTRIBUTION TO HEALTH CARE COST REIMBURSEMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle K—Tobacco Product Manufacturers Contribution to Health Care Cost Reimbursement Trust Fund.

''CHAPTER 100. Tobacco Product Manufacturers Contribution to Health Care Cost Reimbursement Trust Fund.

''CHAPTER 100—TOBACCO PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS CONTRIBUTION TO HEALTH CARE COST REIMBURSEMENT TRUST FUND.

''Sec. 9801. Establishment of Tobacco Product Health Care Cost Reimbursement Trust Fund.

''Sec. 9802. Contributions to Trust Fund.

''SEC. 9801. ESTABLISHMENT OF TOBACCO PRODUCT HEALTH CARE COST REIMBURSEMENT TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Tobacco Product Health Care Cost Reimbursement Trust Fund' (hereafter referred to in this chapter as the 'Trust Fund'), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or transferred to the Trust Fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall transfer to the Trust Fund an amount equivalent to contributions received in the Treasury under section 9802.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS IN TRUST FUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available in each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1997), as provided by appropriation Acts, to the Secretary—

''(A) to distribute to each particular Secretary responsible for the expenditure of Federal funds for that fiscal year under title XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act or any other Federal program for the payment of health care costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products, and

''(B) to pay all expenses of administration incurred by the Department of the Treasury in administering this chapter and the Trust Fund.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF DISTRIBUTION.—Each particular Secretary described in paragraph (1)(A) shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury such documentation as the Secretary requires to determine the appropriate distribution under paragraph (1)(A).

''(3) USE OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—In any case in which an expenditure of Federal funds described in paragraph (1)(A) was made from a trust fund, the distribution under paragraph (1)(A) reimbursing such expenditure shall be made to such trust fund.

''(4) STATE MEDICAID EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall include in the Secretary's submission under paragraph (2) the expenditure of State funds under State plans under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the payment of health care

costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products, and to the extent the distribution to the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A) is attributable to such expenditure, shall reimburse the various States for such expenditures.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE RULES.—For purposes of this section, the rules of subchapter B of chapter 98 shall apply.

''(e) TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'tobacco products' has the meaning given such term by section 5702(c).

''SEC. 9802. CONTRIBUTIONS TO TRUST FUND.

''(a) ANNUAL PREMIUMS.—Each manufacturer of tobacco products shall pay to the Trust Fund, an annual contribution equal to the product of the amount determined under subsection (b) for each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1997) and the manufacturer's market share percentage determined under subsection (c) for the calendar year preceding such fiscal year.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF FUNDING LEVELS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date the President is required to submit the budget of the United States for a fiscal year to Congress, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, after consultation with the Directors of the National Institutes of Health, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, shall make an estimate of—

''(A) the amount of Federal expenditures for that fiscal year under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and other Federal programs, and

''(B) the amount of State expenditures for that fiscal year under State plans under title XIX of the Social Security Act,

for payment of health care costs of individuals with diseases attributable to the use of tobacco products.

''(2) DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATE METHODOLOGY.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall publish in the Federal Register all relevant documentation considered and the methodology used in making the estimate described in paragraph (1).

''(3) REPORT IN BUDGET.—The President shall include the estimate described in paragraph (1) in the budget for the fiscal year.

''(c) MARKET SHARE PERCENTAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, the Secretary shall determine and publish the market share percentage for the preceding calendar year for each manufacturer of tobacco products by determining such manufacturer's percentage share of the total amount of tobacco products sold in the United States during such calendar year.

''(2) INFORMATION.—Not later than April 1, each manufacturer of tobacco products shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may require to determine any market share percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year.

''(d) PAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The annual contribution under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be payable in 12 monthly installments, due on the twenty-fifth day of each calendar month in the fiscal year.

''(e) ENFORCEMENT.—For penalties and other general and administrative provisions applicable to this section, see subtitle F.

''(f) MANUFACTURER OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'manufacturer of tobacco products' has the meaning given such term by section 5702(d).''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

MEDICARE/MEDICAID SOLVENCY ACT—SUMMARY

Federal Health Care Costs Associated with Tobacco Use:

Medicare, $10.2 billion; Medicaid, $5.1 billion; Other Fed., $4.7 billion.

Total: $20.0 billion (Per Year—1993 CDC Figures).

MEDICARE/MEDICAID SOLVENCY ACT

A special HHS panel will determine the total amount of Federal funds spent on tobacco related illnesses each year.

The Secretary of Treasury shall collect a special annual levy from each tobacco company, based on market share, to recoup all the Federal funds spent on treating tobacco related illnesses.

Any State Medicaid funds recouped under this bill would be returned to state treasuries.

This legislation is similar to the Black Lung Trust Fund which collects a levy on mined coal to pay for the health care costs associated with Black Lung Disease.

This legislation will help cut the deficit by approximately $100 billion over the next five years and will help ensure the long-term viability of the Medicare trust fund, which is likely to be insolvent by the year 2001.

COALITION ON SMOKING OR HEALTH,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: We commend you for your leadership in introducing your bill to assess the tobacco industry for the health care costs it imposes on American taxpayers. We agree with you that it is more appropriate for the tobacco industry to pay these costs than innocent taxpayers.

Your proposal would be one of the most important public health steps this country has ever taken. It would conserve taxpayer dollars, discourage hundreds of thousands of teenagers from becoming addicted to tobacco and save about two million lives over time.

You have our full support. We look forward to working with you and your staff.

Sincerely,

SCOTT D. BALLIN,
Vice President for Public Affairs,
American Heart Association.
FRAN DU MELLE,
Deputy Managing Director,
American Lung Association.
MICHAEL F. HERON,
National Vice President for Public Affairs,
American Cancer Society.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise taxes on tobacco products, and to use a portion of the resulting revenues to fund a trust fund for tobacco diversification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

TOBACCO CONSUMPTION REDUCTION AND HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that takes a bold step toward reducing the devastating health and financial effects of tobacco use in this country.

Mr. President, in both 1991 and 1993, I rose before this Chamber to talk about the destructive effects of tobacco use and to introduce legislation that would begin to redress these effects. Since my 1993 statement, almost 1 million more people have died from tobacco-related illnesses. The time to stop this travesty is now, and to do that I am introducing legislation that will raise the Federal excise tax on tobacco by a factor of five, which translates to an increase of $1.00 per pack of cigarettes.

Over 30 years after the 1964 Surgeon General's report sounded the health alarm for smoking, approximately one-quarter of the Nation's adults remain addicted to cigarettes. Smoking now kills an estimated 419,000 Americans every year—more than alcohol, heroin, crack, automobile and airplane accidents, homicides, suicides, and AIDS combined. Furthermore, environmental tobacco smoke—smoke from other people's cigarettes—causes tens of thousands of additional deaths. This year, one out of every five Americans who dies will die from tobacco use.

If these statistics were not staggering enough, each year a growing number of teenagers start smoking, even though selling cigarettes to minors is illegal. Virtually all new users of tobacco are teenagers or younger, and every 30 seconds a child in the United States smokes for the first time. The efforts that have been waged by public health officials against youth smoking have been dwarfed by the billions spent by the industry on advertising aimed at children and teenagers. The addiction of children to tobacco, and consequently the long-term effects, is a moral disgrace.

A spokesman for the Tobacco Institute, a lobbying group for the tobacco industry, was quoted as saying with regard to smoking:

> This is a day and age when we ultimately have to recognize that adults are going to indulge in the legal pleasures that others don't approve of.

My response to the industry is: This legal pleasure kills more than one out of three long-term users when used as intended. This legal pleasure has been determined to be a major cause of heart disease, lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, low-birthweight babies, strokes, and a variety of other diseases. This legal pleasure is as addictive as cocaine or heroin. They are right that I don't approve of the effects of this legal pleasure, and for good reason.

Furthermore, this legal pleasure contributes substantially to health care costs every year. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, health care expenditures caused directly by smoking totaled $50 billion in 1993, and $22 billion of those costs were paid by Government funds. According to a former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, smoking is the largest single drain on the Medicare trust fund.

One of the most effective things we can do to control health care costs is to end smoking. I view tobacco taxes as compensation for a portion of the health care costs burden we are forced to bear, thanks to smoking. It is more than fair to ask smokers to share some of the costs which they help to create.

Some people may think that the tobacco tax has already been raised substantially in recent years, and therefore that it is unfair to raise it again. This is a misconception. Despite the fact that the average price of a pack of cigarettes has risen by more than $1.10 since 1982, only 8 cents of this increase is due to a rise in the Federal excise tax. And even the dollar-per-pack increase which I am proposing will generate only about $12 billion a year in additional income—far less than the $50 billion in health care costs caused directly by tobacco in 1 year.

But this bill has an even more important goal than recovering health care expenditures. It will help decrease tobacco consumption significantly. Conservative estimates predict that a 10 percent increase in the price of cigarettes will reduce overall smoking by about 4 percent. And for kids, who are more price sensitive than adults, the impact is even greater—every 10-percent increase in cigarette prices decreases demand among children and teenager by as much as 14 percent.

Mr. President, despite the many advantages of this legislation, I am not blind to the fact that there are those whom it will impact negatively—particularly, tobacco farmers. By no means do I think that the potential losses to these farmers are an adequate justification for making no efforts to reduce tobacco consumption. But because I realize the impact of an increased excise tax on these farmers, my bill puts 3 percent of all revenues it generates into a special trust fund to be used to help tobacco framers substitute new crops in place of tobacco.

Mr. President, these days everyone is looking for a way to reduce Government spending on health care. Almost all of the actions under consideration will be painful. In contrast, increasing the tobacco tax is one of the wisest and most beneficial ways of addressing this problem. It will save billions of dollars in health care costs, not only for the Federal Government but for private insurers and citizens across the country. It will save countless lives. It will decrease unnecessary suffering. It will discourage millions of children and teenagers from ever becoming addicted to tobacco. And poll after poll has found that public support is high for a significant hike in the tobacco tax—and this support is consistent across people from all geographic and economic backgrounds.

Mr. President, this bill is good health policy. It is good economic policy. And it is key to helping our children and teenagers achieve a tobacco-free future. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a bill summary be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 598

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Tobacco Consumption Reduction and Health Improvement Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN TAXES ON TOBACCO PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CIGARS.—Subsection (a) of section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rate of tax on cigars) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$1.125 cents per thousand (93.75 cents per thousand on cigars removed during 1991 and 1992)'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$5.8125 per thousand''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) LARGE CIGARS.—On cigars weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, a tax equal to 65.875 percent of the price for which sold but not more than $155 per thousand.''

(2) CIGARETTES.—Subsection (b) of section 5701 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on cigarettes) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$12 per thousand ($10 per thousand on cigarettes removed during 1991 and 1992)'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$62 per thousand''; and

(B) by striking ''$25.20 per thousand ($21 per thousand on cigarettes removed during 1991 and 1992)'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$130.20 per thousand''.

(3) CIGARETTE PAPERS.—Subsection (c) of section 5701 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on cigarette papers) is amended by striking ''0.75 cent (0.625 cent on cigarette papers removed during 1991 or 1992)'' and inserting ''3.875 cents''.

(4) CIGARETTE TUBES.—Subsection (d) of section 5701 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on cigarette tubes) is amended by striking ''1.5 cents (1.25 cents on cigarette tubes removed during 1991 or 1992)'' and inserting ''7.75 cents''.

(5) SNUFF.—Paragraph (1) of section 5701(e) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on smokeless tobacco) is amended by striking ''36 cents (30 cents on snuff removed during 1991 or 1992)'' and inserting ''$1.86''.

(6) CHEWING TOBACCO.—Paragraph (2) of section 5701(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''12 cents (10 cents on chewing tobacco removed during 1991 or 1992)'' and inserting ''62 cents''.

(7) PIPE TOBACCO.—Subsection (f) of section 5701 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on pipe tobacco) is amended by striking ''67.5 cents (56.25 cents on chewing tobacco removed during 1991 or 1992)'' and inserting ''$3.4875''.

(8) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco removed after December 31, 1995.

(b) IMPOSITION OF EXCISE TAX ON MANUFACTURE OR IMPORTATION OF ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rate of tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—On roll-your-own tobacco, manufactured in or imported into the United States, there shall be imposed a tax of $1.86 per pound (and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound).''

(2) ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—Section 5702 of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p) ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—The term 'roll-your-own tobacco' means any tobacco which, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling, is suitable for use and likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as tobacco for making cigarettes.''

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (c) of section 5702 of such Code is amended by striking ''and pipe tobacco'' and inserting ''pipe tobacco, and roll-your-own tobacco''.

(B) Subsection (d) of section 5702 of such Code is amended—

(i) in the material preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''or pipe tobacco'' and inserting ''pipe tobacco, or roll-your-own tobacco'', and

(ii) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) a person who produces cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, or roll-your-own tobacco solely for the person's own personal consumption or use, and''.

(C) The chapter heading for chapter 52 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 52—TOBACCO PRODUCTS AND CIGARETTE PAPERS AND TUBES''.

(D) The table of chapters for subtitle E of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 52 and inserting the following new item:

''CHAPTER 52. Tobacco products and cigarette papers and tubes.''

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to roll-your-own tobacco removed (as defined in section 5702(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this subsection) after December 31, 1995.

(B) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—Any person who—

(i) on the date of the enactment of this Act is engaged in business as a manufacturer of roll-your-own tobacco or as an importer of tobacco products or cigarette papers and tubes, and

(ii) before January 1, 1996, submits an application under subchapter B of chapter 52 of such Code to engage in such business,

may, notwithstanding such subchapter B, continue to engage in such business pending final action on such application. Pending such final action, all provisions of such chapter 52 shall apply to such applicant in the same manner and to the same extent as if such applicant were a holder of a permit under such chapter 52 to engage in such business.

(c) FLOOR STOCKS.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—On cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco manufactured in or imported into the United States which is removed before January 1, 1996, and held on such date for sale by any person, there shall be imposed the following taxes:

(A) SMALL CIGARS.—On cigars, weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand, $4.6875 per thousand.

(B) LARGE CIGARS.—On cigars, weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, a tax equal to 53.125 percent of the price for which sold, but not more than $125 per thousand.

(C) SMALL CIGARETTES.—On cigarettes, weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand, $50 per thousand.

(D) LARGE CIGARETTES.—On cigarettes, weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, $105 per thousand; except that, if more than 6½ inches in length, they shall be taxable at the rate prescribed for cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand, counting each 2¾ inches, or fraction thereof, of the length of each as one cigarette.

(E) CIGARETTE PAPERS.—On cigarette papers, 3.125 cents for each 50 papers or fractional part thereof; except that, if cigarette papers measure more than 6½ inches in length, they shall be taxable at the rate prescribed, counting each 2¾ inches, or fraction thereof, of the length of each as one cigarette paper.

(F) CIGARETTE TUBES.—On cigarette tubes, 6.25 cents for each 50 tubes or fractional part thereof; except that, if cigarette tubes measure more than 6½ inches in length, they shall be taxable at the rate prescribed, counting each 2¾ inches, or fraction thereof, of the length of each as one cigarette tube.

(G) SNUFF.—On snuff, $1.50 per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound.

(H) CHEWING TOBACCO.—On chewing tobacco, 50 cents per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound.

(I) PIPE TOBACCO.—On pipe tobacco, $2.8125 per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound.

(2) LIABILITY FOR TAX AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.—

(A) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—A person holding cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco on January 1, 1996, to which any tax imposed by paragraph (1) applies shall be liable for such tax.

(B) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be treated as a tax imposed under section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and shall be due and payable on February 15, 1996, in the same manner as the tax imposed under such section is payable with respect to cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco removed on January 1, 1996.

(3) CIGARS, CIGARETTES, CIGARETTE PAPER, CIGARETTE TUBES, SNUFF, CHEWING TOBACCO, AND PIPE TOBACCO.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''cigar'', ''cigarette'', ''cigarette paper'', ''cigarette tubes'', ''snuff'', ''chewing tobacco'', and ''pipe tobacco'' shall have the meaning given to such terms by subsections (a), (b), (e), and (g), paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (n), and subsection (o) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, respectively.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR RETAIL STOCKS.—The taxes imposed by paragraph (1) shall not apply to cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco in retail stocks held on January 1, 1996, at the place where intended to be sold at retail.

(5) FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.—Notwithstanding the Act of June 18, 1934 (19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.) or any other provision of law—

(A) cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco—

(i) on which taxes imposed by Federal law are determined, or customs duties are liquidated, by a customs officer pursuant to a request made under the first proviso of section 3(a) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (19 U.S.C. 81c(a)) before January 1, 1996, and

(ii) which are entered into the customs territory of the United States on or after January 1, 1996, from a foreign trade zone, and

(B) cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco which—

(i) are placed under the supervision of a customs officer pursuant to the provisions of the second proviso of section 3(a) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (19 U.S.C. 81c(a)) before January 1, 1996, and

(ii) are entered into the customs territory of the United States on or after January 1, 1996, from a foreign trade zone,

shall be subject to the tax imposed by paragraph (1) and such cigars, cigarettes, cigarette paper, cigarette tubes, snuff, chewing tobacco, and pipe tobacco shall, for purposes of paragraph (1), be treated as being held on January 1, 1996, for sale.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to trust fund code) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9512. TOBACCO CONVERSION TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Tobacco Conversion Trust Fund' (hereafter referred to in this section as the 'Trust Fund'), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Trust Fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall transfer to the Trust Fund an amount equivalent to 3 percent of the net increase in revenues received in the Treasury attributable to the amendments made to section 5701 by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 and the provisions contained in section 2(c) of the Tobacco Consumption Reduction and Health Improvement Act of 1995, as estimated by the Secretary.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS IN TRUST FUND.—Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures for purposes of—

''(1) providing assistance to farmers in converting from tobacco to other crops and improving the access of such farmers to markets for other crops, and

''(2) providing grants or loans to communities, and persons involved in the production or manufacture of tobacco or tobacco products, to support economic diversification plans that provide economic alternatives to tobacco to such communities and persons.

The assistance referred to in paragraph (1) may include government purchase of tobacco allotments for purposes of retiring such allotments from allotment holders and farmers who choose to terminate their involvement in tobacco production.''

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subchapter A is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9512. Tobacco Conversion Trust Fund.''

TOBACCO CONSUMPTION REDUCTION AND HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995—SUMMARY

This bill provides for an increase of the Federal excise tax on tobacco products. It raises the excise tax five-fold on cigarettes, from 24 cents to $1.24 per pack. The excise tax for all other tobacco products will also be increased five-fold. This bill will generate approximately $12 billion in additional federal revenues each year.

The reasons for this increase are clear. First, it allows us to use the most potent weapon we have at our disposal to discourage smoking—raising the price of tobacco. This will allow us to specifically direct our attention to a vulnerable and price sensitive group—children and teenagers. It is also smart tax policy—it taxes what we want to discourage so we can cut taxes on the things we want to encourage. Second, the Centers for Disease Control and the Office of Technology Assessment have estimated the cost to society of cigarette smoking at over $100 billion annually; $22 billion of these costs were paid by government funds. It is more than fair to ask smokers to shoulder some of these costs.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 599. A bill to eliminate certain welfare with respect to fugitive felons and probation and parole violators, and to facilitate sharing of information with law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

FUGITIVE FELONS AND WELFARE REFORM

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, like most of my colleagues in the Senate, I have followed with interest the activity in the House regarding welfare reform. It is with a unique perspective that I have viewed the House action having been at the center of the House's welfare reform debate last year and having been deeply involved in the direction and decision making of the House Republican platform.

During the 103d Congress, I served as the ranking Republican member on the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee. Preceding me in that capacity is quite a list of dedicated ranking members who all have and continue to make a very significant contribution to the welfare reform discussions—Senator HANK BROWN, Gov. Carroll Campbell, and the current chairman of that subcommittee, Congressman CLAY SHAW. As the Senate now prepares for its own activity on welfare reform, I hope to continue to be equally active on this side in setting that direction.

It is hard to undertake any discussion on welfare reform without realizing the multitude of issues, programs, problems, and complexities that are involved. And while my activity in the House covered many aspects of welfare and welfare-related programs, one such issue that I wanted to discuss today pertains to fugitive felons receiving welfare benefits.

Under current law, barriers exist to information sharing between law enforcement officials and social service agencies. While few States have defined criteria where the exchange of information can occur between police and social service offices, most States have not. And with the reality of fugitives receiving public assistance, it makes sense to provide police access to welfare records that indicate the whereabouts of wanted individuals, without violating the privacy language and rights of welfare beneficiaries.

In the 103d Congress, I introduced legislation (H.R. 4657) which establishes criteria for information sharing between law enforcement officials and social service agencies, allows cross reference checks between the Immigration and Naturalization Service and law enforcement with regard to illegal immigration, and sets a Federal definition of temporarily absent in instances where children of beneficiaries are away from the home for extended periods of time.

The information and record referencing under the bill is limited to individuals for whom warrants are outstanding. The bill permits access by law enforcement to information when a warrant is produced, and it is found that

the individual is receiving benefits. Someone who is not a fugitive felon would remain fully protected from such inquiries under the Welfare Privacy Act.

Is there a need for such information sharing? I'd like to submit for the RECORD a copy of a news article from Pittsburgh Tribune-Review on July 29, 1994. The article describes a situation in which an individual wanted for an 1984 slaying in Pittsburgh, had been on the run and receiving Federal welfare benefits under his real name. Likewise, a situation last year in Cleveland, OH, highlighted the difficulties that exist in tracking fugitives and trying to interface with social service agencies. In that instance, Cuyahoga County officials were denied access to records as they attempted to cross reference outstanding fugitive warrants with social service records.

It is absurd that taxpayers are subsidizing a fugitive's freedom when checking a recipient's address could lead to their apprehension. Currently, the National Crime Information Center lists 397,000 outstanding fugitive warrants nationwide—warrants being defined as ''felonies'' or ''high misdemeanors'' in cases where States agree to extradition. Several police groups have projected that as many as 75 percent of those fugitives are receiving public assistance. Additionally, as I have discovered with Pennsylvania, the extradition stipulation for warrants in the NCIC data bank actually shields the number of outstanding warrants in a given State. You too may find that your State figures are significant.

Last week, I met with the Philadelphia Fugitive Task Force to discuss the practical effects of the legislation. In confronting their 50,000 outstanding fugitive warrants, they feel strongly that the bill provides them yet another tool in their investigative efforts. Likewise, the measure has received similar comment from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Association of Chiefs of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Law Enforcement Alliance of America.

While the fugitive felon situation generally involves the parent or an adult, the bill also addresses ambiguity in the law with regard to children. Under current law, a mother can continue to receive AFDC payment for a child even if that child is temporarily absent from the home. Depending on their definition, States have the authority to end AFDC payments if the child is not going to physically be in the home for an extended period of time. Again, like the fugitive felon issue, Federal and State law remains undefined in most cases for temporarily absent. My bill would federally define temporarily absent for those instances where juveniles are away from the home as a result of a court decision or criminal activity.

Mr. President, while this legislation today may serve as my first official measure for the 104th Congress in the area of welfare reform, it is by no means the sole measure I will be introducing to the Senate. In the weeks ahead, I plan on introducing proposals covering child support enforcement, supplemental security income, and a more comprehensive proposal speaking to welfare reform in its entirety. Additionally, I plan on being very active within the Agriculture Committee in the area of nutrition programs and examining the reform options available to us, including a review of the block grant concept.

I welcome and encourage my colleagues' interest in this and other initiatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and a copy of the article I referenced earlier be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELIMINATION OF WELFARE BENEFITS WITH RESPECT TO FUGITIVE FELONS AND PROBATION AND PAROLE VIOLATORS.

(a) MEDICAID PROGRAM.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (61);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (62) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (62) the following new paragraph:

''(63) provide that no medical assistance shall be available under the plan to any individual during any period during which the individual—

''(A) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the recipient is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(B) is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.''.

(2) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Section 1902(a)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(7)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: '', except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the State agency from furnishing a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer with the current address, Social Security number and photograph (if applicable) of a recipient at the officer's request if the officer notifies the agency that—

''(A) the recipient is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the recipient is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor), or is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law,

''(B) the location or apprehension of the recipient is within the officer's official duties, and

''(C) the request is made in the proper exercise of the officer's official duties;''.

(b) AFDC PROGRAM.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR AID.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (44);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (45) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (45) the following new paragraph:

''(46) provide that aid shall not be payable under the State plan with respect to any individual during any period during which the individual is—

''(A) fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the individual is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(B) violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.''.

(2) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Section 402(a)(9) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(9)) is amended by striking ''State or local'' and all that follows through ''official duties'' and inserting ''Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer, upon such officer's request, with the current address, Social Security number and photograph (if applicable) of any recipient if the officer furnishes the agency with such recipient's name and notifies the agency that such recipient is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the recipient is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor), or is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law, or has information that is necessary for the officer to conduct the officer's official duties, that the location or apprehension of such recipient is within the officer's official duties''.

(c) FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR FOOD STAMPS.—Section 6 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) No member of a household who is otherwise eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be eligible to participate in the program as a member of that or any other household during any period during which the individual is—

''(1) fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the individual is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(2) violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.''.

(2) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 11(e)(8) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(8)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and (C)'' and inserting ''(C)''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and (D) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the address, Social Security number and photograph (if applicable) of a member of a household shall be made available, on request, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer if the officer furnishes the State agency with the name of the member and notifies the agency that (i) the member (I) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the individual is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor), or is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law, or (II) has information that is necessary for the officer to conduct the officer's official duties, (ii) the location or apprehension of the member is within the official duties of the officer,

and (iii) the request is made in the proper exercise of the officer's official duties''.

(d) SSI PROGRAM.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR AID.—Section 1611(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) A person shall not be an eligible individual or eligible spouse for purposes of this title with respect to any month if, throughout the month, the person is—

''(A) fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the person is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(B) violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.''.

(2) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Section 1631(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(e)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the paragraphs (6) and (7) inserted by sections 206(d)(2) and 206(f)(1) of the Social Security Independence and Programs Improvement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–296; 108 Stat. 1514, 1515) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall furnish any Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer, upon such officer's request, with the current address, Social Security number and photograph (if applicable) of any recipient of benefits under this title, if the officer furnishes the agency with such recipient's name and notifies the agency that—

''(A) such recipient—

''(i) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the person is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor);

''(ii) is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law; or

''(iii) has information that is necessary for the officer to conduct the officer's official duties;

''(B) the location or apprehension of such recipient is within the officer's official duties; and

''(C) the request is made in the proper exercise of the officer's official duties.''.

(e) HOUSING PROGRAMS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.—The United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 6(*l*)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by inserting immediately after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) provide that it shall be cause for immediate termination of the tenancy of a public housing tenant if such tenant—

''(A) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the tenant is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(B) is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.''; and

(B) in section 8(d)(1)(B)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) it shall be cause for termination of the tenancy of a tenant if such tenant—

''(I) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the tenant is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor); or

''(II) is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law;''.

(2) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Title I of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 27. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER AGENCIES.

''(a) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each public housing agency that enters into a contract for assistance under section 6 or 8 of this Act with the Secretary shall furnish to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, upon request, the current address, Social Security number and photograph (if applicable) of any recipient of assistance under this Act if the law enforcement agency—

''(1) furnishes the public housing agency with such recipient's name; and

''(2) notifies such agency that—

''(A) such recipient—

''(i) is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for a crime (or attempt to commit a crime) which, under the laws of the place from which the tenant is fleeing, is a felony (or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor);

''(ii) is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law; or

''(iii) has information that is necessary for the officer to conduct the officer's official duties;

''(B) the location or apprehension of such recipient is within the official duties of the agency; and

''(C) the request is made in the proper exercise of the officer's official duties.''.

SEC. 2. NOTICE TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE OF ILLEGAL ALIENS.

(a) MEDICAID PROGRAM.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (61);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (62) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (62) the following new paragraph:

''(63) provide that the State agency shall, at least 4 times annually and upon request of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, furnish the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the name and address of, and other identifying information on, any individual who the agency knows is unlawfully in the United States.''.

(b) AFDC PROGRAM.—Section 402(a)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(9)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively;

(2) by striking ''(9)'' and inserting ''(9)(A)'';

(3) in clause (v) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(D)'' and inserting ''(iv)'';

(4) by adding ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) provide that, the State agency shall, at least 4 times annually and upon request of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, furnish the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the name and address of, and other identifying information on, any individual who the agency knows is unlawfully in the United States;''.

(c) FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.—Section 11(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)), as amended by section 1(c)(2), is amended—

(1) paragraph (8)—

(A) by striking ''and (D)'' and inserting ''(D)''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and (E) such safeguards shall not prevent compliance with paragraph (26)'';

(2) in paragraph (24) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (25) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(26) that the State agency shall, at least 4 times annually and upon request of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, furnish the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the name and address of, and other identifying information on, any individual who the agency knows is unlawfully in the United States.''.

(d) SSI PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1631(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(e)), as amended by section 1(d)(2) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner shall, at least 4 times annually and upon request of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'Service'), furnish the Service with the name and address of, and other identifying information on, any individual who the agency knows is unlawfully in the United States, and shall ensure that each agreement entered into under section 1616(a) with a State provides that the State shall furnish such information at such times with respect to any individual who the State knows is unlawfully in the United States.''.

(e) HOUSING PROGRAMS.—Section 27 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as added by section 1(e)(2) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) NOTICE TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE OF ILLEGAL ALIENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, at least 4 times annually and upon request of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Service'), furnish the Service with the name and address of, and other identifying information on, any individual who the Secretary knows is unlawfully in the United States, and shall ensure that each contract for assistance entered into under section 6 or 8 of this Act with a public housing agency provides that the public housing agency shall furnish such information at such times with respect to any individual who the public housing agency knows is unlawfully in the United States.''.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF AFDC BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN WHO ARE ABSENT FROM THE HOME FOR A SIGNIFICANT PERIOD.

Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)), as amended by section 1(b)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (45);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (46) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (46) the following new paragraph:

''(47)(A) provide that aid shall not be payable under the State plan to a family with respect to any dependent child who has been, or is expected by the caretaker relative in the family to be, absent from the home for a

period of 45 consecutive days or, at the option of the State, such period of not less than 30 and not more than 90 consecutive days as the State may provide for in the State plan;

''(B) at the option of the State, provide that the State may establish such good cause exceptions to subparagraph (A) as the State considers appropriate if such exceptions are provided for in the State plan; and

''(C) provide that a caretaker relative shall not be eligible for aid under the State plan if the caretaker relative fails to notify the State agency of an absence of a dependent child from the home for the period specified in or provided for under subparagraph (A), by the end of the 5-day period that begins on the date that it becomes clear to the caretaker relative that the dependent child will be absent for the period so specified or provided for in subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to calendar quarters beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of a State that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act, the State shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such amendments before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of this subsection, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be treated as a separate regular session of the State legislature.

[From the Tribune-Review]

FUGITIVE USED REAL NAME FOR WELFARE

(By Lille Wilson)

James Brabham knew who he was. During a decade on the lam for a 1984 slaying in Pittsburgh, he used at least five aliases and five Social Security numbers.

But when he went on welfare, Brabham used his real name—and his state-issued welfare card bore his current address and photo.

The cops who arrested him Wednesday in Philadelphia saw the card when they asked Brabham for identification. They hadn't known he was on welfare.

''I'm sure it would have made things a lot easier,'' said Detective Joe Hasara of the Federal Fugitive Task Force in Philadelphia, one of the squads that for years pursued lead after dead-end lead searching for Brabham.

Police—even those looking for longtime fugitives—don't routinely look at welfare rolls to locate suspects, primarily because of the legal obstacles, Hasara said.

''It's just not feasible,'' said Hasara, citing red tape. ''We'd have to have one or two people doing nothing but getting subpoenas and court orders. We can't operate like that.''

Hasara, a Philadelphia police detective who makes up part of the city's federally funded fugitive task force, located Brabham after a typically long and laborious investigation that involved following tips and digging into clues. He won't be more specific than that, for fear of divulging the task force's gumshoe secrets.

The victim, Charlene Summers, 36, was living with Brabham in Pittsburgh's Beltzhoover area. Police said Brabham reported the January 1984 killing to city homicide in a telephone call. He claimed Summers had attacked him with a knife.

Brabham, who posted bond days after he was charged with her murder, never showed up at a coroner's hearing. A bench warrant for his arrest went out in May 1984. In March 1990, a federal court handed down a fugitive warrant.

By then, the Greater Pittsburgh Fugitive Task Force was already hunting him, said FBI Agent Ralph Young, a task force member.

''We had people all over the country looking for him,'' Young said. ''He never came back to Pittsburgh.''

Philadelphia was one of the investigative hot spots: Brabham had relatives there, Young said.

''We'd hear sightings. We'd follow up. It'd lead to a dead end,'' he said.

The state's welfare listings may be accessible to police who petition the Commonwealth Court for specific information, said department spokesman Kevin Campbell.

Although state law forbids disclosure of individual welfare information for personal, commercial or political uses, a specific statute allows law enforcement queries if authorized by a judge, Campbell said.

''District attorneys have done it in the past, certainly,'' said Campbell, who added that police face no other official barriers.

''Apparently they've never worked the street,'' Hasara snorted.

After Brabham's arrest Wednesday, Young telephoned Summers' mother, Lillie Jones, with the news.

''For ten years, I never gave up on this,'' said Jones, 70, who described a dream she had Tuesday night. ''She and I was very close. In the spiritual world, we had a lot of connection.

''I dreamed some man was chasing her around and around my house with a gun, and around and around my neighbor's house, and she was calling me for help: she ran to me and said, ''Mama, save me.''

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a comprehensive program for the prevention of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome, and for other purposes.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 184, a bill to establish an Office for Rare Disease Research in the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 244

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 244, a bill to further the goals of the Paperwork Reduction Act to have Federal agencies become more responsible and publicly accountable for reducing the burden of Federal paperwork on the public, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the payment to States of per diem for veterans receiving adult day health care, and for other purposes.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 343, a bill to reform the regulatory process, and for other purposes.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to reauthorize appropriations for certain programs under the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and for other purposes.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the taxable sale or use, without penalty, of dyed diesel fuel with respect to recreational boaters.

S. 495

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] were added as cosponsors of S. 495, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to stabilize the student loan programs, improve congressional oversight, and for other purposes.

S. 584

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 584, a bill to authorize the award of the Purple Heart to persons who were prisoners of war on or before April 25, 1962.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, a concurrent resolution relative to Taiwan and the United Nations.

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, supra.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 401

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr.

HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 401 proposed to S. 4, a bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995

BRADLEY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. ROBB, Mr. GLENN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. EXON, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. SIMON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 347 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority; as follows:

On page 5, strike lines 13 through 20 and insert the following:

(5) the term 'targeted tax benefit' means any provision which has the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a different treatment to a particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is limited by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers but such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

HOLLINGS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 404

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. EXON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 347, proposed by Mr. DOLE, to the bill, S. 4, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

"SEC. . PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

''At the end of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, insert the following new section:

'''ENFORCING PAY-AS-YOU-GO

'''SEC. 314. (a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

'''(1) ensure continued compliance with the deficit reduction embodied in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and

'''(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

'''(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

'''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct-spending or receipts legislation (as defined in paragraph (3)) that would increase the deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods (as defined in paragraph (2)) as measured pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5).

'''(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the three following periods—

'''(A) the first fiscal year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

'''(B) the period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; or

'''(C) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

'''(3) DIRECT-SPENDING OR RECEIPTS LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''direct-spending or receipts legislation'' shall—

'''(A) include any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to which this subsection otherwise applies;

'''(B) include concurrent resolutions on the budget;

'''(C) exclude full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990;

'''(D) exclude emergency provisions so designated under section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

'''(E) include the estimated amount of savings in direct-spending programs applicable to that fiscal year resulting from the prior year's sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if any (except for any amounts sequestered as a result of a net deficit increase in the fiscal year immediately preceding the prior fiscal year); and

'''(F) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, include all direct-spending legislation as that term is interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

'''(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall use the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline, and for years beyond those covered by that Office, shall abide by the requirements of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that references to ''outyears'' in that section shall be deemed to apply to any year (other than the budget year) covered by any one of the time periods defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

'''(5) PRIOR SURPLUS AVAILABLE.—If direct-spending or receipts legislation increases the deficit when taken individually (as a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, as the case may be), then it must also increase the deficit when taken together with all direct-spending and receipts legislation enacted after the date or enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, in order to violate the prohibition of this subsection.

'''(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

'''(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

'''(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

'''(f) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 1998.'''

GLENN AMENDMENT NO. 405

Mr. GLENN proposed an amendment to the amendment No. 347 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill, S. 4, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . EVALUATION AND SUNSET OF TAX EXPENDITURES.

(a) LEGISLATION FOR SUNSETTING TAX EXPENDITURES.—The President shall submit legislation for the periodic review, reauthorization, and sunset of tax expenditures with his fiscal year 1997 budget.

(b) BUDGET CONTENTS AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(30) beginning with fiscal year 1999, a Federal Government performance plan for measuring the overall effectiveness of tax expenditures, including a schedule for periodically assessing the effects of specific tax expenditures in achieving performance goals.''.

(c) PILOT PROJECTS.—Section 1118(c) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking ''and'' after the semicolon in paragraph (2);

(2) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) adding after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) describe the framework to be utilized by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Joint Committee on Taxation, for undertaking periodic analyses of the effects of tax expenditures in achieving performance goals and the relationship between tax expenditures and spending programs; and''.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.—Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''TAX EXPENDITURES

''SEC. 409. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains a tax expenditure unless the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report provides that the tax expenditure will terminate not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of the tax expenditure.''.

LEVIN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 406

Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. EXON) proposed an amendment to the amendment No. 347 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill, S. 4, supra; as follows:

At the end of Section 5(4)(A), strike ''; and'' and add the following:

''but shall not include a provision which does not appropriate funds, direct the President to expend funds for any specific project, or create an express or implied obligation to expend funds and—

''(i) rescinds or cancels existing budget authority;

''(ii) only limits, conditions, or otherwise restricts the President's authority to spend otherwise appropriated funds; or

''(iii) conditions on an item of appropriation not involving a positive allocation of funds by explicitly prohibiting the use of any funds; and''.

HATCH (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 407

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 347 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill S. 4, supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after ''separately'' insert '', except for items of appropriation provided

for the judicial branch, which shall be enrolled together in a single measure. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'items of appropriation provided for the judicial branch' means only those functions and expenditures that are currently included in the appropriations accounts of the judiciary, as those accounts are listed and described in the Department of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 104–317)''.

THE WEST VIRGINIA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS ACT OF 1995

BYRD (AND ROCKEFELLER) AMENDMENTS NOS 408–409

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.)

Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 359) to provide for the extension of certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of West Virginia; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 408

In section 1(a), strike ''6901 and 6902'' and insert ''6901, 6902, and 7307''.

In section 1 (a) and (c), strike ''October 3, 1999'' each place it appears and insert ''September 26, 1999''.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

In section ___(a), strike ''6901 and 6902'' and insert ''6901, 6902, and 7307''.

In section ___ (a) and (c), strike ''October 3, 1999'' each place it appears and insert ''September 26, 1999''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a hearing on Tuesday, April 4, 1995, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building. The focus of the hearing is the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Minority Business Development Program.

For further information, please contact Paul Cooksey at 224–5175.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 21, at 9:30 a.m., in SDG–50, to discuss the confirmation of Agriculture Secretary-Designee Daniel Robert Glickman. The continuation of this nomination hearing, if necessary, will take place on Wednesday, March 22, at 9:30 a.m., in SR–332, and Thursday, March 23, at 9:30 a.m. in SR–332.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, for purposes of conducting a Full Committee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to review the findings of a report prepared for the Committee on the clean-up of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to conduct a hearing on Wednesday, March 22, at 9:30 a.m. on the impact of regulatory reform proposals on environmental and other laws within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold a business meeting to vote on pending items.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, beginning at 2:30 p.m., in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building on S. 441, a bill to reauthorize Public Law 101–630, the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and S. 510, a bill to extend the reauthorization for certain programs under the Native American Programs Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 22, 1995, to conduct a hearing on securities litigation reform proposals.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND FAMILY POLICY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Wednesday, March 22, 1995, beginning at 10 a.m. in room SD–215, to conduct a hearing on the soaring costs of Social Security's two disability programs.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1995

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced and spoke on the Illegal Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 1995.

As I indicated then, I look forward to working with all of my colleagues on the Immigration Subcommittee, Judiciary Committee and in the full Senate to craft comprehensive legislation in this session of Congress to stop illegal immigration. I believe that the widest possible dissemination of my bill, and of all other responsible proposals, will help us meet that goal.

I ask that the text of my legislation, S. 580, be printed in today's RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 580

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Illegal Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT
PART A—INCREASED BORDER PATROL, SUPPORT, TRAINING, AND RESOURCES
Sec. 111. Border Patrol expansion and deployment.
Sec. 112. Hiring preference for bilingual Border Patrol agents.
Sec. 113. Improved Border Patrol training.
Sec. 114. Border equipment and infrastructure improvement authority.
PART B—EXPANDED BORDER INSPECTION PERSONNEL, SUPPORT, AND FACILITIES
Sec. 121. Additional land border inspectors.
PART C—DETENTION AND DEPORTATION
Sec. 131. Bar to collateral attacks on deportation orders in unlawful reentry prosecutions.
Sec. 132. Form of deportation hearings.
Sec. 133. Deportation as a condition of probation.
PART D—ENHANCED CRIMINAL ALIEN DEPORTATION AND TRANSFER
Sec. 141. Expansion in definition of ''aggravated felony''.
Sec. 142. Restricting defenses to deportation for certain criminal aliens.
Sec. 143. Denial of discretionary relief to aliens convicted of aggravated felonies.
Sec. 144. Judicial deportation.
Sec. 145. Negotiations for international agreements.
Sec. 146. Annual report.
Sec. 147. Admissibility of videotaped witness testimony.

TITLE II—ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION INCENTIVE REDUCTION

PART A—PUBLIC BENEFITS CONTROL

Sec. 211. Authority to States and localities to limit assistance to aliens and to distinguish among classes of aliens in providing general public assistance.
Sec. 212. Increased maximum criminal penalties for forging or counterfeiting seal of a Federal department or agency to facilitate benefit fraud by an unlawful alien.
Sec. 213. Sponsorship enhancement.
Sec. 214. State option under the medicaid program to place anti-fraud investigators in hospitals.
Sec. 215. Ports-of-entry benefits task force demonstration projects.

PART B—EMPLOYER SANCTIONS SUPPORT

Sec. 221. Additional Immigration and Naturalization Service investigators.
Sec. 222. Enhanced penalties for unlawful employment of aliens.
Sec. 223. Earned income tax credit denied to individuals not authorized to be employed in the United States.
Sec. 224. Enhanced minimum criminal penalties for extortion or involuntary holding of aliens engaged in unlawful employment.
Sec. 225. Work authorization verification.

PART C—ENHANCED WAGE AND HOUR LAWS

Sec. 231. Increased personnel levels for the Labor Department.
Sec. 232. Increased number of Assistant United States Attorneys.

TITLE III—ENHANCED SMUGGLING CONTROL AND PENALTIES

Sec. 301. Minimum criminal penalties for alien smuggling.
Sec. 302. Expanded forfeiture for smuggling or harboring illegal aliens.
Sec. 303. Wiretap authority for alien smuggling investigations.
Sec. 304. Limitation on section 212(c) authority.
Sec. 305. Effective date.

TITLE IV—ADMISSIONS AND DOCUMENT FRAUD CONTROL

Sec. 401. Minimum criminal penalties for document fraud.

TITLE V—BORDER CROSSING USER FEE

Sec. 501. Immigration Law Enforcement Fund.

TITLE I—ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT

PART A—INCREASED BORDER PATROL, SUPPORT, TRAINING, AND RESOURCES

SEC. 111. BORDER PATROL EXPANSION AND DEPLOYMENT.

(a) INCREASED NUMBER OF BORDER PATROL POSITIONS.—Subject to subsection (b), in each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, the Attorney General—

(1) shall increase by no fewer than 700 the number of positions for full-time, active-duty Border Patrol agents within the Immigration and Naturalization Service above the number of such positions for which funds were allotted for the preceding fiscal year; and

(2) may increase by not more than 300 the number of positions for personnel in support of Border Patrol agents above the number of such positions for which funds were allotted for the preceding fiscal year.

(b) DEPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—The Attorney General shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the personnel hired pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deployed among the various Immigration and Naturalization Service sectors in proportion to the level of illegal intrusion measured in each sector during the preceding fiscal year and reasonably anticipated in the next fiscal year, and shall be actively engaged in (or in support of) law enforcement activities related to the illegal crossing of the borders of the United States.

SEC. 112. HIRING PREFERENCE FOR BILINGUAL BORDER PATROL AGENTS.

The Attorney General shall, in hiring the Border Patrol Agents specified in section 111(a), give priority to the employment of multilingual candidates who are proficient in both English and such other language or languages as may be spoken in the region in which such Agents are likely to be deployed.

SEC. 113. IMPROVED BORDER PATROL TRAINING.

Section 103 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1103) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) The Attorney General shall ensure that all Border Patrol personnel, and any other personnel of the Service who are likely to have contact with undocumented or improperly documented persons, or other immigrants, in the course of their official duties, receive in-service training adequate to ensure that all such personnel respect the rights, personal safety, and dignity of such persons at all times.

''(2) The Attorney General shall ensure that the annual report to Congress of the Service—

''(A) describes in detail actions taken by the Attorney General to meet the requirement set forth in paragraph (1);

''(B) incorporates specific findings by the Attorney General with respect to the nature and scope of any verified incident of conduct by Border Patrol personnel that—

''(i) was not consistent with paragraph (1); and

''(ii) was not described in a previous annual report; and

''(C) sets forth specific recommendations for preventing any similar incident in the future.''.

SEC. 114. BORDER EQUIPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IMPROVED EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY.—In order to facilitate or improve the detection, interdiction, and reduction by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of illegal immigration into the United States, the Attorney General is authorized to acquire and utilize any Federal equipment (including, but not limited to, fixed wing aircraft, helicopters, four-wheel drive vehicles, sedans, night vision goggles, night vision scopes, and sensor units) determined available for transfer to the Department of Justice by any other agency of the Federal Government upon request of the Attorney General.

(b) IMPROVED INFRASTRUCTURE.—(1) The Attorney General may, from time to time, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, identify those physical improvements to the infrastructure of the international land borders of the United States necessary to expedite the inspection of persons and vehicles attempting to lawfully enter the United States in accordance with existing policies and procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the United States Customs Service, and the Drug Enforcement Agency.

(2) Such improvements to the infrastructure of the land border of the United States shall be substantially completed and fully funded in those portions of the United States where the Attorney General, in consultation with the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, objectively determines the need to be greatest or most immediate before the Attorney General may obligate funds for construction of any improvement otherwise located.

PART B—EXPANDED BORDER INSPECTION PERSONNEL, SUPPORT, AND FACILITIES

SEC. 121. ADDITIONAL LAND BORDER INSPECTORS.

(a) INCREASED PERSONNEL.—In order to eliminate undue delay in the thorough inspection of persons and vehicles lawfully attempting to enter the United States, the Attorney General and Secretary of the Treasury shall increase, by approximately equal numbers in each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997, the number of full-time land border inspectors assigned to active duty by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the United States Customs Service to a level adequate to assure full staffing during peak crossing hours of all border crossing lanes now in use, under construction, or whose construction has been authorized by Congress.

(b) DEPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the personnel hired pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deployed among the various Immigration and Naturalization Service sectors in proportion to the number of land border crossings measured in each such sector during the preceding fiscal year.

PART C—DETENTION AND DEPORTATION

SEC. 131. BAR TO COLLATERAL ATTACKS ON DEPORTATION ORDERS IN UNLAWFUL REENTRY PROSECUTIONS.

Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In any criminal proceeding under this section, an alien may not challenge the validity of the deportation order described in subsection (a)(1) or subsection (b) unless the alien demonstrates that—

''(1) the alien has exhausted any administrative remedies that may have been available to seek relief against such order;

''(2) the deportation proceedings at which the order was issued improperly deprived the alien of the opportunity for judicial review; and

''(3) the entry of the order was fundamentally unfair.''.

SEC. 132. FORM OF DEPORTATION HEARINGS.

The second sentence of section 242(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(b)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: '', except that nothing in this sentence precludes the Attorney General from authorizing proceedings by electronic or telephonic media (with the consent of the alien) or, where waived or agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the alien''.

SEC. 133. DEPORTATION AS A CONDITION OF PROBATION.

Section 3563(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (21);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (22) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(23) be ordered deported by a United States District Court, or United States Magistrate Court, pursuant to a stipulation entered into by the defendant and the United States under section 143 of this Act, except that, in the absence of a stipulation, the United States District Court or the United States Magistrate Court, may order deportation as a condition of probation, if, after notice and hearing pursuant to section 242A(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the alien is deportable.''.

PART D—ENHANCED CRIMINAL ALIEN DEPORTATION AND TRANSFER

SEC. 141. EXPANSION IN DEFINITION OF "AGGRAVATED FELONY".

(a) EXPANSION IN DEFINITION.—Section 101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)) is amended as follows:

(1) in paragraph (D), strike ''$100,000'' and insert ''$10,000''; and

(2) in paragraphs (F), (G), and (O) strike ''the term of imprisonment imposed is at least 5 years'' and all parenthetical text appearing within that phrase, and insert ''punishable by imprisonment for 3 years or more'';

(3) in paragraph (J)—

(A) strike ''for which a sentence of 5 years' imprisonment or more may be imposed'' and insert ''punishable by imprisonment for 3 years or more''; and

(B) strike ''offense described'' and insert ''offense described in sections 1084 of title 18 (if it is a second or subsequent offense), section 1955 of such title (relating to gambling offenses), and'';

(4) in paragraph (K)—

(A) strike ''or'' after the semicolon in subparagraph (i);

(B) insert ''or'' after the semicolon in subparagraph (ii); and

(C) insert, as new subparagraph (iii), ''is described in sections 2421, 2422 or 2423 of title 18, United States Code (relating to transportation for the purpose of prostitution) for commercial advantage.'';

(5) in paragraph (L), insert as new subparagraph (iii): ''section 601 of the National Security Act of 1947, title 50, United States Code (relating to protecting the identity of undercover agents);

(6) in paragraph (M) strike ''$200,000'' and insert ''$10,000''.

(7) redesignate paragraphs (P) and (Q) as paragraphs (R) and (S), respectively, and add—

(A) as new paragraph (P) the following: ''any offense relating to commercial bribery, counterfeiting, forgery or trafficking in vehicles whose identification numbers have been altered, which is punishable by imprisonment for 3 years or more''; and

(B) as new paragraph (Q) the following: ''any offense relating to perjury or subornation of perjury which is punishable by imprisonment for 3 years or more;'' and

(8) in redesignated paragraph (R), strike ''15'' and insert ''5''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section applies to convictions entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 142. RESTRICTING DEFENSES TO DEPORTATION FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL ALIENS.

Section 243(h)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the alien has been convicted of an aggravated felony.''.

SEC. 143. DENIAL OF DISCRETIONARY RELIEF TO ALIENS CONVICTED OF AGGRAVATED FELONIES.

(a) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION.—Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) Suspension of deportation and adjustment of status under subsection (a)(2) shall not be available to any alien who has been convicted of an aggravated felony.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF EXCLUSION FOR DRUG OFFENSES.—Section 212(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(h)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ''or any other aggravated felony'' after ''torture''.

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS; CHANGE OF NONIMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION.—(1) Section 245(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or'' after ''section 212(d)(4)(C)''; and

(B) by inserting ''; or (5) an alien who has been convicted of an aggravated felony'' immediately after ''section 217''.

(2) Section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) an alien convicted of an aggravated felony.''.

SEC. 144. JUDICIAL DEPORTATION.

Section 242A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252a(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a United States district court shall have jurisdiction to enter a judicial order of deportation at the time of sentencing against an alien—

''(A) whose criminal conviction causes such alien to be conclusively presumed to be deportable under section 241(a)(2)(A)(iii) (relating to conviction of an aggravated felony);

''(B) who has at any time been convicted of a violation of section 276 (a) or (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

''(C) who has at any time been convicted of a violation of section 275 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; or

''(D) who is otherwise deportable pursuant to sections 241(a)(1)(A) through 241(a)(5), inclusive, of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1251).

A United States Magistrate shall have jurisdiction to enter a judicial order of deportation at the time of sentencing where the alien has been convicted of a misdemeanor offense and the alien is deportable under this Act.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) STIPULATED JUDICIAL ORDER OF DEPORTATION.—The United States Attorney, with the concurrence of the Commissioner, may, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11, enter into a plea agreement which calls for the alien, who is deportable under this Act, to waive the right to notice and a hearing under this section, and stipulate to the entry of a judicial order of deportation from the United States as a condition of the plea agreement or as a condition of probation or supervised release, or both. The United States District Court, in both felony and misdemeanor cases, and the United States Magistrate Court in misdemeanors cases, may accept such a stipulation and shall have jurisdiction to enter a judicial order of deportation pursuant to the terms of such stipulation.''.

SEC. 145. NEGOTIATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.

(a) NEGOTIATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State, together with the Attorney General, may enter into an agreement with any foreign country providing for the incarceration in that country of any individual who—

(1) is a national of that country; and

(2) is an alien who—

(A) is not in lawful immigration status in the United States, or

(B) on the basis of conviction of a criminal offense under Federal or State law, or on any other basis, is subject to deportation under the Immigration and Nationality Act,

for the duration of the prison term to which the individual was sentenced for the offense referred to in subparagraph (B). Any such agreement may provide for the release of such individual pursuant to parole procedures of that country.

(b) PRIORITY.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of State should give priority to concluding an agreement with any country for which the President determines that the number of individuals described in subsection (a) who are nationals of that country in the United States represents a significant percentage of all such individuals in the United States.

(c) It is the sense of the Congress that, effective on the date of enactment of this Act, no new treaty providing for the transfer of aliens from Federal or State incarceration facilities to a foreign incarceration facility should permit the prisoner to refuse the transfer.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 146. ANNUAL REPORT.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the number of illegal aliens incarcerated in Federal and State prisons for having committed felonies;

(2) programs and plans underway in the Department of Justice to ensure the prompt removal from the United States of criminal aliens subject to exclusion or deportation; and

(3) methods for identifying and preventing the unlawful reentry of aliens who have been convicted of criminal offenses in the United States and removed from the United States.

SEC. 147. ADMISSIBILITY OF VIDEOTAPED WITNESS TESTIMONY.

Section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Rules of Evidence, the videotaped (or otherwise audiovisually preserved) deposition of a witness to a violation of subsection (a) who has been deported or otherwise expelled from the United States or is otherwise unable to testify may be admitted into evidence in an action brought for that violation if the witness was available for cross examination and the deposition otherwise complies with the Federal Rules of Evidence.''.

TITLE II—ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION INCENTIVE REDUCTION

PART A—PUBLIC BENEFITS CONTROL

SEC. 211. AUTHORITY TO STATES AND LOCALITIES TO LIMIT ASSISTANCE TO ALIENS AND TO DISTINGUISH AMONG CLASSES OF ALIENS IN PROVIDING GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State or local government may prohibit or otherwise limit or restrict the eligibility of aliens or classes of aliens for programs of general cash public assistance furnished under the law of the State or a political subdivision of a State.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority under subsection (a) may be exercised only to the extent that any prohibitions, limitations, or restrictions are not inconsistent with the eligibility requirements for comparable Federal programs or are less restrictive. For the purposes of this section, attribution to an alien of a sponsor's income and resources for purposes of determining the eligibility for and amount of benefits of an alien shall be considered less restrictive than a prohibition of eligibility.

SEC. 212. INCREASED MAXIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FORGING OR COUNTERFEITING SEAL OF A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY TO FACILITATE BENEFIT FRAUD BY AN UNLAWFUL ALIEN.

Section 506 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 506. Seals of departments or agencies

''(a) Whoever—

''(1) falsely makes, forges, counterfeits, mutilates, or alters the seal of any department or agency of the United States, or any facsimile thereof;

''(2) knowingly uses, affixes, or impresses any such fraudulently made, forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered seal or facsimile thereof to or upon any certificate, instrument, commission, document, or paper of any description; or

''(3) with fraudulent intent, possesses, sells, offers for sale, furnishes, offers to furnish, gives away, offers to give away, transports, offers to transport, imports, or offers to import any such seal or facsimile thereof, knowing the same to have been so falsely made, forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered,

shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, if a forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered seal of a department or agency of the United States, or any facsimile thereof, is—

''(1) so forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered;

''(2) used, affixed, or impressed to or upon any certificate, instrument, commission, document, or paper of any description; or

''(3) with fraudulent intent, possessed, sold, offered for sale, furnished, offered to furnish, given away, offered to give away, transported, offered to transport, imported, or offered to import,

with the intent or effect of facilitating an unlawful alien's application for, or receipt of, a Federal benefit, the penalties which may be imposed for each offense under subsection (a) shall be two times the maximum fine, and 3 times the maximum term of imprisonment, or both, that would otherwise be imposed for an offense under subsection (a).

''(c) For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'Federal benefit' has the meaning given such term under section 293(c)(1);

''(2) the term 'unlawful alien' has the meaning given such term under section 293(c)(2); and

''(3) each instance of forgery, counterfeiting, mutilation, or alteration shall constitute a separate offense under this section.''.

SEC. 213. SPONSORSHIP ENHANCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An alien who—

(1) is excludable under section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4));

(2) has not given a suitable bond (as described in section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1183)); and

(3) is otherwise admissible into the United States;

may only be admitted into the United States when sponsored by an individual (referred to in this section as the alien's ''sponsor'') who enters into a legally binding contract with the United States that guarantees financial responsibility for the alien until such alien becomes a United States citizen.

(b) CONTRACT ENHANCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A contract described in subsection (a) shall provide—

(A) that the sponsor shall be liable for any costs incurred by any Federal, State, or political subdivision of a State for general public cash assistance provided to such alien;

(B) that the sponsor shall—

(i) within 20 days of the alien's admission into the United States, purchase a policy of private health insurance (which meets the minimum guidelines established under paragraph (2)) on behalf of such alien and provide the Immigration and Naturalization Service with proof of such purchase; and

(ii) make any necessary premium payments for such policy on behalf of such alien for the duration of the sponsor's responsibility under the contract; and

(C) that the sponsor's responsibility under the contract will continue until the date on which the alien becomes a citizen of the United States.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR HEALTH INSURANCE POLICIES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall establish minimum guidelines with respect to private policies of health insurance required under paragraph (1)(B)(i) that—

(A) specify the coverage and type of the insurance required; and

(B) provide that the Attorney General shall be given notice if the policy lapses or the scope of the coverage changes prior to the end of the sponsor's responsibility under the contract.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If general public cash assistance or medical assistance under a State plan for medical assistance approved under section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is provided to a sponsored alien, the Attorney General, a State, or a political subdivision of a State may bring a civil suit against the sponsor in the United States district court for the district in which the sponsor resides for the recovery of any costs incurred by any Federal, State, or political subdivision of a State in providing such cash benefits or medical assistance provided to such alien.

(2) DEPORTATION.—The failure of a sponsor to comply with the terms of the contract described in subsection (b)(1)(B) may, subject to the contract, be grounds for deportation of the sponsored alien in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act and the deportation procedures applicable under such Act.

(d) EXCEPTIONS TO LIABILITY.—A sponsor or a sponsor's estate shall not be liable under a contract described in subsection (a) if the sponsor—

(1) dies;

(2) if the sponsor's family becomes impoverished as determined by the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 applicable to the family of the size involved) due to unforeseeable circumstances; or

(3) is a debtor under title 11, United States Code, as such term is defined in section 101 of such title.

(e) PUBLIC CHARGE TEST.—The Attorney General shall record the use of sponsorship by immigrant applicants to meet the public charge test for admission to the United States set forth in section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to initial sponsorship-based applications for legal admission into the United States received on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 214. STATE OPTION UNDER THE MEDICAID PROGRAM TO PLACE ANTI-FRAUD INVESTIGATORS IN HOSPITALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (61);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (62) and inserting ''and''; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (62) the following new paragraph:

''(63) in the case of a State that is certified by the Attorney General as a high illegal immigration State (as determined by the Attorney General), at the option of the State, establish and operate a program for the placement of anti-fraud investigators in State, county, and private hospitals located in the State to verify the immigration status and income eligibility of applicants for medical assistance under the State plan prior to the furnishing of medical assistance.''.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1903 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b) is amended—

(1) by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''plus''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b)) of the total amount expended during such quarter which are attributable to operating a program under section 1902(a)(63).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 215. PORTS-OF-ENTRY BENEFITS TASK FORCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PROJECT DESCRIBED.—The Attorney General shall make grants to States to conduct demonstration projects in accordance with subsection (b) for the purpose of establishing and operating a task force at one or more southwestern ports-of-entry located in a State in order to—

(A) detect individuals attempting to enter the United States to illegally obtain Federal or State benefits; and

(B) identify individuals who have previously illegally obtained such benefits.

(2) SOUTHWESTERN PORT-OF-ENTRY.—For purposes of this section, the term ''southwestern port-of-entry'' means an official entry point along the southwestern land border of the continental United States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF PROJECT.—A project conducted in accordance with this subsection shall provide that a task force under the project shall—

(1) interview and investigate an individual entering into the United States at a southwestern port-of-entry if the individual is suspected of being an individual described in subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) (as determined by comparing the entering individual with a profile (developed by the task force) of individuals described in such subparagraphs); and

(2) integrate the computer systems of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the agency administering the State plan for medical assistance approved under section

1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) in order to detect individuals described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1) prior to the individual's entry into the United States at a southwestern port-of-entry.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State desiring to conduct a demonstration project under this section shall prepare and submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Attorney General shall give priority in awarding grants under this section to States that desire to establish demonstration projects at southwestern ports-of-entry that—

(A) have the highest numbers of legal crossings attempted in fiscal year 1995;

(B) have the highest numbers of illegal aliens determined by the Attorney General to be resident in the State in which the southwestern port-of-entry is located; and

(C) meet such other factors as the Attorney General determines are reasonably related to maximizing the degree to which Federal and State benefits fraud may be reduced through operation of the project.

(d) SCOPE AND LOCATION.—The Attorney General shall authorize demonstration projects in not less than 6 southwestern ports-of-entry under this section.

(e) DURATION.—A demonstration project under this section shall be conducted for a period not to exceed 2 years.

(f) REPORTS.—A State that conducts a demonstration project under this section shall prepare and submit to the Attorney General annual and final reports in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purpose of conducting demonstration projects in accordance with this section.

PART B—EMPLOYER SANCTIONS SUPPORT

SEC. 221. ADDITIONAL IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE INVESTIGATORS.

(a) INVESTIGATORS.—The Attorney General is authorized to hire for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 such additional investigators and staff as may be necessary to aggressively enforce existing sanctions against employers who employ workers in the United States illegally or who are otherwise ineligible to work in this country.

SEC. 222. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.

(a) HIRING, RECRUITING, AND REFERRAL VIOLATIONS.—Section 274A(e)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(e)(4)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''$250'' and ''$2,000'' and inserting ''$1,000'' and ''$3,000'', respectively;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking ''$2,000'' and ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$3,000'' and ''$7,000'', respectively; and

(3) in clause (iii), by striking ''$3,000'' and ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$7,000'' and ''$20,000'', respectively.

(b) PATTERN OR PRACTICE VIOLATIONS.—Section 274A(f) of such Act is amended by striking ''$3,000'' and ''six months'' and inserting ''$9,000'' and ''two years''.

SEC. 223. EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT DENIED TO INDIVIDUALS NOT AUTHORIZED TO BE EMPLOYED IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to individuals eligible to claim the earned income tax credit) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIREMENT.—The term 'eligible individual' does not include any individual who does not include on the return of tax for the taxable year—

''(i) such individual's taxpayer identification number, and

''(ii) if the individual is married (within the meaning of section 7703), the taxpayer identification number of such individual's spouse.''

(b) SPECIAL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER.—Section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.—Solely for purposes of subsections (c)(1)(F) and (c)(3)(D), a taxpayer identification number means a social security number issued to an individual by the Social Security Administration (other than a social security number issued pursuant to clause (II) (or that portion of clause (III) that relates to clause (II)) of section 205(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act).''

(c) EXTENSION OF PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERRORS.—Section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the definition of mathematical or clerical errors) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

''(F) an omission of a correct taxpayer identification number required under section 23 (relating to credit for families with younger children) or section 32 (relating to the earned income tax credit) to be included on a return.''

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1995.

SEC. 224. ENHANCED MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR EXTORTION OR INVOLUNTARY HOLDING OF ALIENS ENGAGED IN UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 274C the following new section:

''CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR EXTORTION OF ALIENS ENGAGED IN UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT

''SEC. 274D. (a) ACTIVITIES PROHIBITED.—Any person who, by threatening to disclose the immigration status of an individual known or suspected not to be a lawful resident of the United States to any Federal, State or local government agency or employee, induces or coerces (or attempts to induce or coerce) that individual to work for unlawfully low compensation, under unlawfully unsafe or unhealthy conditions, or to obtain from or through the person food, shelter, medical care, medicine, transportation, clothing, tools or other devices or equipment, shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for a first offense not less than 5 years or more than 10 years, and imprisoned for subsequent offenses not less than 10 or more than 15 years, for each individual so threatened.

''(b) ADJUSTED SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to section 944 of title 28, United States Code, and section 21 of the Sentencing Act of 1987, the United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate guidelines, or amend existing guidelines, to provide that an offender convicted of violating, or conspiring to violate, this section shall be assigned a base offense level under the guidelines that is—

''(1) in the case of a first offense, not lower than 26;

''(2) in the case of an offender with one prior felony conviction, not lower than 34; and

''(3) in the case of bodily injury to such alien, a required enhancement of between 2 and 6 offense levels in proportion to the severity of the injury inflicted.

''(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'lawful resident of the United States' includes any person who is—

''(A) a United States citizen or national;

''(B) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence;

''(C) a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15);

''(D) an asylee;

''(E) a refugee;

''(F) an alien whose deportation is being withheld under section 243(h);

''(G) a parolee; or

''(H) a Chinese national described in section 2(b) of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) who, as of the date of enactment of this section, has applied for adjustment of status in accordance with such Act.''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 274C the following new item:

''Sec. 274D. Criminal penalties for extortion of aliens engaged in unlawful employment.''.

SEC. 225. WORK AUTHORIZATION VERIFICATION.

The Attorney General, together with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop and implement a counterfeit-resistant system to verify work eligibility and federally-funded public assistance benefits eligibility for all persons within the United States. If the system developed includes a document (designed specifically for use for this purpose), that document shall not be used as a national identification card, and the document shall not be required to be carried or presented by any person except at the time of application for federally funded public assistance benefits or to comply with employment eligibility verification requirements.

PART C—ENHANCED WAGE AND HOUR LAWS

SEC. 231. INCREASED PERSONNEL LEVELS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT.

(a) INVESTIGATORS.—The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Attorney General, is authorized to hire in the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 such additional investigators and staff as may be necessary to aggressively enforce existing legal sanctions against employers who violate current Federal wage and hour laws.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—Individuals employed to fill the additional positions described in subsection (a) shall be assigned to investigate violations of wage and hour laws in areas where the Attorney General has notified the Secretary of Labor that there are high concentrations of aliens present in the United States in violation of law.

SEC. 232. INCREASED NUMBER OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

The Attorney General is authorized to hire for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 such additional Assistant United States Attorneys as may be necessary to prosecute actions brought under this Act, or intended to directly further Congress' intention to preclude and deter illegal immigration.

TITLE III—ENHANCED SMUGGLING CONTROL AND PENALTIES

SEC. 301. MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR ALIEN SMUGGLING.

(a) MINIMUM ALIEN SMUGGLING PENALTIES.—

(1) Section 1324(a)(2)(B) of Title 8, United States Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''for each transaction constituting a violation of this paragraph, regardless of the number of aliens involved'' and inserting ''for each alien in respect to whom a violation of this paragraph occurs''; and

(B) by striking ''imprisoned not more than 10 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned for a first offense not less than two and one half or more than 5 years, imprisoned for a second offense not less than 5 years or more than 10 years, and imprisoned for subsequent offenses not less than 10 or more than 15 years'';

Pursuant to section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and section 21 of the Sentencing Act of 1987, the United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate guidelines or amend existing guidelines to provide that an offender convicted of smuggling, transporting, or harboring an unlawful alien under dangerous or inhumane conditions in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1324(a)(2)(B)(ii) shall be assigned a base offense level under chapter 2 of the sentencing guidelines that is—

(1) in the case of a first offense, not lower than 22;

(2) in the case of an offender with one prior felony conviction, not lower than 26;

(3) in the case of an offender with two prior felony convictions, not lower than 32;

(4) in the case of bodily injury to such alien, a required enhancement of between 2 and 6 offense levels in proportion to the severity of the injury inflicted; and

(5) in the case of the death of an alien, not lower than 41.

SEC. 302. EXPANDED FORFEITURE FOR SMUGGLING OR HARBORING ILLEGAL ALIENS.

Section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(b)) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b)(1) to read as follows:

''(b) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.—(1) Any property, real or personal, which facilitates or is intended to facilitate, or which has been used in or is intended to be used in the commission of a violation of sections 1541, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545, or 1546 of title 18, United States Code, or which constitutes or is derived from or traceable to the proceeds obtained directly or indirectly from a commission of a violation of such sections of title 18, United States Code, shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture, except that—

''(A) no property, used by any person as a common carrier in the transaction of business as a common carrier shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section unless it shall appear that the owner or other person in charge of such property was a consenting party or privy to the illegal act;

''(B) no property shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section by reason of any act or omission established by the owner thereof to have been committed or omitted by any person other than such owner while such property was unlawfully in the possession of a person other than the owner in violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State; and

''(C) no property shall be forfeited under this paragraph to the extent of an interest of any owner, by reason of any act or omission established by that owner to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of the owner, unless such action or omission was committed by an employee or agent of the owner, and facilitated or was intended to facilitate, or was used in or intended to be used in, the commission of a violation of section 1546 of title 18, United States Code, which was committed by the owner or which was intended to further the business interests of the owner, or to confer any other benefit upon the owner.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''conveyance'' both places it appears and inserting ''property''; and

(B) by striking ''is being used in'' and inserting ''is being used in, is facilitating, has facilitated, or was intended to facilitate'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' immediately after ''(3)'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Before the seizure of any real property pursuant to this section, the Attorney General shall provide notice and an opportunity to be heard to the owner of the property. The Attorney General shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this subparagraph.'';

(4) in paragraphs (4) and (5) by striking ''a conveyance'' and ''conveyance'' each place such phrase or word appears and inserting ''property''; and

(5) in paragraph (4) by—

(A) striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C),

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; or'', and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) transfer custody and ownership of forfeited property to any Federal, State, or local agency pursuant to section 616(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1616a(c)).''.

SEC. 303. WIRETAP AUTHORITY FOR ALIEN SMUGGLING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (c), by inserting after ''trains)'' the following: '', or a felony violation of section 1425 (relating to the procurement of citizenship or nationalization unlawfully), section 1426 (relating to the reproduction of naturalization or citizenship papers), section 1427 (relating to the sale of naturalization or citizenship papers)''.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON SECTION 212(c) AUTHORITY.

Section 212(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(c)) is amended in the third sentence by striking the period and inserting '', an alien who has been convicted of an offense described in section 274(a)(1) done for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain, or an alien who has been convicted of an offense described in section 274(a)(2)(B)(ii)''.

SEC. 305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to offenses occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—ADMISSIONS AND DOCUMENT FRAUD CONTROL

SEC. 401. MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR DOCUMENT FRAUD.

(a) MINIMUM DOCUMENT FRAUD PENALTIES.—(1) Sections 1028, 1425, 1426, 1427 and 1546(a) of title 18, United States Code are amended by striking ''not more than 5 years'' and inserting ''for a first offense not less than two and one half or more than 5 years, imprisoned for a second offense not less than 5 years or more than 10 years, and imprisoned for subsequent offenses not less than 10 or more than 15 years''.

(b) ADJUSTED SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to section 944 of title 28, United States Code, and section 21 of the Sentencing Act of 1987, the United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate guidelines, or amend existing guidelines, to provide that an offender convicted of violating, or conspiring to violate, sections 1028, 1425, 1426, 1427 and 1546(a) of title 18, United States Code, shall be assigned a base offense level under chapter 2 of the guidelines that is—

(1) in the case of a first offense, not lower than 22;

(2) in the case of an offender with one prior felony conviction, not lower than 26;

(3) in the case of an offender with two prior felony convictions, not lower than 32; and

(4) in the case of procurement, production, transfer, or possession of more than 5 documents or related implements within the scope of this section, a required enhancement of between 1 and 5 offense levels in proportion to the quantity of documents at issue.

TITLE V—BORDER CROSSING USER FEE

SEC. 501. IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund known as the Immigration Law Enforcement Fund (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Fund'').

(b) BORDER CROSSING USER FEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or treaty to which the United States is a party, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and the Treasury, and such other parties as the Attorney General deems appropriate, shall collect from each individual entering into the United States by land or sea, without regard to the immigration or citizenship status of such individual a border crossing user fee of $1.

(c) FEE ADJUSTMENT AND SPECIAL FEE PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Attorney General may—

(1) adjust the border crossing user fee periodically to compensate for inflation and other escalation in the cost of carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(2) develop and implement special discounted fee programs for frequent border crossers including, but not limited to, commuter coupon books or passes.

(d) AUTHORIZE ROLL-OVER OF FUND SURPLUSES FROM YEAR-TO-YEAR.—There shall be deposited in the Fund amounts received by the Attorney General as fees collected under subsection (b).

(e) USES OF USER FEE FUND.—(1) The Fund shall be available to the Attorney General, to the extent and in the amounts provided in appropriation Acts and without fiscal year limitation, to pay for matters authorized under this Act, as follows:

(A) For additional salaries and expenses incurred by reason of the employment of personnel under this Act, including, but not limited to, Border Patrol, inspection, investigation, enforcement, and security personnel, and adjudication officers.

(B) For costs relating to land border crossing infrastructure improvement.

(C) For costs relating to the acquisition by the Department of Justice of technology and equipment (including, but not limited to, aircraft, helicopters, four wheel drive vehicles, sedans, night vision goggles, night vision scopes, and sensor units).

(D) For the cost of facilitating and expanding the activities of the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Interagency Task Force in order to fully abate the flow of narcotics and other illegal drugs into the United States.

(E) For the cost of expediting initial asylum claim review procedures.

(F) For the cost of devising and implementing regulatory reform of the affirmative asylum adjudication process.

(G) For the cost of expanding the Institutional Hearing Program.

(H) For the cost of expanding the Advanced Passenger Information System.

(I) For the cost of increasing rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of terrorists.

(J) For the cost of conducting classes, or otherwise assisting or encouraging, legal immigrants to the United States to attain American citizenship.

(K) For the cost of such other activities that, in the discretion of the Attorney General, will reduce: illegal transit of the Nation's borders, the flow of illegal drugs across such borders, the time necessary to process applications for asylum in the United States, and the number of alien criminals incarcerated in this country.

(2) Funds made available under subparagraph (A) in each fiscal year shall be allotted to districts of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in proportion to the amount of illegal immigration in each district as the Attorney General finds to have occurred in the preceding fiscal year and reasonably anticipated in the coming fiscal year.●

AMERICAN CLASS STRUGGLE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, A.M. Rosenthal had a column recently in the New York Times titled ''American Class Struggle,'' that contains a great deal of common sense that we ought to be listening to.

I am uncomfortable when people of either party start moving on economic class line demagoguery, and there has been some of that on both sides.

I was particularly pleased to read in the Rosenthal column the comments by a highly respected economist Felix J. Rohatyn. He said in a speech at Wake Forest University:

The big beneficiaries of our economic expansion have been the owners of financial assets and a new class of highly compensated technicians working for companies where profit-sharing and stock ownership was widely spread.

What is occurring is a huge transfer of wealth from lower-skilled middle-class American workers to the owners of capital assets and to the new technological aristocracy.

As a result, the institutional relationship created by the mutual loyalty of employees and employers in most American businesses has been badly frayed. . . . These relationships have been replaced by a combination of fear for the future and a cynicism for the present as a broad proportion of working people see themselves as simply temporary assets to be hired or fired to protect the bottom line and create ''shareholder value.''

Mr. President, I ask that the Rosenthal column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

AMERICAN CLASS STRUGGLE

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

When the Republicans took over Congress in the November election, I didn't take it hard. I voted for candidates from both parties, so I told my Democratic friends not to go into mourning. After all, shifting control of Congress once every few decades was not exactly destroying democracy.

But I began to get nervous when I heard Representative Newton Gingrich boast that he was a revolutionary, the only one around.

Myself, I think the first American Revolution was carried out well enough to be the last. Any major-party leader who prattles about being a revolutionary strikes me as stunningly insensitive to the havoc that revolutions cause, especially when they are rooted not in oppression but in the brain of a politician afloat in self-esteem.

I still give him the benefit of the doubt; put the revolutionary talk down to a boyish pose. But sometimes a pose creates a result a young fellow might not foresee.

The fact is that the ambitions of the Newtonians, their lust for the quick, dramatic change and their deep fascination with themselves do have in them the makings of one important ingredient of revolution. That is class struggle.

Done carefully, with each Federal program to be sliced examined with the caring attention that we usually save for our own self-interest, much of the Contract With America could be of benefit.

But absent that tenderness, the program is turning into more than Americans who voted for it might want. They expected to save some government money spent on other Americans, give bureaucrats the scare of their lives, and have a good housecleaning.

But I doubt they expected the slash-and-burn campaign the Republicans have mounted against so much of the economic and social safety net created by Republican as well as Democratic administrations since World War II.

What's more, all this is going on when a particular kind of economic expansion is also taking place. Felix G. Rohatyn, senior partner of Lazard Freres, described it in a speech at Wake Forest University last week:

''The big beneficiaries of our economic expansion have been the owners of financial assets and a new class of highly compensated technicians working for companies where profit-sharing and stock ownership was widely spread.

''What is occurring is a huge transfer of wealth from lower-skilled middle-class American workers to the owners of capital assets and to the new technological aristocracy.

''As a result, the institutional relationship created by the mutual loyalty of employees and employers in most American businesses has been badly frayed. . . . These relationships have been replaced by a combination of fear for the future and a cynicism for the present as a broad proportion of working people see themselves as simply temporary assets to be hired or fired to protect the bottom line and create 'shareholder value.'''

All right, put this attitude toward workers as disposable together with ''slash that net.'' Target people on welfare wholesale, take important aid programs from immigrants, legal or not, put Medicare on the cutting board and hint that Social Security will be next. Reduce money for narcotics therapy, summertime jobs for youngsters, health care and other parts of the net created over the last five decades. Cut very deep, very fast.

Inevitably Americans who find themselves poorer or more frightened, with nothing between them and the ground, will look to business, a big beneficiary and supporter of the cuts, to erect a new net.

Too bad for them. Mr. Rohatyn warns that it won't work, that being the social safety net of last resort is government's business, which makes two of us.

So: If they destroy too much of the government safety net, Republicans will be loading business down with a job it cannot do, with working-class expectations it does not want to meet and cannot.

As a bleeding-heart conservative, I believe that will be not only the prescription for class struggle but the beginning of its reality.

Class struggle does not automatically bring revolution—real, not sound-bite. But in 1932, President Roosevelt understood the danger of economic class struggle, and moved to overcome it and save capitalism. Left unrecognized or ignored, class struggle creates divisions that can undermine society—any society.●

THE 1995 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the subject of drugs. The Office of National Drug Control Policy [ONDCP] has now released its annual National Drug Control Strategy, dated February 1995. I regret that this strategy continues in the direction established in the 1994 strategy, a direction I strongly criticized at the time. The administration has produced another deeply flawed document that will not advance the war against drugs.

In this document the administration outlines its priorities for dealing with illicit drugs. the document extols treatment and prevention as the primary tools in combating the drug problem. The strategy never addresses interdiction. It stresses policy changes to enhance the administration's demand side approach to dealing with the flood of foreign illegal drugs entering the United States, rather than enforcement efforts.

The document is 150 pages long, with a 45 page long lost of consultants. The strategy frequently contradicts itself from one chapter to the next in its interpretation of its findings, whether the findings were based on surveys or medical reports. This strategy provides an overinflated justification for expanded treatment and prevention efforts, without ever dealing with the underlying problem of the ease with which illegal drugs can be obtained.

Furthermore, this document attempts to distinguish between the drug user and the drug dealer, claiming one is a public health problem while the other is a criminal. The truth of the matter is that both using and dealing are criminal violations and the dealer could not exist, much less profit, without the user. Drug dealers can only be arrested by working through drug users. Therefore, enforcement efforts against users should not be curtailed, but instead reinforced.

Some of the contradictions contained within the report are serious. The report begins with a strategy overview which would lend the impression that enforcement was going to be a major theme in the strategy. This does not turn out to be the case. Under the section entitled ''Principles for Responding to Illicit Drug Use'', on page 10, the report states: ''To ensure the safety of our communities, certainty of punishment must be promoted for all drug offenders—particularly young offenders. All offenders must receive appropriate punishment when they first encounter the criminal justice system.'' This theme is further advanced on page 12, section entitled ''Action Plans for Responding to America's Drug Problem'' where it states ''Use the authority of

the criminal justice system to require drug-using offenders to stop taking drugs; Punish the criminal activities of drug users and sellers.''

This theme is immediately contradicted by a subsequent passage that states: ''This Strategy recognizes that Americans make a distinction between drug dealers and drug users when stating how policies should be developed and carried out. Recent public opinion polls indicate that Americans believe that drug dealers deserve tough criminal sanctions and that drug users should have the opportunity for intensive treatment to break their dependence on drugs.'' This directly contradicts the previous message of punishment for both users and dealers. This section further contradicts the need for strong enforcement action when it states: ''The Action Plan for Reducing the Demand for Illicit Drugs emphasized drug prevention as the ultimate key to ensuring [sic] the future of the Nation's children.''

While demand reduction is the ultimate key to victory in the war on drugs, this approach completely disregards the immediate problems of the availability of illicit drugs, the monetary rewards for dealing illegal drugs, and the constant flow of illegal drugs into the United States. furthermore, most drug dealers are also drug users. How are the courts to differentiate between the classes of criminals as described within this strategy?

Law enforcement efforts and the criminal penalties for illegal drug activities directly affect drug availability, financial incentives for drug trafficking, and the flow of these illegal drugs. Once the supply is reduced, then treatment can be effective to further reduce demand.

This section of the strategy closes with 14 listed goals to be used as the measure of success for the strategy. The top eight goals are all treatment or prevention measures. Once again this strategy of targeting treatment without addressing illegal drug availability and drug law enforcement concerns is akin to the old problem of putting the cart before the horse.

Section II, ''Drug Use in America,'' details the number of casual and chronic drug users in the United States. This section states on page 17, ''First, rates of illicit drug use are rising among the Nation's youth and second, rates of heroin use are increasing, particularly because existing drug users are adding heroin to the list of drugs they consume. In addition, there are new users of heroin, many of them youth.''

This statement is immediately contradicted on page 24 of the same section, where it states: ''The strongest sign of an epidemic is the entry of a large number of new users (new initiates) into illicit drug use. There is no systematic evidence that this is the case with heroin.'' The report denies that there is a significant increase in heroin use. Yet in January 1995, 1 month prior to the release of this report, ONDCP stated in its monthly newsletter, ''more potent forms of marijuana are becoming increasingly popular among people under 30 and that heroin and marijuana use are rising.'' The newsletter further states, ''The Department of Health and Human Services also released the Drug Abuse Warning Network [DAWN] survey, showing in 1993 a 31-percent increase in heroin-related emergency room visits,''. These contradictory statements leave us with a very basic question—how can an effective strategy be devised and implemented when the underlying causes and extent of the problem are in dispute?

In December 1994, ONDCP released a newsletter entitled ''Pulse Check, National Trends in Drug Abuse.'' This newsletter concluded that illegal drug use is on the rise, directly contradicting the strategy released 2 months after this publication. On page 17 of the newsletter, under section headed ''Conclusion,'' it states: ''This Pulse Check found a continuing presence of high-purity, low-priced heroin in many urban areas. In addition to the traditional addict in his 30s who injects the drug, nontradional groups are forming and growing larger that include persons in their teens and twenties, females, and middle-income persons. New and young users usually smoke or inhale heroin to avoid the stigma associated with the needle-using addict, but some of these users are quickly switching to injection.''

This section continues: ''Some ethnographic sources report that they are now convinced that the new user group represents a new epidemic of use, particularly since heroin appears to be moving out of traditional user groups and involves alternative methods of use such as snorting and smoking.'' The conclusions stated in this publication directly contradict the National Drug Control Strategy—yet both were prepared by the ONDCP.

Section III, ''Drug Use and Its Consequences,'' clearly shows the nexus between drugs and violent crimes. Although the nexus between drugs and violence is acknowledged, the elevation of treatment over enforcement again takes center stage. Page 38 states: ''Numerous studies confirm the fact that treatment of chronic, hardcore addicts, both within the correctional setting and in community-based programs, is the most cost-effective response and the course of action that makes the most practical sense.''

This blanket statement can be contradicted by any number of additional studies that show that treatment by itself without effective law enforcement efforts will never eradicate the drug problem. This section attempts to justify ONDCP's position by the following statement: ''The most compelling demonstration of the cost-effectiveness of treatment is from a recent California study assessing drug and alcoholism treatment effectiveness. This study found that in 1992 alone, the cost of treating approximately 150,000 drug users in California was $209 million. Approximately $1.5 billion was saved while these individuals were in treatment and in the first year after their treatment. Most of these savings were in the form of reductions in drug-related crime (a two-thirds decline in the level of criminal activity among these drug users was observed from pretreatment to posttreatment).''

This is a very misleading assertion for several reasons: First, if these defendants were incarcerated for drug violations, the same savings due to reduced criminal activity would apply. Second, these individuals were under supervision for this study, making criminal activity difficult. Third, if criminal activity were to take place, how can the possible losses be accurately cacluated? The figure would be the product of pure conjecture.

This section goes on to state: ''Locking up drug users and drug addicts does not go far enough to protect communities from the problems created by drug use.'' This statement is true to the extent that mere incarceration will not eradicate continued drug use, but incarceration is the first step in identifying and eventually treating chronic drug abusers. All too often, bleeding heart liberals forget that drugs are addictive and that most addicts will not voluntarily change their addictive behavior.

Further, incarceration of casual drug users sends a clear and convincing message that illegal drug use will not be tolerated by our society. The real threat of criminal penalties acts as a deterrent to the casual drug user, and increased law enforcement efforts in turn increase this deterring effect.

In my remarks on the drug problem in prior years, I emphasized the importance of social delegitimization of illegal drug use. I believe that the crop of new users reported by ONDCP is, in important part, the product of a relegitimization of illegal drug use, flowing from messages of tolerance implicit in the administration's statements and actions on this subject, taken as a whole.

Mr. President, it is not premature to issue a serious assessment of this administration's performance in the war on drugs. It has been dismal, and will only get worse. The problem is that the full penalty for this administration's failures—in analyzing and understanding the problem, in crafting a policy and budgetary response to it, and in implementing its decisions—will be paid by future generations of Americans. The current occupants of the White House will be long departed from any official responsibility for U.S. policy before the full impact of their mistakes is felt.

I pledge to continue my fight for the people of New York and the citizens of America, who deserve the domestic tranquility they were promised in the Preamble to the Constitution, but who are denied civil peace by the twin

plagues of violent criminal activity and illegal drug use. This year, we will revise last year's crime bill to make it more effective and more responsive to the concerns of the American people.

Moreover, the coming national election will give us a chance to present to the people of the United States this administration's record and ask for their judgment at the polls on its performance in this critical area. I believe the American people will understand as we do the abject and serious failure of this administration's policies, and will vote to change them.●

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Katherine Howard:									
United States	Dollar				1,674.35				1,674.35
England	Dollar		759.00						759.00
Poland	Dollar		940.00						940.00
Total			1,699.00		1,674.35				3,373.35

PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry,
Dec. 15, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John W. Warner:									
China	Yuan	3,847.50	450.00					3,847.50	450.00
Romie L. Brownlee:									
China	Dollar		29.10						29.10
China	Yuan	3,987,50	466.37					3,987.50	466.37
Senator Sam Nunn:									
China	Dollar		311.69						311.69
Korea	Dollar				1,560.95				1,560.95
Richard D. Finn, Jr.:									
Vietnam	Dollar		140.00				103.56		243.56
Thailand	Baht	9,440.65	379.60				313.31	9,440.65	692.91
Hong Kong	Dollar	4,020.16	520.14				609.42	4,020.16	1,129.56
China	Yuan	4,285.43	501.22				233.33	4,285.43	734.55
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
Malaysia	Dollar						470.00		470.00
James M. Bodner:									
Malaysia	Ringgits	981	327.00				470.00	981	797.00
Vietnam	Dong	5,277,550	447.25				103.56	5,277,550	550.81
Thailand	Baht	9,816.33	394.23				313.31	9,816.33	707.54
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
United States	Dollar				3,530.00				3,530.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	4,304.29	547.62				609.42	4,304.29	1,157.04
China	Yuan	3,854.35	452.92				233.33	3,854.35	686.25
Senator William S. Cohen:									
Malaysia	Ringgits	1,163.67	387.89				470.00	1,163.67	857.89
Vietnam	Dong	3,601,950	305.25				103.56	3,601,950	408.81
Thailand	Baht	9,712.49	390.06				313.31	9,712.49	703.37
Hong Kong	Dollar	4,488.14	571.01				609.42	4,488.14	1,180.43
China	Yuan	3,647.30	428.59				233.33	3,647.30	661.92
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
United States	Dollar				3,530.00				3,530.00
Senator Sam Nunn:									
Vietnam	Dollar		140.00				103.56		243.56
Thailand	Baht	10,594	426.00				313.31	10,594	739.31
Hong Kong	Dollar	5,341.67	691.12				609.42	5,341.67	1,300.54
China	Yuan	3,180.60	372.00				233.33	3,180.60	605.33
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
Malaysia	Dollar						470.00		470.00
Joseph G. Pallone:									
Russia	Dollar		1,544.00						1,544.00
Netherlands	Guilder	832.09	484.00					832.09	484.00
Lucia M. Chavez:									
Netherlands	Guilder	1,176.54	688.04					1,176,54	688.04
Russia	Dollar		387.80						387.04
United States	Dollar				3,431.85				3,431.85
Senator John W. Warner:									
United Kingdom	Pound	216.41	344.00					216.41	344.00
John H. Miller:									
Italy	Lire	525,826	322.00					525,826	322.00
United States	Dollar				1,381.25				1,381.25
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Belgium	Franc	20,775.5	672.35					20,775.5	672.35
Germany	Mark	339.485	230.94					339.485	230.94
Denmark	Krone	1,424	236.15					1,424	236.15
Norway	Krone	1,060	165.63					1,060	165.63
Poland	Zloty	12,952,536	570.60					12,952,536	570.60
Hungary	Forint	45,332.84	427.67					45,332.84	427.67
Romania	Leu	260,750	149.00					260,750	149.00
Bulgaria	Lev	11,534.05	181.64					11,534.05	181.64
Turkey	Lira	11,315,571	317.85					11,315,571	317.85
Greece	Drachma	122,300.9	524.90					122,300.9	524.90
Italy	Lira	1,137,791.5	742.20					1,137,791.5	742.20
Austria	Schilling	2,585.06	243.87					2,585.06	243.87
Croatia	Kuna	1,468.298	275.48					1,468.298	275.48
Thomas J. Young:									
Belgium	Franc	26,028.5	842.35					26,028.5	842.35

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Germany	Mark	421.6695	286.85					421.6695	286.85
Denmark	Krone	1,424	236.15					1,424	236.15
Norway	Krone	1,016	158.75					1,016	158.75
Poland	Zloty	13,400,730	590.34					13,400,730	590.34
Hungary	Forint	48,102.84	453.80					48,102.8	453.80
Romania	Leu	281,750	161.00					281,750	161.00
Bulgaria	Lev	12,669.05	199.51					12,669.05	199.51
Turkey	Lira	13,630,317	382.87					13,630,317	382.87
Greece	Drachma	123,777.9	531.24					123,777.9	531.24
Italy	Lira	1,209,991.5	789.30					1,209,991.5	789.30
Austria	Schilling	2,730.06	257.55					2,730.06	257.55
Croatia	Kuna	1,408.518	264.26					1,408.518	264.26
Total			22,341.15		13,434.05		7,179.32		42,954.52

SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Dec. 22, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Raymond Natter:									
Spain	Dollar		355.00						355.00
United States	Dollar				567.95				567.95
Senator Christopher S. Bond:									
Vietnam	Dollar		300.00				103.56		403.56
Thailand	Baht	10,594.00	426.00				313.31	10,594.00	739.31
Hong Kong	Dollar	5,626.80	728.00				609.42	5,626.80	1,337.42
China	Yuan	4,993.20	584.00				233.33	4,993.20	817.33
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
Malaysia	Dollar						470.00		470.00
Brent Franzel:									
Vietnam	Dollar		300.00				103.56		403.56
Thailand	Baht	10,594.00	426.00				313.31	10,594.00	739.31
Hong Kong	Dollar	5,626.80	728.00				609.42	5,626.80	1,337.42
China	Yuan	4,993.20	584.00				233.33	4,993.20	818.33
France	Dollar						65.21		65.21
Malaysia	Dollar						470.00		470.00
Total			4,431.00		567.95		3,589.66		8,588.61

DON RIEGLE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Feb. 22, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Roy Phillips:									
Netherlands	Guilder	832.09	484.00					832.09	484.00
Russia	Dollar		872.00						872.00
United States	Dollar				3,431.85				3,431.85
Total			1,356.00		3,431.85				4,787.85

JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
Feb. 1, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sam Fowler:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		530.78		29.40				560.18
France	Franc	4,415.55	811.41					4,415.55	811.41
United States	Dollar				3,245.15				3,245.15
Richard Grundy:									
Switzerland	Franc	2,891.70	2,226.95	115.00	89.18	143.10	110.20	3,150.60	2,426.33
United States	Dollar		6.65		1,425.75				1,432.40
Total			3,575.79		4,789.48		110.20		8,475.47

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Nov. 3, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James P. Beirne:									
Australia	Dollar	594.70	438.24	122.13	90.00	98.90	72.88	815.73	601.12
Vanuatu	Vatu	74,405	695.38	1,900	17.76	10,325	96.50	86,630	809.64
New Zealand	Dollar	1,198	731.83	314.50	192.12	179.25	109.50	1,691.75	1,033.45
Western Samoa	Tala	759	303.60	137.80	55.12	81	32.40	977.80	391.12
United States	Dollar				4,931.95				4,931.95
James O'Toole:									
Australia	Dollar	569.95	420.00	65	47.89	130.10	95.79	765.05	563.68
Vanuatu	Vatu	75,102	701.00	1,900	17.75	10,525	98.36	87,527	817.11
New Zealand	Dollar	1,198	731.82	12	7.33	209.05	127.70	1,419.05	866.85
Western Samoa	Tala	759	303.60	10	4.00	131	52.40	900	360.00
United States	Dollar				4,946.95				4,946.95
Laura Hudson:									
Australia	Dollar	765.16	519.99		38.00			765.16	557.99
Vanuatu	Vatu	87.370	816.54					87,370	816.54
New Zealand	Dollar	1,478.40	903.25					1,478.40	903.25
Western Samoa	Tala	708.25	283.30		38.00			708.25	321.30
United States	Dollar				4,931.95				4,931.95
Dionne Thompson:									
Australia	Dollar	607.82	447.92	94.99	70.00	88.20	65.00	791.01	582.92
Vanuatu	Vatu	77,430	723.64			6,200	57.94	83,630	781.58
New Zealand	Dollar	1,443.40	881.71			210.68	128.70	1,654.08	1,010.41
Western Samoa	Tala	73,875	295.50			12,500	50.00	86,375	345.50
United States	Dollar				4,931.95				4,931.95
Total			9,197.32		20,320.77		987.17		30,505.26

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Jan. 11, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Christopher Dodd:									
Ireland	Dollar		279.00						279.00
Northern Ireland	Dollar		191.00						191.00
United States	Dollar				1,442.95				1,442.95
Senator John Kerry:									
China	Yuan	8,396	982.00					8,396	982.00
Vietnam	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Thailand	Baht	4,560	183.00					4,560	183.00
India	Rupee	21,954	703.00					21,954	703.00
United Kingdom	Pound	180	283.00					180	283.00
United States	Dollar				6,386.00				6,386.00
Senator Richard Lugar:									
Germany	Dollar		500.00						500.00
France	Franc	1,691.04	312.00					1,691.04	312.00
United Kingdom	Pound	147.44	230.00					147.44	230.00
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
Japan	Dollar		568.02						568.02
Hong Kong	Dollar		863.52						863.52
China	Dollar		280.94						280.94
North Korea	Dollar		392.00						392.00
South Korea	Dollar		168.43						168.43
Vietnam	Dollar		710.66						710.66
United States	Dollar				6,314.95				6,314.95
Senator Claiborne Pell:									
Austria	Schilling	5,179.20	480.00					5,179.20	480.00
Senator Paul Sarbanes:									
Cyprus	Dollar		300.00				335.34		635.34
Greece	Drachma	131,105	539.75			115,254	473.22	246,359	1,012.97
United States	Dollar				1,880.35				1,880.35
Senator Paul Simon:									
Mongolia	Dollar		225.00						225.00
China	Dollar		928.00						928.00
North Korea	Dollar		190.00						190.00
South Korea	Dollar		303.00						303.00
Vietnam	Dollar		620.00						620.00
Steven K. Berry:									
Germany	Mark	143	94.70					143.00	94.70
France	Franc	705.84	136.00				125.00	705.84	261.00
United States	Dollar				1,123.21				1,123.21
Nadereh Chahmirzadi:									
Mozambique	Dollar		242.00						242.00
South Africa	Dollar		3,208.00						3,208.00
United States	Dollar				5,741.75				5,741.75
Geryld B. Christianson:									
Spain	Peseta	273,492	2,130.00					273,492	2,130.00
United States	Dollar				1,256.95				1,256.95
Hungary	Dollar		1,337.00						1,337.00
United States	Dollar				1,415.00				1,415.00
Nancy Chen:									
Mongolia	Dollar		225.00						225.00
China	Dollar		928.00						928.00
North Korea	Dollar		190.00						190.00
South Korea	Dollar		303.00						303.00
Vietnam	Dollar		620.00						620.00
G. Garrett Grigsby:									
Spain	Peseta	273,492	2,130.00					273,492	2,130.00
United States	Dollar				1,122.95				1,122.95
Netherlands	Guilder	832.09	484.00					832.09	484.00
Russia	Dollar		872.00						872.00
United States	Dollar				3,431.85				3,431.85
Michael Haltzel:									
Germany	Mark		1,700.00						1,700.00
United States	Dollar				1,175.95				1,175.95

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Germany	Mark	808	529.50					808	529.50
Austria	Schilling	5,156.40	480.00					5,156.40	480.00
France	Franc	3,288.48	624.00					3,288.48	624.00
United States	Dollar				1,474.75				1,474.75
Thomas Hubbard:									
China	Yuan	14,969.95	1,750.00					14,969.95	1,750.00
India	Rupee	36,384.25	1,165.00					36,384.25	1,165.00
United States	Dollar				5,296.95				5,296.95
Thomas Hughes:									
Ireland	Pound	331.10	515.00					331.10	515.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		920.00						920.00
United States	Dollar				1,170.15				1,170.15
Michelle Maynard:									
Austria	Dollar		480.00						480.00
Netherlands	Dollar		196.00						196.00
France	Dollar		1,284.00						1,284.00
United States	Dollar				1,781.25				1,781.25
Patricia McNerney:									
Bahamas	Dollar		1,312.00						1,312.00
United States	Dollar				630.95				630.95
Kenneth A. Myers:									
Germany	Dollar		500.00						500.00
France	Franc	1,691.04	312.00					1,691.04	312.00
United Kingdom	Pound	375.65	586.00					375.65	586.00
Deanna Okun:									
Japan	Yen	62,574	632.06					62,574	632.06
Taiwan	Dollar	15,156	577.82					15,156	577.82
Hong Kong	Dollar	3,230	418.80					3,230	418.80
China	Dollar		422.92						422.92
North Korea	Dollar		241.43						241.43
South Korea	Won	163,086	206.44					163,086	206.44
Vietnam	Dollar		500.88						500.88
United States	Dollar				2,021.00				2,021.00
Anne Smith:									
Netherlands	Guilder	832.09	484.00					832.09	484.00
Russia	Dollar		872.00						872.00
United States	Dollar				3,431.85				3,431.85
Jonathan Stein:									
Mongolia	Dollar		225.00						225.00
China	Dollar		928.00						928.00
North Korea	Dollar		190.00						190.00
South Korea	Dollar		303.00						303.00
Vietnam	Dollar		620.00						620.00
Nancy Stetson:									
China	Yuan	8,396	982.00					8,396	982.00
Vietnam	Dollar		310.00						310.00
Thailand	Baht	5,308	213.00					5,308	213.00
India	Rupee	22,579	723.00					22,579	723.00
United Kingdom	Pound	180	283.00					180	283.00
United States	Dollar				6,526.00				6,526.00
	AMENDMENT TO REPORT FOR 1ST QUARTER, 1993								
Stephen A. Rickard:									
Syria	Dollar		645.00						645.00
Israel	Dollar		592.00						592.00
Total			46,155.87		53,624.81		933.56		100,714.24

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
Feb. 2, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994.

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mary Sturtevant			1,700.00		3,227.35				4,927.35
Christopher Mellon			1,044.00		3,151.35				4,195.35
Donald Mitchell			1,095.76		3,239.65				4,335.41
Timothy Carlsgaard			879.00		4,472.00				5,351.00
Peter Dorn			1,981.00		4,030.95				6,011.95
Sarah Holmes			981.00		3,229.95				4,210.95
Cliff Blaskowsky			1,981.00		4,030.95				6,011.95
Senator Bob Graham					380.95				380.95
Alfred Cumming					662.05				662.05
Total			9,661.76		26,425.20				36,086.96

DENNIS DeCONCINI,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence,
Dec. 31, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Darrell Panethiere:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,500	1,125.00						1,125.00
United States	Dollar				2,559.35				2,559.35

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			1,125.00		2,559.35				3,684.35

JOE BIDEN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Mar. 7, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Lee Price:									
United States	Dollar				928.75				928.75
Total					928.75				928.75

KWEISI MFUME,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Dec. 21, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM SEPT. 2 TO SEPT. 12, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Patrick J. Leahy:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Senator J. James Exon:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Senator Hank Brown:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Luke Albee:									
Russia	Dollar		1,164.00						1,164.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Leah Gluskoter:									
Russia	Dollar		1,144.00						1,144.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Jan Paulk:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Hunt Shipman:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
William N. Witting:									
Russia	Dollar		1,294.00						1,294.00
Ukraine	Dollar		534.00						534.00
Moldova	Dollar		190.00						190.00
Italy	Lira	917,814	582.00					917,814	582.00
Delegation expenses: [1]									
Russia							7,889.56		7,889.56
Ukraine							6,901.14		6,901.14
Moldova							1,126.14		1,126.14
Italy							4,423.56		4,423.56
Total			23,120.00				20,340.40		43,460.40

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and Senate Resolution 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Jan. 3, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM JUNE 1 TO JUNE 7, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Claiborne Pell:									
Italy	Lira	1,412,104	887.00					1,412,104	887.00
France	Franc	4,163.43	743.47					4,163.43	743.47
Senator Robert J. Dole:									
Italy	Lira	1,396,184	877.00					1,396,184	877.00
France	Franc	2,895.20	517.00					2,895.20	517.00
Senator Daniel K. Inouye:									
Italy	Lira	759,542	478.00					759,542	478.00
Senator Ernest F. Hollings:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,896.80	1,053.00					5,896.80	1,053.00
Senator Sam Nunn:									
France	Franc	5,373.48	959.55					5,373.48	959.55
Senator Pete Domenici:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	4,030.94	719.81					4,030.95	719.81
Senator Joseph R. Biden:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	3,371.2	602.00					3,371.2	602.00
Senator John Glenn:									
Italy	Lira	1,189,224	747.00					1,189,224	747.00
France	Franc	4,428.26	790.76					4,428.26	790.76
Senator Dale Bumpers:									
Italy	Lira	1,349,410	849.22					1,349,410	849.22
France	Franc	4,474.4	799.00					4,474.4	799.00
Senator Patrick J. Leahy:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,376.00	960.00					5,376.00	960.00
Senator David Durenberger:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,896.80	1,053.00					5,896.80	1,053.00
Senator Alan Simpson:									
France	Franc	4,177.6	746.00	593.6	106.00			4,771.2	852.00
Senator John Warner:									
Italy	Lira	1,186,983	747.00					1,186,983	747.00
France	Franc	2,951.2	527.00					2,951.2	527.00
Senator David Pryor:									
Italy	Lira	1,394,592	876.00					1,394,592	876.00
France	Franc	4,664.80	833.00					4,664.80	833.00
Senator Larry Pressler:									
France	Franc	6,389.60	1,141.00					6,389.60	1,141.00
United States	Dollar				3,282.00				3,282.00
Senator Howell Heflin:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,017.6	896.00					5,017.6	896.00
Senator Arlen Specter:									
France	Franc	1,097.6	196.00					1,097.6	196.00
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,896.8	1,053.00					5,896.8	1,053.00
Senator Tom Harkin:									
France	Franc	5,600.00	1,000.00					5,600.00	1,000.00
Senator John F. Kerry:									
France	Franc	3,749.20	669.50					3,749.20	669.50
Senator Bob Smith:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,087.6	908.50					5,087.6	908.50
Senator Harlan Mathews:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	4,356.8	778.00					4,356.8	778.00
Martha S. Pope:									
Italy	Lira	1,067,808	672.00					1,067,808	672.00
France	Franc	4,631.20	827.00					4,631.20	827.00
Steven Benza:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	4,788	855.00					4,788	855.00
Sheila Burke:									
Italy	Lira	1,294,296	813.00					1,294,296	813.00
France	Franc	3,001.60	536.00					3,001.60	536.00
John Cummings:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	5,896.80	1,053.00					5,896.80	1,053.00
Clarkson Hine:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	2,307.20	412.00					2,307.20	412.00
Phi Nguyen:									
France	Franc	3,931.2	702.00					3,931.2	702.00
Jan Paulk:									
Italy	Lira	1,336,349	841.00					1,336,349	841.00
France	Franc	4,300.8	768.00					4,300.8	768.00
Randy Scheunemann:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	3,371.20	602.00					3,371.20	602.00
Sally Walsh:									
Italy	Lira	1,425,333	897.00					1,425,333	897.00
France	Franc	9,128.00	1,630.00					9,128.00	1,630.00
United States	Dollar				528.90				528.90
Delegation expenses: [1]									
Italy							31,636.99		31,636.99
France							51,552.12		51,552.12
Total			44,675.81		3,916.90		83,189.11		131,781.82

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and Senate Resolution 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
Dec. 1, 1994.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994.

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Amitay:									
United States	Dollar				2,260.15				2,260.15
Hungary	Dollar		1,014.00				135.94		1,149.94
Orest Deychakiwsky:									
United States	Dollar				1,743.35				1,743.35
Hungary	Dollar		1,757.00				34.50		1,791.50
David Evans:									
United States	Dollar				1,743.35				1,743.35
Hungary	Dollar		764.00				40.00		804.00
Robert Hand:									
United States	Dollar				1,714.00				1,714.00
Macedonia	Dollar		718.00				177.00		895.00
United States	Dollar				1,386.55				1,386.55
Hungary	Dollar		3,584.00						3,584.00
Janice Helwig:									
United States	Dollar				2,614.13				2,614.13
Hungary	Dollar		8,198.47		1,067.20		144.62		9,410.29
Macedonia	Dollar		364.34				400.00		764.34
Marlene Kaufmann:									
United States	Dollar				2,813.65				2,813.65
Hungary	Dollar		2,702.56				25.60		2,728.16
Ronald McNamara:									
United States	Dollar				3,340.95				3,340.95
Hungary	Dollar		1,014.00				50.00		1,064.00
United States	Dollar				739.95				739.95
Cuba	Dollar		594.00						594.00
Michael Ochs:									
United States	Dollar				1,743.35				1,743.35
Hungary	Dollar		2,535.00				115.00		2,650.00
Unitd States	Dollar				4,410.35				4,410.35
Turkey	Dollar		352.00						352.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		1,281.00				195.00		1,476.00
Russia	Dollar		672.00						672.00
James Ridge, Jr.:									
United States	Dollar				1,743.35				1,743.35
Hungary	Dollar		2,366.00				96.46		2,462.46
Erika Schlager:									
United States	Dollar				2,125.65				2,125.65
Hungary	Dollar		2,079.00						2,079.00
Samuel Wise:									
United States	Dollar				1,853.15				1,853.15
Hungary	Dollar		1,014.00						1,014.00
Hungary	Dollar		3,243.00						3,243.00
United States	Dollar				1,743.35				1,743.35
Hungary	Dollar		3,419.00				14.00		3,433.00
Total			37,671.37		33,042.48		1,428.12		72,141.97

DENNIS DeCONCINI,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 18, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 21 TO OCT. 26, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Amitay:									
United States	Dollar				2,707.35				2,707.35
Germany	Dollar		187.00						187.00
Turkey	Dollar		656.00				25.00		681.00
Senator Dennis DeConcini:									
United States	Dollar				2,805.00				2,805.00
Germany	Dollar		187.00						187.00
Turkey	Dollar		252.00						252.00
Mary Sue Hafner:									
United States	Dollar				2,707.35				2,707.35
Germany	Dollar		187.00						187.00
Turkey	Dollar		656.00						656.00
Robert Hand:									
United States	Dollar				1,543.13				1,543.15
Germany	Dollar		218.07				33.50		251.57
Samuel Wise:									
United States	Dollar				1,877.35				1,877.35
Germany	Dollar		187.00						187.00
Turkey	Dollar		177.00						177.00
Delegation Expense: [1]									
Turkey	Dollar						458.81		458.81
Total			2,707.07		11,640.20		517.31		14,864.58

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384.

DENNIS DeCONCINI,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 18, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Martha S. Pope									
United Kingdom	Dollar		83.16						83.16

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Republic of Ireland	Dollar		576.91						576.91
United States	Dollar				856.55				856.55
Total			660.07		856.55				1,516.62

AL GORE, President of the Senate,
Jan. 19, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Corbin:									
Spain	Peseta	273,492	2,130.00	5,575	43.42			279,067	2,173.42
United States	Dollar				1,143.95				1,143.95
Edward L. King:									
Spain	Dollar		164.46						164.46
Gordon Hamel:									
Germany/Bosnia-Herzegovina	Dollar		150.00						150.00
United States	Dollar				794.25				794.25
Total			2,444.46		1,981.62				4,426.08

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
Jan. 3, 1995.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mira Baratta:									
Belgium	Franc	2596.86	81.00					2596.86	81.00
United Kingdom	Pound	180.93	283.00					180.93	283.00
Italy	Lire	458,873	281.00					458,873	281.00
United States	Dollar				1,381.25				1,381.25
Randy Scheunemann:									
Belgium	Franc	2,400	75.00					2,400	75.00
United Kingdom	Pound	180.93	283.00					180.93	283.00
Total			1,003.00		1,381.25				2,384.25

ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Feb. 7, 1995.

ADDENDUM—CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1994

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ted Stevens:									
United Kingdom	Pound	552.67	849.00					552.67	849.00
United States	Dollar				4,950.05				4,950.05
Steve Cortese:									
United Kingdom	Pound	552.67	849.00					552.67	849.00
United States	Dollar				4,048.95				4,048.95
Total			1,698.00		8,999.00				10,697.00

ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Feb. 6, 1995.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND MARIAN CURTIS BASCOM, SR.

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, for 45 years the Reverend Marian Curtis Bascom, Sr., has, as pastor of the Douglas Memorial Community Church in Baltimore, been a leading force for fairness, opportunity, growth, and advancement, not only for the many devoted members of his congregation, but for all the people of Baltimore. His leadership, vision and commitment have made Reverend Bascom, and the members of his congregation truly a visible, viable, and compassionate force in Baltimore.

This month Reverend Bascom will officially retire as pastor of Douglas Memorial Community Church, but his influence will continue to grow not only by his continued presence and leadership in our community, but also through the lives and works of the countless people he has led, inspired, and challenged to achieve the highest levels of dedication and commitment of which they are capable.

Born in Florida and educated there and in Chicago, Reverend Bascom holds an honorary doctor of divinity degree from Florida Memorial College, and has completed advanced studies at Wesley Seminary and Howard University in Washington, having served as president of Howard's alumni association.

Since coming to Baltimore in 1949 as pastor of Douglas Memorial Community Church, Reverend Bascom has held leadership posts in a broad range of institutions critical to our community's growth and vitality. He has twice served as president of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, and with his fellow clergy in this wide ranging institution, Marian Bascom has been a force for economic, social, and civic progress leading the way to opening up access to our institutions to all people.

His inspired and committed leadership in the community has made him a leader in many ways—the first black commissioner of the Baltimore City Fire Department, first black to serve on the board of Baltimore City Hospitals, past president of the National Council of Community Churches, leader in support of working men and women, and vice president of Associated Black Charities.

Under his inspired leadership, Douglas Memorial Community Church has played a critical role in reaching out to the people of Baltimore and into the world. Under Reverend Bascom's pastorate, Douglas has developed and implemented programs which focus on youth, our senior citizens, and the homeless. There are camps for the youth, a Meals-on-Wheels service, apartments, a vibrant Sunday school and youth fellowship, and a ministry that touches people of all races and creeds throughout the community.

Mr. President, it has been my special honor and privilege to work with Rev. Marian C. Bascom over the years. I have found him to be an inspired leader, committed servant of his faith and tireless advocate for fairness and opportunity. His retirement will be only the next phase of involvement for this dedicated and inspiring clergyman, and I ask that all our colleagues join with me in wishing him every happiness. I also ask that a brief biography of the Reverend Marian Curtis Bascom, Sr., be printed in the RECORD.

The biography follows:

MARION CURTIS BASCOM, SR.: PREACHER, TEACHER, AND INNOVATOR

The growth of Douglas Memorial Community Church as a visible, viable compassionate force in the city of Baltimore is inextricably woven in the leadership of and by its minister, Rev. Marion Curtis Bascom, Sr.

Marion Curtis Bascom, Sr. was born in Pensacola, Florida and was blessed by the early influence of a religious life with his parents and grandparents. He soon became active as a child-preacher at the Mt. Olive Baptist church in Pensacola. As a young boy, he also lived in Chicago, Illinois, where he acquired his early education. Later he returned to Pensacola, and was graduated from High School.

In 1970 his Alma Mater, Florida Memorial College bestowed upon him the honorary Doctor of Divinity Degree. He also completed additional studies at the Wesley Seminary, Washington, D.C. In 1976, Dr. Bascom was selected to receive Howard University's coveted Distinguished Alumni Award at the 111th Anniversary of the founding of the institution. He has served the University frequently as a resource person for the School. Dr. Bascom has been president of the Alumni Association.

Before coming to assume the pastorate of Douglas Memorial Community Church, he had served as pastor at Mt. Zion Baptist Church, Pensacola, Florida; Shiloh Baptist Church, St. Augustine, Florida; and the First Baptist Church, St. Augustine, Florida. In July, 1949, he accepted the invitation to become the pastor of Douglas Memorial Community Church in Baltimore, Maryland.

Under the astute leadership of Dr. Marion Curtis Bascom, Douglas Memorial Community Church has become known as the church whose people have an acute awareness of the religious, social and political problems inherent of the city of Baltimore and which extend into the world. His leadership in connection with outreach programs focused on youth, the aged and homeless has brought recognition to him as one who believes that ''Love for one's fellowman reaches the highest pinnacle when we render service to others.''

Since 1949, Dr. Bascom has attained innumerable religious and civil heights, attesting to his stature as an inspired and committed leader in the Baltimore community. His prodigious list of credits include: twice president of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance; first Black Commissioner of the Baltimore City Fire Department; a former chairman of the Task Force for Welfare Rights; and the first Black to serve on the Board of Baltimore City Hospitals. In addition, he is a Past President of the National Council of Community Churches; and a former member of the Board of Directors of the Baltimore Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He has actively supported the local labor movement, and participated fully in the political life of Baltimore City. He was also a trustee of the Roseland Gardens Culture Center. Community concern has been maintained and Dr. Bascom serves as Vice President of Associated Black Charities.

Dr. Bascom has constantly admonished the Douglas Congregation that instead of doing ''church work'' it should ''do the work of the church.'' As a consequence with his foresight and guidance, Douglas has developed an enviable succession of outreach programs with four of its more prominent being: Camp Farthest Out, Inc., located in Barrett, Maryland, and serving four hundred under-privileged children for two-week periods throughout each summer; the Douglas Memorial Federal Credit Union, with assets over $1,000,000; a Meals-on-Wheels Kitchen serving all creeds and Douglas Village, with 49 apartments, occupying the entire 1300 block of Madison Avenue.

He was responsible for leading the church into sponsorship of a Headstart program and also for establishing the ''Seeker's House,'' a coffee house on Pennsylvania Avenue for area residents. Dr. Bascom was a local leader and activist during the civil rights movement, and marched in Selma with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Poverty marchers enroute to Washington were housed and fed at Douglas Memorial, as a small part of its awareness of the social problems of the day.

His battle for economic equality erupted in the development of a business thereby opening the entrepreneurial door in the minority community to the sale of fine papers—an arena previously closed in the Baltimore community.

Always available to growth prospects, the last five years have seen major efforts to renovate the Church House come to fruition. An elevator, long needed to care for more maturing congregants, has been installed to serve both the church and church house. Plans to install a new organ are evident and growing.

The intrinsic, incalcuable effects of his forty years at Douglas are reflected in a vibrant Sunday Church School, an active Youth Fellowship, an outstanding musical aggregation, responsible and committed circles and spiritual group fellowships—all hallmarks of the blessings visited upon the Douglas Family through the untiring efforts of its pastor, Marion Curtis Bascom, Sr.

In addition to his wife, Dorothy, immediate family members include their children, Bernadette M. Miller, Marion Jr., Peter and Singleton Bascom and Yviane B. Yeadon and their grandchildren; Chokise L. Miller, Ellis and Gillian Yeadon. While his beloved mother, the late Mary A. Knutt, has joined his sainted grandmothers, Marion Bascom senses a welcoming bonding with his maternal heritage—the Andersons—Uncle Tom, Victoria, Thomas Jr., Corine and Harry—with Aunt Dorothy, Barbara and Meta.

Dr. Bascom's favorite scriptual passage, the 139th Psalm, embraces his most fervent prayer:

''Search me, O God, and know my heart! Try me and know my thoughts . . .''●

NOMINATION OF DR. HENRY FOSTER

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise today to join a number of my colleagues who are asking that hearings be held on the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster for Surgeon General.

Dr. Foster is widely recognized as one of the Nation's leading authorities on infant mortality, as well as preventing teen pregnancy and drug abuse. He has contributed a great deal during his career, and is clearly an excellent candidate for the position of Surgeon General of the United States.

It is important that we focus on Dr. Foster's credentials and look at how he has dedicated his career to helping others. After finishing his medical training, Dr. Foster returned to his native rural South and began his lifelong crusade against infant mortality. Dr. Foster developed a comprehensive approach to maternal and child health which involved teams of doctors, social workers, and nutritionists, with a goal of preventing health problems in mothers and newborn babies. The teams worked in rural communities to reach women early in their pregnancies, identify those women with a high potential for complication, and ensure they received specialized attention throughout their pregnancy and following the birth. Dr. Foster's approach was ahead of its time, becoming a national model for regionalized perinatal care.

In 1991 the ''I Have a Future'' program, which Dr. Foster developed, was named a ''Point of Light'' by President Bush for its innovative work to reduce teen pregnancy and build self-esteem for at-risk youth. This program works with parental and community involvement, to help teenagers learn skills needed to start a business or get an education, and to point out the consequences of teenage pregnancy.

These are only two of the successful, innovative programs which Dr. Foster

has developed, but they give a good indication of the great contributions that Dr. Foster has made.

Mr. President, there has been much discussion about Dr. Foster performing abortions. Abortion is a legal procedure that should not disqualify Dr. Foster or any other nominee from Federal appointment. In response to some remarks about this performing abortions, Dr. Foster states that he believes abortion should be safe, legal, and rare, ''but [his] life's work has been dedicated to making sure that young people don't have to face the choice of having abortions.'' With efforts such as the I have a future program, Dr. Foster has shown this dedication.

Mr. President, there are several things that have been twisted and misinterpreted in looking at Dr. Foster's career. We must look at this total record, and his commitment to working with young people, parents, and teachers to ensure we do decrease teen pregnancies, do decrease the number of low birthweight babies, do decrease the number of children living in poverty, and do decrease the number of abortions performed in this country.

I have heard from numerous medical groups in support of Dr. Foster, including, the American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Physicians, American College of Preventive Medicine, and many more. His distinguished career, and his commitment to the health of women and children, eminently qualify Dr. Foster for the position of Surgeon General.

I look forward to his consideration by the full Senate.●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO IMPOSE CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I find curious the delay in the filing of the Senate report on the constitutional amendment to impose congressional term limits. When this matter was first listed on a Judiciary Committee agenda back on January 18, our Republican colleagues seemed in a tremendous rush to proceed on this matter, one of the 100 or so constitutional amendments introduced so far this Congress. When the Judiciary Committee voted to report Senate Joint Resolution 21 to the Senate back on February 9, the rush continued. The fervor seems to have cooled for now here in the Senate. Indeed, it took the majority 3 weeks to circulate a draft report. The committee was asked last Thursday to reconsider the procedural manner in which the resolution was reported, and as far as I can tell, the committee report is still yet to be filed.

I have no problem with the majority putting off consideration of this matter, which I oppose. The proposal is, in my view, a limitation on the right of the people to choose their representatives. I am concerned that our House colleagues will not have the benefit of our views when they take up this matter next week.

Because I have no assurance that the Senate report will be printed and available to them in time for their debate, I ask to include in the RECORD my opposition views, which were submitted to be included in the committee report back on March 3, and which I hope will appear in the Senate report, if and when it is printed.

The views follow:

ADDITIONAL OPPOSING VIEWS OF SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21, A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO IMPOSE CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS

I oppose this constitutional amendment. The Constitution does not set congressional term limits, trusting to the people to decide who will best represent them. Indeed, this proposal is, in essence, a limitation on the rights of the electorate. I reject it as such.

I urge my colleagues not to be afraid to do the right thing, even if it does not appear from certain polls to be the currently popular thing, and stop demagoguing constitutional amendments as the cure to our ills. Our Constitution has served us well, over more than 200 years. It is the cornerstone of our vibrant democracy. It has been amended only 17 times since the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1791—and two of those were prohibition and its repeal.

The Constitution is now under attack. The fundamental protections of separation of powers and the First Amendment are under siege. In the opening days of this Congress almost 100 constitutional amendments have been introduced. One, the so-called balanced budget amendment, has already been passed by the House and been narrowly defeated in the Senate. We risk making a mockery of Article V's requirement that we deem a constitutional amendment ''necessary'' before proposing it to the states.

One way to consider the impact of this proposed amendment is to look at who would not be here currently were this 2-term limit already part of the Constitution. The 2-term limit contained in S.J. Res. 21 would eliminate all of us who have been returned to the Senate by our constituents after standing for reelection more than once.

Think for a moment what imposing such a limitation would mean to the Senate. For example, are Senators Thurmond, Hatfield, Stevens, Packwood, Roth, Domenici, Chafee, Lugar, Kassebaum, Cochran, Simpson and Hatch, and Senators Byrd, Pell, Kennedy, Inouye, Hollings, Nunn, Glenn, Ford, Bumpers, Moynihan, Sarbanes, Biden and others not possessed of judgment and experience on which we all rely and on which their constituents depend? What of the Majority Leader, Senator Dole, should he have had to retire in 1980 after serving only two terms?

Consider what this type of measure would have meant over our history. Those who have served beyond two terms include among their ranks some of our most distinguished predecessors. Each of our Senate Office Buildings, in fact, is named for a Senator whose service would have been cut short by the type of term limit being proposed as a constitutional amendment: Richard Russell, Philip Hart, Everett McKinley Dirksen. It is a loss when illness takes such leaders from us; it would be a tragedy to have denied the country and their constituents their service through an arbitrary rule limiting congressional terms.

Think about Kentucky's Henry Clay; South Carolina's John C. Calhoun; Missouri's Thomas Hart Benton; Ohio's Robert Taft; Iowa's William Allison; Michigan's Arthur Vandenberg; Arizona's Carl Hayden and Barry Goldwater; Maine's Margaret Chase Smith and George Mitchell; Vermont's Justin Morrill and George Aiken; Massachusetts' Daniel Webster and Charles Sumner; Montana's Mike Mansfield; Washington's Scoop Jackson; North Carolina's Sam Ervin; Arkansas's William Fulbright; New York's Jacob Javits; Wisconsin's William Proxmire and the LaFollettes; Minnesota's Hubert H. Humphrey; Tennessee's Howard Baker, Jr. Such lists invariably leave out many who distinguished themselves through their service into a third Senate term.

Voters have not had any trouble electing challengers in the last several years. In 1978, 1980 and 1986, numbers of incumbents were defeated in primaries and general elections for the United States Senate. From the last election, one-third of those elected to the Senate are serving in their first terms. In the House of Representatives fully one third of the Members are beginning their first or second terms. The electorate does not seem to have a problem deciding whom to elect and whom not to reelect.

Indeed, rather than debating a constitutional amendment to impose term limits, our time might be better spent thinking about why more and more of our respected colleagues are choosing to abandon this body. Our friend from Colorado, the Chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee, has already announced that he will not seek reelection in 1996, after five terms in the House but only one here in the Senate. The senior Senator from Illinois, the Ranking Democrat on the Constitution Subcommittee, has also announced that he will not seek reelection after five terms in the House and two terms here in the Senate. The distinguished Ranking Democrat on the Energy Committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana has announced his intention to return to Louisiana.

Last year, George Mitchell and a total of nine of our colleagues in the 103rd Congress chose not to seek reelection. The Congress has become less and less a place where Members choose to run for reelection.

I respect my colleagues for doing what they think is right for themselves and their families. I commend those who like Hank Brown and our freshman colleagues believe strongly in term limits and conform their own actions to that rule. I urge them, however, to stop short of seeking to impose their view on all others and upon all other States for all time by way of this constitutional amendment.

The reality is that this is an institution that is called upon to deal with many important and complex matters, where judgment and experience do count for something. Some sense of history and some expertise can, from time to time, be helpful in confronting our tasks and fulfilling our responsibilities to our constituents and the country. Thus, I do not believe that a one-size-fits-all limit on congressional service makes sense.

Further, as the representative of a small State, I am acutely aware that we fulfill the purposes of the Senate and sometimes best represent our States when we have a bit of seniority and a track record on the issues. I believe, as did our Founders, that it is up to the people to let us know if we seek to overstay our term of service.

Before we embark on this course to rewrite the work of the Founders and impose an artificial limit on the length of congressional service, we should know what evil this constitutional amendment is intended to reach? On this the proponents speak in conflicting voices—some urging that term limits will make us more responsive to the electorate

and others arguing that it will give us greater distance and independence from them. Which is it?

It is remarkable that while the majority's rhetorical flourishes raise to new heights the mythological citizen-legislator and the majority report discusses everything from Aristotle, ancient Greece and term limit suggestions that were rejected by the Founders in the ''final draft of the Constitution,'' to bills, amendments and resolutions not considered by the Judiciary Committee, it nowhere discusses—let alone justifies—the specific congressional term limits it seeks to impose. The sole hearing into this matter was focussed in large part on proponents arguing that a 6-term limit for the House was ''no limit at all'' and that to include such a provision in this measure amounted to ''phony term limits,'' since 12 years is longer than the average term of service in the House. Nowhere in its long-delayed report does the majority discuss Senator Kyl's amendment to double the House term limits from three to six terms, hint at the controversy surrounding this key, substantive provision, nor indicate that it would invalidate limits adopted in over 20 states.

Further, the majority gives no consideration to the effectiveness of limiting terms of only one group of actors in our political democracy. Will we also limit the tenure of professional staff? Will we limit the number of years someone may lobby the Congress? Why not limit the years that someone can serve as a political consultant, a pollster, or an adviser? Are we prepared to venture into campaign reform and limit the number of times a person may contribute to Senate races over time? If not, term limits on candidates will only serve to increase the influence of these other groups at the expense of the people.

Do we expect first-term Senators intent on reelection to be less responsive to lobbyists and political consultants? For those who succeed in being reelected to a second and final term, will they be oblivious of the need to earn a living in succeeding years? With no prospect for a career in public service, Members of Congress may become more solicitous of ''special interests'' as they look beyond their lame duck status to new career opportunities.

Despite good intentions, this proposed constitutional amendment would not give us a citizen-legislature but, instead, a legislature made up of those independently wealthy and capable of taking 12 years from building a career outside this body to serve as philosopher-kings for a time.

I must oppose what I perceive to be a growing fascination with laying waste to our Constitution and the protections that have served us well for over 200 years. The First Amendment, separation of powers, the power of the purse, the right of the people to elect their representatives should be supported and defended. That is the oath that we all swore when we entered this public service. That is our duty to those who forged this great document, our commitment to our constituents and our legacy to those who will succeed us.

The Constitution should not be amended by sound bite. This proposed limitation evidences a distrust not just of congressional representatives but of those who sent us here, the people. Term limits would restrict the freedom of the electorate to choose and are based on disdain for their unfettered judgment. These are not so much term limits on the electorate to choose their representatives.

To those who argue that this proposal will embolden us or provide us added independence because we will not be concerned about reelection, I would argue that you are turning our democracy on its head. This proposal has the effect of eliminating accountability, not increasing it.

It is precisely when we stand for reelection that the people, our constituents, have the opportunity to hold us accountable. This proposal would eliminate that accountability by removing opportunities for the people to reaffirm or reject our representation of them. It would make each of us a lame duck immediately upon reelection.

Thus, my fundamental objection to the proposed constitutional amendment is this: It is, at base, distrustful of the electorate. It does not limit candidates so much as it limits the rights of the people to choose whoever they want to represent them. We should be acting to legislate more responsively and responsibly, not to close off elections by making some candidates off limits to voters. I will put my faith in the people of Vermont and keep faith with them to uphold the Constitution.

LEAHY AMENDMENT

When this matter reaches the Senate for debate, I intend to offer an amendment, along the lines of the one that I offered during the course of the Judiciary Committee's deliberations. I will try to move us toward an honest discussion of what this amendment would mean and what impact it would have on Congress. When politicians talk about imposing term limits, they tend to support proposals that, on examination, will not affect them. Thus, I have pointed out that S.J. Res. 21 is drafted so as not to affect adversely any of us.

This proposal is designed to become effective after the ratification process, which may itself take seven years. Thereafter, and only thereafter, are we to start counting terms in office for purposes of these constitutional term limits. Thus, this proposal is drafted so that some of us can get in two more successful reelection campaigns before we have even to start counting terms toward the 2-term limit. I suspect that all of us expect to be ''former'' Senators in 2020 after as many as four more terms, anyway. That is all that this amendment contemplates.

By contrast, my amendment will have the affect of making these constitutionally-mandated congressional term limits apply to each of us immediately upon ratification. Thus, the 2-term limit would apply to each of us then currently serving. Those of us serving in our second term, or greater, would be able to serve out the remainder of that term. Those in their first term in the Senate at the time of ratification would be able to run for reelection, once.

As I noted in the course of the Judiciary Committee's deliberations, my amendment would conform the congressional term limits amendment to the transition rule adopted in the 22nd Amendment, which imposed term limits on the President. The 22nd Amendment provides that it would ''not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.'' The 22nd Amendment did not say that the President serving at the time of ratification could be elected to two more, 4-year terms. It is noteworthy that this precedent continues to be ignored by the majority.

As reported, S.J. Res. 21 includes language in section 3 intended to provide special privileges to those Members who are serving at the time of ratification. Thus, all prior and current service is to be disregarded and Members serving at the time of ratification are to be accorded the prospect of two additional 6-year Senate terms and six additional 2-year House terms, regardless of the number of prior terms in the Senate or House. Rather than have the constitutional amendment eligibility limitations apply to everyone, S.J. Res. 21 is drafted so that Members serving at the time of ratification would be accorded the special privilege of being able to complete their current terms and then start over, counting from zero, with respect to elections and service toward term limits. This is, in the words of a member of the Committee who voted in favor of the constitutional amendment ''transparent hypocrisy.''

A few examples indicate the unfairness of these special privileges:

Senators elected after ratification would be locked into inferior status in terms of seniority, chairmanships, committee assignments and staff allocations. By contrast, Senators serving now and at the time of ratification would have their seniority preserved and protected.

A Senator elected one day before ratification would be able to serve three full 6-year terms before the limits took effect.

A Senator first elected in 1990 could run for reelection to a second term in 1996, run successfully for a third term in 2002, see the ratification process subsequently completed in 2003, finish out the third term in 2008 and still be reelected to two more full terms through 2020 before being affected by any term limits. At the same time a new Senator first elected in 2004 would be restricted to two terms and be barred from serving past 2016. Thus, the older Senator would be able to serve four years past the forced retirement of the newer and for a total of 18 years more than the newer Senator.

Senators voting for the amendment ought to be willing to bind themselves to its terms and not just to bind others who follow in their footsteps. Yet during the Judiciary Committee markup, the following Senators voted for this popular proposal and against my amendment to have it apply to them fully upon ratification: Hatch, Thurmond, Simpson, Grassley, Brown, Thompson, DeWine, Kyl and Abraham.

The amendment I will propose to the Senate will strike 3 and its language excluding elections and service occurring before final ratification from the calculation of the term limits being imposed. Instead, the amendment will expressly provide that the term limits being imposed by the constitutional amendment would apply to Members serving at ratification.

In order to avoid a retroactive effect or canceling the results of a completed election, the amendment will allow Members serving at the time of ratification to complete their current term. The prohibition in the proposed constitutional amendment would then operate prospectively to forbid any Member serving a term at or beyond the term limit being imposed from seeking reelection.

The amendment will also be intended to remove the ambiguity created by language included in Section 1, which begins: ''After this article becomes operative, no person. * * *'' Unless stricken, this language might be interpreted to exempt Members of Congress serving before ratification from the effect of the constitutional amendment entirely. At the least, the language implies that the eligibility of those Members of Congress serving at ratification is intended to be determined by consciously disregarding their current and past elections and service.

Unless stricken this language could create a special class of Members and grant them special privilege from the full effect of the constitutional amendment at the moment that it is ratified. The irony is that many of the very Members who vote to impose term

limits on others elected in the future would secure for themselves special dispensation so that they may serve either an unlimited number of terms or as many terms as can be begun before final ratification plus an additional two terms in the Senate and an additional six terms in the House.

The effect on my amendment will be that upon ratification of this constitutional amendment to impose congressional term limits, our current terms of service will be considered. This is in keeping with the substance of the amendment and would give it full effect upon ratification, rather than waiting for another 12 to as many as 20 years before it takes effect. If constitutionally-mandated congressional term limits are necessary to solve an important problem, then why should the amendment to the Constitution exclude the very situation that it is being proposed to correct? We should not provide ourselves with special privileges and adopt rules for the next generation of Members. ''Grandfathering'' or ''grandparenting'' ourselves from the full effects of this amendment is not any way to proceed, if it is the will of the Congress and the States that we should proceed.●

MEASURE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S. 169

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Calendar No. 13, S. 169 be indefinitely postponed.

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

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1158

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair if H.R. 1158 has arrived from the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the bill is at the desk.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, therefore I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will remain at the desk and will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1995

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 23, 1995; that following the prayer the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate then resume consideration of the line-item veto bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, Members who still have amendments on the list must offer those amendments by 10 a.m. Thursday morning. Votes can therefore be expected throughout Thursday's session of the Senate, including final passage of the pending line-item veto.

Mr. President, I want to repeat that. Those Members who still have amendments that are on the list, that have been cleared to be on that list under unanimous consent, must offer those amendments by 10 a.m. Thursday morning. Votes will be expected throughout the day, including final passage of the pending line-item veto bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1995

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection the Senate, at 9:16 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 23, 1995 at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO BELARUSAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 26, 1995, the Belarusan American Association, Inc., in New Jersey will commemorate the 77th anniversary of the Proclamation of the Belarusan Democratic Republic at the Hyatt Regency in New Brunswick, NJ. It will be a great honor and a privilege for me to participate in this important event.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is particularly important at this moment in history that we proclaim our strong support for the Republic of Belarus and the other Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The ongoing Russian military action in Chechnya raises serious questions about the possibility of imperialistic designs by Russia on former nations under its empire—whether Czarist or Soviet. President Yeltsin, whose control over the situation seems to be less than secure, has bowed to nationalist and militarist forces in Moscow on the Chechnya question. While the official status of Chechnya as a part of the Russian Federation is different from the other independent former Soviet Republics, such as Belarus, the Yeltsin government has created a very troubling precedent. There are clearly forces in Russia that seek to reassert control over the neighboring countries.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States has sought to provide economic assistance to the Newly Independent States. Amid the pressures that many of these states are now under because of structural economic problems, ethnic tensions and the threat of Russian imperialism, we must maintain a strong commitment to helping these emerging nations achieve a democratic political system and a market economy. For nearly half a century, we devoted considerable sums to containing the Soviet threat. Now that the Soviet Union has collapsed, we have the opportunity, with much more modest levels of spending, to invest in the long-term stability of these formerly captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is actually on March 25 that Belarusans throughout the world salute the sacrifices and bravery of the members of the Council of the Berlarusan Democratic Republic, who in 1918 liberated their country from the harsh and oppressive Czarist and Soviet rule. Representatives of the United Councils of the First Belarusan Convention, meeting in the capital city of Miensk [Minsk], issued a proclamation of independence of the Belarusan National Republic, adopted a national flag with three horizontal stripes—white, red and white—and received widespread international recognition. For the first time since 1795, the Belarusan nation re-emerged as an independent state. Despite the hardships from the First World War and the revolutionary turmoil in neighboring Russia, the Belarusan language, culture, and national identity flourished.

Unfortunately, the freedom and independence of the Belarusan nation did not last long. In 1921, Russia's Bolshevik regime invaded and conquered the Newly Independent State and renamed it the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. For the next 70 years, the Belarusan people endured a totalitarian Communist regime, denied the most basic civil and political rights. Millions of Belarusan nationals were exterminated. Although the Byelorussian SSR was officially considered a member of the United Nations since 1945, the country was in fact politically and militarily dominated by Moscow, with the Belarusans' aspirations for self-government and independence completed subverted.

The Belarusan Parliament initially declared its independence back in July 1990. Following the attempted coup against Soviet President Gorbachev in August 1991, the Speaker of the Belarusan Supreme Council, Stanislav Shuskevich invited Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk to Belarus in December 1991 to finally bury the moribund Soviet Union. In its place was established the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] with Miensk as its administrative seat. Although the Belarusan Parliament, as many other emerging East European democracies, was dominated by former Communists, protections for Belarusan culture, as well as basic human rights, were enacted. On June 23, 1994, Belarus held its first multiparty presidential elections since its independence, with a runoff election on July 10, 1994. The winner, Aleksandr Lukashenka, was a former Communist Party official and former head of the parliament's Anti-Corruption Committee. The Helsinki Commission, which observed the elections, proclaimed that the elections were conducted in conformance with international practices and that the results reflected the freely expressed will of the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, since my wife Sarah is part Belarusan, I have had the opportunity to become particularly familiar with this proud people. My district, the Sixth District of New Jersey, is home to a significant Belarusan-American community. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, Americans in general have had the opportunity to learn more about this distinct land and its culture. In 1994 President Clinton visited the Belarusan capital, and a variety of United States public and private sector initiatives have been launched in Belarus. Let us resolve to continue to improve the economic, security, and cultural ties between the great peoples of the United States and the Republic of Belarus.

STATEMENT ON TAYLOR EMERGENCY TIMBER SALVAGE SALE AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Taylor emergency timber salvage sale amendment. This legislation responds to the 33 lives lost fighting forest fires last year; it responds to the $1 billion spent by the taxpayer fighting high-intensity out-of-control forest fires; it responds to millions of dollars in revenues forgone by Federal and State governments; and it responds to the environmental disaster facing our Nation's forests by prescribing clearly what must be done to begin to alleviate our national forest health problem.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment mandates the removal of disease- or insect-invested trees, dead, damaged, or down trees, or trees affected by fire or insect attack. This legislation includes trees imminently susceptible to fire or insect attack that refers to any area in which 10 percent or more of the conifer basal area has been lost to drought, insect, or disease related mortality in the last 10 years.

This amendment also mandates removal, without regard to size limitations or retention standards where removal is necessary for the health, protection or restoration of the forest. Because the amendment addresses an emergency situation, it necessarily encompasses forests, such as those impacted by the California spotted owl report or the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project report.

In spite of these requirements, environmental concerns will be met. U.S. Forest Service Chief Jack Ward Thomas and his staff reviewed the amendment, suggested modifications, and evaluated the Forest Service's technical and operational capability to meet its requirements. The amendment neither authorizes salvage timber sales on lands specifically protected by Congress, nor does it forgo environmental requirements. An environmental assessment must be prepared which will satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and my State need our national forests to be managed properly. This legislation will begin to alleviate this urgent problem. I urge my colleagues to support the Taylor emergency timber salvage sale amendment.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN PRAISE OF PAUL HARVEY'S COMMENTS ABOUT THE BELEAGURED OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, recently a column by fellow Oklahoman Paul Harvey was published which effectively highlights the problems faced by our Nation's domestic oil and gas enterprises. I commend this column to my colleagues in the hope that Mr. Harvey's wise words, born of experience, will be heeded as we consider legislation affecting this vital industry this session.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Mar. 10, 1995]

NATION'S OIL INDUSTRY CONTINUES TO SUFFER

(By Paul Harvey)

Our nation's balance of trade with other nations is unbalanced in their favor largely because of all the foreign oil we are buying—needlessly.

While drilling rigs sit idle in Texas, Oklahoma and 28 other states, our country continues to import from other countries more than half of all the oil we use. Meanwhile, the administration persists in maintaining policies that make it impossible for stateside oil companies to compete.

Commerce Secretary Ron Brown has persistently refused even to consider a tariff on imports, which would ''level the playing field.'' The White House has declined even to consider initiatives to bolster our own oil industry, to stimulate our own production.

Denise Bode, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, is outraged. She predicts ''a fire storm'' in the oil-and gas-producing states.

The American Petroleum Institute, convinced it will get nothing from the White House, is turning for help to Congress. The eight-member Oklahoma congressional delegation is seeking remedial legislation.

Sens. Bob Dole, R-Kan., and Don Nickles, R-Ponca City, are offering a parallel proposal to the Senate. What they seek is a $3-a-barrel tax credit for existing and new marginal oil wells, phasing out when the market prices hit $20 a barrel.

It can be argued that our nation is vulnerable again to being held hostage by Middle East potentates, who could cut off our oil within hours in the event of confrontation. That is so.

But a poor boy who grew up in Tulsa is more urgently anxious about the prospect of losing our nation's limited reserves forever.

Underground oil is not a ''pool'' of liquid. Mostly, it is suspended in sand or porous rock. Over time, even under applied water pressure, the flow dwindles, until one day, you have wells producing perhaps only three barrels a day.

After time, that three-barrel well will not pay its way because of cheap imports. If you plug that well, and later effort to re-drill the same well might cost $5 million, which is utterly unrealistic. So, that oil is gone forever.

Domestic United States oil production is the lowest it has been in 40 years—500,000 jobs have disappeared in the oil industry in the past 10 years. Twenty-two thousand have been eliminated in just the two Clinton years.

Considering those numbers, a tax credit to encourage production is one of the best investments our country could make.

TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR ''ART'' HOLLINGSWORTH

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Arthur ''Art'' Hollingsworth. Mr. Hollingsworth is retiring after more than 21 years of public service in Rohnert Park, CA, which is located within the district I am privileged to represent. His dedication and commitment to improve the lives of the people of Rohnert Park is appreciated by those who have worked with him over the years, and by many who have benefited from his efforts.

Art spent more than 13 years on the Rohnert Park City Council, including three terms as mayor. He was a member of the city's planning commission for 8 years, and served for 2 years as its chairman. Having served on a city council myself, I know that these years were filled with lots of hard work, countless meetings, and long work days.

Despite this, however, Art's commitment to the community did not end with his official city duties. He also involved himself in a variety of local nonprofit activities and youth programs. Art was an advocate for our youth and worked to raise money for local high school athletic activities. In addition, he was a leader in many professional community groups, including the Rohnert Park Chamber of Commerce where he served as president for two terms.

Mr. Speaker, Art Hollingsworth has made many contributions to his community through his hard work and dedication. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting his efforts today, and in wishing him, and his family, all the best in the future.

IN HONOR OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE D. FRENCH SLAUGHTER, JR.

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues information concerning the naming of the main building of the Locust Grove campus of Germanna Community College of Virginia in honor of Congressman D. French Slaughter, Jr. The special dedication ceremony will take place on April 21, 1995, in Locust Grove, VA.

French Slaughter is a 20-year veteran of the Virginia General Assembly and was the chief patron of the State Community College Act of 1966. In 1969 he was a key leader in founding Germanna Community College upon the distinctive historical 100 acre site it now occupies. Upon retiring from the House of Representatives in 1991, he donated his personal papers and other memorabilia to the college. This collection will be on display at the dedication.

Our colleague worked hard to create educational opportunities for all people. He provided vision, support, and strong leadership in pursuing this goal. His efforts were key in helping so many individuals in quest of a dream; a dream of higher education which, to many, became a reality.

Germanna Community College is providing a fitting tribute to our former colleague who worked so hard and achieved much success in the pursuit of education for the people of Virginia.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 8, UNITED STATES CODE, ''ALIENS AND NATIONALITY''

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to revise and codify certain general and permanent laws, related to aliens and nationality, as title 8 of the United States Code. This bill has been prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel as a part of the responsibilities of that Office to prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, for enactment into positive law, all titles of the United States Code.

This bill is intended to make no substantive change in the existing law.

Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of the bill should contact the Judiciary Committee document clerk in room B–29 of the Cannon House Office Building. The telephone number is 225–0408. In addition, a section-by-section summary—containing reviser's notes and tables—of the bill, may be obtained through Edward F. Willett, Jr., Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives, H2–304 Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515–6711.

Persons wishing to comment on the bill should submit those comments to the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Judiciary Committee no later than June 15, 1995.

TALENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT LICENSE

HON. WES COOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which allows the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to grant the Talent Irrigation District, which is in my district in Jackson County, OR, an extension of its hydro project construction commencement deadline.

The project is a 2.4-megawatt powerhouse, planned as an attachment to the existing Emigrant Dam, on the Emigrant River in southern Oregon. Low water conditions in the Emigrant River resulting from 8 years of continuous drought in Oregon have caused the irrigation district to reevaluate the project's operating plan. I believe granting an extension in this case will enable local officials to better configure this project to maximize power production and fish enhancement in light of the reduced water flows in the Emigrant River.

Construction of the existing Emigrant Dam was completed in 1959. It is a structural height of 176 feet and impounds 39,000 acre feet of water, which is delivered to about 8,000 users, irrigating approximately 30,000 acres.

On May 24, 1989, FERC issued a construction license to the Talent Irrigation District for the hydro project extension at Emigrant Dam. The license required construction to commence within 2 years—by May 24, 1991. In January 1991, the district requested and received a 2-year extension of the construction commencement deadline, until May 14, 1993, citing the need to consult further with the Bureau of Reclamation and continue negotiating a power sales agreement.

All negotiations were completed by April 1992, but the low flow conditions in the Emigrant River caused the Talent Irrigation District to postpone the commencement of construction and reevaluate the hydro project's proposed operating plan. When the 2-year extension expired on May 24, 1993, FERC canceled the license.

In order to commence with this project, the district needs its license reinstated and additional time to carefully evaluate the operating plan for the Emigrant hydro project and adjust it to perform better under low water conditions, both for power production and fish enhancement. The Federal Power Act, however, only allows FERC to grant one 2-year extension to the district, which is granted in 1991. Therefore, legislation is required to authorize FERC to extend the deadline further.

The legislation I am introducing today reinstates the Talent Irrigation District license and grants the district up to 4 years to begin construction.

CONGRATULATING JILL MOSS GREENBERG—MARYLAND WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME HONOREE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to recognize an outstanding citizen of Prince George's County, MD. Ms. Jill Moss Greenberg, a resident of Hyattsville, was recently named one of six women throughout the entire State of Maryland to be inducted into the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame.

I have known Jill for a number of years and have worked very closely with her on the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as well as in my capacity as chairman of the Helsinki Commission in seeking the release of Jewish refuseniks from the former Soviet Union. Over the years she has been instrumental in forging change throughout our county, our State, our Nation and on the international level—change that has benefited the lives of many people. She is truly worthy of this honor.

Recently, Ms. Andrea Novotny of the Prince George's Journal wrote of the outstanding contributions Jill Moss Greenberg has made in garnering this recognition and I am pleased to share this article with my colleagues and urge them all to join me in congratulating one of Maryland's Women's Hall of Fame honorees—Jill Moss Greenberg.

HONOREE RECALLS HER ACTIVIST PAST

(By Andrea Novotny)

Twenty years ago, women could not have credit cards in their name and faced expulsion from school for running on the ''boys' track.''

But Jill Moss Greenberg, 52, of Hyattsville, a self-described civil rights and feminist pioneer, worked to change those and other gender, race and socio-economic inequities. She is one of six women who on Tuesday were named honorees of the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame, established by the Maryland Commission for Women in 1985.

''People don't even think of it now. But it was a hard fight to get to where we are today. . . . No one should be a second-class citizen. We are working to create a society where no one is marginalized and no one is a footnote. The whole is greater than the parts, and every individual has the potential of creating great change,'' Greenberg said.

''There are a lot of laws on the books, but it is a constant struggle to make them real in the lives of everyday people. We have to assure that those accomplishments remain and that we continue to go forward for the rest.''

Greenberg began tackling social problems as a teenager, joining the Civil Rights movement while still in junior high school. By middle school, she was volunteering on the presidential campaign of Adlai Stevenson, who she believed shared her vision of civil liberty.

Greenberg's efforts with a friend to remove barriers for the disabled led to the creation of one of the first preschools for disabled children in the United States. She was in her junior year in college.

''From the time I was very young, my family raised me with the values that each person could make a difference. Something can always be done about social inequities,'' Greenberg said.

She now works as director of multicultural education at the Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, providing assistance to school systems in five states on issues involving gender and race. ''Racial minorities and women not only have a glass ceiling, but they have to clean it too,'' Greenberg noted. ''. . . As Frederick Douglass said, 'you can't have change without a struggle.' ''

Greenberg, a Maryland resident for 24 years, led the effort to form the county's Commission for Women in 1972. At that time she was also working with the state's Commission for Women to help women participate in the legislative process.

Greenberg played a significant role in the passage of the Maryland Equal Rights Amendment, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and Title IX, a federal law that requires federally funded schools to provide equal opportunities in athletics for male and female students.

But overcoming barriers wasn't easy.

''So many people opposed civil rights and civil equity back then,'' Greenberg recalled. She first had to win the support of former Congresswoman Gladys Noon Spellman, who was expelled from high school for running on the school's only track, then designated for boys.

''People thought Title IX would defeminize females and demasculinize males. Other congressmen said if it became law, our daughters would have to shower with boys. But they were missing the point. It wasn't just about athletic equity, it was about learning to win and lose and letting others experience the things that prepared them for life,'' Greenberg said. ''The education girls receive determines their employment and life-long existence.

''Our goal now is not just to put different genders, races and cultures in a classroom, but to have them treated equally within that environment,'' Greenberg said. She learned cultural and religious sensitivity working with the county school system's task forces on black male achievement and multicultural education and serving on the regional board of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Greenberg founded the Maryland Women's History Project and the Black History at Your Door Step Project to recognize historical contributions of women and members of racial minorities.

''In a 500-page social studies text-book, only seven pages were dedicated to women. When women finally won suffrage, 75 years ago, the books said they were 'given' the vote—not that they achieved it through great struggle,'' Greenberg said.

''We need to create respect for each other so we can understand and value diversity.''

Greenberg cautions against over-simplifying complex issues facing today's multicultural society and she says finding solutions is an ongoing challenge.

''Do we stand for what our country is about or what is comfortable? We need to be able to have the courage to stand up for our convictions,'' Greenberg said. ''We still see a lot of inequity, but when people who share the same vision work together, they become a powerful force in creating change.''

GUAM COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my strong support of the continued funding for the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment of the Humanities.

In its 29-year history, the NEA has awarded over 100,000 grants for music, theater, dance, arts, education, and outreach to many communities across the country. The Federal Government's elimination of the funding of these agencies would greatly affect the lives of many people, especially children, throughout the Nation and especially on Guam. The Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities Agency [CAHA] would stand to lose a great deal because Guam does not have a large enough population base to commercialize the arts and humanities.

I would like to point out the important contributions that the NEA and the NEH have provided for us on Guam. In 1994, Guam received the basic State grant annual funding of $201,000, which is subgranted to applicant on Guam who apply to CAHA to do artistic community-related projects. In addition, CAHA received a grant of $10,000 from the Folk Arts Program to support the Folk Arts Apprentice Program.

In 1993, CAHA received a grant of $100,000 from the NEA to support the continued development of a Chamorro culture village in the village of Inarajan. During that same year CAHA also received a grant of $17,600 from the Folks Arts Program to support a survey to identify, document, and form a consortium among builders and navigators of traditional sea-faring canoes in the Micronesian Island communities. The termination of funding for the NEA and the NEH would deprive CAHA of its ability to do its job—that of supporting funds to community artists and organizations and subsequently monitoring the development of these projects.

I would like to bring to your attention what Guam could lose if the funds for the NEA and

the NEH were to be eliminated: Funding for the Guam Symphony Society; folks arts, masters of traditional art apprenticeship program funding for the arts in Education Program—taking art into the schools; grants for the Isla Center for the Arts; college crafts program at Gef Pa'go, Chamorro Cultural Village; funding for the University of Guam Theater and Music Department; funding for the consortium for the Pacific Arts and Culture which brings the Missoula Children's Theater to Guam grants to Media arts, literary arts, performing arts, visual arts, and folks arts; and grants to artist fellowships.

CAHA's mission has been to show case our culture and make people understand its importance to our island. The whole point of the arts and humanities programs, which CAHA supports, is to create an opportunity for people to expand their views and knowledge about the various cultures which constitute the melting pot of America. The very existence of the CAHA, is threatened without the funding provided by the NEA and the NEH. The opportunity that CAHA affords the community to engage on a larger scale also would be gone.

In fiscal year 1995, Guam was the only jurisdiction in the United States to have all grant applications approved as well as to receive an additional grant. By these actions, the NEA and the NEH have recognized Guam's outstanding record of funding artists and projects important to our community.

Finally, I would like to commend the fine work that CAHA has accomplished in years past and to congratulate Ms. Deborah Bordallo on her recent appointment as executive director to the Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities. With the renewed funding from the NEA and the NEH, we, on Guam, will work hard toward supporting CAHA for many generations to come.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. OLSON, JUDGE OF THE LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert M. Olson, judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, will retire from the bench on April 7, 1995.

Judge Olson has served more than 22 years as a Los Angeles Superior Court judge, and is currently the third ranking judge in terms of seniority in that court.

The majority of Judge Olson's judicial career has been spent in the Los Angeles Superior Court's northeast district in Pasadena, where he has twice served as supervising judge of the district. Since January 1990, Judge Olson has served in a satellite courtroom of the northeast district located in the Alhambra courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his judicial career, Judge Olson has demonstrated the highest level of personal integrity and conduct. He has always shown a great respect for the law and he has consistently performed his judicial duties with compassion, sensitivity, and courtesy.

He was always regarded with the highest esteem by the Los Angeles legal community. He has a lot of heart, a wonderful temperament, and a well-honed sense of humor.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize Superior Court Judge Robert M. Olson before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives upon his retirement from the bench.

ANOTHER MEDICAL BREAKTHROUGH BY VA MEDICAL RESEARCHER

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see news reports this week about an important scientific advance for people who are paralyzed.

Stories in the Washington Post, the Baltimore Sun and other papers described the Neuroprosthetic Hand Grasp System—a new computerized device that can help some people with spinal cord injuries regain use of their hands.

I was absolutely delighted to learn of this exciting work, because I believe it will bring hope to thousands of people who have lost so much through catastrophic injury.

But I was also pleased by this news because it reflects the tremendous value of an outstanding research program that has not received the recognition it is due.

This development for paralyzed persons—like many other medical advances—came from the research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Unfortunately, the public is not well informed about the work of VA scientists and researchers. They do not know that, over the years, VA research has established an impressive record for achieving health care improvements for disabled veterans, while bringing scientific advances for the society at large.

VA researchers are responsible for breakthroughs such as the first effective drug treatment for schizophrenia, the pioneer kidney and liver transplants, the first cardiac pacemaker implant, and development of the scientific basis for computer assisted CAT scanning—which revolutionized diagnostic medicine.

This program is one of the most cost-effective approaches to research anywhere in the medical world. It is based on a clinician-investigator approach, under which most of VA's scientists work in patient care programs, as well as in their laboratories.

Our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the entire VA research family. On this day, I especially commend the members of the VA research team that led the way in developing the Neuroprosthetic Hand Grasp System, and to their colleagues in the academic world and the private sector.

We should take pride in the achievements of our VA medical researchers. This is a program that deserves our recognition and support as it seeks to improve the lives of all Americans.

There follows the article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post yesterday morning:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1995]

EVERY MOVEMENT COUNTS—DEVICE GIVES QUADRIPLEGICS A CHANCE TO GRASP

(By Paul W. Valentine)

BALTIMORE, March 20.—Slowly, laboriously, his brow knitted in concentration, Kevin Hara picked up the pen in his right hand, positioned it firmly between his thumb and first finger and scribbled his name.

A few months ago, Hara, 21, a Georgetown University student who was paralyzed below the shoulders in a 1991 trampoline accident, could not move his hands or fingers.

Now, with an experimental electrical stimulator implanted in his chest to bypass his injured spinal cord and activate hand muscles, he is able to write, grasp a cup, shave, brush his teeth and tap out letters on a computer keyboard.

Hara was one of three quadriplegic patients who gathered at the Veterans Administration Medical Center today to demonstrate the new technology, called the Neuroprosthetic Hand Grasp System.

Medical investigators in Baltimore, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Boston, Palo Alto, Calif., and Melbourne, Australia, hope to get U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval of the experimental technology within a year and put it on the medical market within five years.

''It's made a big difference in my life,'' Hara said. ''I'm able to do more, but it's also improved my confidence.'' A junior, he said he hopes to become a physician and specialize in psychiatry.

Restoring the ability to do things ''the rest of us take for granted'' is often slow and halting, with rewards measured in minuscule improvements day to day, said Peter H. Gorman, the neurologist who heads the Baltimore program.

''After you break your neck,'' said Jo Heiden, 30, of Arlington, a quadriplegic who was injured in a fall 11 years ago, ''anything you can do to get some independence back is important.''

Besides the patients in Baltimore, an additional 21 are enrolled in similar programs in the other cities. The implant surgery and long follow-up therapy for patients to learn how to use the muscle stimulator costs about $35,000, doctors said.

Restoring muscular activity for paralyzed patients is not new, Paraplegics since the late 1970s have used external stimulators on their legs to help them walk.

But the technology demonstrated today is the only one using a surgically implanted stimulator to restore functional movements in the hands and fingers of quadriplegics, according to Gorman, chief of rehabilitative services at the VA hospital in Baltimore. He also is an assistant professor of neurology at the University of Maryland Medical Center.

The implant program is not suitable for all paralyzed patients. Of the 90,000 people with quadriplegic spinal cord injuries in the United States, Gorman said, only about 14,000 might be eligible—those able to move their shoulders and bend their elbows but not use their hands.

Another important factor, Gorman said, is to be ''highly motivated to try the new technology.''

In spinal cord injuries, ''the brain is no longer able to send messages to the nerves in the arm,'' said W. Andrew Eglseder, an orthopedic surgeon who performed the implants on Hara, Heiden and Jeanette Semon last year.

The new technology, he said, ''sends signals to the muscles directly, in effect, bypassing the patient's damaged nerve system.''

An electrical stimulator smaller than a cassette is implanted in the upper chest and

connected to a series of wires that are embedded in the arm from the shoulder almost to the wrist. The wires are attached to seven electrodes that are sewn into paralyzed forearm muscles that control the hand.

The stimulator is attached outside the body to a computerized radio transmitter control unit that the patient attaches to the back of a wheelchair. The control unit also is attached by wire to another device taped to the chest and shoulder.

By moving the shoulder up and down or backward and forward, the patient signals the control unit to send electrical impulses through the stimulator and down into the arm muscles to activate finger and hand movement.

After the surgery, patients are hospitalized for three to four weeks. Then slowly they begin months of physical therapy, learning ''grasp patterns'' and ''integrating them into their daily routine,'' said Linda M. Marshall, chief of occupational therapy at the VA medical center.

The Baltimore program is funded by a $170,000 grant from the Department of Veterans Affairs and involved no cost to the three patients.

Similarly, programs in the other five cities are funded by the department, the National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research and NeuroControl Corp., of Cleveland, maker of the stimulator device.

The three Baltimore patients, sitting side by side in wheelchairs eagerly displayed their newly recovered skills.

Semon, 30, a Department of Agriculture budget analyst who lives in Chantilly, leaned forward, picked up a fork and pierced a pink ball of Play-Doh on a plate.

''Yum,'' she said, pretending to take a bite.

Heiden, a computer software engineer, typed a quick message on a computer keyboard with one finger. That may not seem much, she said, but before the implant surgery, she could only jab at the keyboard with a broken pencil wedged in a splint on her arm.

''My typing speed has increased tremendously,'' she said.

''I can load and unload paper for my printer, too.''

PROTECTING OUR NATION'S FLAG

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of my longstanding support to affirm the right of State legislatures and the U.S. Congress to protect the American flag, I am proud to once again be an original introducer today of a constitutional amendment declaring that Congress and the States shall have the power to prohibit the act of physical desecration of the American flag.

This is not the first time the House will consider this resolution. As my colleagues may recall, on June 21, 1990, the House fell just 34 votes short of the two-thirds vote required to approve this constitutional amendment. Since that time, 44 States have passed resolutions calling on Congress to give them the opportunity to ratify an amendment to the Constitution protecting the flag—6 more than the 38 States needed for ratification.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that on the 50th anniversary of the historic flag-raising atop Iwo Jima's Mount Suribachi, that we reintroduce this amendment to protect our flag from desecration. On this occasion we remember the 75,000 marines who fought for 36 days in one of the most grueling battles of World War II, a time when ''uncommon valor was a common virtue.'' We honor the nearly 7,000 men who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country during the fight for the island, and the countless others wounded in this campaign.

In memory of those who fought that battle, we have erected the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington, VA, where the moving re-creation of that famous flag-raising stands with the glorious Stars and Stripes atop the flagpole. It stands as a memorial not only to the Americans who served so bravely in that battle, but for all Americans who marched in battle behind the Stars and Stripes to restore freedom and protect the ideals which our great flag symbolizes.

Few things dishonor their memory more than acts of desecration of the American flag.

Our flag waves across the United States as a symbol of freedom and democracy and as a constant reminder of those who paid the ultimate price in service to their country. Casting contempt on the flag is the same, in my view, as casting contempt upon our Constitution and all the values of our great Nation for which it stands—liberty, equality, and justice for all. On battlefields throughout our Nation's history many lives have been lost and much pain and suffering endured by those committed to the defense of these values. To desecrate the flag is to cast contempt upon these brave men and women who carried our flag into battle with them; soldiers who have fought so bravely and offered their lives to protect the freedoms which we enjoy today and the promise of a free future for our children.

The United States stands as an example of freedom and justice for all to follow. The American flag remains a symbol throughout the world of that freedom and justice. It has inspired ordinary Americans to make extraordinary sacrifice, and should be respected and protected always. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and supporting this amendment.

A TRIBUTE TO 13 GOOD SAMARITANS

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, please let the record show that I submit these remarks jointly with my colleague, the Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT of Virginia.

Too often we fail to recognize the good things today's youth do. We are always quick to criticize them, but unfortunately are often slow to offer praise when it is deserved. We want to change that today.

Thirteen children from Newport News deserve special recognition for an extraordinarily good deed. While playing a game of chase on a recent Sunday afternoon, the youngsters witnessed the mugging of a 75-year-old woman. As the mugger sprinted away from the scene of the crime, the children, some as young as 5, gave chase to the suspect. They followed the suspect for two blocks, eventually leading police to the spot where he was hiding. The kids also showed police a nearby truck where the suspect had thrown the woman's purse.

These 13 kids are a shining example of the good things that are happening in our communities. Unfortunately, we have the tendency to only focus on the negative. The children could have easily ignored Edna Moss' cries for help and continued playing. Instead, they chose not to let the crime go unnoticed. Mrs. Moss is probably correct in her belief that the police may not have been able to catch the thief if it were not for the actions of the kids.

We want to take this opportunity to enter each of the 13 youngsters names in the RECORD. They are Calvin Williams, age 12; Maurice Williams, 11; Jamar Williams, 7; Shawn Stephenson, 8; Phillip Gayles, 12; Delvin Johnson, 13; August Taylor, 12; Antonio Bell, 5; Shenell Pressley; Demarcus Gardner, 9; Michael Carter, 6; Tierra Davies, 5; and Akeem Tate, 8.

We are pleased that so many people in the community, from local business owners to the Newport News City Council, have recognized the deeds of these 13 good Samaritans. ABC's ''Prime Time Live'' also has done a feature on the children that was broadcast nationwide. They truly deserve the recognition.

JULIAN AND ELISE WAGER HONORED FOR ENTIRE FAMILY'S COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues two of my constituents who exemplify what it means to be concerned, community activists—Julian and Elise Wager.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to some people's belief, great neighborhoods don't just happen. They are created through the hard work of hundreds and thousands of community members joining together in common cause.

Astoria, Queens, is just such a neighborhood, and Julian and Elise Wager are two of the most dedicated, most caring members of the community. My field Julie, as he is known to his legion of friends, is currently the extremely capable chief of staff at the Western Queens Gazette—without a doubt one of New York's finest newspapers.

But Julie's contributions to the community don't end at the workplace. Julie has also been president of the Steinway Street Merchants Association since 1976 and president of the Central Astoria Local Development Coalition since 1984. Under his able leadership, these two organizations have supported local Astoria businesses, preserved local jobs, and helped make Astoria the vibrant, wonderful community it is today.

Elise Wager also has a remarkable record of community involvement. In fact, until just recently, Elise was the executive director of Queens Overall Economic Development, a capacity in which she served for almost 15 years. She has now returned to Adelphi University where she is pursuing her masters in social work. I know that Queens Overall Economic Development was sad to lose her leadership, but Adelphi has truly gained a special person.

Of course Julie and Elise's greatest contributions to the world came in the form of their two lovely daughters Adrian and Stacey. Both Adrian and Stacey are now married and have moved away from Astoria, but I know they have brought their parents' commitment to community betterment to their respective homes in Arlington, VA, and Hannacroix, NY.

In fact, I am particularly pleased to announce that the Wager family has recently grown by two members. Adrian Wager-Zito and her husband Michael Zito, are the new parents of a baby girl, Francesca Barrett Zito; Stacey Wager-Pacuk and her husband Edward Pacuk, are also the parents of a baby girl, Rebecca Grace Pacuk.

Therefore, it seems appropriate to me, as the Wager family has embarked upon a new generation, to request that my colleagues take a moment to salute two members of my community who have given so much of themselves for the betterment of others: Julie and Elise Wager—community activists, caring professionals, committed citizens, and, of course, proud grandparents.

RETIREMENT OF MASTER CHIEF JOSEPH RAMIREZ ADA

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate Master Chief Joseph Ramirez Ada, a native son of Guam, on his distinguished career and his well-earned retirement. He is a veteran submariner and one of the highest rated enlisted personnel in the Guam Area Command of the U.S. Navy. Master Chief Ada, the son of Jose Quichocho and Maria Ramirez Ada, first enlisted in the Navy back in 1966. He has since attained the rank of master chief quartermaster, one of the highest ranks in the naval enlisted tier, second only to the master chief petty officer of the Navy.

In addition to this extraordinary accomplishment, Master Chief Ada always represented the best that the island of Guam has to offer. Prior to his present post, he served aboard the U.S.S. *John Adams* (SSBN–620), the U.S.S. *Puffer* (SSN–652), and the U.S.S. *Haddock* (SSN–621). He was also assigned to the Submarine *Flotilla Eight* and the Navy Astronautics Group Detachment ''Bravo.'' After this, he was named command senior chief of Submarine Group Seven and, later, command master chief of Development Group One. Throughout almost three decades of active duty service he was the deserving recipient of several significant military awards. In addition to seven Good Conduct Medals, two Navy Achievement Medals, two Navy Commendation Medals and a Meritorious Service Medal, Master Chief Ada is the first Chamorro to receive the Admiral Claude V. Ricketts Award for inspirational leadership.

Since being assigned to the Guam Area Command of the U.S. Navy, Master Chief Ada greatly assisted in many civic efforts. He assisted in combined military and civilian projects such as last year's 50th anniversary celebration of the liberation of Guam. His assistance was also instrumental in the island's recovery from natural disasters such as Typhoon Omar and the earthquake of August 1993.

He has expressed great interest in our youth and local community through his volunteer work with the Guam Special Olympics and the assistance he provided local students in their high school drill and color guard competitions. He also supported local mayors in numerous military functions, parades, funerals, fiestas, and sister-village activities in addition to being a leader in the Navy's Community Partnership Programs.

After over 29 years of distinguished service, Master Chief Ada has chosen to retire from the Navy. An official retirement ceremony celebrating his accomplishments was held last Friday, March 17 on Guam. On behalf of the people of Guam, I would like to congratulate Master Chief Ada for his accomplishments, congratulate him on his well-earned retirement, and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

DR. MARTIN STEINBERG MAKES SIGNIFICANT ADVANCES IN THE TREATMENT OF SICKLE CELL ANEMIA

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that recently appeared in the February 13–19, 1995 edition of The Stars and Stripes. The article features Dr. Martin Steinberg, the associate chief of staff for research at the Jackson, MS, VA Medical Center and his work in a nationally-recognized study of drug that may be the first successful treatment for severe cases of sickle cell anemia. Dr. Steinberg has been with the Jackson VA Medical Center since October 1967. He is well known for his expertise and is VA's sickle cell program director.

Dr. Steinberg's accomplishments in this area are another example of the tremendous research that is being done by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and all of us are extremely proud of Dr. Steinberg's work and his association with the Jackson VA Medical Center.

[From the Stars and Stripes, Feb. 1995]

VA RESEARCHER KEY FIGURE IN SICKLE-CELL ANEMIA BREAKTHROUGH

(By Dick Maggrett)

A researcher at the Jackson, MS, VA Medical Center has played a key role in a nationwide study of a cancer drug that proved to be the first successful treatment for severe cases of sickle-cell anemia, a blood disorder affecting 72,000 mostly black Americans.

Physician Martin Steinberg, an associate chief of staff for research, led a group studying hydroxyurea and its effects on sickle-cell patients. ''This is a significant advance,'' he said.

Steinberg and his fellow scientists believe that hydroxyurea may work by stimulating the production of fetal hemoglobin, which is present in fetuses and newborn babies. By about four months of age, fetal hemoglobin has been replaced by adult hemoglobin.

Steinberg, who also is a professor of medicine at the University of Mississippi Medical Center, where some of the research was conducted, said hydroxyurea isn't a cure but that its administration was ''the first effective treatment for this serious illness and may greatly improve the quality of life of sickle-cell anemia patients.''

In patients with the disease, hemoglobin molecules stick to one another, forming long rods inside red blood cells and causing them to take on a sickle-like shape and become rigid. The cells, unable to squeeze through tiny blood vessels, deprive tissue of an adequate blood supply and cause pain.

In the $500,000 National Institutes of Health (NIH)-sponsored study that examined genetic analyses of patients, half received the drug and half a placebo. In this phase of the work, Steinberg examined the genetic determinants linked to the sickle hemoglobin gene.

Between January 1992 and April 1993 the study enrolled 299 adult sickle-cell anemia patients, 18 years of age and older, at 21 clinics in the United States. All patients had experience at least three pain crises within 12 months.

The only side effect was mild reversible bone marrow suppression, which caused lowering of blood counts.

The study showed that daily doses of hydroxyurea reduced the frequency of painful episodes and hospital admissions for sickle-cell crises by about 50 percent. Recurrent painful episodes are the most disabling feature of the illness and interfere with education, jobs and social development.

Hydroxyurea therapy also reduced the frequency of acute chest syndrome, a life-threatening complication characterized by chest pain, fever and an abnormal chest X-ray. Test patients taking the drug had about 50 percent fewer episodes of acute chest syndrome than those taking a placebo.

And patients on hydroxyurea also required about 50 percent fewer units of blood transfused than those on the placebo. This finding has ''important'' public health implications, according to the Jackson VAMC.

Hydroxyurea proved effective in dramatically reducing pain in adult patients with sickle-cell anemia, and NIH recently stopped drug trials four months early and notified 5,000 doctors of the treatment.

Steinberg hopes his research will discover the means of predicting which patients will respond best to the drug. He said he will attempt to determine whether it might be possible to foretell the response of fetal hemoglobin to hydroxyurea.

Steinberg cautioned that hydroxyurea may not be appropriate for all sickle-cell patients.

''The drug should not be used in patients likely to become pregnant,'' Steinberg said. ''Long-term safety in adults and safety and effectiveness of treatment in children have not been determined.''

And, Steinberg said, hydroxyurea also has the potential to cause life-threatening decreases in blood counts called ''cytopenia.''

Hydroxyurea hasn't been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for treatment of sickle-cell anemia, although physicians can prescribe it for that purpose. The FDA may consider approving hydroxyurea for sickle-cell anemia after Bristol-Myers Squibb, the drug's manufacturer, gets the study's results.

The VA facility couldn't say when that might be.

Hydroxyurea currently is used for treating polycythemia vera, a disease in which too many red blood cells are produced.

Sickle-cell anemia is an inherited disease most common in people with ancestors from Africa, the Middle East, the Mediterranean basin and India.

One in 12 African-Americans carries the sickle-cell trait.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of my attendance at the White House for a ceremony commemorating the signing by President Clinton of S. 1, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995, of which I was a House sponsor, I was unable to be in attendance in the House for two recorded votes, rollcall vote No. 253 on permitting the committee to sit, and rollcall vote No. 254 on approval of the Journal.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted ''yea'' on both rollcall votes No. 253 and No. 254.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 23, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD–138

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Business meeting, to mark up an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescission for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995.
SD–192

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings to examine the accelerating growth of the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.
SD–215

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to review United States dependence on foreign oil.
SD–419

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Executive Office of the President, and the General Services Administration.
SD–138

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs.
SD–138
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.
SD–116
Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on U.S. ballistic missile defense requirements and programs.
SR–222
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the nomination of Daniel R. Glickman, of Kansas, to be Secretary of Agriculture.
SD–366
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management and The District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine initiatives to reduce the cost of Pentagon travel processing.
SD–342
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 454, to reform the health care liability system and improve health care quality through the establishment of quality assurance programs.
SD–430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on Africa humanitarian and refugee issues.
SD–192
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine United States assistance to Europe and the newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union.
SD–419

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to access to health care clinics.
SD–192
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the defense technology and industrial base policy.
SR–232A

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up S. 141, to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, S. 555, Health Professions Education Consolidation and Reauthorization Act of 1995, S. 184, Office for Rare Disease Research Act of 1995, proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Ryan White Care Act, and pending nominations.
SD–430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Judicial Conference.
S–146, Capitol
Armed Services
Closed business meeting, to consider certain pending military nominations.
SR–222

10:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR–485

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine proposals to reform habeas corpus procedures, focusing on eliminating prisoners' abuse of the judicial process.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Airland Forces Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on tactical aviation issues.
SR–222

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 506, to reform Federal mining laws.
SD–366
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Smithsonian Institution.
SR–301
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–192
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the science programs of the National Science Foundation and activities of the Office of Science and

Technology Policy (Executive Office of the President).
SR–253

Environment and Public Works
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System and other related transportation requirements.
SD–406

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on agricultural credit.
SR–332

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Court of Veteran's Appeals, and Veterans Affairs Service Organizations.
SD–138

APRIL 3

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management.
SD–138

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on market effects of Federal farm policy.
SR–332

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs.
SD–106

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
SD–138

10:00 a.m.
Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Minority Business Development Program.
SH–216

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD–192

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the U.S. Forest Service land management planning process.
SD–366

Rules and Administration
To resume hearings to examine the future of the Smithsonian Institution.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Prisons, both of the Department of Justice.
S–146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on welfare reform in Indian Country.
SR–485

APRIL 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy programs.
SD–106

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
SD–138

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System, issues related to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, and the innovative financing of transportation facilities.
SD–406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget.
SD–116

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for energy conservation.
SD–116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Legal Services Corporation.
S–146, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for fossil energy, clean coal technology, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the Naval Petroleum Reserve.
SD–116

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for Environmental Protection Agency science programs.
SD–138

MAY 11

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
SD–116

1:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–116

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.
SD–192

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on direct lending practices.
SD–430

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 24

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the 10th Amendment and the Conference of the States.
SD–226

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.
Special on Aging
To hold hearings to examine ways that individuals and families can better plan and pay for their long term care needs.
SD–628

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4295–S4407

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 587–599. **Page S4365**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S.J. Res. 29, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North-South dialogue on the Korean Peninsula and the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework.

S. Con. Res. 3, relative to Taiwan and the United Nations.

S. Con. Res. 9, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States. **Page S4364**

Legislative Line-Item Veto: Senate continued consideration of S. 4, to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S4301–58

Adopted:

(1) Exon Amendment No. 373 (to Amendment No. 347), to include in the definition of ''targeted tax benefits'' provisions that worsen the deficit in periods beyond those covered by the budget resolution. **Pages S4323–24**

(2) Feingold Amendment No. 356 (to Amendment No. 347), to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to limit consideration of non-emergency matters in emergency legislation. **Pages S4325–26**

(3) Exon Amendment No. 402 (to Amendment No. 347), to provide a process to ensure that savings from rescission bills be used for deficit reduction. **Page S4326**

(4) Glenn Amendment No. 405 (to Amendment No. 347), to provide for the evaluation and sunset of tax expenditures. **Pages S4338–39**

Rejected:

(1) Bradley Amendment No. 403 (to Amendment No. 347), to modify the definition of targeted tax benefit. (By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 109), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4301–09, S4322–23**

(2) Feingold/Simon Amendment No. 362 (to Amendment No. 347), to express the sense of the Senate regarding deficit reduction and tax cuts. (By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 110), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4322–23**

(3) Hollings Amendment No. 404 (to Amendment No. 347), to provide that entitlement and tax legislation shall not worsen the deficit. (By 52 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 111), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4310–21, S4323**

Pending:

(1) Dole Amendment No. 347, to provide for the separate enrollment for presentation to the President of each item of any appropriation bill and each item in any authorization bill or resolution providing direct spending or targeted tax benefits. **Pages S4301–58**

(2) Abraham Modified Amendment No. 401 (to Amendment No. 347), to require the Congress to approve the bills prior to transmittal to the President. **Pages S4330–38**

(3) Levin/Murkowski/Exon Amendment No. 406 (to Amendment No. 347), to clarify the definition of items of appropriations. **Pages S4340–41**

(4) Hatch Amendment No. 407 (to Amendment No. 347), to exempt items of appropriation provided for the judicial branch from enrollment in separate bills for presentment to the President. **Pages S4341–42**

(5) Daschle Amendment No. 348 (to Amendment No. 347), in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S4351–57

(6) Exon (for Byrd) Amendment No. 350 (to Amendment No. 347), to prohibit the use of savings achieved through lowering discretionary spending caps to offset revenue decreases subject to pay-as-you-go requirements. **Pages S4357–58**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the pending cloture votes on Dole Amendment No. 347, listed above, be vitiated, and a unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill and certain amendments pending and to be proposed thereto, on Thursday, March 23. **Page S4326**

Measures Indefinitely Postponed:

Unfunded Mandate Reform Act: Senate indefinitely postponed S. 169, to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations. **Page S4407**

Executive Reports of Committees: The Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons (Treaty Doc. 103–25), with certain conditions. (Exec. Rept. 104–1) **Page S4365**

Messages From the House: **Page S4363**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S4363**

Communications: **Pages S4363–64**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4364–65**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S4365–86**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4386–87**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4387–88**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S4388**

Authority for Committees: **Page S4388**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4388–S4407**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—111) **Page S4323**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 9:16 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 23, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S4407.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Agriculture, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from James R. Lyons, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, and Paul W. Johnson, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, both of the Department of Agriculture.

Subcommittee will meet again on Wednesday, March 29.

SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities concluded hearings on proposals to reform the process of securities litigation, including related provisions of S. 240 and H.R. 1058, after receiving testimony from Mark J. Griffin, Utah Department of Commerce, Salt Lake City, on behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association, Inc.; Sheldon H. Elsen, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York; David Guin, Ritchie and Rediker, Birmingham, Alabama, on behalf of the National Association of Securities and Commercial Law Attorneys; Bartlett Naylor, International Brotherhood of Teamsters (AFL–CIO), Washington, D.C.; and Joan R. Gallo, San Jose, California.

NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee held hearings to examine the Department of Energy environmental management programs, focusing on waste management and cleanup activities at the Hanford nuclear reservation site in the State of Washington, receiving testimony from Senators Gorton and Murray; Thomas P. Grumbly, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management; and Steven M. Blush and Thomas H. Heitman, both of Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

REGULATORY REFORM

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee held hearings to examine the impact of regulatory reform proposals on environmental law, receiving testimony from Steven Kaplan, General Counsel, Department of Transportation; Carol M. Browner, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; John R. Schmidt, Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice; Sally Katzen, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget; Tom Looby, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver, on behalf of the Environmental Council of the States; Thomas O. McGarity, University of Texas School of Law, Austin; Cass R. Sunstein, University of Chicago Law School, Chicago, Illinois; John D. Graham, Harvard School of Public Health and Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, Boston, Massachusetts; and Michael E. Baroody, National Association of Manufacturers, on behalf of the Alliance for Reasonable Regulation, and George C. Freeman, Jr. and

Philip J. Harter, both of the American Bar Association, all of Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

FEDERAL DISABILITY PROGRAMS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy held hearings to examine the growth and escalating costs of the Social Security Disability Insurance and the Supplemental Security Income disability programs, receiving testimony from Senators Cohen and Santorum; Shirley S. Chater, Commissioner, Social Security Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; David Koitz, Specialist in Retirement and Social Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and James Slattery, National Commission on Childhood Disability, Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

The nominations of Jacquelyn L. Williams-Bridgers, of Maryland, to be Inspector General; Philip C. Wilcox, Jr., of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Coordinator for Counter Terrorism; and Ray L. Caldwell, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Burdensharing, all of the Department of State; Gloria Rose Ott, of California, Harvey Sigelbaum, of New York, George J. Kourpias, of Maryland, and John Chrystal, of Iowa, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, United States International Development Cooperation Agency, and routine lists in the Foreign Service;

S. 384, to direct the President to submit reports to certain congressional committees concerning United States support for Mexico during its debt crisis, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Con. Res. 3, relative to Taiwan and the United Nations;

S.J. Res. 29, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to dialogue on the North-South Korean Peninsula and the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework;

S. Con. Res. 9, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States; and

The Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects and Two Accompanying Protocols on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I) and on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) (Treaty Doc. 103–25), with certain conditions.

Also, committee began consideration of S. Con. Res. 6, to express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Treasury should submit monthly reports to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives concerning compliance by the Government of Mexico regarding certain loans, loan guarantees, and other assistance made by the United States to the Government of Mexico, but did not take final action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

AUTHORIZATION—INDIAN PROGRAMS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on the following bills:

S. 510, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1999 for the Native American Social and Economic Development Strategies Grant Program administered by the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Gary Niles Kimble, Commissioner, Administration for Native Americans, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; and A. David Lester, Council of Energy Resource Tribes, Denver, Colorado; and

S. 441, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1997 for programs of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, after receiving testimony from W. Craig Vanderwagen, Director, Division of Clinical and Preventive Services, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; Ada E. Deer, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Herbert Becker, Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice; Anita Schacht, Hopi Child Sexual Abuse Project, Kykotsmovi, Arizona; and Laurel Keenan, Bay Mills Indian Community, Brimley, Michigan.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Fifteen public bills, H.R. 1288–1302; and one private bill, H.R. 1303, were introduced. **Pages H3571–72**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Gillmor to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3419**

Journal: By a recorded vote of 326 ayes to 88 noes, with 1 voting ''present,'' Roll No. 254, the House approved the Journal of Tuesday, March 21. **Pages H3419, H3435**

Holocaust Memorial Council: The Speaker appointed the following Members to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council on the part of the House: Representatives Gilman, Regula, LaTourette, Lantos, and Yates. **Page H3419**

Committees To Sit: By a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 253, the House agreed to the Armey motion that all Committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today and for the balance of the week during the proceedings of the House under the 5-minute rule. **Pages H3426–35**

Personal Responsibility Act: House continued consideration of H.R. 4, to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence; but came to no resolution thereon. Consideration of amendments will continue on Thursday, March 23. **Pages H3449–H3529**

Agreed To:

The Archer technical amendment (agreed to by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 203 nos, Roll No. 257); **Pages H3491–96, H3522**

The Archer en bloc amendment, as modified, that expresses the sense of the Congress regarding marriage as the foundation of a successful society and that out-of-wedlock births have negative consequences; strikes the provision in title I (Temporary Family Assistance Block Grants) requiring States to reduce out-of-wedlock births and replaces it with (1) a requirement to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies, (2) strikes the requirement that States provide education, counseling, and health services to male and female teenagers as a means of reducing such pregnancies, and (3) prohibits States from using block grant funds to provide health services; increases required work participation rates in title I for all families over the course of a fiscal year from 4 percent to 10 percent in fiscal year 1996, from 4 percent to 15 percent in fiscal year 1997, from 8 percent to 20 percent in fiscal year 1998, from 12 percent to 25 percent in fiscal year 1999, and from 17 percent to 27 percent in fiscal year 2000; prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from overruling the ability of States to determine in their definitions of child abuse and neglect what is proper health care for a child; expresses the sense of the Congress that States should establish expedited adoption procedures and allocate sufficient funds from their Child Protection Block Grant toward adoption and medical assistance to reduce the amount of time children must spend in foster care; requires family and school-based Nutrition Block Grants to be equitably distributed to members of the Armed Forces residing in a State; limits the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to request specific information concerning grants under his jurisdiction to what ''can reasonably be required''; adds criminal forfeiture authority to the powers of the Department of Justice and Agriculture in prosecuting violators of the Food Stamp Act; clarifies the 10-year penalty for willfully misrepresenting residency in order to receive benefits in more than one State; strikes provisions in title VII (Child Support) that prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from granting exemptions to the following State law requirements: (1) procedures for establishing paternity, modification of orders, recording orders in the State registry, recording Social Security numbers, interstate enforcement, or expedited processing, (2) requires the Secretary to conclude that a network of local disbursement units costs less and takes less time than a centralized system in order to secure approval, (3) requires States to give employers one address to send child support withholding payments for centralized collection, and makes a number of technical corrections; and requires the Social Security number of the deceased appear on death certificates (agreed to by a recorded vote of 249 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 258); **Pages H3496–H3509, H3522–23**

The Kleczka amendment that strikes provisions in the bill which would authorize States to use for non-welfare purposes Federal welfare moneys that accumulate in State emergency account funds; **Pages H3514–15**

The Bunn of Oregon amendment that allows unwed mothers to continue to receive assistance if certain conditions are met (agreed to by a recorded vote of 351 ayes to 81 noes, Roll No. 260); **Pages H3515–17, H3524**

The Smith of New Jersey amendment that allows families on welfare to receive additional benefits, limited to particular goods and services used in the

care of a child to mothers under age 18 who are barred from receiving cash benefits for new children born while the family is on welfare, provided that the form of payment is by voucher (agreed to by a recorded vote of 352 ayes to 80 noes, Roll No. 261); **Pages H3517–22, H3524–25**

The Wyden amendment that insures that States give consideration to relatives when making foster care or adoption placements; and **Pages H3525–27**

The Woolsey technical amendment. **Page H3527**

Rejected:

The Kennedy motion to rise and report the bill back to the House (rejected by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 256); and **Pages H3499–H3500**

The Talent amendment that sought to increase the minimum number of hours that a recipient with children over the age of 5 has to work from 20 hours to 30 hours a week in fiscal year 1996 (rejected by a recorded vote of 96 ayes to 337 noes, Roll No. 259). **Pages H3509–14, H3523–24**

H. Res. 119, the rule under which the bill is being considered for amendment, was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 211 nays, Roll No. 255. **Pages H3436–49**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H3434–35, H3435, H3448–49, H3499–H3500, H3522, H3522–23, H3523–24, H3524, and H3524–25. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 12:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 23.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Cooperative States Research and Education and Extension Service. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA: Floyd P. Horn, Acting Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics; and William D. Carlson, Acting Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension.

The Subcommittee also continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress and public witnesses.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary (and Related Agencies) held a hearing on Telecommunications Issues. Testimony was heard from Larry Irving, Assistant Secretary, Communications and Information, Department of Commerce; Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, FCC; and William E. Baugh, Jr., Assistant Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress and public witnesses.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior (and Related Agencies) held a hearing on the Forest Service. Testimony was heard from Jack W. Thomas, Chief, Forest Service, USDA.

LABOR—HHS—EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education (and Related Agencies) held a hearing on National Institute of Nursing Research, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Fogarty International Center, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institute of Drug Abuse, and on National Library of Medicine. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Suzanne S. Hurd, M.D., Acting Director, National Institute of Nursing Research; Enoch Gordis, M.D., Director, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; Philip E. Schambra, M.D., Director, Fogarty International Center; Rex William Cowdry, M.D., Acting Director, National Institute of Mental Health; Alan I. Leshner, M.D., Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse; and Donald A. B. Lindberg, M.D., Director, National Library of Medicine.

NATIONAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on National Security met in executive session to hold a hearing on Ballistic and Cruise Missile Threat, ABM Treaty, and on BMDO Programs and Budget. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Daniel J. Spohn, Defense Intelligence Officer, Acquisition Support, Counter Proliferation and Arms Control; Kent Stansberry, Chairman, Compliance Review Group, Office of the Under Secretary (A&T); and Lt. Gen. Malcolm R.

O'Neill, USA, Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation (and Related Agencies) continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government held a hearing on the OMB. Testimony was heard from Alice M. Rivlin, Director, OMB.

VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the Office of Science and Technology Policy. Testimony was heard from John H. Gibbons, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy.

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Continued hearings on the following: H.R. 1062, Financial Services Competitiveness Act of 1995; Glass-Steagall Reform, and related issues. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FALL OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the fall of Medicare Trust Fund. Testimony was heard from Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Environment approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 483, to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States.

EDUCATION STANDARDS

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Education Standards. Testimony was heard from Senator Bingaman; Pascal D. Fogione, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Delaware; and public witnesses.

FAMILY REINFORCEMENT ACT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 11, Family Reinforcement Act of 1995.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations held an oversight hearing on Department of Health and Human Services: Opportunities for Cost Savings. Testimony was heard from June Gibbs Brown, Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; Sarah F. Jaggar, Director, Health Financing and Policy, GAO; and public witnesses.

CRISIS IN SUDAN

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa held a hearing on the Crisis in Sudan. Testimony was heard from Representative Wolf; Edward Brynn, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, African Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 927, Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1995.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 660, amended, Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995; H.R. 1240, amended, Sexual Crimes Against Children Act of 1995; and H.R. 962, to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 relating to the membership of the United States Commission on Immigration Reform.

The Committee also considered other pending committee business.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on National Security: Continued hearings on the fiscal year 1996 national defense authorization request. Testimony was heard from the following former officials of the Department of Defense: Gen. Alfred M. Gray, Jr., USMC (Ret.), former Commandant, Marine Corps; Adm. Carlisle A.H. Trost, USN (Ret.), former Chief, Naval Operations; and Gen. Robert W. RisCassi, USA (Ret.), former Commander in Chief, U.S. Forces Korea.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Readiness held a hearing on Naval Petroleum Reserves. Testimony was heard from Representative

Thomas; the following officials of the Department of Energy: Patricia Fry Godley, Assistant Secretary, Fossil Energy; and Robert Nordhaus, General Counsel; Victor S. Rezendes, Director, Energy and Science Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

AIRLINE INDUSTRY—FINANCIAL CONDITION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the Financial Condition of the Airline Industry: Present and Future (focus on continuation of the fuel tax exemption). Testimony was heard from Representatives Dunn, Collins of Georgia, and Danner; Patrick V. Murphy, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary, Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak), 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, General Government, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the Department of Defense Medical Program and related health care issues, 2 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 9 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings on S. 575, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, and S. 158, to provide for the energy security of the Nation through encouraging the production of domestic oil and gas resources in deep water on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works, business meeting, to mark up S. 503, to impose a moratorium on the listing of species as endangered or threatened and the designation of critical habitat in order to ensure that constitutionally protected private property rights are not infringed, S. 534, to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste, and other pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to hold hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System and transportation issues related to clean air conformity requirements, 2 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Medicaid and Health Care for Low-Income Families, to hold hearings to examine the use of Medicaid 1115 waivers which allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive certain requirements of the Social Security Act, 2:00 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on the reorganization and revitalization of America's foreign affairs institutions, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, business meeting, to mark up S. 291, to reform the regulatory process, to make Government more efficient and effective, and S. 343, to reform the regulatory process, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting, to mark up S. 531, to authorize a circuit judge who has taken part in an in banc hearing of a case to continue to participate in that case after taking senior status, and S. 343, to reform the regulatory process, time and room to be announced.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate Committee Meetings scheduled ahead, see pages E662–664 in today's RECORD.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, hearing on the state of the American Dairy Industry and the status of the Dairy Title of the 1990 Farm bill, 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Food and Consumer Services, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary (and Related Agencies), on International Organizations, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on District of Columbia, on D.C.'s Financial Condition, 10 a.m., H–144 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Congressional and Public Witnesses, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on Export Financing/Outside Witnesses, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior (and Related Agencies), on National Biological Survey, 10 a.m., and on DOE: Energy Information Administration, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Economic Regulation, and on Emergency Preparedness, 1:30 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education (and Related Agencies), on National Center for Human Genome Research, Office of the Director, and on Buildings and Facilities, 10 a.m., and on National Eye Institute, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, 2:30 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Family Housing, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, on Advanced Research Projects Agency, 10 a.m., and on Space Programs, 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Transportation (and Related Agencies), on Public Witnesses, 10 a.m., HC–6 Capitol.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing on the condition of deposit funds and the impact of the proposed deposit insurance premium reduction on the bank and thrift industries, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on Corporate Restructuring, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on issues related to flow control measures for the disposal of solid waste, 9:30 a.m., and a hearing on issues involved in the interstate transportation of solid waste, 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings on the implementation and enforcement of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, to continue hearings on training issues, 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to mark up H.R. 11, Family Reinforcement Act of 1995, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on House Oversight, Task Force on Contested Election, hearing on Second Congressional District of Connecticut contested election, 8:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on SEED Act Assistance Programs for Eastern Europe, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, oversight hearing on matters pertaining to the activities and operations of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, 9:30 a.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing on removal of criminal and illegal aliens, 11 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on National Security, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, to continue hearings on the fiscal year 1996 national defense authorization request, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Readiness, to continue hearings on the fiscal year 1996 national defense authorization request, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, executive, to continue hearings on the fiscal year 1996 national defense authorization request, receiving a classified briefing on research and development budget and programs, 10 a.m., S–407 Capitol.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on sodium mineral leasing issues: What is a ''fair market value'' royalty on trona, and what are its implications on the export market for soda ash? 1 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 1175, Marine Resources Revitalization Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Technology Administration/National Institute of Standards and Technology Fiscal Year 1996 authorization, 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on issues regarding Graduate Medical Education, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Mexico: Origins of the Peso Crisis, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 4, Legislative Line-Item Veto, and amendments to be proposed thereto.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 23

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 4, Personal Responsibility Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bateman, Herbert H., Va., E659
Cooley, Wes, Ore., E656
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E655
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E657
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E656
Istook, Ernest J., Jr., Okla., E656
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E659
Montgomery, G.V. (Sonny), Miss., E658, E660
Moorhead, Carlos J., Calif., E658
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E655
Portman, Rob, Ohio, E661
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E657, E660
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E656
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E656
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E659

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶The Congressional Record is available as an online database through *GPO Access*, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d Session (January 1994) forward. It is available on a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. The annual subscription fee for a single workstation is $375. Six month subscriptions are available for $200 and one month of access can be purchased for $35. Discounts are available for multiple-workstation subscriptions. To subscribe, Internet users should telnet swais.access.gpo.gov and login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Dial in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661 and login as swais (all lower case); no password is required; at the second login prompt, login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Follow the instructions on the screen to register for a subscription for the Congressional Record Online via *GPO Access*. For assistance, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262, or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.