United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *104th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1995 *No. 191*

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PETRI].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 4, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Make right, O God, the conflicts of the day that seem to tear at the fabric of our society, that threaten the traditions that we hold dear. Even as we pray for Your might in our midst, we pray You will encourage our hands to do the good works that serve people in their need, that Your word of peace will speak to our words, that Your gift of grace will touch us with common purpose so our deeds will reflect the majesty of Your whole creation and the bounty of all Your blessings. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKELTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1316. An act to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the ''Safe Drinking Water Act''), and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MIKE PARKER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Chair laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MIKE PARKER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 1, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

MIKE PARKER,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JIM KOLBE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Chair laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JIM KOLBE; Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 20, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House that this office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court, Tucson, Arizona.

After consultation with the General Counsel, we have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM KOLBE,
Member of Congress.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. CLEVELAND

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire today mourns the loss yesterday of former Congressman James C. Cleveland. Congressman Cleveland served ably from the Second Congressional District in New Hampshire from 1963 until 1980, when he retired and his seat was taken by now Senator JUDD GREGG.

Congressman Cleveland was a conservationist, a sportsman, an attorney. Indeed, he set up a law practice with my uncle in Concord in the fifties. I think what is most important to us was that Congressman Cleveland represented in the sixties and seventies

Printed on recycled paper.

many of the values that we as Republicans now hold dear to us, fiscal conservatism and a concern for the environment as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the loss of Congressman Cleveland. He was a political ally. He was an adviser. But, most important to me, he was a dear friend.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

FREE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's paper, the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. DOLE, said, and I am quoting him, concerning a Federal Government shutdown, ''I don't believe we should shut down the Government. I think it would be a mistake. I do not believe it should happen. I don't believe it will happen.''

I think the majority leader is probably right. The Congress would be insane or close to it to shut the Government down 10 days before Christmas. A lot of folks who are not Federal employees and are nowhere close to Federal employees would regard that as the act that deserved the Scrooge Award of 1995.

But will the Congress overlook the District of Columbia and allow it the short continuing resolution that I am certain will come for Federal employees? My prediction is you will probably let the Government stay open until we get back from the recess.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to explain that for the District, that does almost nothing, because we are not a Federal agency. We are a city of almost 600,000 people, and you cannot run a complicated city, down on its luck, with 2- and 3-week continuing resolutions. You then have to calibrate how much money you spend on the basis of for example, if it is 2 weeks, one-fourteenth, so you do not overobligate. With the city in the financial condition it is in, that should be unthinkable.

There is a very special congressional responsibility, therefore, to release in the next continuing resolution the District's money, raised solely in the District, until such time as an appropriation bill has been signed. I would hope that an appropriation bill will be signed before December 15. But, very frankly, our appropriation is stuck on stupid. It is stuck up here on controversial issues having nothing to do with the wishes of the people of the District of Columbia. So I cannot guarantee that by December 15 our appropriation will be signed.

I have a bill that would allow the District to spend its own money until such time as an appropriation bill is signed. That way we would have the flexibility to run the city. Otherwise, we are put in the position where, if unfunded mandates such as AFDC have to be matched on time, as they do, and a payroll has to be paid on time, as it does, we could overobligate.

The Congress has been most critical of the District for what it says has been overobligation in the past. The last thing the Congress, I am sure, would like to do, is put the District in the position where it is between the hardest rock and the worst hard place, where it had unfunded mandates and funded mandates that it had to meet and had no way to meet them because it can only spend a certain percentage of its funds.

The Washington Post said in an editorial recently:

> House Speaker Gingrich, Subcommittee on D.C. Appropriations Chairman Jim Walsh and other Congressional leaders who seek to bring financial order to this city should see the importance of separating the local functions as well as the responsibilities of the Control Board and chief financial officer from Federal stalemates. If their concern for the District's financial stability is genuine, they should press for immediate enactment of a continuing resolution, as well as for protections against any more situations like this.

Shutting the District down, when its own money is here only because the Congress requires it to come here, not because the Congress provides it, is an outrage. I ask this body, if and when such time should come that a continuing continuing resolution is needed to keep Federal agencies going, and if that continuing resolution is a short-term continuing resolution, that you allow the District to spend its own money—and about 80 percent of the money in our appropriation is raised by hard working D.C. taxpayers in the District of Columbia—and that you allow that money to be spent, so that the District will not be thrown into worse financial shape than is already the case.

That is not what this body desires. This body has been working beneficially with the District. So has the Financial Authority. We do not need another setback. I acknowledge that the District is responsible for many of its own problems, but the fact is, it is trying to get hold of those problems now. The District should not be thrown into further disarray because the Congress goes into short-term continuing resolutions, overlooking the difference between HHS, the State Department, and HUD and the District of Columbia.

The District is a living, breathing city that has suffered tremendously throughout this period. It is the innocent bystanders for whom I speak now, not the Mayor, not the City Council and not the Delegate, but the hard working residents who pay taxes in the District of Columbia. Free the District of Columbia.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2684, THE SENIOR CITIZENS RIGHT TO WORK ACT OF 1995

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report to accompany H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens Right to Work Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

ILL-ADVISED MISSION IN BOSNIA SHOULD BE ABANDONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Friday evening, the Vice President was on ABC News ''Nightline.'' In his comments, the Vice President stated that the task of bringing peace to Bosnia would be done at a minimal risk to American troops. This would be true, but for one provision to which the administration has signed up: namely, the guaranteeing and coordinating of the arming and training of one of the belligerents.

According to testimony by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, our Government policy is supervising—that is, guaranteeing and coordinating—the arming and training of Bosnian Moslem forces. This is a flawed and dangerous policy. It gives the appearance that we favor one side of this bitter internal struggle over another. It makes our Government appear to be a combatant. We cannot be both a combatant and a peacekeeper.

This policy of arming and training Bosnian Moslems—even through a third party, but guaranteed and supervised by us—concerns me greatly. Three points are to be considered:

First, already, there exists a parity between the warring factions, the Serbs on the one hand and the Croat-Moslem Federation on the other. Note the recent battlefield successes by the Federation. Further, the Moslems have been receiving arms by way of Croatia for some time.

Second, our allies are not in favor of arming and training the Moslem forces. The French and British, in particular, are against it. This was pointed out in news reports Thursday morning.

Third, the arming and training of the Moslem forces, quoting the Vice President: ''we are going to see that it happens * * * we commit to making sure that is going to happen.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a flawed policy. The Vice President concedes that it would be wrong for the American troops to directly arm and train the

Bosnian Moslems, as it would destroy the even-handedness and perception of even-handedness of our troops in the field. I say that the United States guaranteeing and coordinating this effort is just as bad. Having America in charge of this effort—having other countries or other persons contracted to do the job—still destroys the even-handedness and perception of even-handedness of our Americans in uniform. This policy has red, white, and blue stamped all over it. This policy paints each American soldier with a bulls'-eye target.

In order for peacekeeping to work, there must be trust—trust of the former belligerents in the impartiality of the peacekeepers. This trust and confidence will not exist so long as our Government pursues the policy of supervising the arming and training of the Moslems. It is one thing, in the words of Secretary of Defense William Perry, to ''be the meanest dog in town.'' It is another not to have to fight at all.

The U.S. Army Field Manual, regarding peacekeeping, states: ''Peacekeeping requires an impartial, even-handed approach.'' Our National Security Committee heard testimony from retired generals and others who stressed the need for peacekeepers to be neutral, to be even-handed.

Soon, our American soldiers, some 20,000 of them, will arrive in Bosnia as peacekeepers between the three warring sides: the Croats, the Bosnian Serbs, and the Bosnian Moslems. A few weeks ago, in a White House meeting, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot told me of plans for the U.S. Government to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. Being concerned with this policy, I wrote a letter to the President on October 31, criticizing this stance. After the peace agreement was signed, I wrote another letter on November 22. After I, along with several others, criticized this plan—which would clearly put our troops in danger by destroying their required impartiality—a new plan to arm and train then appeared. This new arrangement is one of farming out, contracting out, laundering out the task to third parties.

There is nothing in the Dayton peace agreement, initialed by the three belligerents, that requires the United States to arm and train anyone. This slightly altered policy still violates the required impartiality of the United States, and that lack of impartiality will be transferred to our soldiers serving as peacekeepers.

Ordinary military risk is one thing; inviting vengeance against our troops is another.

Those who came up with this wrong-headed policy should learn the wisdom of the Missouri Ozarks: ''Those who aid my enemy become my enemy.'' The Serbs will look upon American troops as enemies and the Moslems will expect favors.

Bosnia is a snake pit of anger, hatred, and vengeance. We are putting our troops in a snake pit while we are angering half the snakes. This policy could well be a death warrant for scores of American men and women in uniform. Taking sides in previous peacekeeping efforts—1983 in Beirut and 1993 in Mogadishu—brought tragedy to Americans in uniform. We should learn from the past.

The President agreed to furnish 20,000 troops for peacekeeping—not 20,000 targets for vengeance.

Remember, this is the Balkans, the scene of centuries of hate, centuries of killing, and centuries of vengeance. I, for one, see no reason for American troops to be made victims of vengeance because of this wrong-headed policy of arming and training the Moslems.

As a matter of fact, our troops have not been forewarned of the additional security risk that our policy could bring. On December 1, I wrote the Secretary of Defense a letter, urging his Department to issue memorandums to the soldiers to be on extra alert, as this policy puts them at higher risk.

I understand the need for America to assume a leadership role in the world. I understand the need for America to be the leader of NATO. But I do not understand why American troops will be inserted into this war-torn country as both peacekeepers and combatants. The credibility of American soldiers as impartial peacekeepers will be lost.

I urge this administration to abandon this policy, as it will undoubtedly bring needless loss of life and injury to our fine troops in Bosnia.

I include for the RECORD my letters dated October 31, November 22, and December 1.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 31, 1995.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please know that I very much want to help you in supporting the promising Bosnian peace initiative. However, I have great concerns about the effort to equip and train the Bosnian Muslims, especially while U.S. troops are operating in Bosnia.

I believe the ''equip and train'' effort corrupts the implementation force (IFOR) as a neutral peace force, and needlessly places the lives of American troops at risk. The effort will cause America to be perceived as a party to the conflict in the eyes of the Bosnian Serbs, their friends, and their allies. There will be no avoiding it, even if an attempt is made to keep the effort separate from IFOR. The message received in the region will be clear: American troops are not in Bosnia to implement a peace agreement, but rather to protect the Bosnian Muslims.

The purpose of the ''equip and train'' effort is to establish military parity. However, given what has happened in Bosnia over the last three months, I question the assertion that a military imbalance exists. On the contrary, I suggest a regional military balance has existed for sometime. Furthermore, I sense that the warring factions have grown weary of prolonging the fight.

We are walking down the dangerous path toward an arms race in Bosnia just at the time when American troops will attempt to bring peace to an area suffering from a savage war. Will not the Russians respond to the cries of their ethnic cousins, the Bosnian Serbs, who fear being driven from their homes in the future by a menacing Bosnian Muslim force? Our effort to equip and train Bosnian Muslims could bring more war to the region.

No matter how we try to separate it from IFOR, the effort to equip and train will have ''RED, WHITE, AND BLUE'' written all over it. This would jeopardize the safety of U.S. forces. The Serb partisans will have an incentive to make American troops pay the price, and American troops will become the object of Serb anger and acts of vengeance.

Therefore, I believe that we should defer any effort to equip and train until IFOR departs the country. My suggestion keeps faith with the Bosnian Muslims without needlessly jeopardizing the lives of American troops.

Again, Mr. President, I want to help you bring peace to Bosnia. But I would find it difficult to support U.S. participation in IFOR should we embark on the dangerous path of equipping and training Bosnians Muslims.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 22, 1995.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that a Bosnian peace agreement has been reached, our attention turns to the impending deployment of American troops to Bosnia as peacekeepers. With the proposal for American military participation in the implementation force, it is critical that Congress have the answer to the question I have raised with you and members of your Administration over the past few weeeks. The question is:

Will the U.S. government or any of its allies supply training, armaments or equipment, either directly or indirectly, to any of the belligerents or former belligerents between now and the end of our troop involvement in Bosnia?

I ask the question because we have had the sad experience of American forces being viewed as favoring one side over another in previous conflicts, resulting in American injuries and deaths. I refer to Beirut in 1983 and Mogadishu in 1993. This is especially important in light of the news report on the BBC this morning that the Bosnian Serb leadership is sharply divided on this agreement.

I would appreciate hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 1, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM J. PERRY,
The Secretary of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: If the U.S. Department of State insists on arming and training the Croat-Muslim Federation—with an American guarantee and coordination of the effort, as testified to by Secretary Christopher yesterday—will the 20,000 American soldiers in the Bosnia-Herzegovina region be forewarned of this additional security risk? Will they be informed of the possibility of vengeful acts by the Serbs, or of hostilities from Muslims expecting but denied favorable treatment?

This is a major security issue. I urge the Department of Defense to issue memoranda to each soldier to be on extra alert, as this State Department policy will put them at higher risk.

Please respond at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2076

Mr. ROGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104–378)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2076) ''making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes,'' having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:*

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, $74,282,000; including not to exceed $3,317,000 for the Facilities Program 2000, and including $5,000,000 for management and oversight of Immigration and Naturalization Service activities, both sums to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed 45 permanent positions and 51 full-time equivalent workyears and $7,477,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program only for the Offices of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General, exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 1995: Provided further, That not to exceed 76 permanent positions and 90 full-time equivalent workyears and $9,487,000 shall be expended for the Executive Support program for the Offices of Legislative Affairs, Public Affairs and Policy Development: Provided further, That the latter three aforementioned offices shall not be augmented by personnel details, temporary transfers of personnel on either a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis or any other type of formal or informal transfer or reimbursement of personnel or funds on either a temporary or long-term basis.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, $16,898,000 to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City or any domestic or international terrorist incident, (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities, and (3) the costs of conducting a terrorism threat assessment of Federal agencies and their facilities: Provided, That funds provided under this section shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, $38,886,000: Provided, That the obligated and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated to the General Administration, Salaries and Expenses appropriation for the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the Office of the Pardon Attorney shall be merged with this appropriation.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For activities authorized by sections 130005 and 130007 of Public Law 103–322, $47,780,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund: Provided, That the obligated and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated to the General Administration, Salaries and Expenses appropriation under Title VIII of Public Law 103–317 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall be merged with this appropriation.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $28,960,000; including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, $5,446,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; $401,929,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: Provided, That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed $22,618,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through ''Salaries and Expenses'', General Administration: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1342, the Attorney General may accept on behalf of the United States and credit to this appropriation, gifts of money, personal property and services, for the purpose of hosting the International Criminal Police Organization's (INTERPOL) American Regional Conference in the United States during fiscal year 1996.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $4,028,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, as authorized by section 6601 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, 1989, as amended by Public Law 101–512 (104 Stat. 1289).

In addition, for Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities, $12,000,000 shall be made available to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of the Working Capital Fund in the Department of Justice.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For the expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, as authorized by section 130005 of Public Law 103–322, $7,591,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $65,783,000: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $48,262,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $17,521,000: Provided further, That any fees received in excess of $48,262,000 in fiscal year 1996, shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental agreements, $895,509,000, of which not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 1997 for the purposes of (1) providing training of personnel of the Department of Justice related to locating debtors and their property, such as title searches, debtor skiptracing, asset searches, credit reports and other investigations, (3) paying the costs of the Department of Justice for the sale of property not covered by the sale proceeds, such as auctioneers' fees and expenses, maintenance and protection of property and businesses, advertising and title search and surveying costs, and (4) paying the costs of processing and tracking debts owed to the United States Government: Provided, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of those funds available for automated litigation support contracts and $4,000,000 for security equipment shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Office of the United States Attorneys, not to exceed 8,595 positions and 8,862 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Attorneys.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For activities authorized by sections 190001(d), 40114 and 130005 of Public Law 103–322, $30,000,000 to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $20,269,000 shall be available to help meet increased demands for litigation and related activities, $500,000 to implement a program to appoint additional Federal Victim's Counselors, and $9,231,000 for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program $102,390,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), to remain available until expended, for activities authorized by section 115

of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–554), which shall be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: Provided, That deposits to the Fund are available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $44,191,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to section 589a(f) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: Provided further, That the $102,390,000 herein appropriated from the United States Trustee System Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from such Fund estimated at not more than $58,199,000: Provided further, That any of the aforementioned fees collected in excess of $44,191,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including service as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $830,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service; including the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of vehicles and aircraft, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; $423,248,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For activities authorized by section 190001(b) of Public Law 103–322, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, but not including expenses otherwise provided for in appropriations available to the Attorney General; $252,820,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), to remain available until expended.

In addition, for Federal Prisoner Detention, $9,000,000 shall be made available until expended to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of the Working Capital Fund in the Department of Justice.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diems of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, including advances, $85,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $4,750,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovations, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses; and of which not to exceed $4,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation and maintenance of a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, $5,319,000.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(A)(ii), (B), (C), (F), and (G), as amended, $30,000,000 to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses in accordance with the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, $2,655,000.

PAYMENT TO RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

For payments to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund, $16,264,000, to become available on October 1, 1996.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the detection, investigation, and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking not otherwise provided for, to include intergovernmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $359,843,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation: Provided further, That any unobligated balances remaining available at the end of the fiscal year shall revert to the Attorney General for reallocation among participating organizations in succeeding fiscal years, subject to the reprogramming procedures described in section 605 of this Act.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 1,815 passenger motor vehicles of which 1,300 will be for replacement only, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; $2,189,183,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 for automated data processing and telecommunications and technical investigative equipment and $1,000,000 for undercover operations shall remain available until September 30, 1997; of which not less than $102,345,000 shall be for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to our national security; of which not to exceed $98,400,000 shall remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making payments or advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, and drug investigations; and of which $1,500,000 shall be available to maintain an independent program office dedicated solely to the relocation of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division and the automation of fingerprint identification services: Provided, That not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That $58,000,000 shall be made available for NCIC 2000; of which not less than $35,000,000 shall be derived from ADP and Telecommunications unobligated balances; and of which $22,000,000 shall be derived by transfer and available until expended from unobligated balances in the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Justice.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by Public Law 103–322, $218,300,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $208,800,000 shall be for activities authorized by section 190001(c); $4,000,000 for Training and Investigative Assistance authorized by section 210501(c)(2); and $5,500,000 for establishing DNA quality assurance and proficiency testing standards, establishing an index to facilitate law enforcement exchange of DNA identification information, and related activities authorized by section 210306.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; $97,589,000 to remain available until expended.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs; purchase of not to exceed 1,208 passenger motor vehicles, of which 1,178 will be for replacement only, for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; $745,668,000, of which not to exceed $1,800,000 for research and $15,000,000 for transfer to the Drug Diversion Control Fee Account for operating expenses shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $4,000,000 for purchase of evidence and payments for information, not to exceed $4,000,000 for contracting for ADP and telecommunications equipment, and not to exceed $2,000,000 for technical and laboratory equipment shall remain available until September 30, 1997, and of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by sections 180104 and 190001(b) of Public Law 103–322, $60,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including not to exceed $50,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; purchase for police-type use (not to exceed 813 of which 177 are for replacement only) without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and research related to immigration enforcement; $1,394,825,000; of which $506,800,000 is available for the Border Patrol, of which $12,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997; of which not to exceed $400,000 for research shall remain available

until expended; and of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for costs associated with the training program for basic officer training: Provided, That none of the funds available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for administrative expenses to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of $25,000 during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1996: Provided further, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: Provided further, That not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Department of Labor and the Social Security Administration not to exceed $10,000,000 for programs to verify the immigration status of persons seeking employment in the United States: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be used for the continued operation of the San Clemente and Temecula checkpoints unless: (1) the checkpoints are open and traffic is being checked on a continuous 24-hour basis and (2) the Immigration and Naturalization Service undertakes a commuter lane facilitation pilot program at the San Clemente checkpoint within 90 days of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall undertake the renovation and improvement of the San Clemente checkpoint, to include the addition of two to four lanes, and which shall be exempt from Federal procurement regulations for contract formation, from within existing balances in the Immigration and Naturalization Service Construction account: Provided further, That if renovation of the San Clemente checkpoint is not completed by July 1, 1996, the San Clemente checkpoint will close until such time as the renovations and improvements are completed unless funds for the continued operation of the checkpoint are provided and made available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act, as the result of certification by the Attorney General that exigent circumstances require the checkpoint to be open and delays in completion of the renovations are not the result of any actions that are or have been in the control of the Department of Justice: Provided further, That the Office of Public Affairs at the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall conduct its business in areas only relating to its central mission, including: research, analysis, and dissemination of information, through the media and other communications outlets, relating to the activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: Provided further, That the Office of Congressional Relations at the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall conduct business in areas only relating to its central mission, including: providing services to Members of Congress relating to constituent inquiries and requests for information; and working with the relevant congressional committees on proposed legislation affecting immigration matters: Provided further, That in addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title to the Attorney General, the Attorney General is authorized to accept and utilize, on behalf of the United States, the $100,000 Innovation in American Government Award for 1995 from the Ford Foundation for the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Operation Jobs program.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by sections 130005, 130006, and 130007 of Public Law 103–322, $316,198,000 to remain available until expended which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $44,089,000 shall be for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, $231,570,000 for improving border controls, and $40,539,000 for expanded special deportation proceedings: Provided, That of the amounts made available, $78,000,000 shall be for the Border Patrol.

CONSTRUCTION

For planning, construction, renovation, equipping and maintenance of buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, not otherwise provided for, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 853, of which 559 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles; and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments; $2,567,578,000: Provided, That there may be transferred to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Prison System (FPS), where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the FPS, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the FPS: Provided further, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: Provided further, That not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000,000 for the activation of new facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1997: Provided further, That of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 for the care and security in the United States of Cuba and Haitian entrants: Provided further, That no funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to privatize any Federal prison facilities located in Forrest City, Arkansas, and Yazoo City, Mississippi.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For substance abuse treatment in Federal prisons as authorized by section 32001(e) of Public Law 103–322, $13,500,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; leasing the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Facility; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; $334,728,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $14,074,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: Provided, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation: Provided further, That not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated to ''Buildings and Facilities'' in this Act or any other Act may be transferred to ''Salaries and Expenses,'' Federal Prison System upon notification by the Attorney General to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in compliance with provisions set forth in section 605 of this Act: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $22,351,000 shall be available for the renovation and construction of United States Marshals Service prisoner holding facilities.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase of (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed $3,559,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and with the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, as amended, $99,977,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by Public Law 102–534 (106 Stat. 3524).

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, JUSTICE, ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103–322 (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (''the 1968 Act''); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended (''the 1990 Act''), $202,400,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which $6,000,000 shall be for the Court Appointed Special Advocate Program, as authorized by section 218 of the 1990 Act; $750,000 for Child Abuse Training Programs for Judicial Personnel and Practitioners, as authorized by section 224 of the 1990 Act; $130,000,000 for Grants to Combat Violence Against Women to States, units of local governments and Indian tribal governments, as authorized by section 1001(a)(18) of the 1968 Act; $28,000,000 for Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies to States, units of local governments and Indian tribal governments, as authorized by section 1001(a)(19) of the 1968 Act; $7,000,000 for Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement Assistance Grants, as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act $1,000,000 for training programs to assist probation and parole officers who work with released sex offenders, as authorized by section 40152(c) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; $50,000 for grants for televised testimony, as authorized by section 1001(a)(7) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; $200,000 for the study of State databases on the

incidence of sexual and domestic violence, as authorized by section 40292 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; $1,500,000 for national stalker and domestic violence reduction, as authorized by section 40603 of that Act; $27,000,000 for grants for residential substance abuse treatment for State prisoners authorized by section 1001(a)(17) of the 1968 Act; and $900,000 for the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, as authorized by section 240001(d) of the 1994 Act: Provided, That any balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for State and Local Narcotics Control and Justice Assistance Improvements, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, $388,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102–534 (106 Stat. 3524), of which $60,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs: Provided, That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103–322 (''the 1994 Act''), the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (''the 1968 Act''); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended (''the 1990 Act''), $3,005,200,000 to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which $1,903,000,000 shall be for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, pursuant to H.R. 728 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995 for the purposes set forth in paragraphs (A), (B), (D), (F), and (I) of section 101(a)(2) of H.R. 728 and for establishing crime prevention programs involving cooperation between community residents and law enforcement personnel in order to control, detect, or investigate crime or the prosecution of criminals; Provided, That recipients are encouraged to use these funds to hire additional law enforcement officers: Provided further, That funds may also be used to defray the costs of indemnification insurance for law enforcement officers: Provided further, That $10,000,000 of this amount shall be available for educational expenses as set forth in section 200103 of the 1994 Act; $25,000,000 for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized by section 106(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, as amended, and section 4(b) of the National Child Protection Act of 1993; $147,000,000 as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the 1968 Act, which shall be available to carry out the provisions of subpart 1, part E of title I of the 1968 Act, notwithstanding section 511 of said Act, for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs; $300,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; $617,500,000 for Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants pursuant to subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (as amended by section 114 of this Act), of which $200,000,000 shall be available for payments to states for incarceration of criminal aliens, and of which $12,500,000 shall be available for the Cooperative Agreement Program; $1,000,000 for grants to States and units of local government for projects to improve DNA analysis, as authorized by section 1001(a)(22) of the 1968 Act; $9,000,000 for Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants, as authorized by section 210501(c)(1) of the 1994 Act; $1,000,000 for Law Enforcement Family Support Programs, as authorized by section 1001(a)(21) of the 1968 Act; $500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 220002(h) of the 1994 Act; $1,000,000 for Gang Investigation Coordination and Information Collection, as authorized by section 150006 of the 1994 Act; $200,000 for grants as authorized by Section 32201(c)(3) of the 1994 Act: Provided further, That funds made available in fiscal year 1996 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions: Provided further, That any 1995 balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: Provided further, That if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this title to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform non-administrative public safety service.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

For necessary expenses, including salaries and related expenses of the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, to implement ''Weed and Seed'' program activities, $28,500,000, which shall be derived from discretionary grants provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs, to remain available until expended for intergovernmental agreements, including grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts, with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes and drug offenses in ''Weed and Seed'' designated communities, and for either reimbursements or transfers to appropriation accounts of the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies which shall be specified by the Attorney General to execute the ''Weed and Seed'' program strategy: Provided, That funds designated by Congress through language for other Department of Justice appropriation accounts for ''Weed and Seed'' program activities shall be managed and executed by the Attorney General through the Executive Office for Weed and Seed: Provided further, That the Attorney General may direct the use of other Department of Justice funds and personnel in support of ''Weed and Seed'' program activities only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, $144,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 299 of part I of title II and section 506 of title V of the Act, as amended by Public Law 102–566, of which: (1) $100,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by parts A, B, and C of title II of the Act; (2) $10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by sections 281 and 282 of part D of title II of the Act for prevention and treatment programs relating to juvenile gangs; (3) $10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 285 of part E of title II of the Act; (4) $4,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by part G of title II of the Act for juvenile mentoring programs; and (5) $20,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by title V of the Act for incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended, $4,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 214B, of the Act: Provided, That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

For payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796), as amended, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100–690 (102 Stat. 4339–4340), and, in addition, $2,134,000, to remain available until expended, for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of said Act.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed $45,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations established by the Attorney General.

SEC. 102. Subject to section 102(b) of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, as amended by section 112 of this Act, authorities contained in Public Law 96–132, ''The Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1980,'' shall remain in effect until the termination date of this Act or until the effective date of a Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: Provided, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 105. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: Provided, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 104 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish and publicize a program under which publicly-advertised, extraordinary rewards may be paid, which shall not be subject to spending limitations contained in sections 3059 and 3072 of title 18. United States Code; Provided, That any reward of $100,000 or more, up to a maximum of $2,000,000, may not be made without the personal approval of the President or the Attorney General and such approval may be delegated.

SEC. 107. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act, including those derived from the Violent Crime Reduction, Trust Fund, may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 20 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605

of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 108. For fiscal year 1996 and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts in the Federal Prison System's Commissary Fund, Federal Prisons, which are not currently needed for operations, shall be kept on deposit or invested in obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States and all earnings on such investment shall be deposited in the Commissary Fund.

SEC. 109. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding subparagraph (E), as follows:

''(E) Subject to the notification procedures contained in section 605 of Public Law 103–121, and after satisfying the transfer requirement in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, any excess unobligated balance remaining in the Fund on September 30, 1995 shall be available to the Attorney General, without fiscal year limitation, for any Federal law enforcement, litigative/prosecutive, and correctional activities, or any other authorized purpose of the Department of Justice. Any amounts provided pursuant to this subparagraph may be used under authorities available to the organization receiving the funds.''.

SEC. 110. Hereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no transfers may be made from Department of Justice accounts other than those authorized in this Act, or in previous or subsequent appropriations Acts for the Department of Justice, or in part II of title 28 of the United States Code, or in section 10601 of title 42 of the United States Code; and

(2) no appropriation account within the Department of Justice shall have its allocation of funds controlled by other than an apportionment issued by the Office of Management and Budget or an allotment advice issued by the Department of Justice.

SEC. 111. (a) Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a plan is confirmed or''.

(b) Section 589a(b)(5) of such title is amended by striking '';'' and inserting, ''until a reorganization plan is confirmed;''.

(c) Section 589a(f) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''.'' and inserting, ''until a reorganization plan is confirmed;'', and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) 100 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of this title after a reorganization plan is confirmed.''.

SEC. 112. Public Law 102–395, section 102 is amended as follows: (1) in subsection (b)(1) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''; (2) in subsection (b)(1)(C) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''; and (3) in subsection (b)(5)(A) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''.

SEC. 113. Public Law 101–515 (104 Stat. 2112; 28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by inserting ''and criminal justice information'' after ''for the automation of finger-print identification''.

SEC. 114.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—Subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle A—Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants

''SEC. 20101. DEFINITIONS.

''As used in this subtitle—

''(1) the term 'indeterminate sentencing' means a system by which—

''(A) the court may impose a sentence of a range defined by statute; and

''(B) an administrative agency, generally the parole board, or the court, controls release within the statutory range;

''(2) the term 'part 1 violent crime' means murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault as reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for purposes of the Uniform Crime Reports; and

''(3) the term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''SEC. 20102. AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide grants to eligible States—

''(1) to build or expand correctional facilities to increase the prison bed capacity for the confinement of persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime or adjudicated delinquent for an act which if committed by an adult, would be a part 1 violent crime;

''(2) to build or expand temporary or permanent correctional facilities, including facilities on military bases, prison barges, and boot camps, for the confinement of convicted nonviolent offenders and criminal aliens, for the purpose of freeing suitable existing prison space for the confinement of persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime; and

''(3) to build or expand jails.

''(b) REGIONAL COMPACTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), States may enter into regional compacts to carry out this subtitle. Such compacts shall be treated as States under this subtitle.

''(2) REQUIREMENT.—To be recognized as a regional compact for eligibility for a grant under section 20103 or 20104, each member State must be eligible individually.

''(3) LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—No State may receive a grant under this subtitle both individually and as part of a compact.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible State may receive either a general grant under section 20103 or a truth-in-sentencing incentive grant under section 20104.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—An eligible State may receive a grant under both sections 20103 and 20104 if the amount that such State is eligible to receive under section 20103 in a year equals or exceeds the amount that such State is eligible to receive under section 20104 for that year.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding the eligibility requirements of sections 20103 and 20104, a State that certifies to the Attorney General that, as of the date of enactment of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1996, such State has enacted legislation in reliance on subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, as enacted on September 13, 1994, and would in fact qualify under those provisions, shall be eligible to receive a grant for fiscal year 1996 as though such State qualifies under sections 20103 or 20104 of this subtitle.

''SEC. 20103. GENERAL GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall submit an application to the Attorney General that provides assurances that such State has, since 1993—

''(1) increased the percentage of persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime sentenced to prison;

''(2) increased the average prison time actually to be served in prison by persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime sentenced to prison; and

''(3) increased the average percentage of time of the sentence to be actually served in prison by persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime and sentenced to prison.

''(b) INDETERMINATE SENTENCING EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a State shall be eligible for a grant under this section if such State submits an application to the Attorney General that provides assurances that the State on the date of the enactment of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996—

''(1) practices indeterminate sentencing with regard to any part 1 violent crime; and

''(2) since 1993 the State has increased—

''(A) the percentage of persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime sentenced to prison; and

''(B) the average time served in the State for the offenses of murder, rape, and robbery under the State's sentencing and release guidelines for such offenses.

''SEC. 20104. TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING INCENTIVE GRANTS.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall submit an application to the Attorney General that provides assurances that—

''(1) such State has implemented truth-in-sentencing laws that require persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime to serve not less than 85 percent of the sentence imposed (not counting time not actually served, such as administrative or statutory incentives for good behavior);

''(2) such State has truth-in-sentencing laws that have been enacted, but not yet implemented, that require such State, not later than 3 years after such State submits an application to the Attorney General, to provide that persons convicted of a part 1 violent crime serve not less than 85 percent of the sentence imposed; or

''(3) if, in the case of a State that on the date of enactment of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, practices indeterminate sentencing with regard to any part 1 violent crime, such State demonstrates that the average time served for part 1 violent crimes in the State equals at least 85 percent of the sentences established for such crimes under the State's sentencing and release guidelines (not counting time not actually served, such as administrative or statutory incentives for good behavior).

''(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a State may provide that the Governor of the State may allow for the earlier release of—

''(1) a geriatric prisoner; or

''(2) a prisoner whose medical condition precludes the prisoner from posing a threat to the public, but only after a public hearing in which representatives of the public and the prisoner's victims have had an opportunity to be heard regarding a proposed release.

''SEC. 20105. SPECIAL RULES.

''(a) SHARING OF FUNDS WITH COUNTIES AND OTHER UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(1) RESERVATION.—Each State shall reserve not more than 15 percent of the amount of funds allocated in a fiscal year pursuant to section 20106 for counties and units of local government to construct, develop, expand, modify, or improve jails and other correctional facilities.

''(2) FACTORS FOR DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—To determine the amount of funds to be reserved under this subsection, a State shall consider the burden placed on a county or unit of local government that results from the implementation of policies adopted by the State to carry out sections 20103 and 20104.

''(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 20103 or 20104, a State shall provide assurances to the Attorney General that the State has implemented or will implement not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subtitle policies that provide for the recognition of the rights and needs of crime victims.

''(c) FUNDS FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, if a State, or unit of local government located in a State that otherwise meets the requirements of sections 20103 or 20104, certifies to the Attorney General that exigent circumstances exist that require the State to expend funds to confine juvenile offenders, the State may use funds received under this subtitle to build or expand juvenile correctional facilities or pretrial detention facilities for juvenile offenders.

''(d) PRIVATE FACILITIES.—A State may use funds received under this subtitle for the privatization of facilities to carry out the purposes of section 20102.

"SEC. 20106. FORMULA FOR GRANTS.

''In determining the amount of funds that may be granted in each State eligible to receive a grant under section 20103 or 20104, the Attorney General shall apply the following formula:

''(1) MINIMUM AMOUNT FOR GRANTS UNDER SECTION 20103.—Of the amount set aside for grants for section 20103, 0.6 percent shall be allocated to each eligible State, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.05 percent.

''(2) MINIMUM AMOUNT FOR GRANTS UNDER SECTION 20104.—Of the amount set aside for grants for section 20104—

''(A) if less than 20 States are awarded grants under section 20104, 2.5 percent of the amounts paid shall be allocated to each eligible State, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.05 percent; and

''(B) if 20 or more States are awarded grants under section 20104, 2.0 percent of the amounts awarded shall be allocated to each eligible State in a fiscal year for a grant under section 20104, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.04 percent.

''(3) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES.—

''(A) DISTRIBUTION OF REMAINING AMOUNTS.—The amounts remaining after the application of paragraph (1) or (2) shall be allocated to each eligible State in the ratio that the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 years preceding the year in which the determination is made bears to the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by all such States to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 years preceding the year in which the determination is made.

''(B) UNAVAILABLE DATA.—If data regarding part 1 violent crimes in any State is unavailable for the 3 years preceding the year in which the determination is made or substantially inaccurate, the Attorney General shall utilize the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for the previous year for the State for the purposes of allocation of funds under this subtitle.

''(4) REGIONAL COMPACTS.—In determining the funds that States organized as a regional compact may receive, the Attorney General shall first apply the formula in either paragraph (1) or (2) and (3) of this section to each member State of the compact. The States organized as a regional compact may receive the sum of the amounts so determined.

"SEC. 20107. ACCOUNTABILITY.

''(a) FISCAL REQUIREMENTS.—A State that receives funds under this subtitle shall use accounting, audit, and fiscal procedures that conform to guidelines prescribed by the Attorney General, and shall ensure that any funds used to carry out the programs under section 20102(a) shall represent the best value for the State governments at the lowest possible cost and employ the best available technology.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—The administrative provisions of sections 801 and 802 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall apply to the Attorney General under this subtitle in the same manner that such provisions apply to the officials listed in such sections.

"SEC. 20108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle—

''(A) $997,500,000 for fiscal year 1996;

''(B) $1,330,000,000 for fiscal year 1997;

''(C) $2,527,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

''(D) $2,660,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

''(E) $2,753,100,000 for fiscal year 2000.

''(2) DISTRIBUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 20109, and except as provided in subparagraph (B), of the amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1)—

''(i) one-third of such amount shall be allocated pursuant to section 20106 to eligible States under section 20103; and

''(ii) two-thirds of such amount shall be allocated pursuant to section 20106 to eligible States under section 20104.

''(B) ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—Subject to section 20109, if the amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) exceeds $750,000,000—

''(i) half of such amount shall be allocated pursuant to section 20106 to eligible States under section 20103; and

''(ii) half of such amount shall be allocated pursuant to section 20106 to eligible States under section 20104.

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS.—

''(1) USES OF FUNDS.—Except as provided in section 20111, funds made available pursuant to this section shall be used only to carry out the purposes described in section 20102(a).

''(2) NONSUPPLANTING REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available pursuant to this section shall not be used to supplant State funds, but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would, in the absence of Federal funds, be made available from State sources.

''(3) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 3 percent of the funds made available pursuant to this section shall be used for administrative costs.

''(4) CARRYOVER OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this section during any fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

''(5) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this subtitle may not exceed 90 percent of the costs of a proposal as described in an application approved under this subtitle.

"SEC. 20109. PAYMENTS FOR INCARCERATION ON TRIBAL LANDS.

''(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, from amounts appropriated under section 20108 to carry out sections 20103 and 20104, the Attorney General shall reserve, to carry out this section—

''(1) 0.3 percent in each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997; and

''(2) 0.2 percent in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000.

''(b) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—From the amounts reserved under subsection (a), the Attorney General may make grants to Indian tribes for the purposes of constructing jails on tribal lands for the incarceration of offenders subject to tribal jurisdiction.

''(c) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Attorney General an application in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may by regulation require.

"SEC. 20110. PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE STATES FOR INCARCERATION OF CRIMINAL ALIENS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make a payment to each State which is eligible under section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and which meets the eligibility requirements of section 20104, in such amount as is determined under section 242(j) and for which payment is not made to such State for such fiscal year under such section.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section from amounts authorized under section 20108, an amount which when added to amounts appropriated to carry out section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for fiscal year 1996 equals $500,000,000 and for each of the fiscal years 1997 through 2000 does not exceed $650,000,000.

''(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than May 15, 1999, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Congress which contains the recommendation of the Attorney General concerning the extension of the program under this section.

"SEC. 20111. SUPPORT OF FEDERAL PRISONERS IN NONFEDERAL INSTITUTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make payments to States and units of local government for the purposes authorized in section 4013 of title 18, United States Code.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated from amounts authorized under section 20108 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"SEC. 20112. REPORT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

''Beginning on July 1, 1996, and each July 1 thereafter, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress on the implementation of this subtitle, including a report on the eligibility of the States under sections 20103 and 20104, and the distribution and use of funds under this subtitle.''.

(b) PREFERENCE IN PAYMENTS.—Section 242(j)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(j)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) in carrying out paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall give preference in making payments to States and political subdivisions of States which are ineligible for payments under section 20110 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968.—

(A) PART V.—Part V of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is repealed.

(B) FUNDING.—

(i) Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by striking paragraph (20).

(ii) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), any funds that remain available to an applicant under paragraph (20) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall be used in accordance with part V of such Act as such Act was in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—

(A) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended by striking the matter relating to title V.

(B) COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), any funds that remain available to an applicant under title V of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 shall be used in accordance with such subtitle as if such subtitle was in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING.—The table of contents of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended by striking the matter relating to subtitle A of title II and inserting the following:

''SUBTITLE A—TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING GRANTS

''Sec. 20101. Definitions.
''Sec. 20102. Authorization of Grants.
''Sec. 20103. General Grants.
''Sec. 20104. Truth-in-sentencing incentive grants.
''Sec. 20105. Special rules.

''Sec. 20106. Formula for grants.
''Sec. 20107. Accountability.
''Sec. 20108. Authorization of appropriations.
''Sec. 20109. Payments for Incarceration on Tribal Lands.
''Sec. 20110. Payments to States for Incarceration on Criminal Aliens.
''Sec. 20111. Report by the Attorney General.''.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding provisions of 41 U.S.C. 353 or any other provision of law, the Federal Prison System may enter into contracts and other agreements with private entities for a period not to exceed 3 years and 7 additional option years for the confinement of Federal prisoners.

SEC. 116. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 4 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–2(b)) is amended by striking ''March 11, 1993'' each place it appears and inserting ''August 1, 1994''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Federal, State, or local government agency may not use a voter registration card (or other related document) that evidences registration for an election for Federal office, as evidence to prove United States citizenship.

SEC. 118. Section 1344(b)(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(6) the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration;''.

SEC. 119. (a) AUTHORITY OF THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (the ''Commission'') is authorized to receive and determine the validity and amount of claims by nationals of the United States against the Federal Republic of Germany covered by Article 2(2) of the Agreement Between the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Final Benefits to Certain United States Nationals Who Were Victims of National Socialist Measures of Persecution, entered into force September 19, 1995 (the ''Agreement''). In deciding such claims, the Commission shall be guided by the criteria applied by the Department of State in determining the validity and amount of the claims covered by and settled under Article 2(1) of the Agreement.

(b) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—Except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the provisions of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1621 et sec.), except for section 7(b) (22 U.S.C. 1626 (b)), shall apply with respect to claims under this section. Any reference in such provisions to ''this title'' shall be deemed to refer to those provisions and to this section.

(c) CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT.—

(1) Not later than two years after the entry into force of the Agreement, the Commission shall certify to the Secretary of State, in writing, its determinations as to the validity and amount of the claims authorized for decision under subsection (a).

(2) In the case of claims found to be compensable under subsection (a), the Commission shall certify the awards entered in the claims to the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 5 of Title 1 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1624). Such awards shall be paid in accordance with subsections (a) and (c)–(f) of section 7 of such title (22 U.S.C. 1626) out of a special fund established in accordance with section 8 of such title (22 U.S.C. 1627), following conclusion of the negotiations provided for in Article 2(2) of the Agreement.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS.—Records pertaining to the claims received by the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be publicly disclosed and shall not be required to be disclosed pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of this section or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1996''.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES

TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $20,889,000, of which $2,500,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $98,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $40,000,000 to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 1517; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed $30,000 per vehicle; obtain insurance on official motor vehicles; and rent tie lines and teletype equipment; $264,885,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to 15 U.S.C. 4912; and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 401(b); purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law; $38,604,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities: Provided further, That payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided as part of such activities may be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities, and for providing information to the public with respect to the export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce and other export control programs of the United States and other governments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91–304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, $328,500,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project when in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, $20,000,000: Provided, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, as amended, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, $32,000,000.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration, $2,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1995: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended.

ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE
ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, $45,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION
REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to disseminate economic and statistical data products as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 1525–1527 and, notwithstanding 15 U.S.C. 4912, charge fee necessary to recover the full costs incurred in their production. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, receipts received from these data dissemination activities shall be credited to this account, to be available for carrying out these purposes without further appropriation.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing, and publishing statistics, provided for by law, $138,812,000.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to collect and publish statistics for periodic census and programs provided for by law, $150,300,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, $17,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for spectrum management, analysis, and operations and for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Services of the NTIA in furtherance of its assigned functions under this paragraph and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, $15,500,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of the Act, as amended: Provided, That not to exceed $2,200,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of the Act: Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 391 of the Act, the prior year unobligated balances may be made available for grants for projects for which applications have been submitted and approved during any fiscal year.

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, $21,500,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of the Act, as amended: Provided, That not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be available for program administration and other support activities as authorized by section 391 of the Act including support of the Advisory Council on National Information Infrastructure: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated herein, not to exceed 5 percent may be available for telecommunications research activities for projects related directly to the development of a national information infrastructure: Provided further, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 392(a) and 392(c) of the Act, these funds may be used for the planning and construction of telecommunications networks for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public information, public safety or other social services.

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks; $82,324,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds made available under this heading are to be derived from deposits in the Patent and Trademark Office Fee Surcharge Fund as authorized by law: Provided further, That the amounts made available under the Fund shall not exceed amounts deposited; and such fees as shall be collected pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1113 and 35 U.S.C. 41 and 376, shall remain available until expended.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $259,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $8,500,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund''.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $80,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $500,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund'': Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading in this or any other Act may be used for the purposes of carrying out additional program competitions under the Advanced Technology Program: Provided further, That any unobligated balances available from carryover of prior year appropriations under the Advanced Technology Program may be used only for the purposes of providing continuation grants.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c–278e, $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including acquisition, maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; not to exceed 358 commissioned officers on the active list; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and alteration, modernization, and relocation of facilities as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 883i; $1,795,677,000, to remain available until extended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 but consistent with other existing law, fees shall be assessed, collected, and credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections to be available until expended, to recover the costs of administering aeronautical charting programs: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such additional fees are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final general fund appropriation estimated at not more than $1,792,677,000: Provided further, That any such additional fees received in excess of $3,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996: Provided further, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of the national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That in addition, $63,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries'': Provided further, That grants to State pursuant to sections 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed $2,000,000.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

Of amounts collected pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1456a, not to exceed $7,800,000, for purposes set forth in 16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(A), 16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(B)(v), and 16 U.S.C. 1461(e).

CONSTRUCTION

For repair and modification of, and additions to, existing facilities and construction of new facilities, and for facility planning and design and land acquisition not otherwise provided for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the repair, acquisition, leasing, or conversion of vessels, including related equipment to maintain and modernize the existing fleet and to continue planning the modernization of the fleet for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FISHING VESSEL AND GEAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION FUND

For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 95–376, not to exceed $1,032,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1980 (b) and (f), to remain available until expended.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of Public Law 95–372, not to exceed $999,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to that Act, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN FISHING OBSERVER FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975, as amended (Public Law 96–339), the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended (Public Law 100–627) and the American Fisheries Promotion Act (Public Law 96–561), there are appropriated from the fees imposed under the foreign fishery observer program authorized by these Acts, not to exceed $196,000, to remain available until expended.

FISHING VESSEL OBLIGATIONS GUARANTEES

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of guaranteed loans authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, $250,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to guarantee loans for any new fishing vessel that will increase the harvesting capacity in any United States fishery.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

UNDER SECRETARY FOR TECHNOLOGY/OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Under Secretary for Technology/Office of Technology Policy, $5,000,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed $3,000 for official entertainment, $29,100,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1–11 as amended by Public Law 100–504), $19,849,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $75,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 201. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 202. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 203. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support the hurricane reconnaissance aircraft and activities that are under the control of the United States Air Force or the United States Air Force Reserve.

SEC. 204. None of the funds provided in this or any previous Act, or hereinafter made available to the Department of Commerce shall be available to reimburse the Unemployment Trust Fund or any other fund or account of the Treasury to pay for any expenses paid before October 1, 1992, as authorized by section 8501 of title 5, United States Code, for services performed after April 20, 1990, by individuals appointed to temporary positions within the Bureau of the Census for purposes relating to the 1990 decennial census of population.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 206. (a) should legislation be enacted to dismantle or reorganize the Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Commerce, no later than 90 days thereafter, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate a plan for transferring funds provided in this Act to the appropriate successor organizations: Provided, That the plan shall include a proposal for transferring or rescinding funds appropriated herein for agencies or programs terminated under such legislation: Provided further, That such plan shall be transmitted in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce or the appropriate head of any successor organization(s) may use any available funds to carry out legislation dismantling or reorganizing the Department of Commerce to cover the costs of actions relating to the abolishment, reorganization or transfer of functions and any related personnel action, including voluntary separation incentives if authorized by such legislation: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts that may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included under section 205 of this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 207. None of the funds appropriated under this Act or any other law shall be used to implement subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), (g), or (i) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533), until such time as legislation reauthorizing the Act is enacted or until the end of fiscal year 1996, whichever is earlier, except that monies appropriated under this Act may be used to delist or reclassify species pursuant to subsections 4(a)(2)(B), 4(c)(2)(B)(i), and 4(c)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any regulation and including the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965), the transfer of title to the Rutland City Industrial Complex to Hilinex, Vermont (as related to Economic Development Administration project Number 01–11–01742) shall not require compensation to the Federal Government for the fair share of the Federal Government of that real property.

SEC. 209. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development of the Department of Commerce, shall—

(1) not later than January 1, 1996, commence the demolition of the structures on, and the cleanup and environmental remediation on, the parcel of land described in subsection (b);

(2) not later than March 31, 1996, complete the demolition, cleanup, and environmental remediation under paragraph (1); and

(3) not later than April 1, 1996, convey the parcel of land described in subsection (b), in accordance with the requirements of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)), to the Tuscaloosa County Industrial Development Authority, on receipt of payment of the fair market value for the parcel by the Authority, as agreed on by the Secretary and the Authority.

(b) LAND PARCEL.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel of land consisting of approximately 41 acres in Holt, Alabama (in Tuscaloosa County), that is generally known as the ''Central Foundry Property'', as depicted on a map, and as described in a legal description, that the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, determines to be satisfactory.

SEC. 210. Any costs incurred by a Department or agency funded under this title resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this title shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency: Provided, that the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this provision is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, that use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996''.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court, as required by law, excluding care of the building and grounds, including purchase or hire, driving, maintenance and operation of an automobile for the Chief Justice, not to exceed $10,000 for the purpose of transporting Associate Justices, and hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; not to exceed $10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for miscellaneous expenses, to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, $25,834,000.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 13a–13b), $3,313,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until expenses.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, judges, and other officers and employees, and for necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, $14,288,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge and eight judges, salaries of the officers and employees of the court, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, $10,859,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries of circuit and district judges (including judges of the territorial courts of the United States), justices and judges retired from office or from regular active service, judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims, bankruptcy judges, magistrate judges, and all other officers and employees of the Federal Judiciary not otherwise specifically provided for, and necessary expenses of the courts, as authorized by law, $2,433,141,000 (including the purchase of firearms and ammunition); of which not to exceed $13,454,000 shall remain available until expended for space alteration projects; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects; and of which $500,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other legal reference materials, including subscriptions.

In addition, for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $2,318,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities of the Federal Judiciary as authorized by law, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, as authorized by section 190001(a) of Public Law 103–322.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For the operation of Federal Public Defender and Community Defender organizations, the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, as amended, the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of persons furnishing investigative, expert and other services under the Criminal Justice Act (18 U.S.C. 3006A(e)), the compensation (in accordance with Criminal Justice Act maximums) and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to assist the court in criminal

cases where the defendant has waived representation by counsel, the compensation and reimbursement of travel expenses of guardians ad litem acting on behalf of financially eligible minor or incompetent offenders in connection with transfers from the United States to foreign countries with which the United States has a treaty for the execution of penal sentences, and the compensation of attorneys appointed to represent jurors in civil actions for the protection of their employment, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1875(d), $267,217,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 18 U.S.C. 3006A(i): Provided, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for Death Penalty Resource Centers or Post-Conviction Defender Organizations after April 1, 1996.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees and expenses of jurors as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1871 and 1876; compensation of jury commissioners as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1863; and compensation of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases pursuant to rule 71A(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C. Appendix Rule 71A(h)); $59,028,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the compensation of land commissioners shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

COURT SECURITY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the procurement, installation, and maintenance of security equipment and protective services for the United States Courts in courtrooms and adjacent areas, including building ingress-egress control, inspection of packages, directed security patrols, and other similar activities as authorized by section 1010 of the Judicial Improvement and Access to Justice Act (Public Law 100–702); $102,000,000, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service which shall be responsible for administering elements of the Judicial Security Program consistent with standards or guidelines agreed to by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Attorney General.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as authorized by law, including travel as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1345, hire of a passenger motor vehicle as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), advertising and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $47,500,000, of which not to exceed $7,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Judicial Center, as authorized by Public Law 90–219, $17,914,000; of which $1,800,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1997, to provide education and training to Federal court personnel; and of which not to exceed $1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FUNDS

PAYMENT TO JUDICIARY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 377(o), $24,000,000, to the Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 376(c), $7,000,000, and to the United States Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement Fund, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 178(l), $1,900,000.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 58 of title 28, United States Code, $8,500,000, of which not to exceed $1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 301. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 302. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Special Court established under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, Public Law 92–236.

SEC. 303. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Judiciary in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services, Defender Services'', shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries and expenses appropriation for district courts, courts of appeals, and other judicial services shall be available for official reception and representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States: Provided, That such available funds shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be administered by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in his capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

SEC. 305. Section 333 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph, by striking, ''shall'' the first, second, and fourth place it appears and inserting ''may''; and

(2) in the second paragraph—

(A) by striking ''shall'' the first place it appears and inserting ''may''; and

(B) by striking '', and unless excused by the chief judge, shall remain throughout the conference''.

This title may be cited as ''The Judiciary Appropriations Act, 1996''.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended; representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, or specific Acts of Congress; acquisition by exchange or purchase of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343, 40 U.S.C. 481(c) and 22 U.S.C. 2674; and for expenses of general administration $1,708,800,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 140(a)(5) and the second sentence of section 140(a)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), not to exceed $125,000,000 of fees may be collected during fiscal year 1996 under the authority of section 140(a)(1) of that Act: Provided further, That all fees collected under the preceding proviso shall be deposited in fiscal year 1996 as an offsetting collection to appropriations made under this heading to recover the costs of providing consular services and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the preceding two provisos shall remain in effect through April 1, 1996: Provided further, That starting in fiscal year 1997, a system shall be in place that allocates to each department and agency the full cost of its presence outside of the United States.

Of the funds provided under this heading, $24,856,000 shall be available only for the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service for operation of existing base services and not to exceed $17,144,000 shall be available only for the enhancement of the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service and shall remain available until expended. Of the latter amount, $9,600,000 shall not be made available until expiration of the 15 day period beginning on the date when the Secretary of State and the Director of the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service submit the pilot program report required by section 507 of Public Law 103–317.

In addition, not to exceed $700,000 in registration fees collected pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, may be used in accordance with section 45 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, 22 U.S.C. 2717; and in addition not to exceed $1,223,000 shall be derived from fees from other executive agencies for lease or use of facilities located at the International Center in accordance with section 4 of the International Center Act (Public Law 90–553, as amended by section 120 of Public Law 101–246); and in addition not to exceed $15,000 which shall be derived from reimbursements, surcharges, and fees for use of Blair House facilities in accordance with section 46 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2718(a)).

Notwithstanding section 402 of this Act, not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts made available in this Act in the appropriation accounts, ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' and ''Salaries and Expenses'' under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs'' may be transferred between such appropriation accounts: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section

For an additional amount for security enhancements to counter the threat of terrorism, $9,720,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, provided for by law, including expenses authorized by section 9 of the Act of August 31, 1964, as amended (31 U.S.C. 3721), and the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended, $363,276,000.

For an additional amount for security enhancements to counter the threat of terrorism, $1,870,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Capital Investment Fund, $16,400,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by Public Law 103–236: Provided, That section 135(e) of Public Law 103–236 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), $27,369,000, notwithstanding section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (P.L. 96–465), as it relates to post inspections: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, (1) the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency is hereby merged with the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of State; (2) the functions exercised and assigned to the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency before the effective date of this Act (including all related functions) are transferred to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of State; and (3) the Inspector General of the Department of State shall also serve as the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 905 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4085), $4,500,000.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

For expenses, not otherwise provided, to enable the Secretary of State to provide for extraordinary protective services in accordance with the provisions of section 214 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4314) and 3 U.S.C. 208, $8,579,000.

SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE OF UNITED STATES MISSIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the Foreign Services Buildings Act of 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292–300), and the Diplomatic Security Construction Program as authorized by title IV of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4851), $385,760,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c): Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for acquisition of furniture and furnishings and generators for other departments and agencies.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service pursuant to the requirement of 31 U.S.C. 3526(e), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c), of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Repatriation Loans Program Account, subject to the same terms and conditions.

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $593,000, as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2671: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In addition, for administrative Expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $183,000 which may be transferred to and merged with the Salaries and Expenses account under Administration of Foreign Affairs.

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

For necessary expenses to carry out the Taiwan Relations Act, Public Law 96–8(93 Stat. 14), $15,165,000.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as authorized by law, $125,402,000.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, $700,000,000: Provided, That any payment of arrearages shall be directed toward special articles that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: Provided further, That 20 percent of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for the assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until a certification is made under section 401(b) of Public Law 103–236 for fiscal year 1996 may only be made if the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and International Relations of the House of Representatives are notified of the steps taken, and anticipated, to meet the requirements of section 401(b) of Public Law 103–236 at least 15 days in advance of the proposed certification: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to pay assessed and other expenses of international peacekeeping activities directed to the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security, $225,000,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used, and shall not be available, for obligation or expenditure for any new or expanded United Nations peacekeeping mission unless, at least fifteen days in advance of voting for the new or expanded mission in the United Nations Security Council (or in an emergency, as far in advance as is practicable), (1) the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and other appropriate Committees of the Congress are notified of the estimated cost and length of the mission, the vital national interest that will be served, and the planned exit strategy; and (2) a reprogramming of funds pursuant to section 605 of this Act is submitted, and the procedures therein followed, setting forth the source of funds that will be used to pay for the cost of the new or expanded mission: Provided Further, That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses authorized by section 5 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, in addition to funds otherwise available for these purposes, contributions for the United States share of general expenses of international organizations and conferences and representation to such organizations and conferences as provided for by 22 U.S.C. 2656 and 2672 and personal services without regard to civil service and classification laws as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5102, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c), of which not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for representation as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 4085.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to meet obligations of the United States arising under treaties, or specific Acts of Congress, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For necessary expenses for the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and to comply with laws applicable to the United States Section, including not to exceed $6,000 for representation; as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries expenses, not otherwise provided for, $12,058,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of authorized projects, $6,644,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c).

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for the International Joint Commission and the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, as authorized by treaties between the United States and Canada or Great Britain, and for the Border Environment Cooperation Commission as authorized by Public Law 103–182; $5,800,000, of which not to exceed $9,000 shall be available for representation expenses incurred by the International Joint Commission.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses for international fisheries commissions, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law, $14,669,000: Provided, That the United States' share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3324.

OTHER

PAYMENT TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

For a grant to the Asia Foundation, as authorized by section 501 of Public Law 101–246, 5,000,000 to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c).

RELATED AGENCIES

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses not otherwise provided, for arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities, $35,700,000, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses as authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2551 et seq.).

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 (91 Stat. 1636), to carry out international communication, educational and cultural activities; and to carry out related activities authorized by law, including employment, without regard to civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $700,000 of this appropriation), as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, and entertainment, including official receptions, within the United States, not to exceed $25,000 as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1474(3); $445,645,000: Provided, That not to exceed $1,400,000 may be used for representation abroad as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1452 and 4085: Provided further, That not to exceed $7,615,000 to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from or in connection with English teaching, library, motion pictures, and publication programs as authorized by section 810 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended: Provided further, That not to exceed $1,700,000 to remain available until expended may be used to carry out projects involving security construction and related improvements for agency facilities not physically located together with Department of State facilities abroad.

TECHNOLOGY FUND

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to provide for the procurement of information technology improvements, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 (91 Stat. 1636), $5,050,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For expenses of educational and cultural exchange programs, as authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 (91 Stat. 1636), $200,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorizing by 22 U.S.C. 2455.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses of Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated as authorized

by sections 4 and 5 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (20 U.S.C. 5204–05), all interest and earnings accruing to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund on or before September 30, 1996, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary or other compensation, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376; or for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A–110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A–122 (Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations), including the restrictions on compensation for personal services.

ISRAELI ARAB SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Israeli Arab Scholarship Program as authorized by section 214 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2452), all interest and earnings accruing to the Israeli Arab Scholarship Fund on or before September 30, 1996, to remain available until expended.

AMERICAN STUDIES COLLECTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of American Studies Collections as authorized by section 235 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, all interest and earnings accruing to the American Studies Collections Endowment Fund on or before September 30, 1996, to remain available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977, to carry out international communication activities; $325,191,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended, not to exceed $16,000 may be used for official receptions within the United States as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1474(3), not to exceed $35,000 may be used for representation abroad as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1452 and 4085, and not to exceed $39,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; and in addition, not to exceed $250,000 from fees as authorized by section 810 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, to remain available until expended for carrying out authorized purposes, and in addition, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $1,000,000 in monies received (including receipts from advertising, if any) by or for the use of the United States Information Agency from or in connection with broadcasting resources owned by or on behalf of the Agency, to be available until expended for carrying out authorized purposes.

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended, the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act, and the International Broadcasting Act of 1994, including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception, $24,809,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That not later than April 1, 1996, the headquarters of the Office of Cuba Broadcasting shall be relocated from Washington, D.C. to south Florida, and that any funds available under the headings ''International Broadcasting Operations'', ''Broadcasting to Cuba'', and ''Radio Construction'' may be available to carry out this relocation.

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a).

EAST-WEST CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960 (22 U.S.C. 2054–2057), by grant to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in the State of Hawaii, $11,750,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary, or enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376.

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the North/South Center Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2075), by grant to an educational institution in Florida known as the North/South Center, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

For grants made by the United States Information Agency to the National Endowment for Democracy as authorized by the National Endowment for Democracy Act, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 401. Funds appropriated under this title shall be available, except as otherwise provided, for allowances and differentials as authorized by subchapter 59 of 5 U.S.C.; for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and hire of passenger transportation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1343(b).

SEC. 402. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of State in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the United States Information Agency in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 403. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for compensation of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, only for actual hours worked by such Commissioner.

SEC. 404. (a) No later than 90 days after enactment of legislation consolidating, reorganizing or downsizing the functions of the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Information Agency and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate a proposal for transferring or rescinding funds appropriated herein for functions that are consolidated, reorganized or downsized under such legislation: Provided, That such plan shall be transmitted in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Information Agency, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as appropriate, may use any available funds to cover the costs of actions to consolidate, reorganize or downsize the functions under their authority required by such legislation, and of any related personnel action, including voluntary separation incentives if authorized by such legislation: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts that may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included under section 402 of this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 405. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act for the United States Information Agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Department of State may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchanges Act of 1948 and section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

(b) Subsection (a) shall cease to be in effect after April 1, 1996.

SEC. 406. Section 36(a)(1) of the State Department Authorities Act of 1956, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2708), is amended to delete ''may pay a reward'' and insert in lieu thereof ''shall establish and publicize a program under which rewards may be paid''.

SEC. 407. Section 8 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 is amended in the last sentence by striking ''fiscal year 1995'' and inserting ''fiscal year 1999''.

SEC. 408. Sections 6(a) and 6(b) of Public Law 101–454 are repealed.

SEC. 409. It is the sense of the Senate that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act should be used for the deployment of combat-equipped forces of the Armed Forces of the United States for any ground operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless—

(1) Congress approves in advance the deployment of such forces of the Armed Forces; or

(2) the temporary deployment of such forces of the Armed Forces of the United States into Bosnia and Herzegovina is necessary to evacuate United Nations peacekeeping forces from a situation of imminent danger, to undertake emergency air rescue operations, or to provide for the airborne delivery of humanitarian supplies, and the President reports as soon as practicable to Congress after the initiation of the temporary deployment, but in no case later than 48 hours after the initiation of the deployment.

SEC. 410. Any costs incurred by a Department or agency funded under this title resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this title shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this provision is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of State and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996''.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

For the payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidies as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, $162,610,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States as determined by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, $46,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That these funds will be available only upon enactment of an authorization for this program.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, $66,600,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may use proceeds derived from the sale or disposal of National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels that are currently collected and retained by the Maritime Administration, to be used for facility and ship maintenance, modernization and repair, conversion, acquisition of equipment, and fuel costs necessary to maintain training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy and State maritime academies and may be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for use as provided in the National Maritime Heritage Act (P.L. 103–451): Provided further, That reimbursements may be made to this appropriation from receipts to the ''Federal Ship Financing Fund'' for administrative expenses in support of that program in addition to any amount heretofore appropriated.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $1,000,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, not to exceed $3,500,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operations and Training.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration, and payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof: Provided, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No obligations shall be incurred during the current fiscal year from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this Act or in any prior appropriation Act, and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, $206,000, as authorized by Public Law 99–83, section 1303.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $8,750,000: Provided, That not to exceed $50,000 may be used to employ consultants: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the Chairperson who is permitted 125 billable days.

COMMISSION IN IMMIGRATION REFORM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Immigration Reform pursuant to section 141(f) of the Immigration Act of 1990, $1,894,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as authorized by Public Law 94–304, $1,090,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 3 of Public Law 99–7.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d) and 621–634), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); nonmonetary awards to private citizens; not to exceed $26,500,000, for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, sections 6 and 14 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991; $233,000,000: Provided, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from available funds.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–02; not to exceed $600,000 for land and structure; not to exceed $500,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repair to buildings; not to exceed $4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase (not to exceed sixteen) and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $175,709,000, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997, for research and policy studies: Provided, That $116,400,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation estimated at $59,309,000: Provided further, That any offsetting collections received in excess of $116,400,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1111), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–02; $14,855,000: Provided, That not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $79,568,000: Provided, That not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718, as amended: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $48,262,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $31,306,000, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That any fees received in excess of $48,262,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission shall be available for obligation for expenses authorized by section 151 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–242, 105 Stat. 2282–2285).

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP TRUST FUND

For expenses of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission as authorized by Public Law 94–118, as amended, from the interest earned on the Japan-United States Friendship Trust Fund, $1,247,000; and an amount of Japanese currency not to exceed the equivalent of $1,420,000 based on exchange rates at the time of payment of such amounts as authorized by Public Law 94–118.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, $278,000,000, of which $265,000,000 is for basic field programs; $7,000,000 is for the Office of the Inspector General, of which $5,500,000 shall remain available until expended and be used to contract with independent public accountants for financial audits of all recipients in accordance with the requirements of section 509 of this Act; and $6,000,000 is for management and administration: Provided, That $198,750,000 of the total amount provided under this heading for basic field programs shall not be available except for the competitive award of grants and contracts under section 503 of this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

SEC. 501. (a) Funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation for basic field programs shall be distributed as follows:

(1) The Corporation shall define geographic areas and make the funds available for each geographic area on a per capita basis relative to the number of individuals in poverty determined by the Bureau of the Census to be within the geographic area, except as provided in paragraph (2)(B). Funds for such a geographic area may be distributed by the Corporation to 1 or more persons or entities eligible for funding under section 1006(a)(1)(A) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996e(a)(1)(A)), subject to sections 502 and 504.

(2) Funds for grants from the Corporation, and contracts entered into by the Corporation for basic field programs, shall be allocated so as to provide—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), an equal figure per individual in poverty for all geographic areas, as determined on the basis of the most recent decennial census of population conducted pursuant to section 141 of title 13, United States Code (or, in the case of the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Alaska, Hawaii, and the United States Virgin Islands, on the basis of the adjusted population counts historically used as the basis for such determinations); and

(B) an additional amount for Native American communities that received assistance under the Legal Services Corporation Act for fiscal year 1995, so that the proportion of the funds appropriated to the Legal Services Corporation for basic field programs for fiscal year 1996 that is received by the Native American communities shall be not less than the proportion of such funds appropriated for fiscal year 1995 that was received by the Native American communities.

(b) As used in this section:

(1) The term ''individual in poverty'' means an individual who is a member of a family (of 1 or more members) with an income at or below the poverty line.

(2) The term ''poverty line'' means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

SEC. 502. None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be used by the Corporation to make a grant, or enter into a contract, for the provision of legal assistance unless the Corporation ensures that the person or entity receiving funding to provide such legal assistance is—

(1) a private attorney admitted to practice in a State or the District of Columbia;

(2) a qualified nonprofit organization, chartered under the laws of a State or the District of Columbia, that—

(A) furnishes legal assistance to eligible clients; and

(B) is governed by a board of directors or other governing body, the majority of which is comprised of attorneys who—

(i) are admitted to practice in a State or the District of Columbia; and

(ii) are appointed to terms of office on such board or body by the governing body of a State, county, or municipal bar association, the membership of which represents a majority of the attorneys practicing law in the locality in which the organization is to provide legal assistance;

(3) a State or local government (without regard to section 1006(a)(1)(A)(ii) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996e(a)(1)(A)(ii)); or

(4) a substate regional planning or coordination agency that serves a substate area and whose governing board is controlled by locally elected officials.

SEC. 503. (a)(1) Not later than April 1, 1996, the Legal Services Corporation shall implement a system of competitive awards of grants and contracts for all basic field programs, which shall apply to all such grants and contracts awarded by the Corporation after March 31, 1996, from funds appropriated in this Act.

(2) Any grant or contract awarded before April 1, 1996, by the Legal Services Corporation to a basic field program for 1996—

(A) shall not be for an amount greater than the amount required for the period ending March 31, 1996;

(B) shall terminate at the end of such period; and

(C) shall not be renewable except in accordance with the system implemented under paragraph (1).

(3) The amount of grants and contracts awarded before April 1, 1996, by the Legal Services Corporation for basic field programs for 1996 in any geographic area described in section 501 shall not exceed an amount equal to 3/12 of the total amount to be distributed for such programs for 1996 in such area.

(b) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Legal Services Corporation shall promulgate regulations to implement a competitive selection process for the recipients of such grants and contracts.

(c) Such regulations shall specify selection criteria for the recipients, which shall include—

(1) a demonstration of a full understanding of the basic legal needs of the eligible clients to be served and a demonstration of the capability of serving the needs;

(2) the quality, feasibility, and cost effectiveness of a plan submitted by an applicant for the delivery of legal assistance to the eligible clients to be served; and

(3) the experience of the Legal Services Corporation with the applicant, if the applicant has previously received financial assistance from the Corporation, including the record of the applicant of past compliance with Corporation policies, practices, and restrictions.

(d) Such regulations shall ensure that timely notice regarding an opportunity to submit an application for such an award is published in periodicals of local and State bar associations and in at least one daily newspaper of general circulation in the area to be served by the person or entity receiving the award.

(e) No person or entity that was previously awarded a grant or contract by the Legal Services Corporation for the provision of legal assistance may be given any preference in the competitive selection process.

(f) For the purposes of the funding provided in this Act, rights under sections 1007(a)(9) and 1011 of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(9) and 42 U.S.C. 2996j) shall not apply.

SEC. 504. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation may be used to provide financial assistance to any person or entity (which may be referred to in this section as a ''recipient'')—

(1) that makes available any funds, personnel, or equipment for use in advocating or opposing any plan or proposal, or represents any party or participates in any other way in litigation, that is intended to or has the effect of altering, revising, or reapportioning a legislative, judicial, or elective district at any level of government, including influencing the timing or manner of the taking of a census;

(2) that attempts to influence the issuance, amendment, or revocation of any executive order, regulation, or other statement of general applicability and future effect by any Federal, State, or local agency;

(3) that attempts to influence any part of any adjudicatory proceeding of any Federal, State, or local agency if such part of the proceeding is designed for the formulation or modification of any agency policy of general applicability and future effect;

(4) that attempts to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation, constitutional amendment, referendum, initiative, or any similar procedure of the Congress or a State or local legislative body;

(5) that attempts to influence the conduct of oversight proceedings of the Corporation or any person or entity receiving financial assistance provided by the Corporation;

(6) that pays for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, administrative expense, or related expense, associated with an activity prohibited in this section;

(7) that initiates or participates in a class action suit;

(8) that files a complaint or otherwise initiates or participates in litigation against a defendant, or engages in a precomplaint settlement negotiation with a prospective defendant, unless—

(A) each plaintiff has been specifically identified, by name, in any complaint filed for purposes of such litigation or prior to the precomplaint settlement negotiation; and

(B) a statement or statements of facts written in English and, if necessary, in a language that the plaintiffs understand, that enumerate the particular facts known to the plaintiffs on which the complaint is based, have been signed by the plaintiffs, are kept on file by the recipient, and are made available to any Federal department or agency that is auditing or monitoring the activities of the Corporation or of the recipient, and to any auditor or monitor receiving Federal funds to conduct such auditing or monitoring, including any auditor or monitor of the Corporation:

Provided, That upon establishment of reasonable cause that an injunction is necessary to prevent probable, serious harm to such potential plaintiff, a court of competent jurisdiction may enjoin the disclosure of the identity of any potential plaintiff pending the outcome of such litigation or negotiations after notice and an opportunity for a hearing is provided to potential parties to the litigation or the negotiations: Provided further, That other parties to the litigation or negotiation shall have access to the statement of facts referred to in subparagraph (B) only through the discovery process after litigation has begun;

(9) unless—

(A) prior to the provision of financial assistance—

(i) if the person or entity is a nonprofit organization, the governing board of the person or entity has set specific priorities in writing, pursuant to section 1007(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(2)(C)(i)), of the types of matters and cases to which the staff of the nonprofit organization shall devote time and resources; and

(ii) the staff of such person or entity has signed a written agreement not to undertake cases or matters other than in accordance with the specific priorities set by such governing board, except in emergency situations defined by such board and in accordance with the written procedures of such board for such situations; and

(B) the staff of such person or entity provides to the governing board on a quarterly basis, and to the Corporation on an annual basis, information on all cases or matters undertaken other than cases or matters undertaken in accordance with such priorities;

(10) unless—

(A) prior to receiving the financial assistance, such person or entity agrees to maintain records of time spent on each case or matter with respect to which the person or entity is engaged;

(B) any funds, including Interest on Lawyers Trust Account funds, received from a source other than the Corporation by the person or entity, and disbursements of such funds, are accounted for and reported as receipts and disbursements, respectively, separate and distinct from Corporation funds; and

(C) the person or entity agrees (notwithstanding section 1009(d) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996h(d)) to make the

records described in this paragraph available to any Federal department or agency that is auditing or monitoring the activities of the Corporation or of the recipient, and to any independent auditor or monitor receiving Federal funds to conduct such auditing or monitoring, including any auditor or monitor of the Corporation;

(11) that provides legal assistance for or on behalf of any alien, unless the alien is present in the United States and is—

(A) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20));

(B) an alien who—

(i) is married to a United States citizen or is a parent or an unmarried child under the age of 21 years of such a citizen; and

(ii) has filed an application to adjust the status of the alien to the status of a lawful permanent resident under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), which application has not been rejected;

(C) an alien who is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to an admission under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) (relating to refugee admission) or who has been granted asylum by the Attorney General under such Act;

(D) an alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a result of withholding of deportation by the Attorney General pursuant to section 243(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253(h));

(E) an alien to whom section 305 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) applies, but only to the extent that the legal assistance provided is the legal assistance described in such section; or

(F) an alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a result of being granted conditional entry to the United States before April 1, 1980, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(7)), as in effect on March 31, 1980, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political calamity;

(12) that supports or conducts a training program for the purpose of advocating a particular public policy or encouraging a political activity, a labor or antilabor activity, a boycott, picketing, a strike, or a demonstration, including the dissemination of information about such a policy or activity, except that this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the provision of training to an attorney or a paralegal to prepare the attorney or paralegal to provide—

(A) adequate legal assistance to eligible clients; or

(B) advice to any eligible client as to the legal rights of the client;

(13) that claims (or whose employee claims), or collects and retains, attorneys' fees pursuant to any Federal or State law permitting or requiring the awarding of such fees;

(14) that participates in any litigation with respect to abortion;

(15) that participates in any litigation on behalf of a person incarcerated in a Federal, State, or local prison;

(16) that initiates legal representation or participates in any other way, in litigation, lobbying, or rulemaking, involving an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system, except that this paragraph shall not be construed to preclude a recipient from representing an individual eligible client who is seeking specific relief from a welfare agency if such relief does not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law in effect on the date of the initiation of the representation;

(17) that defends a person in a proceeding to evict the person from a public housing project if—

(A) the person has been charged with the illegal sale or distribution of a controlled substance; and

(B) the eviction proceeding is brought by a public housing agency because the illegal drug activity of the person threatens the health or safety of another tenant residing in the public housing project or employee of the public housing agency;

(18) unless such person or entity agrees that the person or entity, and the employees of the person or entity, will not accept employment resulting from in-person unsolicited advice to a nonattorney that such nonattorney should obtain counsel or take legal action, and will not refer such nonattorney to another person or entity or an employee of the person or entity, that is receiving financial assistance provided by the Corporation; or

(19) unless such person or entity enters into a contractual agreement to be subject to all provisions of Federal law relating to the proper use of Federal funds, the violation of which shall render any grant or contractual agreement to provide funding null and void, and, for such purposes, the Corporation shall be considered to be a Federal agency and all funds provided by the Corporation shall be considered to be Federal funds provided by grant or contract.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a recipient from using funds from a source other than the Legal Services Corporation for the purpose of contacting, communicating with, or responding to a request from, a State or local government agency, a State or local legislative body or committee, or a member thereof, regarding funding for the recipient, including a pending or proposed legislative or agency proposal to fund such recipient.

(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Legal Services Corporation shall promulgate a suggested list of priorities that boards of directors may use in setting priorities under subsection (a)(9).

(d)(1) The Legal Services Corporation shall not accept any non-Federal funds, and no recipient shall accept funds from any source other than the Corporation, unless the Corporation or the recipient, as the case may be, notifies in writing the source of the funds that the funds may not be expended for any purpose prohibited by the Legal Services Corporation Act or this title.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not prevent a recipient from—

(A) receiving Indian tribal funds (including funds from private nonprofit organizations for the benefit of Indians or Indian tribes) and expending the tribal funds in accordance with the specific purposes for which the tribal funds are provided; or

(B) using funds received from a source other than the Legal Services Corporation to provide legal assistance to a covered individual if such funds are used for the specific purposes for which such funds were received, except that such funds may not be expended by recipients for any purpose prohibited by this Act or by the Legal Services Corporation Act.

(e) As used in this section:

(1) The term ''controlled substance'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(2) The term ''covered individual'' means any person who—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), meets the requirements of this Act and the Legal Services Corporation Act relating to eligibility for legal assistance; and

(B) may or may not be financially unable to afford legal assistance.

(3) The term ''public housing project'' has the meaning as used within, and the term ''public housing agency'' has the meaning given the term, in section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a).

SEC. 505. None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation or provided by the Corporation to any entity or person may be used to pay membership dues to any private or nonprofit organization.

SEC. 506. None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation may be used by any person or entity receiving financial assistance from the Corporation to file or pursue a lawsuit against the Corporation.

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation may be used for any purpose prohibited or contrary to any of the provisions of authorization legislation for fiscal year 1996 for the Legal Services Corporation that is enacted into law. Upon the enactment of such Legal Services Corporation reauthorization legislation, funding provided in this Act shall from that date be subject to the provisions of that legislation and any provisions in this Act that are inconsistent with that legislation shall no longer have effect.

SEC. 508. (a) The requirements of section 504 shall apply to the activities of a recipient described in section 504, or an employee of such a recipient, during the provision of legal assistance for a case or matter, if the recipient or employee begins to provide the legal assistance on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) If the recipient or employee began to provide legal assistance for the case or matter prior to the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) each of the requirements of section 504 (other than paragraphs (7), (11), and (15) of subsection (a) of such section) shall, beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, apply to the activities of the recipient or employee during the provision of legal assistance for the case or matter; and

(2) the requirements of paragraphs (7), (11), and (15) of section 504(a) shall apply—

(A) beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, to the activities of the recipient or employee during the provision of legal assistance for any additional related claim for which the recipient or employee begins to provide legal assistance on or after such date; and

(B) beginning July 1, 1996, to all other activities of the recipient or employee during the provision of legal assistance for the case or matter.

(c) The Legal Services Corporation shall, every 60 days, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth the status of cases and matters referred to in subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 509. (a) An audit of each person or entity receiving financial assistance from the Legal Services Corporation under this Act (referred to in this section as a ''recipient'') shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and shall report whether—

(1) the financial statements of the recipient present fairly its financial position and the results of its financial operations in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;

(2) the recipient has internal control systems to provide reasonable assurance that it is managing funds, regardless of source, in compliance with Federal laws and regulations; and

(3) the recipient has complied with Federal laws and regulations applicable to funds received, regardless of source.

(b) In carrying out the requirements of subsection (a)(3), the auditor shall select and test a representative number of transactions. Any noncompliance found by the auditor during the audit under this section shall be reported within 30 days to the Office of the Inspector General.

(c) Audits conducted in accordance with this section shall be in lieu of the financial audits otherwise required by section 1009(c) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996h(c)).

(d) Notwithstanding section 1006(b)(3) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996e(b)(3)), the Legal Services Corporation shall have access to financial records, time records, retainer agreements, client trust fund and eligibility records, and client names, for each recipient, except for reports or records subject to the attorney-client privilege.

(e) The Legal Services Corporation shall not disclose any name or document referred to in subsection (d), except to—

(1) a Federal, State, or local law enforcement official; or

(2) an official of an appropriate bar association for the purpose of enabling the official to conduct an investigation of a rule of professional conduct.

(f) The requirements of this section shall apply to a recipient for its first fiscal year beginning on or after January 1, 1996.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of Public Law 92–522, as amended, $1,190,000.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, as authorized by Public Law 98–399, as amended, $350,000: Provided, That this shall be the final Federal payment to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission for operations and necessary closing costs.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $287,738,000, of which $3,000,000 is for the Office of Economic Analysis, to be headed by the Chief Economist of the Commission, and of which not to exceed $10,000 may be used toward funding a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions, and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations, appropriate representatives and staff to exchange views concerning developments relating to securities matters, development and implementation of cooperation agreements concerning securities matters and provision of technical assistance for the development of foreign securities markets, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance at such consultations and meetings including: (i) such incidental expenses as meals taken in the course of such attendance, (ii) any travel and transportation to or from such meetings, and (iii) any other related lodging or subsistence: Provided, That immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of one percentum to one-twenty-ninth of one percentum, and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: Provided further, That the total amount appropriated for fiscal year 1996 under this heading shall be reduced as such fees are deposited to this appropriation so as to result in a final total fiscal year 1996 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $103,445,000: Provided further, That any such fees collected in excess of $184,293,000 shall remain available until expended but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996: Provided further, That $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the Commission shall be available for the enforcement of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 in addition to any other appropriated funds designated by the Commission for enforcement of such Act.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration as authorized by Public Law 103–403, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344, and not to exceed $3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $219,190,000: Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Small Business Administration, and certain loan servicing activities: Provided further, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to this account, to be available for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1–11 as amended by Public Law 100–504, $8,500,000.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $4,500,000, and for the cost of guaranteed loans, $156,226,000, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note, of which $1,216,000, to be available until expended, shall be for the Microloan Guarantee Program, and of which $40,510,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That during fiscal year 1996, commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, shall not exceed the amount of financings authorized under Section 20(n)(2)(B) of the Small Business Act, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $92,622,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, as amended, $34,432,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $71,578,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

For additional capital for the ''Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund'', authorized by the Small Business Investment Act, as amended, $2,530,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 510. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by The State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–572 (106 Stat. 4515–4516)), $5,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 605. (a) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 1996, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous Appropriations Act to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 1996, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent whichever is less, that (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 606. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), overhaul, conversion, or modernization of vessels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in shipyards located outside of the United States.

SEC. 607. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 608. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer,

or enforce any guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission covering harassment based on religion, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which such funds are made available that such guidelines do not differ in any respect from the proposed guidelines published by the Commission on October 1, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 51266).

SEC. 609. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay for any cost incurred for (1) opening or operating any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was not operating on July 11, 1995; (2) expanding any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was operating on July 11, 1995; or (3) increasing the total number of personnel assigned to United States diplomatic or consular posts in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam above the levels existing on July 11, 1995, unless the President certifies within 60 days, based upon all information available to the U.S. Government that the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is fully cooperating with the United States in the following four areas:

(1) resolving discrepancy cases, live sightings and field activities.

(2) recovering and repatriating American remains,

(3) accelerating efforts to provide documents that will help lead to fullest possible accounting of POW/MIA's

(4) providing further assistance in implementing trilateral investigations with Laos.

SEC. 610. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any United Nations undertaking when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds (1) that the United Nations undertaking is a peacekeeping mission, (2) that such undertaking will involve United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national, and (3) that the President's military advisors have not submitted to the President a recommendation that such involvement is in the national security interests of the United States and the President has not submitted to the Congress such a recommendation.

SEC. 611. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to provide the following amenities or personal comforts in the Federal prison system—

(1) in-cell television viewing except for prisoners who are segregated from the general prison population for their own safety;

(2) the viewing of R, X, and NC–17 rated movies, through whatever medium presented;

(3) any instruction (live or through broadcasts) or training equipment for boxing, wrestling, judo, karate, or other martial art, or any bodybuilding or weightlifting equipment of any sort;

(4) possession of in-cell coffee pots, hot plates, or heating elements; or

(5) the use or possession of any electric or electronic musical instrument.

SEC. 612. None of the funds made available in title II for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the heading ''Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding and Conversion'' may be used to implement sections 603, 604, and 605 of Public Law 102–567.

SEC. 613. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for ''USIA Television Marti Program'' under the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act or any other program of United States Government television broadcasts to Cuba, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such use would be inconsistent with the applicable provisions of the March 1995 Office of Cuba Broadcasting Reinventing Plan of the United States Information Agency.

SEC. 614. (a)(1) Section 5002 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 401 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to the Advisory Corrections Council.

(b) This section shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 615. Any costs incurred by a Department or agency funded under this Act resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency: Provided, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this provision is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

TITLE VII—RESCISSIONS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $65,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $60,000,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $7,400,000 are rescinded.

TITLE VIII—PRISON LITIGATION REFORM

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995''.

SEC. 802. APPROPRIATE REMEDIES FOR PRISON CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3626 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 3626. Appropriate remedies with respect to prison conditions

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR RELIEF.—

''(1) PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—(A) Prospective relief in any civil action with respect to prison conditions shall extend no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right of a particular plaintiff or plaintiffs. The court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right. The court shall give substantial weight to any adverse impact on public safety or the operation of a criminal justice system caused by the relief.

''(B) The court shall not order any prospective relief that requires or permits a government official to exceed his or her authority under State or local law or otherwise violates State or local law, unless—

''(i) Federal law permits such relief to be ordered in violation of State or local law;

''(ii) the relief is necessary to correct the violation of a Federal right; and

''(iii) no other relief will correct the violation of the Federal right.

''(C) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the courts, in exercising their remedial powers, to order the construction of prisons or the raising of taxes, or to repeal or detract from otherwise applicable limitations on the remedial powers of the courts.

''(2) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, to the extent otherwise authorized by law, the court may enter a temporary restraining order or an order for preliminary injunctive relief. Preliminary injunctive relief must be narrowly drawn, extend no further than necessary to correct the harm the court finds requires preliminary relief, and be the least intrusive means necessary to correct that harm. The court shall give substantial weight to any adverse impact on public safety or the operation of a criminal justice system caused by the preliminary relief and shall respect the principles of comity set out in paragraph (1)(B) in tailoring any preliminary relief. Preliminary injunctive relief shall automatically expire on the date that is 90 days after its entry, unless the court makes the findings required under subsection (a)(1) for the entry of prospective relief and makes the order final before the expiration of the 90-day period.

''(3) PRISONER RELEASE ORDER.—(A) In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, no prisoner release order shall be entered unless—

''(i) a court has previously entered an order for less intrusive relief that has failed to remedy the deprivation of the Federal right sought to be remedied through the prisoner release order; and

''(ii) the defendant has had a reasonable amount of time to comply with the previous court orders.

''(B) In any civil action in Federal court with respect to prison conditions, a prisoner release order shall be entered only by a three-judge court in accordance with section 2284 of title 28, if the requirements of subparagraph (E) have been met.

''(C) A party seeking a prisoner release order in Federal court shall file with any request for such relief, a request for a three-judge court and materials sufficient to demonstrate that the requirements of subparagraph (A) have been met.

''(D) If the requirements under subparagraph (A) have been met, a Federal judge before whom a civil action with respect to prison conditions is pending who believes that a prison release order should be considered may sua sponte request the convening of a three-judge court to determine whether a prisoner release order should be entered.

''(E) The three-judge court shall enter a prisoner release order only if the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that—

''(i) crowding is the primary cause of the violation of a Federal right; and

''(ii) no other relief will remedy the violation of the Federal right.

''(F) Any State or local official or unit of government whose jurisdiction or function includes the appropriation of funds for the construction, operation, or maintenance of program facilities, or the prosecution or custody of persons who may be released from, or not admitted to, a prison as a result of a prisoner release order shall have standing to oppose the imposition or continuation in effect of such relief and to seek termination of such relief, and shall have the right to intervene in any proceeding relating to such relief.

''(b) TERMINATION OF RELIEF.—

''(1) TERMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—(A) In any civil action with respect to prison conditions in which prospective relief is ordered, such relief shall be terminable upon the motion of any party or intervener—

''(i) 2 years after the date the court granted or approved the prospective relief;

''(ii) 1 year after the date the court has entered an order denying termination of prospective relief under this paragraph; or

''(iii) in the case of an order issued on or before the date of enactment of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 2 years after such date of enactment.

''(B) Nothing in this section shall prevent the parties from agreeing to terminate or modify relief before the relief is terminated under subparagraph (A).

''(2) IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, a defendant or intervener shall be entitled to the immediate termination of any prospective relief if the relief was approved or granted in the absence of a finding by the court that the relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right.

''(3) LIMITATION.—Prospective relief shall not terminate if the court makes written findings based on the record that prospective relief remains necessary to correct a current or ongoing violation of the Federal right, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and that the prospective relief is narrowly drawn and the least intrusive means to correct the violation.

''(4) TERMINATION OR MODIFICATION OF RELIEF.—Nothing in this section shall prevent any party or intervener from seeking modification or termination before the relief is terminable under paragraph (1) or (2), to the extent that modification or termination would otherwise be legally permissible.

''(c) SETTLEMENTS.—

''(1) CONSENT DECREES.—In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, the court shall not enter or approve a consent decree unless it complies with the limitations on relief set forth in subsection (a).

''(2) PRIVATE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—(A) Nothing in this section shall preclude parties from entering into a private settlement agreement that does not comply with the limitations on relief set forth in subsection (a), if the terms of that agreement are not subject to court enforcement other than the reinstatement of the civil proceeding that the agreement settled.

''(B) Nothing in this section shall preclude any party claiming that a private settlement agreement has been breached from seeking in State court any remedy available under State law.

''(d) STATE LAW REMEDIES.—The limitations on remedies in this section shall not apply to relief entered by a State court based solely upon claims arising under State law.

''(e) PROCEDURE FOR MOTIONS AFFECTING PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—

''(1) GENERALLY.—The court shall promptly rule on any motion to modify or terminate prospective relief in a civil action with respect to prison conditions.

''(2) AUTOMATIC STAY.—Any prospective relief subject to a pending motion shall be automatically stayed during the period—

''(A)(i) beginning on the 30th day after such motion is filed, in the case of a motion made under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b); or

''(ii) beginning on the 180th day after such motion is filed, in the case of a motion made under any other law; and

''(B) ending on the date the court enters a final order ruling on the motion.

''(f) SPECIAL MASTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) In any civil action in a Federal court with respect to prison conditions, the court may appoint a special master who shall be disinterested and objective and who will give due regard to the public safety, to conduct hearings on the record and prepare proposed findings of fact.

''(B) The court shall appoint a special master under this subsection during the remedial phase of the action only upon a finding that the remedial phase will be sufficiently complex to warrant the appointment.

''(2) APPOINTMENT.—(A) If the court determines that the appointment of a special master is necessary, the court shall request that the defendant institution and the plaintiff each submit a list of not more than 5 persons to serve as a special master.

''(B) Each party shall have the opportunity to remove up to 3 persons from the opposing party's list.

''(C) The court shall select the master from the persons remaining on the list after the operation of subparagraph (B).

''(3) INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL.—Any party shall have the right to an interlocutory appeal of the judge's selection of the special master under this subsection, on the ground of partiality.

''(4) COMPENSATION.—The compensation to be allowed to a special master under this section shall be based on an hourly rate not greater than the hourly rate established under section 3006A for payment of court-appointed counsel, plus costs reasonably incurred by the special master. Such compensation and costs shall be paid with funds appropriated to the Judiciary.

''(5) REGULAR REVIEW OF APPOINTMENT.—In any civil action with respect to prison conditions in which a special master is appointed under this subsection, the court shall review the appointment of the special master every 6 months to determine whether the services of the special master continue to be required under paragraph (1). In no event shall the appointment of a special master extend beyond the termination of the relief.

''(6) LIMITATIONS ON POWERS AND DUTIES.—A special master appointed under this subsection—

''(A) may be authorized by a court to conduct hearings and prepare proposed findings of fact, which shall be made on the record;

''(B) shall not make any findings or communications ex parte;

''(C) may be authorized by a court to assist in the development of remedial plans; and

''(D) may be removed at any time, but shall be relieved of the appointment upon the termination of relief.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'consent decree' means any relief entered by the court that is based in whole or in part upon the consent or acquiescence of the parties but does not include private settlements;

''(2) the term 'civil action with respect to prison conditions' means any civil proceeding arising under Federal law with respect to the conditions of confinement or the effects of actions by government officials on the lives of persons confined in prison, but does not include habeas corpus proceedings challenging the fact or duration of confinement in prison;

''(3) the term 'prisoner' means any person subject to incarceration, detention, or admission to any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program;

''(4) the term 'prisoner release order' includes any order, including a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunctive relief, that has the purpose or effect of reducing or limiting the prison population, or that directs the release from or nonadmission of prisoners to a prison;

''(5) the term 'prison' means any Federal, State, or local facility that incarcerates or detains juveniles or adults accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law;

''(6) the term 'private settlement agreement' means an agreement entered into among the parties that is not subject to judicial enforcement other than the reinstatement of the civil proceeding that the agreement settled;

''(7) the term 'prospective relief' means all relief other than compensatory monetary damages;

''(8) the term 'special master' means any person appointed by a Federal court pursuant to Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or pursuant to any inherent power of the court to exercise the powers of a master, regardless of the title or description given by the court; and

''(9) the term 'relief' means all relief in any form that may be granted or approved by the court, and includes consent decrees but does not include private settlement agreements.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3626 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section, shall apply with respect to all prospective relief whether such relief was originally granted or approved before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this title.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsections (b) and (d) of section 20409 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 are repealed.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter C of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''3626. Appropriate remedies with respect to prison conditions.''.

SEC. 803. AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL RIGHTS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT.

(a) INITIATION OF CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 3(c) of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997a(c)) (referred to in this section as the ''Act'') is amended to read as follows:

''(c) The Attorney General shall personally sign any complaint filed pursuant to this section.''.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''he'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Attorney General''; and

(B) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the Attorney General's''; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) The Attorney General shall personally sign any certification made pursuant to this section.''.

(c) INTERVENTION IN ACTIONS.—Section 5 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''he'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Attorney General''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The Attorney General shall personally sign any certification made pursuant to this section.''; and

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) The Attorney General shall personally sign any motion to intervene made pursuant to this section.''.

(d) SUITS BY PRISONERS.—Section 7 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997e) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 7. SUITS BY PRISONERS.

''(a) APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.—No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.

''(b) FAILURE OF STATE TO ADOPT OR ADHERE TO ADMINISTRATIVE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.—The failure of a State to adopt or adhere to an administrative grievance procedure shall not constitute the basis for an action under section 3 or 5 of this Act.

''(c) DISMISSAL.—(1) The court shall on its own motion or on the motion of a party dismiss any action brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility if the court is satisfied that the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

''(2) In the event that a claim is, on its face, frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from

such relief, the court may dismiss the underlying claim without first requiring the exhaustion of administrative remedies.

''(d) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—(1) In any action brought by a prisoner who is confined to any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, in which attorney's fees are authorized under section 2 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1988), such fees shall not be awarded, except to the extent that—

''(A) the fee was directly and reasonably incurred in proving an actual violation of the plaintiff's rights protected by a statute pursuant to which a fee may be awarded under section 2 of the Revised Statutes; and

''(B)(i) the amount of the fee is proportionately related to the court ordered relief for the violation; or

''(ii) the fee was directly and reasonably incurred in enforcing the relief ordered for the violation.

''(2) Whenever a monetary judgment is awarded in an action described in paragraph (1), a portion of the judgment (not to exceed 25 percent) shall be applied to satisfy the amount of attorney's fees awarded against the defendant. If the award of attorney's fees is not greater than 150 percent of the judgment, the excess shall be paid by the defendant.

''(3) No award of attorney's fees in an action described in paragraph (1) shall be based on an hourly rate greater than 150 percent of the hourly rate established under section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, for payment of court-appointed counsel.

''(4) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a prisoner from entering into an agreement to pay an attorney's fee in an amount greater than the amount authorized under this subsection, if the fee is paid by the individual rather than by the defendant pursuant to section 2 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1988).

''(e) LIMITATION ON RECOVERY.—No Federal civil action may be brought by a prisoner confined in a jail, prison, or other correctional facility, for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of physical injury.

''(f) HEARINGS.—(1) To the extent practicable, in any action brought with respect to prison conditions in Federal court pursuant to section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, pretrial proceedings in which the prisoner's participation is required or permitted shall be conducted by telephone, video conference, or other telecommunications technology without removing the prisoner from the facility in which the prisoner is confined.

''(2) Subject to the agreement of the official of the Federal, State, or local unit of government with custody over the prisoner, hearings may be conducted at the facility in which the prisoner is confined. To the extent practicable, the court shall allow counsel to participate by telephone, video conference, or other communications technology in any hearing held at the facility.

''(g) WAIVER OF REPLY.—(1) Any defendant may waive the right to reply to any action brought by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) or any other Federal law. Notwithstanding any other law or rule of procedure, such waiver shall not constitute an admission of the allegations contained in the complaint. No relief shall be granted to the plaintiff unless a reply has been filed.

''(2) The court may require any defendant to reply to a complaint brought under this section if it finds that the plaintiff has a reasonable opportunity to prevail on the merits.

''(h) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'prisoner' means any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.''.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 8 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997f) is amended by striking ''his report'' and inserting ''the report''.

(f) NOTICE TO FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS.—Section 10 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997h) is amended—

(1) by striking ''his action'' and inserting ''the action''; and

(2) by striking ''he is satisfied'' and inserting ''the Attorney General is satisfied''.

SEC. 804. PROCEEDINGS IN FORMA PAUPERIS.

(a) FILING FEES.—Section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''(a) Any'' and inserting ''(a)(1) Subject to subsection (b), any'';

(B) by striking ''and costs'';

(C) by striking ''makes affidavit'' and inserting ''submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such prisoner possesses'';

(D) by striking ''such costs'' and inserting ''such fees'';

(E) by striking ''he'' each place it appears and inserting ''the person'';

(F) by adding immediately after paragraph (1), the following new paragraph:

''(2) A prisoner seeking to bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding without prepayment of fees or security therefor, in addition to filing the affidavit filed under paragraph (1), shall submit a certified copy of the trust fund account statement (or institutional equivalent) for the prisoner for the 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint or notice of appeal, obtained from the appropriate official of each prison at which the prisoner is or was confined.''; and

(G) by striking ''An appeal'' and inserting ''(3) An appeal'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if a prisoner brings a civil action or files an appeal in forma pauperis, the prisoner shall be required to pay the full amount of a filing fee. The court shall assess and, when funds exist, collect, as a partial payment of any court fees required by law, an initial partial filing fee of 20 percent of the greater of—

''(A) the average monthly deposits to the prisoner's account; or

''(B) the average monthly balance in the prisoner's account for the 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint or notice of appeal.

''(2) After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the prisoner shall be required to make monthly payments of 20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account. The agency having custody of the prisoner shall forward payments from the prisoner's account to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds $10 until the filing fees are paid.

''(3) In no event shall the filing fee collected exceed the amount of fees permitted by statute for the commencement of a civil action or an appeal of a civil action or criminal judgment.

''(4) In no event shall a prisoner be prohibited from bringing a civil action or appealing a civil or criminal judgment for the reason that the prisoner has no assets and no means by which to pay the initial partial filing fee.'';

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''subsection (a) of this section'' and inserting ''subsections (a) and (b) and the prepayment of any partial filing fee as may be required under subsection (b)''; and

(5) by amending subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(e)(1) The court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel.

''(2) Notwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that—

''(A) the allegation of poverty is untrue; or

''(B) the action or appeal—

''(i) is frivolous or malicious;

''(ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or

''(iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.''.

(b) EXCEPTION TO DISCHARGE OF DEBT IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING.—Section 523(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) for a fee imposed by a court for the filing of a case, motion, complaint, or appeal, or for other costs and expenses assessed with respect to such filing, regardless of an assertion of poverty by the debtor under section 1915 (b) or (f) of title 28, or the debtor's status as a prisoner, as defined in section 1915(h) of title 28.''.

(c) COSTS.—Section 1915(f) of title 28, United States Code (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)), is amended—

(1) by striking ''(f) Judgment'' and inserting ''(f)(1) Judgment'';

(2) by striking ''cases'' and inserting ''proceedings''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) If the judgment against a prisoner includes the payment of costs under this subsection, the prisoner shall be required to pay the full amount of the costs ordered.

''(B) The prisoner shall be required to make payments for costs under this subsection in the same manner as is provided for filing fees under subsection (a)(2).

''(C) In no event shall the costs collected exceed the amount of the costs ordered by the court.''.

(d) SUCCESSIVE CLAIMS.—Section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.''.

(e) DEFINITION.—Section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) As used in this section, the term 'prisoner' means any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.''.

SEC. 805. JUDICIAL SCREENING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1915 the following new section:

''§ 1915A. Screening

''(a) SCREENING.—The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

''(b) GROUNDS FOR DISMISSAL.—On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—

''(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or

''(2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

''(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'prisoner' means any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1915 the following new item:

''1915A. Screening.''.

SEC. 806. FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS.

Section 1346(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b)'' and inserting ''(b)(1)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) No person convicted of a felony who is incarcerated while awaiting sentencing or while serving a sentence may bring a civil action against the United States or an agency, officer, or employee of the Government, for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of physical injury.''.

SEC. 807. PAYMENT OF DAMAGE AWARD IN SATISFACTION OF PENDING RESTITUTION ORDERS.

Any compensatory damages awarded to a prisoner in connection with a civil action brought against any Federal, State, or local jail, prison, or correctional facility or against any official or agent of such jail, prison, or correctional facility, shall be paid directly to satisfy any outstanding restitution orders pending against the prisoner. The remainder of any such award after full payment of all pending restitution orders shall be forwarded to the prisoner.

SEC. 808. NOTICE TO CRIME VICTIMS OF PENDING DAMAGE AWARD.

Prior to payment of any compensatory damages awarded to a prisoner in connection with a civil action brought against any Federal, State, or local jail, prison, or correctional facility or against any official or agent of such jail, prison, or correctional facility, reasonable efforts shall be made to notify the victims of the crime for which the prisoner was convicted and incarcerated concerning the pending payment of any such compensatory damages.

SEC. 809. EARNED RELEASE CREDIT OR GOOD TIME CREDIT REVOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1932. Revocation of earned release credit

''In any civil action brought by an adult convicted of a crime and confined in a Federal correctional facility, the court may order the revocation of such earned good time credit under section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code, that has not yet vested, if, on its own motion or the motion of any party, the court finds that—

''(1) the claim was filed for a malicious purpose;

''(2) the claim was filed solely to harass the party against which it was filed; or

''(3) the claimant testifies falsely or otherwise knowingly presents false evidence or information to the court.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1931 the following:

''1932. Revocation of earned release credit.''.

(c) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3624 OF TITLE 18.—Section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the first sentence;

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking ''A prisoner'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (2), a prisoner'';

(ii) by striking ''for a crime of violence,''; and

(iii) by striking ''such'';

(C) in the third sentence, by striking ''If the Bureau'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (2), if the Bureau'';

(D) by striking the fourth sentence and inserting the following: ''In awarding credit under this section, the Bureau shall consider whether the prisoner, during the relevant period, has earned, or is making satisfactory progress toward earning, a high school diploma or an equivalent degree.''; and

(E) in the sixth sentence, by striking ''Credit for the last'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (2), credit for the last''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) Notwithstanding any other law, credit awarded under this subsection after the date of enactment of the Prison Litigation Reform Act shall vest on the date the prisoner is released from custody.''.

SEC. 810. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title, the amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

This Act may be cited as the ''Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD ROGERS,
JIM KOLBE,
CHARLES H. TAYLOR,
RALPH REGULA,
MIKE FORBES,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JUDD GREGG,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS (with reservations),
ROBERT C. BYRD,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Senate Amendment: The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and insert the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

OVERSEAS STAFFING

The conferees agree with the concern expressed in the House report concerning the lack of a system for determining overall allocation of resources and costs among agencies for operations outside of the U.S. Expansion of staffing or presence overseas is to be brought to the attention of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees at the outset of the planning process, well in advance of the proposed use of any appropriated funds, preferably through the annual budget submission. The conferees are intent upon finding the proper way to assure control of the deployment of personnel and resources outside of the U.S.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $74,282,000 for General Administration as provided in both the House and Senate bills. The conference agreement also includes a provision that limits the number of positions and amounts expended for the Department Leadership and Executive Support programs as included by the Senate, but modifies the provision to permit augmentation of the Department Leadership program by reimbursable and non-reimbursable personnel and to allow for continuation of reimbursable positions for the Office of Freedom of Information and Privacy Appeals. The House bill did not contain a provision on this matter.

The conference agreement also assumes elimination of the Office of the Associate Attorney General.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

The conference agreement includes $16,898,000 for the Counterterrorism Fund, instead of $26,898,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate bills. The conferees understand that balances of $24,445,000 remain available from the 1995 Supplemental Appropriation, Public Law 104–19, for authorized purposes of this Fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

The conference agreement includes $86,666,000 for Administrative Review and Appeals as proposed by the Senate, instead of $87,516,000 as proposed by the House. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $47,780,000 will be provided from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF) for both expedited asylum and deportation hearings as proposed by the House, instead of providing $14,347,000 from the VCRTF only for expedited deportation hearings as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that of the total amount provided, $85,252,000 is included for the Executive Office for Immigration Review and $1,414,000 is included for the Office of the Pardon Attorney.

The conference agreement also includes technical bill language that allows outstanding balances for these programs from prior years to be merged with this new appropriation account.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes $28,960,000 for the Office of Inspector General, instead of $30,484,000 as proposed by the House and $27,436,000 as proposed by the Senate.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $5,446,000 for the U.S. Parole Commission as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

(INCLUDES TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement includes a direct appropriation of $409,520,000 for General Legal Activities, as proposed by both the House and Senate bills. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $7,591,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF) as proposed by the House, instead of $2,991,000 from the VCRTF as proposed by the Senate, to support immigration initiatives. In addition to this amount, the conferees agreed to provide $12,000,000 by transferring balances available in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund. Thus, the total amount provided for General Legal Activities is $421,520,000.

Both the House and Senate bills assumed a transfer of General Legal Activities resources to the U.S. Attorneys program. The

conference agreement does not includes this transfer of resources. However, the conferees agree that the Attorney General should report to the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate by March 1, 1996, on the transfer of attorneys to field locations of the Environment and Tax Divisions and offices that are co-located with U.S. Attorneys.

The conferees have also agreed that funding for the Community Relations Service activities will not be provided from funds available under the General Legal Activities account, as proposed by the House.

THE NATIONAL CHILDHOOD VACCINE INJURY ACT

The conference agreement includes a reimbursement of $4,028,000 for fiscal year 1996 from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund to the Department of Justice, as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

The conference agreement provides $85,143,000 for the Antitrust Division as proposed by both the House and Senate bills. Of the amount provided, the conference agreement assumes, based on latest estimates, that $19,360,000 will be derived from unobligated offsetting collections from the prior year, instead of $16,000,000 as assumed in both the House and Senate bills.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The conference agreement includes $925,509,000 for the U.S. Attorneys, instead of $911,556,000 as proposed by the House and $939,463,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $30,000,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF) as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,731,000 from the VCRTF as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that amounts provided from the VCRTF shall be used to support expedited deportation of denied asylum applicants, Federal Victim's Counselors under the Violence Against Women Act, and increased demands for criminal prosecution and related activities.

The conference agreement provides for the following: (1) requested adjustments to base, including restoration of absorption of the 1996 pay raise; (2) $10,000,000 for security upgrades at U.S. Attorneys offices; (3) $2,158,000 for increased prosecution of violators of immigration laws; (4) $9,231,000 from the VCRTF for expedited deportation of denied asylum applicants; (5) $48,083,000 to maintain attorney and support personnel hired in fiscal year 1995 and for additional attorneys and support for violent crime prosecution; and (6) $500,000 to implement a program to appoint Federal Victim's Counselors. The conference agreement does not assume a transfer of resources from the General Legal Activities account to the U.S. Attorneys program, as proposed by the House. In addition, the conferees agree that to the extent possible within the resources provided, the Department of Justice should expand the pilot debt collection program, as stated in the Senate report.

The conference agreement also includes bill language to reflect the total number of positions and full-time equivalent (FTE) employment expected to be supported by the level of resources provided for the U.S. Attorneys in fiscal year 1996. Within the FTE provided, the conferees assume 300 FTE will support student interns. The conferees agree that this language is necessary as a result of the U.S. Attorneys mismanagement which led to the hiring of more employees in 1995 than could be sustained by the resource level provided in fiscal year 1995. The conferees' strong support for the mission of the U.S. Attorneys does not extend to careless hiring and fiscal management practices.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

The conference agreement provides $102,390,000 in budget (obligational) authority for the U.S. Trustees, instead of $101,596,000 as proposed by the House and $103,183,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $44,191,000 will be derived from anticipated offsetting collections. In addition, under section 111, the conferees agree to include an extension of post-confirmation quarterly fee payments made under Chapter 11 as proposed in both the House and Senate bills and expect that these fees will apply to all pending Chapter 11 cases with confirmed reorganization plans.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

The conference agreement provides $830,000 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission as proposed by the House, instead of $905,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

The conference agreement includes $448,248,000 for the U.S. Marshals Service, instead of $443,973,000 as proposed by the House and $454,639,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $25,000,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF) as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000,000 from the VCRTF as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following: (1) requested adjustments to base; (2) $10,000,000 for security upgrades at existing courthouses; (3) $18,209,000 for additional security personnel to staff new and expanded courthouses scheduled to open in 1996; and (4) $11,066,000 for equipment and communications expenses in new courthouse locations. The conferees understand that the Marshals Service funded a number of requirements by reprogramming resources at the end of fiscal year 1995 and thus have not provided funding increases for requested items. The conferees agree that any additional funding for these items, if necessary, should be requested through a reprogramming of resources in fiscal year 1996.

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement provides $252,820,000 for Federal Prisoner Detention, instead of $295,331,000 as proposed by the Senate and $250,331,000 as proposed by the House. In addition to this amount, the conferees understand, that based on the latest carryover estimates, an additional $33,511,000 is available for this program from unobligated balances from the prior year. The conferees have also agreed to provide an additional $9,000,000 by transferring balances available in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund. Thus, total funding provided for this account is $295,331,000.

The conferees have also agreed to change the name of this appropriation from ''Support of U.S. Prisoners'' to ''Federal Prisoner Detention''.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

The conference agreement includes $85,000,000 for Fees and Expenses of Witnesses as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The conference agreement provides $5,319,000 for the Community Relations Service (CRS) instead of $10,638,000 as proposed by the Senate and elimination of this program as a separate account as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that if emergent circumstances require additional funding for Conflict Prevention and Resolution activities of the CRS, the Attorney General may provide resources for these activities within transfer authorities provided under Section 605 of this Act.

The conferees have also agreed that the activities related to the resettlement of Cubans and Haitians should be transferred to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that the costs of these activities should be supported by the Immigration Examinations Fee account.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

The conference agreement provides $30,000,000 for the Assets Forfeiture Fund instead of $35,000,000 as provided in both the House and Senate bills. This reduction is based on a revised estimate of revenue from forfeited assets that will be available in fiscal year 1996.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $2,655,000 for administrative expenses in accordance with the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

PAYMENT TO RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

The conference agreement includes an advance appropriation of $16,264,000 for fiscal year 1997 for payments to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund, as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

The conference agreement includes $359,843,000 for Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement as proposed by the Senate, instead of $374,943,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees recognize that over $76,000,000 of funds requested for this account are for agencies other than Department of Justice (DOJ) agencies and while the conferees have agreed to the level proposed by the Senate they have not allocated the reduction solely to non-DOJ agencies, as proposed by the Senate. Instead, the conferees expect the Office of Investigative Agencies Policy at the Department of Justice to allocate these resources based on current task force requirements and to notify the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate of the proposed distribution of these resources pursuant to the reprogramming requirements in Section 605 of this Act. In addition, the conferees direct the Administration to submit the budget requirements of non-DOJ agencies for fiscal year 1997 within the budgets proposed for those agencies.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement includes $2,407,483,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), instead of $2,332,081,000 as proposed by the House and $2,506,671,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $218,300,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF), instead of $80,600,000 as proposed by the House and $202,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. In addition, the conferees agree that of the amounts provided, not less than $102,345,000 shall be used for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to national security, instead of $121,345,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following program increase: (1) $1,400,000 for personnel to staff the FBI Command Center;

(2) $3,450,000 for FBI Legal Attaches; (3) $25,000,000 for tactical operations development and acquisition program; (4) $8,470,000 for 125 additional FBI staff; (5) $12,500,000 for FBI forensic services, including $9,900,000 to modernize FBI forensic laboratory equipment and $2,600,000 for 75 forensic examiners, technicians and support personnel; (6) $2,900,000 for equipment for Emergency Response Teams; (7) $5,000,000 to upgrade and develop FBI databases on gangs and hostage/barricade situations; (8) $4,000,000 for State, Indian Tribal and local training; (9) $33,400,000 only for research efforts and engineering services to develop new techniques and equipment to perform court-approved wiretaps and interceptions of communications and shall not be used for deployment of any technology that may be developed without authorizing legislation; (10) $3,000,000 for aviation maintenance and equipment; (11) $10,000,000 for wireless radio communications and leasing of antenna sites; (12) $5,000,000 for Safe Street Task Forces; (13) $4,200,000 for FBI's DRUGFIRE program, including equipping of State and local laboratories; and (14) $15,000,000 for FBI's Combined DNA Index System, including $9,500,000 to equip State and local laboratories with this technology.

The conference agreement does not include $28,737,000 requested to fully annualize positions approved in fiscal year 1995 because the FBI failed to hire personnel to fill these additional positions.

FBI international operations.—The conference agreement provides an increase of $3,450,000 for FBI Legal Attache offices. However, the conferees are concerned that the FBI has not adequately presented its short and long term plan for expansion of its international operations and activities. Therefore, the conferees agree that the additional funds provided in this Act may not be expended until a plan for FBI international operations has been developed jointly by the Department of Justice and the Department of State, and has been presented to and approve by the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate consistent with the reprogramming requirements in Section 605 of this Act.

NCIC 2000.—The conferees agree that one of the highest priority projects of Federal, State and local law enforcement is the completion of NCIC 2000. The conferees are aware of delays in the scheduled completion and additional resource requirements that are necessary to bring this vital system on line. The conference agreement therefore ensures that funds will be available for completion of this project by directing balances available in the FBI ADP and Telecommunications account and the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund to be applied to this project. Furthermore, the conferees are aware that the FBI has an additional $34,548,000 in unobligated balances to be transferred into the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund and directs the FBI to transfer this entire amount immediately to the Working Capital Fund to support the NCIC 2000 project and other needs of the Department of Justice.

The conferees direct the Attorney General and the FBI to make oversight of the management of this project and the contractor a top management priority. Upon receiving information that the contract was severely behind schedule and that the cost for completion of the NCIC 2000 project had escalated to almost double the initial cost estimates, the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate urged the FBI to consider a ''firm-fixed'' contract in its renegotiation process. The conferees are concerned that the FBI has entered into another ''cost-plus'' contract for this project. Congress has made completion of this project on time and within the resources provided a priority. The Department of Justice and the FBI should do the same. The conferees direct the FBI to provide a quarterly status report on this project and the performance of the contractor.

Similarly, the conferees are concerned about schedule delays within the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) project. The conferees are particularly concerned that while the FBI will have entered into contracts on each of the four IAFIS segments by the end of this calendar year, it does not appear that the issues related to integration of these components systems have been adequately addressed. Again, the conferees direct the Attorney General and the FBI to make management of this important project a top priority and expect to receive quarterly status reports on the IAFIS project.

CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes $97,589,000 for Construction for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), instead of $98,400,000 as proposed by the House and $98,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following: (1) $10,000,000 for renovations, equipment and telecommunications upgrades to the FBI Headquarters Command Center; (2) $57,089,000 for architectural design, site planning and the first phase of construction for a new FBI Forensic Laboratory Facility to be located at Ft. Belvoir, Virginia; and (3) $30,500,000 for upgrades to the FBI Training Academy at Quantico, Virginia, including $21,350,000 to fully complete the modernization of the outdoor firing range and the tactical firearms training center and $9,150,000 for necessary maintenance.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $805,668,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) instead of $793,488,000 as proposed by the House, and $850,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $60,000,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF) as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees also agree that in addition to amounts appropriated, $47,241,000 will be available from the Diversion Control Fund for diversion control activities.

The conference agreement includes the following program increases: (1) $580,000 for DEA's legal attache program; (2) $5,000,000 for contract linguist support; (3) $1,650,000 for advanced telephony; (4) $7,400,000 for office automation; (5) $3,965,000 for 30 new agents for domestic heroin enforcement; (6) $4,950,000 for mobile enforcement teams, including teams to address illicit drug activities in rural areas; (7) $2,000,000 for wireless radio communications; and (8) $2,000,000 for DRUGFIRE systems.

The conference agreement does not include $15,400,000 requested to fully annualize positions approved in fiscal year 1995 because the DEA has failed to hire personnel to fill these additional positions.

The conferees understand that the funding provided for an additional DEA Legal Attache office is a portion of funds necessary to establish a joint FBI/DEA Legal Attache office in Beijing, China. Consistent with funding provided for FBI Legal Attache Offices, the conferees agree that these funds should not be expended by DEA until the Committees on Appropriations have approved the plan for FBI international operations.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $1,711,023,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), including the Border Patrol, instead of $1,725,023,000 as proposed by the House, and a total of $1,735,796,000 as proposed by the Senate ($1,119,296,000 for INS and $616,500,000 for the Border Patrol). Of the amounts provided, the conference agreement provides $316,198,000 from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF), instead of $303,542,000 as proposed by the House and $175,662,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees also agree that in addition to amounts appropriated, $821,447,000 will be available from offsetting fee collections for the purposes outlined in the House and Senate reports. The conferees agree not to include funding for border control activities by doubling the current fee for 245(i) applications. Furthermore, the conferees agree not to implement a border crossing toll as proposed by the Administration.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, including the full cost of the pay raise and the following program increases to support enhanced border control, detention and removal of criminal and other deportable aliens, and worksite enforcement and verification:

Border control.—The conference agreement includes 1,420 positions, 614 FTE and $152,172,000 for enhanced border control activities, of which $30,872,000 is from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, including (1) $83,500,000 for 800 new border patrol agents and 160 support personnel and the reallocation of 200 border patrol agent positions from interior stations to the front lines of the border; (2) $7,100,000 for border technology and an additional helicopter; (3) $20,000,000 for 400 new land border inspectors for the Southern border; (4) $6,000,000 for anti-smuggling units; (5) $4,700,000 for a pilot interior repatriation effort; and (6) $30,872,000 for automated border lookout systems, including a pilot exit control system.

Detention and removal of deportable aliens.—The conference agreement includes an increase of 1,400 positions, 702 FTE and $128,716,000, of which $33,116,000 is from the VCRTF, to apprehend, locate, detain and deport illegal aliens, including: (1) $46,116,000 to fully support the Institutional Hearing Program; (2) $42,700,000 for 418 detention personnel and for over 2,800 additional detention beds; (3) $26,315,000 for 279 deportation personnel to remove abscondees, criminal aliens and illegal aliens who have been denied asylum or apprehended from worksites; (4) $5,200,000 to add warrants for arrest into NCIC 2000 for aliens who are repeat offenders to reentry after deportation; and (5) $8,385,000 for the purchase of new vehicles and transportation costs.

Worksite enforcement and verification.—The conference agreement includes an increase of 384 positions, 192 FRE and $50,444,000, including $40,444,000 for investigations personnel to enhance employer sanctions activities and backfill 200 border patrol agents positions that will be reallocated to border patrol stations along with immediate border, and $10,000,000 to improve the accuracy of INS records and develop pilots for verification systems, including the expansion of the current INS telephone verification systems.

Border control systems modernization.—Within total amounts provided in the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, $153,570,000 is recommended to continue the border systems modernization effort started last year. The conferees agree that within this effort, the INS should conduct a pilot program to collect records of departing passengers and should also extend fingerprint-based identification systems and automated case tracking systems to the entire Southwest border, as stated in the House and Senate reports.

Resource deployment.—The conferees expect that INS will deploy border patrol agent and

inspector positions to the Southwest border to support the greatest areas of illegal traffic. The conferees direct INS to assign these new positions as ''front-line'' employees on the immediate border and to staff inspection lanes for the facilitation of traffic across the border. In addition, as mentioned in the House and Senate reports, the conferees expect INS to ensure that staffing levels at the Miami and Hawaii airports are consistent with past years INS staffing models plus projected passenger increases for fiscal year 1996 and that INS participates in the Unified Port Management Pilot Project. The conferees also expect INS to review the requirements of States and localities in the central region of the country in its allocation of additional personnel for interior enforcement initiatives. The conferees direct INS to consult with the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate before a final allocation of all of these positions is determined.

INS Offices of Congressional and Public Affairs.—The conferees have agreed to include language that clarifies the activities to be performed by the INS Offices of Congressional and Public Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

BORDER PATROL

The conference agreement for the Immigration and Naturalization Service includes $584,800,000 for the Border Patrol, including $78,000,000 to be provided from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF). For the past two years, the conferees agree that the Congress has made resources to hire additional Border Patrol agents a top priority. The conferees are concerned that despite clear guidance from Congress, those resources have in some instances been diverted to other activities within INS. At a time when budgetary resources are scarce and Congress has made difficult choices in order to ensure that funding is provided to maintain the integrity of our Nation's borders, mismanagement of resources by INS cannot be tolerated. To ensure that the funding provided by Congress is used for its intended purpose, the conferees have agreed to add bill language which directs INS to provide the level of funding for the Border Patrol assumed by the conferees in their determination of total funding levels for the INS.

The resource level provided by the conference agreement provides for an additional 1,000 border patrol agents on the front lines of the border by hiring 800 new border patrol agents and reallocating 200 border patrol positions from interior border patrol stations to stations that are on the immediate border. The conferees understand that INS must undertake a significant recruitment and training process in order to hire and train the new agents in addition to over 2,000 other INS employees. Therefore, the conferees expect INS to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on a quarterly basis, its progress and plans in meeting the hiring goals for new border patrol agents. In addition, the conferees urge the Department to seek, on behalf of INS, the allowable waivers from the Office of Personnel Management that would allow INS to reemploy retired (with no loss of retirement pay) Border Patrol agents and investigators, if feasible, in order to meet training and hiring requirements.

The resource level provided by the conference agreement includes $12,000,000 for the reallocation of 200 border patrol agent positions from interior stations to the front lines of the border. The conferees agree that effective border control is the most important means of controlling illegal immigration and that the INS must utilize its border patrol resources in a way that ensures that apprehension of illegal aliens at the border is its first priority. The conferees also agree that INS can no longer use border patrol resources on functions not directly related to border control. However, the conferees recognize the importance of an INS enforcement presence in parts of the country that have significant populations of illegal immigrants. Rather than close any of these offices, the conferees direct INS to restaff these offices with criminal investigative positions in order to ensure that the interior enforcement activities currently performed in these locations can continue. The conferees also recognize that some of the border patrol agents in these offices may opt to convert to the investigator positions and encourage INS management to consider personnel and relocation issues in implementing this action.

California checkpoints.—The conferees have agreed to eliminate the provision in the House bill that would have closed the border patrol traffic checkpoints in San Clemente and Temecula, California. However, the conferees agree that the current operation of these checkpoints is unacceptable. The conferees agree that the effectiveness of these checkpoints is contingent on full operation of these checkpoints on a continuous 24-hour basis and improvements to the current San Clemente checkpoint to reduce delays and increase the safety of agents, the persons being checked, and nearby communities. Therefore, the conferees have included language that prohibits operation of the checkpoints if the checkpoints are not operated on a continuous 24-hour basis and a commuter lane pilot program to expedite commuter traffic is not established. In addition, the conferees direct INS to immediately make the needed improvements, with $7,500,000 currently available in construction resources, to the San Clemente checkpoint and expect the procurements required to complete these improvements to be made on an expedited basis. The conferees further stipulate that if INS fails to complete these improvements by July 1, 1996, the checkpoint will close immediately until the improvements are completed. However, funds will be available, subject to the reprogramming requirements in section 605 of this Act, to reopen the checkpoint if the Attorney General certifies that exigent circumstances exist. The conferees also expect that INS continue its policy that eliminates high speed pursuits at these checkpoints and direct INS to seek approval by the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate prior to any change in this policy. Furthermore, the conferees direct INS to assign staff to these checkpoints at the full authorized strength and provide additional permanent interior enforcement personnel to Oceanside, Vista, and Carlsbad, California in order to address the problem of alien smuggling operations and related criminal activity in the communities surrounding these checkpoints.

CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes $25,000,000 for Construction for INS, instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House and $35,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following: (1) $7,000,000 for border infrastructure improvements; (2) $4,300,000 for a triple fencing pilot project along the San Diego border; (3) $2,700,000 to renovate Charleston Naval Base for a satellite training facility for the Border Patrol; and (4) $11,000,000 for construction costs for the planned joint INS/U.S. Marshals detention facility to be located in Batavia, New York.

Border Patrol training facility.—The Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate approved a reprogramming for $2,300,000 submitted by the Department of Justice on August 11, 1995, to upgrade and modify facilities at the Charleston Naval Base to meet additional training requirements of the Border Patrol which exceed the capacity of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center at Glynco, Georgia. The selection of Charleston Naval Base as the new Border Patrol training center was announced by the Department of Justice on July 28, 1995, following a competitive evaluation of several active and former Department of Defense facilities.

Justice Department officials recently informed the House and Senate Appropriations Committee of their desire to establish two INS training facilities, instead of the single Border Patrol facility at Charleston. Their latest proposal would establish a new training facility for INS personnel, other than the border patrol, at Charleston, and a new, separate Border Patrol training facility be constructed at another location.

The conferees have reviewed the most recent Department of Justice proposal and agree that only one additional training facility is necessary to meet INS training requirements for the Border Patrol and that INS should prioritize its remaining training requirements and accommodate this training at the FLETC and through exported training in INS field locations. The conferees have reviewed cost estimates submitted by the Naval Facilities Command and are confident of the accuracy of the Navy's cost estimates and schedule. The conferees question whether a training facility at another location can be constructed more expeditiously and for less cost and believe that the Department has already delayed the process needlessly. Accordingly, the conferees have agreed that construction and modifications at the Charleston Naval Base for the new Border Patrol Training Facility, the site already approved by both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, should proceed without further delay.

IMMIGRATION EMERGENCY FUND

The conferees have included language in section 605 of this Act, which applies reprogramming requirements to the unobligated balances from prior years of all agencies covered in this Act, including all unobligated balances available in the Immigration Emergency Fund.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $2,581,078,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Prison System, instead of $2,588,078,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $13,500,000 will be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF), as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees also agree that in addition to amounts appropriated, $47,000,000 will be available from unobligated balances from the prior year, instead of $40,000,000 as assumed in both the House and Senate bills. The amount provided is the full amount requested to activate all facilities that are scheduled to open in 1996 and is to be used for the purposes set forth in the House and Senate reports, including activations and expansions of prisons at the following locations: Beaumont, Texas; Taft, California; Forrest City, Arkansas; Tallahassee, Florida; Milan, Michigan; Lompac, California; Fort Worth, Texas; and Lexington, Kentucky. In addition the conferees agree that funding should also be provided so that facilities located in Yazoo City, Mississippi, and Brooklyn, New York are prepared for activation and to ensure that security is not compromised.

The conferees also agreed to include bill language prohibiting the privatization of

Federal prison facilities located in Forrest City, Arkansas and Yazoo City, Mississippi, which were included as part of the Administration's proposal to privatize most future pretrial, minimum, and low security prisons.

National Institute of Corrections.—The conferees recognize the value of and support the continuation of activities and programs of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC). Beginning in fiscal year 1996, funding for NIC shall be included in the Bureau of Prisons Salaries and Expenses budget, Contract Confinement program. The conferees have included $8,000,000 for this purpose. The NIC shall continue to carry out all functions currently performed by the NIC as outlined in sections 4351–5353 of title 18 United States Code, with the exception of its grant program. Because these activities are primarily performed on behalf of State and local entities, the conferees expect the Bureau of Prisons, when practical and to the maximum extent possible, to pursue reimbursement from State and local entities for these services and to present a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate by June 30, 1996, that outlines a reimbursement structure that will fully support these activities.

Health care privatization demonstration project.—The conferees understand that health care costs are one of the fastest growing components of the Bureau of Prisons budget. The conferees agree that the Bureau of Prisons should develop and provide a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate by March 1, 1996, to utilize private and other contracts to provide medical care for inmates, including the use of telemedicine and electronic media. The conferees agree that the Bureau of Prisons should conduct a demonstration project at a minimum of one Federal correctional complex beginning in fiscal year 1996 and for the duration of not less than three years as outlined in the Senate report.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

The conference agreement includes $334,728,000 for construction, modernization, maintenance and repair of prison and detention facilities housing Federal prisoners, instead of $323,728,000 as proposed by the House and $349,410,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for the following program enhancements:

Beaumont, TX, Medium Security Facility	$64,500,000
Western Region, Architectural/Engineering design	11,000,000
Mid-Atlantic Region, Site/Planning and design	12,350,000
Lee County, VA, Medium Security Facility and Camp	96,550,000
Hawaii, Detention Space Site/Planning	14,253,000
Marshals Service Holding Facilities	20,051,000
Health and Safety Renovations	4,526,000

The conferees have agreed to provide funding for one facility in the Western Region, as proposed by the Administration. The conferees direct the Bureau of Prisons to select one of the two sites considered in their long range plan and to notify the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate of this decision, with appropriate justification, by January 15, 1996.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

(LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES)

The conference agreement includes a limitation on administrative expenses of $3,559,000 for the Federal Prison Industries, as proposed by both the House and Senate bills.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

The conference agreement includes $302,377,000 for Justice Assistance, instead of $250,377,000 as proposed by the House and $345,245,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $202,400,000 shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF), instead of $152,400,000 as proposed by the House and $242,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following programs from direct appropriations and the VCRTF:

Direct Appropriation:	
National Institute of Justice	$30,000,000
Defense/Law Enforcement Technology Network	*(7,800,000)*
Bureau of Justice Statistics	21,379,000
Missing Children	5,971,000
Regional Information Sharing System	14,500,000
White Collar Crime Information Center	3,850,000
Management and Administration	24,277,000
Total, Direct Appropriation	99,977,000
Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund:	
Violence Against Women Act Programs:	
General Grants	130,000,000
Court-Appointed Special Advocate Program	6,000,000
Child Abuse Training Programs for Judicial Personnel	750,000
Grants for Televised Testimony	50,000
Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies	28,000,000
Rural Domestic Violence	7,000,000
National Stalker and Domestic Violence Reduction	1,500,000
Federal Victims Counselors *(included under U.S. Attorneys)*	*(500,000)*
Training Programs	1,000,000
Study of State detadases	200,000
Total, Violence Against Women Act	174,500,000
Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners	27,000,000
Safe Return Program	900,000
Total, Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund	202,400,000

Defense/law enforcement technology transfer.—The conferees support the efforts of the Departments of Justice and Defense to identify defense and other advanced technologies for law enforcement purposes. The conference agreement provides $7,800,000 to assist the National Institute of Justice in its efforts to adopt technologies for law enforcement purposes. Within this amount, $5,000,000 is provided for continuation of the law enforcement technology network, as proposed by the Senate, and $2,800,000 is to expand the technology commercialization initiative, as proposed by the House.

Missing children.—The conference agreement provides $5,971,000 for the Missing Children Program as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees agree that within this amount, consideration be given to the establishment of an exploited child unit within the National Center of Missing and Exploited Children to assist in the nationwide investigation of child sex offenses.

National White Collar Crime Center.—The conference agreement includes $3,850,000 for the National White Collar Crime Center as proposed by the House, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided, $2,100,000 is for the ongoing operations of the NWCCC and $1,750,000 is for the establishment of a State and local law enforcement support capability for computer crimes.

Management and administration.—The conference agreement provides $24,277,000 for Management and Administration expenses of the Office of Justice Programs. In addition, the budget assumes that up to one percent of the total appropriation for each program funded under the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund may be used for management and administration expenses of those programs. The conferees agree with that assumption. Further, if one percent is insufficient to support the administration of these programs, the Attorney General may request an increase in that percentage in accordance with the reprogramming requirements in section 605 of this Act.

Violence Against Women Act Programs.—The conference agreement provides $175,000,000 for Violence Against Women Act programs as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House. Of the total provided, $500,000 is included under the U.S. Attorneys appropriation for Federal Victim's Counselors. The conference agreement also includes language as proposed by the Senate, to clarify that funds provided for Grants to Combat Violence Against Women and to Encourage Arrest Policies are provided to States, units of local governments and Indian Tribal governments.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

The conference agreement includes $3,393,200,000 for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance, instead of $3,333,343,000 as proposed by the House and $3,487,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, the conference agreement provides that $3,005,200,000 shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF), instead of $3,283,343,000 as proposed by the House and $3,147,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following programs from direct appropriations and the VCRTF:

Direct Appropriation	
Byrne Discretionary Grants	$60,000,000
Byrne Formula Grants	328,000,000
Total Direct Appropriations	388,000,000
Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund:	
Byrne Formula Grants	147,000,000
Local Law Enforcement Block Grant	1,903,000,000
Upgrade Criminal History Records (Brady Bill)	25,000,000
State Prison Grants	617,500,000
Alien Incarceration	*(200,000,000)*
Cooperative Agreement Program	*(12,500,000)*
State Criminal Alien Incarceration Program	300,000,000
DNA Identification Grants	1,000,000
Information Technology Grants	9,000,000
Law Enforcement Family Support Programs	1,000,000

Tuberculosis in Prisons ..	200,000
Gang Information System	1,000,000
Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention	500,000
Total, Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund	3,005,200,000

Edward Byrne grants to States.—The conference agreement provides $535,000,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program, of which $60,000,000 is for discretionary grants and $475,000,000 is provided under the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund for formula grants under this program.

Byrne discretionary grants.—The conference agreement provides $60,000,000 for discretionary grants under Chapter A of the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Assistance Program, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $80,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the amount provided, the conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to provide:

$28,500,000 for the Weed and Seed program;

$4,000,000 for State and local law enforcement activities related to the 1996 Olympic Games;

$3,000,000 for the National Crime Prevention Council to continue and expand the National Citizens Crime Prevention Campaign (McGruff);

$1,750,000 to continue and expand the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program;

$2,000,000 for continued funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force;

$1,000,000 for continued funding for the National Judicial College;

$4,350,000 for a grant to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America; and

$1,000,000 to SEARCH Group, Inc. to continue and expand the National Technical Assistance Program, which provides support to State and local criminal justice agencies to improve their use of computers and information technology.

Within the available resources the conferees also urge BJA to favorably consider funding for the Centers of Excellence on Violence Prevention; the National Night Out Program; and the Center of Advanced Support in Technology for Law Enforcement (CASTLE), as stated in the Senate report.

State identification grants.—The conference agreement does not include $60,000,000 or authorize a new State Technology Grant program as proposed by the Senate under section 119. The conferees understand the intent of the program is to grant funds to State and local governments to upgrade their criminal justice identification systems for linkage to national databases such as the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS), NCIC 2000, ballistics testing systems, and DNA Identification Systems. However, the conferees also understand that the two primary systems, IAFIS and NCIC 2000, are not scheduled to be on-line until 1988. Thus, providing funding for State linkages to these systems at this time is premature. However, the conferees recognize that State and local governments could benefit from systems upgrades and linkages for ballistics testing and DNA identification and analysis. Therefore, the conference agreement provides a total of $21,000,000 under the FBI and DEA for the FBI's DNA CODIS system and DRUGFIRE system, including funding for State systems upgrades. In addition, $10,000,000 is provided under the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund for Information Technology and DNA identification grants and $25,000,000 is provided to upgrade criminal history records in order to implement the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), resulting from the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND PROGRAMS

Local law enforcement block grant.—The conference agreement includes $1,903,000,000 for a Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,690,000,000 for the Community Policing Program, $100,000,000 for Drug Courts, $10,000,000 for rural law enforcement, $2,000,000 for the Ounce of Prevention Council and $30,000,000 for crime prevention programs, as proposed by the Senate.

The Local Law Enforcement Block Grant will provide resources directly to local communities to permit them to combat violent crime according to their local needs and priorities. This includes putting more police on America's streets. The conferees have included language encouraging localities to use funding provided under this block grant to hire additional police and to build on the police hiring initiative funded in fiscal year 1995. the block grant requires a local match of 10 percent, as compared to 25 percent under the Community Policing Program, thereby enabling more communities to hire police.

The conference agreement provides that the funding will be distributed for this block grant to local governments by using the outline provided in H.R. 728, as passed by the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995, with some modifications, and may be used at the discretion of local governments for the following purposes:

(1) Hiring, training, and employing on a continuing basis new, additional law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel;

(2) Paying overtime to presently employed law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel;

(3) Procuring equipment, technology, and other material directly related to basic law enforcement functions;

(4) Enhancing security measures in and around schools and any other facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidents of crime;

(5) Establishing or supporting drug courts;

(6) Enhancing the adjudication process of cases involving violent juvenile offenders; and

(7) Establishing multi-jurisdictional task forces, particularly in rural areas, composed of Federal and local law enforcement officials to prevent and control crime.

The conferees have also included language that clarifies that the types of prevention programs allowed under the law enforcement block grant are programs that involve cooperation between community residents and law enforcement in order to control, detect, or investigate crime or to prosecute criminals. Examples of these programs currently used in many local communities which have high rates of success include the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program, National McGruff Network programs, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and other direct police-sponsored programs such as neighborhood watch programs. The conferees have also included as an allowable use under the block grant the purchase of insurance to indemnify sworn law enforcement officers subjected to legal action as a result of the discharge of their duty, in cases where the officer acted in good faith and in a manner in which the officer reasonably believed to be in the best interest of public safety. In addition, the conference agreement provides that $10,000,000 of the total amount provided will be available for educational expenses under the Police Corps program.

National instant criminal background check system.—The conference agreement provides $25,000,000 for states to upgrade criminal history records as required under the Brady Bill and for the FBI to complete development of the national instant criminal background check system, as proposed by both the House and Senate.

State prison grants.—The conference agreement provides $617,500,000 for State Prison Grants pursuant to section 114 of this Act which amends the Prison Grant program included in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Of this amount, $200,000,000 is provided for reimbursement to States for the incarceration of criminal aliens and $12,500,000 is provided for the Cooperative Agreement Program. The remaining $405,000,000 is intended for General Grants and Truth-in-Sentencing Grants and administration of the program and includes a $1,215,000 set-aside for Indian Tribes to build corrections facilities.

State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.—The conference agreement provides $300,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program for reimbursement to States for the costs of incarceration of criminal aliens, as proposed by both the House and Senate. In addition to this amount the conferees have also agreed to provide $200,000,000 for this purpose under the State Prison Grants program, as proposed by the House. Thus, the conferees recommend a total of $500,000,000 for reimbursement to states for alien incarceration, as proposed by the House. The conferees have also agreed to provide this funding pursuant to section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as proposed by the Senate, instead of pursuant to section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, as proposed by the House, so that funds will also be available for political subdivisions of the State.

Youthful offender incarceration grants.—The conference agreement provides funding for youthful offender incarceration grants as an allowable use under the State Prison Grant program. Therefore, funding is not included under this separate program as proposed by both House and Senate.

DNA identification State grants.—The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for DNA Identification State Grants, as proposed by both the House and Senate.

Improved training and technology/automation grants.—The conference agreement provides $9,000,000 for Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House. As stated in the House report, the conferees expect that within the overall amounts recommended, the Office of Justice Programs will examine the following proposals, provide grants if warranted, and report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on its intentions for each proposal: (1) North Carolina fingerprint system, and (2) San Francisco communication system.

Law Enforcement Family Support Programs.—The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for law enforcement family support programs, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Treatment of tuberculosis in correctional institutions.—The conference agreement provides $200,000 for treatment of tuberculosis in State and Federal Correctional institutions, as proposed by the House.

Gang investigation coordination and information collection.—The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for improved information collection on gang investigations as proposed by both the House and Senate. The conferees

are aware that the Regional Information Sharing System (RISS) is developing gang databases for use by State and local law enforcement agencies and encourage the Office of Justice Programs to utilize the RISS network to enhance the collection of gang investigative information.

Motor vehicle theft prevention.—The conference agreement includes $500,000 for grants to combat motor vehicle theft as proposed by the House, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

The conference agreement includes $28,500,000 for the Weed and Seed program, instead of $23,500,000 as proposed by the House and $43,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that the total amount provided shall be derived from discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs. Within the amounts provided, the conferees expect that $270,000 will be provided to the Gospel Mission of Washington, D.C., for the purpose of renovating the former Fulton Hotel and converting it into a drug treatment center for women.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

The conference agreement includes $148,500,000 for Juvenile Justice programs as proposed by the House, instead of $168,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to eliminate a provision proposed by the House that provided $10,000,000 of discretionary grants under this program to be used for the Weed and Seed program. The conferees suggest that these funds be used to enhance grants addressing youth gangs and related violence and have therefore agreed to also eliminate a provision proposed by the Senate that provided an additional $20,000,000 for youth gang prevention from discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs.

Juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.—Of the total amount provided, $144,000,000 is for grants and administrative expenses for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) programs including:

1. $5,000,000 for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (Part A).

2. $70,000,000 for Formula Grants for assistance to State and local programs (Part B).

3. $25,000,000 for Discretionary Grant for National Programs and Special Emphasis Programs (Part C). Within the amount provided for Part C discretionary grants, the conferees expect the OJJDP to provide:

$2,300,000 to continue and expand the National Council of Juvenile and Family Courts which provides continuing legal education in family and juvenile law;

$1,000,000 for the Teens, Crime and the Community program; and

$250,000 for the Low Country Children's Center.

In addition, the conferees also expect OJJDP to examine each of the following proposals included in the House and Senate reports, to provide grants if warranted, and to report to the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and Senate on its intentions for each proposal:

A grant to the Santa Fe Boys and Girls Club;

A grant to the Mable Dodge Lujan Foundation in Taos, New Mexico;

A grant to the Kids Peace national Center for Kids for its Intensive Treatment Family Program;

A grant to Parents Anonymous Inc.;

A grant to continue funding for an Institute for Families in Society Study; and

A grant to the Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior.

4. $10,000,000 to expand the Youth Gangs (Part D) program which provides grants to public and private nonprofit organizations to prevent and reduce the participation of at-risk youth in the activities of gangs that commit crimes.

5. $10,000,000 for Discretionary Grants for State Challenge Activities (Part E) to increase the amount of a State's formula grant by up to 10 percent, if that State agrees to undertake some or all of the ten challenge activities designed to improve various aspects of a State's juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs.

6. $4,000,000 for the Juvenile Mentoring Program (Part G) to reduce juvenile delinquency, improve academic performance, and reduce the drop-out rate among at-risk youth through the use of mentors by bringing together young people in high crime areas with law enforcement officers and other responsible adults who are willing to serve as long-term mentors.

7. $20,000,000 for Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs (Title V), to units of general local government for delinquency prevention programs and other activities for at-risk youth.

Victims of Child Abuse Act.—The conference agreement includes $4,500,000 for the various programs authorized under the Victims of Child Abuse Act (VOCA). In addition, funding of $6,750,000 is provided for Victims of Child Abuse programs under the Violence Against Women Programs funded by the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. The following programs are included in the recommendation:

$4,500,000 to Improve Investigations and Prosecutions (Subtitle A) as follows:

$500,000 to establish Regional Children's Advocacy Centers, as authorized by section 213 of VOCA.

$2,000,000 to establish local Children's Advocacy Centers, as authorized by section 214 of VOCA.

$1,500,000 for a continuation grant to the National Center for Prosecution of Child Abuse for specialized technical assistance and training programs to improve the prosecution of child abuse cases, as authorized by section 214a of VOCA.

$500,000 for a continuation grant to the National Network of Child Advocacy Centers for technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 214a of VOCA.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

The conference agreement includes $2,134,000 for Public Safety Officers benefits as proposed by both the House and the Senate bills.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes the following general provisions for the Department of Justice:

Section 101.—The conference agreement includes section 101 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which makes up to $45,000 of the funds appropriated to the Department of Justice available for reception and representation expenses.

Sec. 102.—The conference agreement includes section 102 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which continues certain authorities for the Justice Department in fiscal year 1996 that were contained in the Department of Justice Authorization Act, fiscal year 1980.

Sec. 103.—The conference agreement includes section 103 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which prohibits the use of funds to perform abortions in the Federal Prison System.

Sec. 104.—The conference agreement includes section 104 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which prohibits use of the funds in this bill to require any person to perform, or facilitate the performance of, an abortion.

Sec. 105.—The conference agreement includes section 105 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which states that nothing in the previous section removes the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services to female inmates who seek to obtain abortions outside a Federal facility.

Sec. 106.—The conferees have agreed to modify section 106 as proposed by both the House and Senate, which allows the Department of Justice to spend up to $10,000,000 for rewards for information regarding acts of terrorism against a United States person or property at levels not to exceed $2,000,000 per award, in order to clarify that the provision relates to rewards that are publicly-advertised and offered to the general public.

Sec. 107.—The conference agreement includes section 107 as proposed in the Senate bills, which allows the Department of Justice, subject to reprogramming procedures, to transfer up to 5 percent between any appropriation, but limits to 10 percent the amount that can be transferred into any one appropriation. The House bill excluded the Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance account from this authority.

Sec. 108.—The conference agreement includes section 108 as proposed in the House and Senate bills, which allows the Federal Prison System's Commissary Fund to invest amounts not needed for operations of the United States.

Sec. 109.—The conference agreement includes section 109 as proposed in the House and Senate bills, that allows balances remaining in the Assets Forfeiture Fund after September 30, 1995 to be available to the Attorney General for any authorized purpose of the Department of Justice.

Sec. 110.—The conference agreement includes section 110 as proposed in the Senate bill, which prohibits the transfer of Justice Department funds in fiscal year 1996 and hereafter, to other Departments and the Office of Management and Budget. The House bill prohibited this transfer only for fiscal year 1996.

Sec. 111.—The conference agreement includes section 111 as proposed in the House and Senate bills, which extends the quarterly fee payments for debtors under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code to include the period from when a reorganization plan is confirmed by the Bankruptcy Court until the case is converted or dismissed. The conferees intend that this fee will apply to both pending and new cases.

Sec. 112.—The conference agreement includes section 112 as proposed in the House and Senate bills, that continues the undercover operations authorities for the FBI and DEA for one year. No new authorities are provided.

Sec. 113.—The conference agreement includes section 113 as proposed in the House and Senate bills, that allows the user fee surcharge currently collected by the FBI to defray automation costs related to the development of the NCIC 2000 and Uniform Crime Report systems in addition to costs of the fingerprint identification system.

Sec. 114.—The conferees have agreed to include section 114 and have revised the language proposed in the Senate bill which authorizes a new Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants program to replace the program currently authorized in Title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The House bill referenced the Prison Grant program authorized under H.R. 667 as passed by the House on February 10, 1995, for

resources provided for this grant program under the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

The conferees agree that the Prison Grant program should reward and provide an incentive to States that are taking the necessary steps to keep violent criminals off the streets. The conferees further agree that the program currently authorized in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 fails to provide an adequate incentive because it allows fifty percent of the funds to be awarded to States even if they have not moved toward truth-in-sentencing and even if they have not increased the percentage of convicted violent offenders sentenced to prison or the time served.

The revised language included in this section authorized $10,270,000,000 for fiscal years 1996 through 2000 for States to build or expand correctional facilities for the purpose of incarcerating criminals convicted of Part I violent crimes, or persons adjudicated delinquent for an act which if committed by an adult, would be a Part I violent crime. It does not allow funds to be used to operate prisons as provided in the current program and it requires a 10-percent match by the State instead of a 25-percent match as included in the current program. The conferees agree that in developing criteria for determining the eligibility for funding to build or expand bedspace, the Department of Justice should include a requirement that States demonstrate the ability to fully support, operate and maintain the prison for which the State is seeking construction funds.

The provision would establish two grant programs to States: (1) General grants which will receive one-third of the funds, and (2) Truth-in-Sentencing grants which will receive two-thirds of the funds; except when the appropriation exceeds $750,000,000 for the Prison Grant program in which case each grant program will receive 50 percent of the funds. The conference agreement increases the minimum grant award to 0.6 percent for General grants and to 2.0 percent or 2.5 percent for Truth-in-Sentencing grants (depending on the number of States qualifying for Truth-in-Sentencing grants). A State would qualify for a General grant if it practices indeterminate sentencing and since 1993 has increased the percentage of persons convicted of a Part I violent crime sentenced to prison and increased the average time served in the State for offenses of murder, rape, and robbery under the State's sentencing and release guidelines for such offenses. A State also would qualify for a General grant if it does not practice indeterminate sentencing but since 1993 it has increased the percentage of convicted violent offenders sentenced to prison, increased the average length of such offenders given sentences, and required that such offenders actually serve a higher percentage of their sentences. A State would qualify for a Truth-in-Sentencing grant if it has enacted truth-in-sentencing laws which require criminals convicted of Part I violent crimes to serve at least 85 percent of their sentences. A State also would qualify for Truth-in-Sentencing grants if it practices indeterminate sentencing and it can demonstrate that the average time served for Part I violent crimes in the State equals at least 85 percent of the sentence established under the State's sentencing and release guidelines.

Other provisions of the new authorization require that States share up to 15 percent of the funds received with counties and other units of local government for the construction and expansion of correctional facilities, including jails, to the extent that such units of local government house State prisoners due to States carrying out the policies of the Act. In addition, under exigent circumstances, States may also use funds to expand juvenile correctional facilities, including pretrial detention facilities and juvenile boot camps. States are also required to implement policies that provide for the recognition of the rights and needs of crime victims to be eligible for grants. The authorization also includes the availability of appropriations to reimburse States that satisfy truth-in-sentencing requirements for the incarceration of criminal aliens. In addition, funds are available, to the extent they are appropriated, for the Cooperative Agreement Program for the short-term housing of Federal prisoners in State institutions and a set-aside program has been included for Indian tribes to build correctional facilities.

Sec. 115.—The conference agreement includes section 115 as proposed by the Senate which allows the Federal Prison System to enter into contracts and other agreements with private entities for a multi-year period for the confinement of Federal prisoners.

The conferees have agreed not to include section 116 as proposed by the Senate, which would have provided the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the same overseas danger pay authority currently provided to the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The conferees have agreed not to include section 117 as proposed by the Senate, which would have removed restrictions on the commercial sale of goods and services produced or provided by the Federal Prison Industries if the President certified that the sale of such goods or services would not result in the loss of jobs in the private sector or adversely affect the sale of private sector goods or services sold on a local or regional basis.

Sec. 116.—The conference agreement includes section 118 as proposed by the Senate and changes the number to section 116, which amends the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to exempt States which have adopted same-day registration laws prior to August 1, 1994, rather than March 11, 1993, as in current law.

The conferees have agreed not to include section 119 as proposed in the Senate bill which would have provided authorization for a new State grant program for identification systems and would have appropriated $60,000,000 for this program under the Office of Justice Programs.

The conferees have agreed not to include section 120 as proposed in the Senate bill which would have required the Attorney General to reserve not less than two percent, but not more than three percent of the funds appropriated for the Local Crime Prevention Block Grant program, the Weed and Seed program, and the Youth Gang program under Juvenile Justice, to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

However, the conferees are aware that there is a diverse group of programs funded by the Department of Justice to assist State and local law enforcement and communities in preventing crime. The conferees are concerned that there has not been a recent comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of all of these programs and expects that nine months after enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both House and Senate, a thorough evaluation of the crime programs funded by the Office of Justice Programs, with special emphasis on factors that relate to juvenile crime and the effect of these programs on youth violence.

The conferees further expect that research for this evaluation will (1) be provided directly or through grants and contracts, (2) be independent in nature, and (3) employ rigorous and scientifically recognized standards and methodologies. It is further expected that the evaluation will measure, but shall not be limited to: (a) reductions in delinquency, juvenile crime, youth gang activity, youth substance abuse, and other high risk factors; (b) reductions in the risk factors in the community, schools, and family environments that contribute to juvenile violence; and (c) increases in the protective factors that reduce the likelihood of delinquency and criminal behavior.

Sec. 117.—The conference agreement includes section 121 as proposed by the Senate and changes the number to section 117, which prohibits the use of voter registration cards by any Federal agency as proof of citizenship.

The conferees have agreed not to include section 122 as proposed by the Senate which would have required the reimbursement to localities for the incarceration of criminal aliens for both 1996 and 1995 expenses. However, the conferees have agreed to provide funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program pursuant to section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as proposed by the Senate, so that funds provided in 1996 will be available for political subdivisions of the State. This change is included under Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

Sec. 118.—The conference agreement includes section 123 as proposed by the Senate and changes the number to section 118, which gives the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration the same authority provided to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the FBI to use a government vehicle for home to work transportation.

Sec. 119.—The conference agreement includes new language that authorizes the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to receive and determine the validity and amounts of claims by U.S. nationals against the Federal Republic of Germany covered by article 2(2) of the Agreement Between the United States and Germany Concerning Final Benefits to Certain United States Nationals Who Were Victims of National Socialist Measures of Persecution, which became enforceable September 19, 1995. In deciding claims under subsection (a) of this section, the conferees intend that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission consider on the merits the claim of any person who has not benefited from the compensation provided under article 2(1) of the agreement. In applying the criteria set forth in article 1 of the agreement, the conferees expect the Commission will determine whether an institution should be considered a ''concentration camp'' based on whether the institution is recognized by relevant authorities as a concentration camp or whether conditions at the institution in question were comparable to conditions at a recognized concentration camp.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES

TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $20,889,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the amount proposed in the Senate bill, and $60,000 below the amount proposed in the House bill.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $40,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of

the International Trade Commission (ITC) for fiscal year 1996, instead of $42,500,000 as proposed by the House and $34,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees expect ITC to apply any necessary staffing reductions proportionately to all agency offices, including program as well as administrative support offices.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $264,885,000 for the operations and administration of the International Trade Administration for fiscal year 1996 as proposed by the House, instead of $266,079,000 as proposed by the Senate. The following table reflects the distribution of these funds by activity agreed to by the conferees:

Trade Development	$56,485,000
Int'l Economic Policy	18,400,000
Import Administration	29,200,000
U.S. & F.C.S.	162,600,000
Carryover	−2,000,000
Total, ITA	264,885,000

The conferees intend that this distribution be used as the basis for any proposed reprogramming of funds under this account.

The conferees concur with the language included in the House report regarding the Office of Textiles and Apparels, the National Textile Center, and the Textile/Clothing Technology Corporation. Amounts provided for Trade Development include funding for each of these items in accordance with the House report. The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 for the Market Development Cooperator Program under Trade Development. Therefore, Trade Development operations are maintained at current services levels.

The conferees expect the funds provided for the Import Administration to support a personnel level sufficient to support the enforcement of trade laws.

The conferees intend that amounts provided above the base for the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service are for domestic field restructuring and expansion of the Commercial Service in the big emerging markets.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $38,604,000 for the Bureau of Export Administration (BXA) as proposed by the Senate, instead of $38,644,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the conference agreement includes a new proviso, not in either bill, allowing payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided to support export administration activities to be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities.

The conferees understand that BXA maintains carryover balances of approximately $3,000,000, and expect the Department to submit a notification of the proposed use of these carryover amounts in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The conference agreement includes $328,500,000 for the Economic Development Administration grant programs as proposed by the House instead of $89,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The following table shows the distribution of these funds by activity as agreed to by the conferees:

Public Works (Title I)	$165,200,000
Planning	24,400,000
Technical Assistance	9,900,000
Defense Conversion	90,000,000
Economic Adjustment (Title IX)	30,000,000
Trade Adjustment Assistance	8,500,000
Research and Evaluation	500,000

The conference agreement increases amounts for Economic Adjustment (Title IX) above the request in order to provide assistance to communities impacted by economic dislocations such as reduced timber harvests on Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service lands and coal industry downswings. Expenditure of funds provided over the amount of the request for this activity shall be subject to the reprogramming procedures outlined in section 605 of the accompanying Act.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 for salaries and expenses for the EDA as proposed by the House instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect EDA to use either the Salaries and Expenses appropriation or the revolving fund (under 42 U.S.C. 3143) to pay the salaries and expenses of the EDA Liquidation Division.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

The conference agreement includes $32,000,000 for the programs of the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) as proposed by the House instead of $32,789,000 as proposed by the Senate. In addition, the conferees have deleted language included in the Senate bill which would have transferred $1,000,000 of prior year unobligated balances under this account to a new Commerce Reorganization Transition Fund.

The conferees endorse language included in the House report regarding funding for programs that further minority business participation in technology commercialization. Further, the conferees expect MBDA to reduce FTE in order to achieve an appropriate ratio of support staff to total program level.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $2,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration as proposed by the House instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. These funds are to remain available through December 31, 1995.

ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conferees have provided $45,900,000 for salaries and expenses of the activities funded under the Economic and Statistical Analysis account instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $46,896,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION

REVOLVING FUND

The conference agreement includes language allowing the dissemination of economic and statistical data products as full cost as proposed in both the House and Senate bills.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $133.812,000 for the Bureau of the Census Salaries and Expenses account as proposed by the Senate instead of $136,000,000 as proposed by the House. Within the amounts provided, the conferees expect the Bureau to continue the initiative to restructure standard industrial codes.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

The conferees have provided $150,300,000 for the Census Bureau's Periodic Censuses and Programs account instead of $135,000,000 as proposed by the House and $193,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have included the following amounts for Census programs:

Economic Censuses	$25,000,000
Census of governments	2,000,000
Census of agriculture	10,000,000
Intercensal Demographic estimates	5,000,000
Decennial Census	50,000,000
Continuous measurement	9,000,000
Sample redesign	3,000,000
CASIC	4,000,000
Geographic support	36,000,000
Data processing systems	12,000,000
Less Deobligations	−3,100,000
Less carryover	−2,600,000
Total	150,300,000

The conferees intend that this distribution be used as the basis for any proposed reprogramming of funds in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

The amount provided under this account reflects the conferees' continuing concerns with the inability of the Census bureau to recognize budgetary realities. The Bureau is preparing to undertake the Year 2000 decennial census during a time of severe budget constraints within the Federal government. It is critical that the Bureau act now to reprioritize statistical needs and to streamline operations in order to function within these fiscal constraints. The conferees are concerned that the Bureau and the Department have failed to submit a proposal, requested in the House report, on reprioritization of statistical programs and possible program eliminations. The conferees believe that this review is critical, and expect the Department to submit this proposal to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than January 15, 1996.

Further, the conferees are disturbed that the Bureau continues to exceeds its full-time equivalent employment (FTE) ceiling. While the conferees understand the cyclical nature of the Bureau's programs, this continuing coverage is of particular concern since it has occurred during the Bureau's low point in the ten year census cycle. According to the National Research Council's report on census modernization, between 1970 and 1990 the cost of Bureau headquarters management increased from $30,000,000 to $105,000,000, a 350 percent increase, and headquarters staff increased by almost 3,000 FTE, a 67 percent increase. The conferees believe that there are areas which can and must be streamlined and reduced. The conferees expect the Bureau to include in the aforementioned report an explanation of the cause, cost, and duration of the FTE ceiling coverage and its plans to remedy this situation.

Census 2000.—The conferees continue to be concerned about progress related to the next decennial census. The Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate have for several years cautioned the Bureau that the cost of the Year 2000 Census had to be kept in check, and that only through early planning and decision making could costs be controlled.

The conferees recognize the fiscal year 1996 is a critical year in planning for the decennial census, and that numerous decisions will be made and preparations taken which will have a significant bearing on the overall cost of conducting the census, as well as the design selected. In light of the impact these decisions will have on future appropriations in an era of shrinking resources, the conferees expect the Bureau to consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, as well as the appropriate authorizing committees, and to submit a notification in

accordance with section 605 of the accompanying Act before implementing plans for the Year 2000 Census final design, methodology, content, and pre-census and post-census operations.

In addition, the conferees expect the Bureau to include in its report to the Committees, as described above, a response to the serious issues raised by the National Research Council concerning cost increases surrounding the 1990 Census and its plans to avoid such increases in the Year 2000 Census. The specific raised by the NRC to be addressed in this report include: (1) dramatic increases in census headquarters staffing and costs; (2) data collection cost increases; (3) data processing cost increases; (4) data dissemination costs; and (5) census testing costs.

Finally, the conferees are disappointed that the Bureau has failed to act on the stipulation included in the fiscal year 1995 House report directing the Bureau to work to obtain reimbursement from other Federal agencies for the costs associated with obtaining information on the decennial census. The conferees expect the Bureau to include in its report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees an explanation of its progress in implementing this action.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $17,000,000 for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration salaries and expenses instead of $19,709,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate bill included a total of $17,000,000 for NTIA salaries and expenses, of which $8,000,000 was provided through direct appropriations and $9,000,000 was provided by transfer from the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund for spectrum management. The conference agreement does not include a specific transfer of funds from the Justice Working Capital Fund into this account.

The conference agreement also includes language, as proposed by the Senate, expanding the purposes for which funds may be transferred to NTIA from other government agencies to include spectrum management, analysis and operations. The House bill addressed only funds transferred from other agencies for costs incurred in telecommunications research engineering and related activities by NTIA's Institute for Telecommunications Sciences. This language will allow NTIA to receive funds from other agencies to offset the cost of spectrum management, particularly those costs related to national security and law enforcement. The conferees expect NTIA, working with the Office of Management and Budget, to develop a proposal allowing for the reimbursement of spectrum management costs by other agency users and to provide a report on this proposal to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate no later than January 15, 1996.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes $15,500,000 for Public Broadcasting Facilities, Planning and Construction grants instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement allows up to $2,200,000 of this amount to be used for program administration, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

The conferees have provided $21,500,000 for NTIA's Information Infrastructure Grant program instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the amount provided, the conference agreement designates $3,000,000 for program administration, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have not included bill language proposed by the Senate requiring NTIA to add certain criteria to the factors taken into consideration in selecting projects funded under this program, including the extent to which a proposal is consistent with State plans and priorities and the extent to which particular applications have been coordinated with telecommunications and information entities within the State. However, the conferees support NTIA's use of such criteria as additional factors to be considered when selecting grants under this program.

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conferees have provided $82,324,000 for the Patent and Trademark Office as proposed by the Senate instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

The conference agreement includes $259,000,000 for the internal (core) research account of the National Institute of Standards and Technology instead of $263,000,000 as proposed by the House and $222,737,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees concur with the House and Senate position that the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Program be funded under this account. The conferees expect the remaining funds provided to be distributed proportionately to the activities delineated in the House report.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have earmarked $1,200,000 within the amount provided under this account for continuation of the ''green buildings'' program. The House bill contained no similar provision.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

The conference agreement includes $80,000,000 for the NIST external research account instead of $81,100,000 as proposed by the House and $101,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have provided this amount to fund only the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program as proposed by the House. The Senate bill would have allowed up to $25,300,000 to be used to support continuation grants for prior year Advanced Technology Program awards.

The conferees have provided $80,000,000 for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program instead of $81,100,000 as proposed by the House and $76,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees intend that these funds be applied in accordance with the direction given in the House report.

The conference agreement retains language included in both the House and Senate bills directing that no additional grants be awarded with carryover funds under the Advanced Technology Program, and that any remaining unobligated balances be used to fund continuation costs of ATP grants awarded in prior fiscal years.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

The conference agreement included $60,000,000 for the NIST Construction account as proposed by the House instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have included the House language allowing these funds to be used for both construction of new facilities and renovation of existing facilities rather than the Senate language which would have limited use of the funds to renovation of existing facilities only.

The conference agreement also includes, in a later section, the rescission of $75,000,000 of prior year carryover amounts from this account. The result of the conference action will allow NIST to obligate $79,000,000 under this account for fiscal year 1996. The conferees intend that these funds be used for the purpose of proceeding with the construction of a new Chemistry building at the NIST Gaithersburg campus, with the remaining $9,000,000 to be applied to routine maintenance and repair of structures at both the Gaithersburg and Boulder campuses. The conferees are also concerned about the obligation of more than $50,000,000 from this account late in fiscal year 1995, and expect NIST to submit no later than January 15, 1996, a full accounting of funds obligated under this account during fiscal year 1995. The conferees are particularly concerned about the obligation of $22,150,000 of funds against an existing contract for ''conservative estimates''. The conferees expect NIST to submit a reprogramming of funds in accordance with section 605 of this Act for any amounts subsequently deobligated under any NIST construction contract.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The conferees have provided an appropriation of $1,795,677,000 for the Operations, Research, and Facilities account of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) instead of $1,724,452,000 as proposed by the House and $1,809,092,000 as proposed by the Senate. In addition, the conference agreement allows $3,000,000 in offsetting fees related to the aeronautical charting program to be collected to offset this amount, resulting in a final direct appropriation of $1,792,677,000 instead of $1,721,452,000 as proposed by the House and $1,806,092,000 as proposed by the Senate.

In addition to the new budget authority provided, the conference agreement allows a transfer of $63,000,000 from balances in the account titled ''Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Related to American Fisheries'', instead of $57,500,000 as proposed by the House and $62,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate requiring the National Weather Service to expand not more than $700,000 to operate and maintain agricultural weather service centers. The House bill contained no similar provision. Funding for agricultural weather offices is addressed later in this report.

The conferees concur with instructions contained in the House and Senate reports regarding the development of a revised budget structure for NOAA in consultation with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and expect the submission of the fiscal year 1997 budget request to conform to this new structure.

The conferees are aware that, during the recent shutdown of Federal activities, NOAA utilized carryover funds from various programs, projects and activities to continue operating without following standard notification procedures required under section 605 of the Appropriations Act. Upon enactment of the accompanying Act, the conferees expect NOAA to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a detailed accounting of the carryover funds utilized for this purpose, including a plan for restoring those activities from which funds were redirected.

The conferees expect NOAA to use the Federal Ship Financing Fund to cover administrative expenses related to that account.

Unless specifically stated otherwise in this Statement of the Committee of the Conference, the conferees intend that amounts expended from the NOAA Operations, Research and Facilities account be allocated as previously described in the Committee reports of the House and Senate.

The following table reflects the distribution of the funds provided in this conference agreement:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
FY 1996 Budget

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE:					
Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy:					
Mapping and Charting	27,899	$31,086	$35,000	$31,086	34,000
Automated Nautical Charting System II	1,250	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Subtotal.....	29,149	33,586	37,500	33,586	36,500
Geodesy	20,667	19,927	20,927	20,927	20,167
Total, Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy	49,816	53,513	58,427	54,513	56,667
Observation and Assessment:					
Observation and Prediction	12,358	12,899	11,000	11,000	11,000
Circulatory survey program.....	700	700	0	700	0
Chesapeake Bay observation buoys....	400	0	400	0	400
Ocean services.....	4,418	4,451	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal.....	17,876	18,050	14,400	14,700	14,400
Estuarine and Coastal Assessment	2,674	3,130	2,674	2,674	2,674
Ocean assessment program.....	24,528	21,925	14,600	21,925	21,925
Damage assessment.....	1,200	4,500	1,200	3,200	1,200
Transfer from Damage Assessment Fund	6,770	6,550	6,550	6,550	6,550
Oil Pollution Act of 1990.....	1,300	1,395	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal.....	36,472	37,500	26,024	35,349	33,349

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Coastal Ocean Science					
Coastal ocean program.....	7,943	18,541	5,000	13,000	11,500
Oil Spill Research.....	800	0	0	0	0
National Institute of Envir. Renewal.....	500	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	9,243	18,541	5,000	13,000	11,500
Total, Observation and Assessment...	63,591	74,091	45,424	63,049	59,249
Ocean and Coastal Management:					
Coastal Management					
CZM grants.....	45,500	46,637	41,000	46,637	46,200
Estuarine research reserve system	3,350	4,214	0	0	1,000
Estuarine Management Plans	1,000	0	0	1,000	500
Nonpoint pollution control.....	5,000	8,000	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	54,850	58,851	41,000	47,637	47,700
Ocean Management					
Marine sanctuary program.....	8,961	12,371	11,000	12,371	11,685
Subtotal.....	8,961	12,371	11,000	12,371	11,685
Total, Ocean and Coastal Management.	63,811	71,222	52,000	60,008	59,385
TOTAL, NOS.....	177,218	198,826	155,851	177,570	175,301

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE:					
Information Collection & Analyses:					
Resource Information	73,677	94,171	76,285	83,171	83,171
Antarctic research	1,200	1,200	1,000	1,200	1,200
Chesapeake Bay Studies	1,890	1,890	1,000	1,500	1,500
Right whale research	214	214	0	214	200
Gear entanglement studies	651	651	0	0	0
MARFIN	3,780	3,780	3,000	3,000	3,000
SEAMAP	1,340	1,340	700	1,340	1,200
Aquaculture	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	1,250
Alaskan groundfish surveys	661	661	661	661	661
Bering Sea pollock research	945	945	945	945	945
West Coast groundfish	780	780	780	780	780
New England stock depletion	1,116	1,116	1,000	1,000	1,000
Hawaii stock management plan	500	0	0	500	500
Yukon River chinook salmon	700	700	500	700	700
Winter Run chinook salmon	250	250	0	250	0
Atlantic salmon research	710	710	500	710	710
Gulf of Maine groundfish survey	567	567	450	567	567
Dolphin/Yellowfin Tuna Research	500	500	0	500	250
Habitat research/evaluation	470	470	450	450	450
Pacific salmon treaty program	5,587	5,587	5,000	5,587	5,587
Fisheries Cooperative Inst.	410	410	0	410	410
Hawaiian monk seals	520	520	0	520	500
Stellar sea lion recovery plan	1,440	1,440	720	1,440	1,440
Hawaiian sea turtles	240	240	0	240	240
Atlantic bluefin tuna research	300	0	0	0	0
Halibut/Sablefish	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Subtotal	102,148	121,842	94,191	109,385	107,461

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Fishery Industry Information					
Fish statistics.....	11,937	14,187	13,000	13,000	13,000
Alaska groundfish monitoring.....	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200
PACFIN/catch effort data.....	2,300	2,300	2,300	3,000	3,000
Rec. fishery harvest monitoring.....	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Subtotal.....	22,337	24,587	23,400	24,100	24,100
Information Analyses & Dissemination	20,913	22,606	18,373	20,913	20,913
Computer hardware and software.....	5,000	5,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal.....	25,913	27,606	22,373	24,913	24,913
Total, Info., Collection, & Analyses..	150,398	174,035	139,964	158,398	156,474

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Conservation and Management Operations:					
Fisheries Management Programs	15,856	25,034	16,000	20,034	19,500
Columbia River hatcheries.....	10,300	10,300	9,000	10,300	10,300
Columbia River end. species studies..	288	288	140	288	288
Regional councils.....	8,556	10,200	9,000	10,200	10,200
International fisheries commissions..	1,250	400	395	950	400
Management of George's Bank.....	480	480	478	478	478
Beluga whale committee.....	200	0	200	200	200
Pacific tuna management.....	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	1,500
Subtotal.....	38,930	48,702	35,213	44,450	42,866
Protected Species Management	4,939	6,368	5,000	5,000	6,225
ESA listing & status review.....	930	930	0	930	0
Tissue bank & stranding network.....	295	295	0	295	0
Driftnet Act implementation.....	3,000	3,000	2,500	3,278	3,278
Marine Mammal Protection Act.....	8,000	10,250	6,000	10,250	9,000
Endangered species recovery plans	7,000	14,800	3,000	14,800	13,000
Fishery observer training.....	300	0	300	417	417
East Coast observers.....	700	700	350	350	350
Subtotal.....	25,164	36,343	17,150	35,320	32,270

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Habitat Conservation	7,979	10,665	8,000	8,000	8,000
Enforcement & Surveillance	15,460	18,445	15,500	16,061	15,800
Total, Conservation and Mgmt. Opns...	87,533	114,155	75,863	103,831	98,936
State and Industry Assistance Programs:					
Interjurisdictional fisheries grants	3,156	3,156	2,000	3,156	2,600
Anadromous grants.....	2,108	2,108	1,500	2,108	2,108
Anadromous fishery project.....	250	250	0	250	250
North Atlantic fishery project	2,800	0	0	0	0
Interstate fish commissions.....	4,000	4,000	2,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal	12,314	9,514	5,500	9,514	8,958
Fisheries Development Program					
Fisheries trade promotion activities..	1,500	1,500	0	0	0
Product quality and safety.....	9,155	9,624	10,000	9,624	9,624
Hawaiian Fisheries Development	750	0	0	750	750
Marine Biotechnology.....	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	1,900
Seafood Inspection.....	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000
Subtotal.....	18,405	18,124	10,000	17,374	17,274
Total, State & Industry Assist. Progs.	30,719	27,638	15,500	26,888	26,232
' Fisheries Add-On (Undistributed).....			20,000		
TOTAL, NMFS.....	268,650	315,828	251,327	289,117	281,642

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH:					
Climate and Air Quality Research:					
Interannual & Seasonal Climate Research/ Climate & Global Change	64,837	97,788	60,346	64,000	65,500
Long-Term Climate & Air Quality Research	27,272	39,144	27,272	27,272	27,272
VENTS	2,496	0	0	2,500	2,500
High Performance Computing	5,500	15,558	6,500	6,500	6,500
Subtotal	35,268	54,702	33,772	36,272	36,272
GLOBE	7,000	7,038	0	7,000	0
Total, Climate and Air Quality	107,105	159,528	94,118	107,272	101,772
Atmospheric Programs					
Weather Research	33,613	34,720	33,613	33,613	33,613
Wind profiler	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,350
Federal/state weather mod. grants	3,100	0	0	0	0
Southeastern storm research	400	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	41,463	39,070	37,963	37,963	37,963
Solar/Geomagnetic Research	5,483	7,839	5,483	5,483	5,483
Total, Atmospheric Program	46,946	46,909	43,446	43,446	43,446
Ocean and Great Lakes Programs:					
Marine Prediction Research	9,506	10,226	9,506	10,226	10,226
GLERL	4,558	4,558	4,000	4,558	5,200
Great lakes nearshore research	200	200	0	200	0
SE US/Caribbean FOCI program	450	0	0	0	0
GLERL/Zebra mussel	911	0	0	911	0
Lake Champlain study	150	0	0	0	0
Pacific Island technical assistance.	190	0	0	0	0

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Subtotal.....	15,965	14,984	13,506	15,895	15,426
Sea Grant					
Sea grant college program.....	49,000	49,400	53,300	50,400	53,300
Sea grant oyster disease.....	1,500	0	0	0	0
Sea grant-zebra mussel.....	2,800	0	0	0	0
National coastal R&D instututе.....	1,000	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	54,300	49,400	53,300	50,400	53,300
Undersea Research Program					
NOAA Undersea Research Program.....	14,432	0	0	14,432	12,000
Regional marine research centers....	1,500	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	15,932	0	0	14,432	12,000
Total, Ocean & Great Lakes Programs	86,197	64,384	66,806	80,727	80,726
TOTAL, OAR.....	240,248	270,821	204,370	231,445	225,944

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE:					
Operations and Research:					
Local Warnings and Forecasts	441,133	417,410	405,300	394,008	405,300
Susquehanna River Basin Flood Sys..	1,250	669	669	1,250	669
Aviation forecasts.....	35,596	35,596	35,596	35,596	35,596
Flood Warning System/Colorado River	288	288	0	0	0
Regional climate centers.....	3,200	0	0	3,000	2,000
California data buoys.....	200	200	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	481,667	454,163	441,565	433,854	443,565
Central Forecast Guidance	29,015	30,457	28,193	28,193	28,193
Atmospheric and Hydrological Research	2,487	2,669	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total, Operations and Research.....	513,169	487,289	471,758	464,047	473,758

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Systems Acquisition:					
Public Warning and Forecast Systems					
NEXRAD	82,982	55,249	53,335	53,335	53,335
ASOS	17,515	16,952	16,952	16,952	16,952
AWIPS/NOAAPort	34,947	52,097	50,000	50,000	50,000
Computer Facility Upgrades	9,985	12,745	12,000	12,000	12,000
Total, Systems Acquisition	145,429	137,043	132,287	132,287	132,287
TOTAL, NWS	658,598	624,332	604,045	596,334	606,045

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICE:					
Satellite Observing Systems:					
Polar spacecraft and launching	146,228	198,824	184,765	184,765	174,765
Polar convergence/IPO	16,000	54,000	39,500	39,500	39,500
Landsat	0	12,000	0	10,000	10,000
Geostationary spacecraft and launching..	132,242	179,101	162,273	150,106	153,106
Ocean remote sensing.....	6,000	1,600	0	5,000	4,000
Environmental observing services	51,271	55,912	49,000	49,000	49,000
Total, Satellite Observing Systems....	351,741	501,437	435,538	438,371	430,371
Environmental Data Management Systems :	24,365	28,564	24,365	24,365	29,865
Data and Information Services.....	11,300	15,100	11,300	11,300	11,300
Total, EDMS.....	35,665	43,664	35,665	35,665	41,165
TOTAL, NESDIS.....	387,406	545,101	471,203	474,036	471,536

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
PROGRAM SUPPORT:					
Administration and Services:					
Executive direction and administration	25,490	25,882	20,000	20,000	20,000
Systems Program Office (SPO).....	1,798	2,607	1,500	1,500	1,500
Subtotal.....	27,288	28,489	21,500	21,500	21,500
Central Administrative Support.....	37,853	54,749	30,000	35,579	33,000
Retired Pay Commissioned Officers.....	7,706	7,889	7,706	7,706	7,706
Total, Administration and Services	72,847	91,127	59,206	64,785	62,206
Marine Services.....	62,011	62,202	60,000	62,202	61,100
Aircraft Services	9,153	9,853	9,500	9,153	9,153
Instrumentation.....	1,300	395	0	0	0
Total, Aircraft Services.....	10,453	10,248	9,500	9,153	9,153
TOTAL, PS.....	145,311	163,577	128,706	136,140	132,459

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1995 Appropriation	FY 1996 President's Budget	FY 1996 House Allowance	FY 1996 Senate Allowance	Conference Recom
Direct Obligations	1,877,431	2,118,485	1,815,502	1,904,642	1,892,927
Reimbursable Obligations.....	316,216	313,715	309,715	309,715	309,715
Anticipated offsetting collections	6,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
	322,216	316,715	312,715	312,715	312,715
TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	2,199,647	2,435,200	2,128,217	2,217,357	2,205,642
FINANCING:					
Deobligations.....	(16,000)	(18,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(29,000)
Unobligated balance transferred, net	0	(2,650)	0	(2,650)	(2,650)
Federal Ship Financing Fund expenses					(1,700)
Anticipated offsetting collections.....		(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)
Federal funds.....	(280,607)	(279,911)	(272,207)	(272,207)	(272,207)
	(41,609)	(33,804)	(37,508)	(37,508)	(37,508)
BUDGET AUTHORITY	1,861,431	2,097,835	1,785,502	1,871,992	1,859,577
FINANCING FROM:					
Promote and develop American fisheries.....	(55,500)	(55,500)	(57,500)	(62,000)	(63,000)
Damage assessment & restoration revolving fu	(6,770)	(3,900)	(6,550)	(3,900)	(3,900)
Transfer from BPA	0	(10,300)	0	0	0
Mandatory Fish Fees (ITQs)	0	(10,000)	0	0	0
Administrative Overhead Resciss.....					
APPROPRIATION, ORF	1,799,161	2,018,135	1,721,452	1,806,092	1,792,677

The following narrative provides additional information related to certain items included in the preceding table.

NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

The conferees have provided a total of $175,301,000 under this account for the activities of the National Ocean Service.

Mapping and charting.—The conferees have provided $34,000,000 for NOAA's mapping and charting programs for the purposes as described in the House report, with additional guidance given under the Fleet Modernization account addressed later in this report. In addition, the conferees would be willing to entertain a proposal to reprogram up to $1,000,000 of these amounts for observation and prediction activities to maintain tide and sea level measurements.

Coastal Ocean Program.—The conferees have provided $11,500,000 for the Coastal Ocean Program, of which $700,000 is for the continuation of research on high-salinity estuaries as proposed by the Senate. Within the total amount provided, the conferees expect the Coast Ocean Program managers to respond to the algae bloom in the Peconic Estuary system and adjacent Long Island waters that have devastated the commercial fishing industry. In addition to a concentrated research effort to understand the physiology of the brown tide organism, a systematic and comprehensive mapping of the bottom of the Peconic system should be conducted as soon as possible to identify containments and profile the problems being experienced by the shellfish industry. This action would supplement current efforts to maintain the health and integrity of the entire Peconic system through the Peconic Estuary Program.

Coastal zone management.—The conference agreement includes $46,200,000 for CZM program grants. An additional $1,000,000 is provided for the National Estuarine Research Reserve program, in addition to $3,300,000 provided under the Coastal Zone Management Fund described later in this report. The conferees have agreed to provide $500,000 to complete NOAA support for the special area management plan.

Marine Sanctuary Program.—The conference agreement includes $11,685,000 for the National Marine Sanctuary Program. The conferees are aware of concerns related to the proposal to designate a new marine sanctuary site in Puget Sound, Washington. The conferees also recognize the efforts being made by State and local officials, through existing programs, to manage the unique resources in Puget Sound. The conferees expect NOAA to continue the designation process without final designation of the Northwest Straits National Marine Sanctuary in the waters of Puget Sound prior to January 1, 1997 or until all of the county legislative bodies within or bordering the proposed marine sanctuary boundaries vote in the affirmative to ask for final designation.

Other.—Within the amounts provided for geodesy, the conferees have included $500,000 for continuation of geodetic survey work as described in the Senate report, and $1,000,000 for continuation of the land information system as described in the House report. Of the latter amount, $500,000 is included for the Orleans Parish and $500,000 is for the City of Sulphur to complete the Calcasieu Parish project. The conferees expect NOAA to provide a report within 30 days of enactment of the accompanying Act on the status of unobligated balances available under this program and a proposal to restore amounts previously appropriated for this program in order to complete this activity as soon as possible.

The conference agreement includes a total of $10,000,000 for NOAA's Coastal Services Center as requested in the budget and provided by the Senate.

Deep Ocean Isolation Study.—The conferees have been made aware of an innovative deep ocean waste handling and disposal system, featuring a patented tethered delivery technology, that could identify an environmentally safe method of subaqueous capping in isolated areas of the deepest ocean. The conferees expect NOAA to evaluate this proposal, and to develop a funding plan for an engineering analysis and preliminary design work on systems to transport dredge soil to a deposit site, transfer the material to a receiving platform, and deploy the tethered delivery system to safely conduct deep ocean waste isolation. The conferees expect NOAA to provide a report on its evaluation of this proposal to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the appropriate authorizing committees, including an estimate of the cost to conduct an initial test of this new system, by April 1, 1996.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

The conference agreement includes a total of $281,642,000 for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Within the amounts provided in the above table for base fisheries resource information programs, the conference agreement includes funding at the fiscal year 1995 level for conservation engineering, marine mammal research and protected species research.

The conferees are concerned that the operations of the hatcheries funded in the NOAA Operations, Research and Facilities (ORF) and Construction accounts be performed in a manner to best support the Northwest Salmon plan. The conferees further understand that the current designation of use of the construction funds for screen diversions may be overly restrictive. The conferees intend that some of these Construction funds, not to exceed $3,500,000, may be available for operations and maintenance provided that the use of funds for such a purpose are subject to a reprogramming notification under the general provisions of this Act, and provided further that NOAA and the States can demonstrate that such a use would maximize the implementation of the Endangered Species Act requirements. The conferees further stipulate that such a plan anticipate no more than the fiscal year 1996 level of funding for these purposes in subsequent years.

Pursuant to the original intent of the Mitchell Act, it is the intent of the conferees that the hatcheries rearing or releasing fish at or below the Bonneville Dam include a program in fiscal year 1996 to release fish above the dam to rebuild upriver natural runs.

Within the funding provided for the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the conferees intend that NOAA provide $1,500,000 for marine resource observers in the North Pacific, $550,000 for harbor seal research by the State of Alaska, $250,000 to the State of Alaska to assist in the implementation of marine mammal take reduction plans in the fisheries off Alaska, and $350,000 to be allocated to the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission for the following purposes: (1) scientific research; (2) International Whaling Commission representation; and (3) implementation of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and NOAA cooperative agreement. The conferees also expect NOAA to complete a detailed cost-benefit analysis for the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico menhaden fisheries which may be re-classified from Category III to either Category II or I before any final rule is implemented regarding the incidental taking of marine mammals by commercial fishermen as published in the *Federal Register* of June 16, 1995.

The conferees concur with the language included in the Senate report regarding RECFIN and MARFIN programs. The conferees also agree with the designations given in the Senate report, within the total amounts available for NMFS, for experimental bycatch research and funding for the Newport Marine Science Center.

The conferees have included funds for the implementation of the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act, and strongly support the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) actions to improve the management of coastal fisheries. However, the conferees are concerned that in several areas involving public participation, the ASMFC's deliberative process has been inadequate. The conferees expect ASMFC to specifically improve: (1) the public hearing process; (2) the method by which the public is informed of Commission activities; and (3) the effectiveness of ASMFC's advisory committees in the fishery management process. Finally, the conferees expect ASMFC to implement a process for the peer review of fish population models upon which fishery management decisions are based.

Because the Endangered Species Act has not been reauthorized since 1992, the conferees find it inappropriate to fund the application of this law to new prelisting or listing activities associated with threatened or endangered species. These activities include designation of critical habitat, review of petitions to list species and/or revise critical habitat, or other activities the agency conducts as part of its prelisting and listing actions, except for activities associated with the development and/or implementation of habitat conservation plans. The conference agreement does, however, include funds for species currently listed under the law in order to avoid disruption of ongoing programs for these species as well as impacts on the activities of private parties. Section 207 of the accompanying Act also addresses the issue of ESA activities to be conducted by NOAA within the amounts provided.

The conferees concur with the House and Senate direction regarding the NMFS Sea Turtle/Shrimp Fishery Emergency Response Plan (ERP) except that it is the conferees' firm intent that the peer review requirements and revisions required by the House and Senate reports regarding the March 14, 1995 Emergency Response Plan shall also apply to the November 14, 1994 Biological Opinion which led to the Emergency Response Plan. The conferees expect NMFS and the Department of Commerce not to implement any shrimp fishery closures that may result from the March 14, 1995 ERP prior to October 1, 1996.

Any funding provided in this conference agreement for endangered species recovery plan are not to be used by NOAA for any sea turtle, shrimp fishery emergency response plan activities or sea turtle protection and Kemp Ridley recovery activities, except those activities, studies and recovery actions specifically outlined in the House and Senate reports and this statement of conferees. The increases provided for these activities in this conference agreement are intended to enhance salmon conservation efforts in the Pacific Northwest.

The conferees endorse the House and Senate direction regarding an independent survey and analysis of the red snapper stock and red snapper management plan and expect these to be conducted within the total

amounts available for NMFS at the level provided in the Senate report. However, since passage of the House and Senate appropriations bills, the Commerce Department has approved an individual transferable quota (ITQ) system for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, despite recent House passage of authorizing legislation prohibiting ITQs. The conferees direct the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of NOAA not to expend any funds to implement or enforce an ITQ system in the Gulf of Mexico until the independent assessment and analysis of red snapper stock is completed. The conferees also direct the Secretary and the Administrator to immediately study the feasibility of establishing a commercial bycatch season allowing red snapper endorsed vessels to land restricted catch of red snapper that will utilize an amount of fish commensurate with current estimates of bycatch mortality during the closed directed harvest season. This relief quota for commercial harvesters should be evaluated and compared to the quota averages attributed to the recreational fishery in terms of its biological stock impact.

The conferees expect NOAA to include as a priority under the Saltonstall-Kennedy and MARFIN grant programs, proposals for research and education efforts directed at the protection of high-risk consumers from naturally occurring bacteria associated with raw molluscan shellfish. Specifically, the conferees expect these programs to support ongoing efforts by the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference and the Gulf of Mexico Oyster industry in addressing concerns associated with *Vibrio vulnificus*.

The statement of the managers accompanying the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for NOAA included a designation of $500,000 in Saltonstall-Kennedy funds for comprehensive education program for at-risk consumers who consume raw molluscan shellfish. The conferees expect NMFS to transfer the remaining $250,000 of this amount to the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference (ISSC) to continue implementation of the multi-year education program. The conferees expect the ISSC to manage the program in order to fully utilize its extensive network to ensure balanced participation between Federal and state agencies, the oyster industry and other affected parties in continuing this education program.

The conferees support the NMFS proposal to create an office to address issues related to the marine recreational fishing industry, within available resources. The conferees expect NMFS, as co-chair of the National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council, to provide the expected guidance and leadership in the effort to conserve, restore, and enhance aquatic systems to provide for increased recreational fishing opportunities nationwide.

Within amounts provided for fisheries management programs, the conferees expect NMFS to maintain a program for fisheries trade promotion.

OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH

The conference agreement includes a total of $213,944,000 for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research activities.

Interannual and seasonal climate research.—The conferees have provided $65,500,000 for interannual and seasonal climate research under the structure proposed by the House, of which $575,500,000 is to continue the basic Climate and Global Change program. The remaining $8,000,000 is to carry out the base interannual and seasonal research programs.

Marine prediction research.—The conference agreement provided $10,226,000 for marine prediction research. Within this amount, the conferees intend that Lake Champlain and Southeast fisheries studies be funded according to the Senate report.

GLERL.—Within the $5,200,000 provided for the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, the conferees expect NOAA to continue to support the Great Lakes nearshore research and GLERL zebra mussel research programs.

Sea grant.—The conferees have included $53,300,000 for the National Sea Grant program, and expect NOAA to continue to fund oyster disease research, zebra mussel research and the National Coastal Research and Development Institute within these amounts. The conferees urge NOAA to fund proposals related to the *Vibrio vulnificus* issue and the education of at-risk consumers regarding raw molluscan shellfish.

NURP.—The conferees have provided $12,000,000 for the National Undersea Research Program, and direct that each NURP center receive at least $1,560,000 of these funds. The conferees direct that priority be given to the NURP centers which have received the greatest reductions from rescissions in the previous fiscal year in allocating excess funds after each center has received the minimum $1,560,000.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

The conference agreement includes a total of $606,045,000 for the National Weather Service.

The amount provided includes $405,300,000 for local warnings and forecasts, including the staffing related to the modernization of the weather service, data buoy maintenance, Pacific and Alaska regional headquarters, and specialized weather services.

The conferees expect that any reductions required within the amounts provided in this conference agreement be applied first to staffing levels at NWS central headquarters. Further, the conferees concur with language included in the House report regarding notification prior to NWS office closures.

While the conference agreement assumes the privatization of specialized weather services, the conferees recognized that it may be necessary, within the funds available, for the National Weather Service to continue to provide agricultural weather, fruit frost, and fire related services for a limited time in areas where private sector entities are not yet available to provide these services. The conferees expect NOAA to submit a report by April 30, 1996, on the status of these privatization proposals. The conferees expect NWS to continue the marine facsimile weather service program within funds provided under local warnings and forecasts.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA AND INFORMATION SERVICE

The conference agreement includes $471,536,000 for NOAA's satellite and data management programs.

The conferees have included $10,000,000 for NOAA's participation in the LANDSAT program. The conferees are concerned that NOAA's participation in this program will take critical funding away from operational satellites crucial to the National Weather Service. The conferees encourage NOAA to continue to work with other Federal agencies participating the LANDSAT program to obtain funds for operating LANDSAT ground systems. Should other funding be obtained, the conferees would consider a proposal to reprogram these funds toward other NOAA satellite requirements. The conferees expect these funds not to be obligated prior to enactment of authorization legislation endorsing NOAA's participation in this program.

The conference agreement includes $29,865,000 for data management systems within with amount provided for NESDIS. The conferees have provided an increase in this account to support initiatives aimed at converting NOAA's aging paper and microfilm records into intelligent data formats.

The conferees recognize that, in general, the most cost-effective means of procurement is open competition. While there has been discussion within NOAA of providing a sole source procurement for the next buy of Geostationary Operational Environmental Stationary (GOES) satellites, the conferees believe that this procurement should be subject to competition and a fixed price contract, if practicable. The conferees are in agreement that the next buy of GOES satellites should be for ''clones'' of the current GOES I-M satellites (or ''GOES-NEXT''), requiring no new sensors or any other change calling for additional research and development. The goals for the GOES program should be to provide continuity in coverage and to reduce unit costs.

PROGRAM SUPPORT

The conference agreement provides $132,459,000 for NOAA program support.

Marine services.—The conference agreement includes $61,100,000 for marine services. The conferees expect funds made available under this account and the NOAA Fleet Modernization account, including prior year carryover funds, for mapping, charting, and geodesy services to be used to acquire such services through contracts entered into with qualified private sector contractors. The conferees expect that contracts for hydrographic, geodetic, and photogrammetric surveying and mapping services shall be awarded in accordance with title IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.), as proposed in the House report. Further, the conferees intend that no funds provided under this account, in this Act or in any prior year appropriation, be used to procure equipment that replaces or modernizes NOAA's in-house measurement capabilities when similar services may be obtained by contract through the private sector. The conferees believe that it is inappropriate for NOAA to use its limited resources to acquire specialized equipment for the NOAA fleet, considering the uncertainty of the future of the fleet as well as the availability of such equipment among potential private sector contractors for mapping and charting activities.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

The conference agreement includes an appropriation of $7,800,000, as provided in both the House and Senate bills, from the Coastal Zone Management Fund for the purposes designated by the Senate. The conferees intend that amounts provided will be available as follows: $4,000,000 for program administration, $500,000 for State development grants, and $3,300,000 for the National Estuarine Research Reserve Program. The conferees have provided an additional $1,000,000 in direct appropriations under the NOAA Operations, Research, and Facilities account for the National Estuarine Research Reserve Program.

CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes a total of $50,000,000 for the NOAA Construction account as proposed by the Senate instead of $42,731,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have provided these funds for the purposes described in the following paragraphs.

The conference agreement includes funding for the National Centers for Environmental Prediction, as proposed in both the House and Senate reports. The conferees have provided $3,700,000 for general facilities maintenance, $1,500,000 for the Sandy Hook lease, $2,000,000 for environmental compliance, $2,000,000 for above-standard costs at the Boulder laboratory, and $1,800,000 for NOAA research facilities.

The conferees have included a total of $19,300,000 for NEXRAD weather office construction and maintenance.

The conferees have included $4,700,000 for Columbia River facilities in accordance with the language included under the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) addressed in the Operations, Research and Facilities account.

The conference agreement includes funds for NMFS Honolulu laboratory renovations and the Newport Science Center architectural and engineering studies in accordance with the Senate report. The conferees have provided $3,000,000 for the NMFS Southeast laboratory.

As provided by both the House and Senate, the conferees have included $10,000,000 for Pribilof Island cleanup. In addition to direction given in both the House and Senate reports, the conferees expect NOAA to use a portion of these funds to stabilize to an appropriate building condition the historic seal processing plant located on the island of Saint George.

The conferees are aware of current shortfalls that exist at the NMFS Tiburon Lab. The conferees expect the NOAA Administrator to prepare a plan of action outlining the most cost-effective approach to address these shortfalls in order to maintain the current research mission. This plan should be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 15, 1996. Funds provided in prior years for the Tiburon replacement are made available for this planning effort.

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

The conference agreement includes $8,000,000 for the NOAA Fleet Modernization account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills, and language identical to that included in the House bill. In addition, the conference agreement retains language included in section 612 of the House and Senate bills further clarifying the uses of these funds.

FISHING VESSELS AND GEAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION FUND

The conference agreement includes $1,032,000 for an appropriation to the Fishing Vessel and Gear Damage Fund as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

The conference agreement includes $999,000 for the Fishermen's Contingency Fund, as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

FOREIGN FISHING OBSERVER FUND

The conference agreement includes $196,000 for the expenses related to the Foreign Fishing Observer Fund, as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

FISHING VESSEL OBLIGATIONS GUARANTEES

The conference agreement provides $250,000 in subsidy amounts for Fishing Vessel Obligations Guarantees as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar provision. In addition, the conference agreement makes a technical language change to clarify that no loans may be made to purchase any new vessel that would increase the harvesting capacity of any U.S. fishery.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

UNDER SECRETARY FOR TECHNOLOGY/OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for the Technology Administration as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill. The conferees concur with language included in the House report regarding this account.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $29,100,000 for the general administration of the Commerce Department as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes $19,849,000 for the Commerce Department Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $21,849,000 as proposed by the House.

COMMERCE REORGANIZATION TRANSITION FUND

The conference agreement does not include an appropriation of $20,000,000 for a new Commerce Reorganization Transition Fund as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement includes a new general provision (section 210) requiring that any costs resulting from reorganization or consolidations be absorbed within the total budget authority available to the Department.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

The conference agreement includes a rescission of $75,000,000 from the NIST Construction account under title II of the Act instead of a rescission of $152,993,000 from projected end-of-year carryover balances as proposed by the Senate in title VII of the Act. The House bill contained no similar rescission. This rescission of $75,000,000 reduces the carryover appropriation under this account to $19,000,000. Uses of the remaining funds are addressed in the description of the fiscal year 1996 appropriation under this account.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes the following general provisions for the Department of Commerce:

Section 201.—The conference agreement includes section 201, identical in both versions of the bill, regarding certifications of advanced payments.

Sec. 202.—The conference agreement includes section 202, identical in both versions of the bill, allowing funds to be used for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Sec. 203.—The conference agreement includes section 203, identical in both bills, prohibiting reimbursement to the Air Force for hurricane reconnaissance planes.

Sec. 204.—The conference agreement includes section 204, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, prohibiting funds from being used to reimburse the Unemployment Trust Fund for temporary census workers.

Sec. 205.—The conference agreement includes section 205, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, regarding transfer authority between Commerce Department appropriation accounts.

Sec. 206.—The conference agreement includes a new section 206 providing for the notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of a plan for transferring funds to appropriate successor organizations within 90 days of enactment of any legislation dismantling or reorganizing the Department of Commerce, should such legislation be enacted. This section also includes language allowing the Secretary of Commerce or the appropriate head of any successor organization to use available funds to cover the costs of actions relating to the abolishment, reorganization, or transfer of functions and to transfer funds between appropriations accounts in order to cover these costs, should such actions be necessary.

The Senate bill included under section 206 language entitled ''Consolidation of Functions of Commerce Department'' which: (1) provided broad authority to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to abolish, reorganize, consolidate or transfer functions within the Department of Commerce in accordance with the provisions of the Senate bill, to terminate or transfer associated personnel as considered appropriate by OMB; (2) authorized employee buyouts through December 15, 1995; and (3) established a Commerce Reorganization Transition fund to cover the costs of consolidation and employee buyouts. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees have included new language for section 206 in order to conform the actions taken in this Act to any subsequently enacted legislation dismantling or reorganizing the Department of Commerce.

The conference agreement does not include the language under section 207 as proposed by the Senate, requiring the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study of the Doppler weather surveillance radar to assess the impact on property owners in the immediate area of the radar sites, as well as the costs of relocating these radars. However, the conferees expect the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, upon enactment of an authorization and to the extend funds are available, to identify an alternative site for the relocation of the NEXRAD radar tower presently located at Sulphur Mountain in Ventura County, California.

Sec. 207.—The conference agreement includes section 207 requiring that no funds provided in this Act, or under any other law, be used to implement certain subsections of the Endangered Species Act until reauthorizing legislation is enacted. This language is identical to that included in the Senate bill as section 208. The House bill contained no similar provision. This language prohibits the Secretary of Commerce, through the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), from proposing the listing of new species under the Endangered Species Act, designation of critical habitat, or final listing determinations, pending reauthorization of that Act. NMFS may use funds for delisting, or for the reclassification of a species from endangered to threatened, and funds may be used for prelisting conservation and other activities that will help prevent future listings of species, and implementation of section 4(d) rules.

Sec. 208.—The conference agreement includes section 208, included in the Senate bill under section 209, allowing the transfer of title of a project in Hilinex, Vermont, originally funded under the Economic Development Administration. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 209.—The conference agreement includes section 209, included in the Senate bill as section 210, providing for the demolition of structures, environmental cleanup and conveyance of land by the Economic Development Administration to the Tuscaloosa (AL) County Industrial Development Authority. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 210.—The conference agreement includes a new section 210, not included in either bill, requiring that any costs related to personnel actions incurred by a Department or agency funded in title II of the accompanying Act as a result of funding levels provided in this Act, be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $25,834,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Supreme Court as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

CARE OF THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The conference agreement includes $3,313,000 for the Supreme Court Care of the Buildings and Grounds account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills. The conference agreement also provides that $500,000 of the amount appropriated shall be available until expended as proposed by the House, instead of $565,000 as proposed by the Senate.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $14,288,000 for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,070,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have provided the higher amount to fund additional court security officers requested by the Court.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $10,859,000 for the U.S. Court of International Trade as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conferees have provided $2,433,141,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Judiciary, instead of $2,409,024,000 as proposed by the House and $2,446,194,665 as proposed by the Senate. Including amounts provided under the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, addressed below, the total amount available in this conference agreement for the salaries and expenses of the courts is $2,463,141,000 rather than $2,450,524,000 as proposed by the House and $2,476,194,665 as proposed by the Senate.

Within the overall funding available for fiscal year 1996, the conferees expect the Judiciary to fund its highest program priorities, including additional magistrate judges to eliminate existing backlogs in caseloads.

The conference agreement also appropriates $2,318,000 from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund for expenses associated with the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

Optimal utilization of judicial resources.—The conferees are concerned about the ability to sustain the current appropriations level for the Judicial Branch in the context of the need to balance the budget and reduce the deficit. The conferees want to ensure that the Judiciary maintains its current high standards for the delivery of justice in our courts and the public's confidence in the court system. Particularly in this time of budgetary constraints, this must be done in the most cost-effective way possible.

In order to provide the Congress with the means to better evaluate the operations of the courts, the conferees expect the Judicial Conference to continue its effort to identify ways to make the courts more efficient and less costly. As part of this effort, the conferees request that the Judiciary undertake a review, to be performed by an independent, nonpartisan, professional organization outside the Judiciary, but with the complete cooperation and support of the Judiciary. A report of its finding should be submitted by no later than November 30, 1996, with an interim report on the findings to be submitted by April 1, 1996. While the report may address possible improvements in any aspect of the Judiciary and its functions, the conferees expect the report to emphasize the following:

The extent to which the current judicial workload corresponds to the distribution of judicial resources.

The extent to which underutilized court facilities could be closed, or the sharing of courtroom space expanded, without appreciably affecting the delivery of justice, and the potential for savings in space costs that could be realized.

The extent to which the use of contract services might be substituted for non-judge employees in the courts and what, if any, savings could be realized.

The extent to which savings and efficiencies can be realized through enhanced use of automation and other high technology initiatives.

Violent crime reduction trust fund.—The conference agreement includes an appropriation of $30,000,000 from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, the same amount provided in the Senate bill. The House bill included an appropriation of $41,500,000 from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund for the Judiciary. The conferees intend that these funds be used to offset workload requirements of the Federal Judiciary related to the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and any increased workload requirements related to title VIII of this Act.

DEFENDER SERVICES

The conferees have included $267,217,000 for the Federal Judiciary's Defender Services account, instead of $260,000,000 as proposed by the House and $274,433,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided is for the operation of Federal public defender and community defender organizations and the compensation, reimbursement, and expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under the Criminal Justice Act, as amended.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate establishing April 1, 1996 as the date by which no funds provided under this account may be expended for Death Penalty Resource Centers (Post-Conviction Defender Organizations). The House bill included no specific date, but would have terminated these centers upon enactment of this Act. The conferees agree that establishing April 1, 1996 as the termination date will allow for a more orderly and efficient close-out of this program.

The conferees recognize the concerns expressed by the Judiciary that the cost of panel attorney representation in Federal capital habeas cases be kept to an appropriate level. Therefore, the conferees expect the Judiciary to initiate a study of approaches to reducing panel attorney costs and the feasibility of conducting a pilot project to assess flat-fee contracts as one such approach. The conferees expect a report on the results of this study to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate within one year of enactment of this Act.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

The conference agreement includes $59,028,000 for Fees of Jurors and Commissioners as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

COURT SECURITY

The conference agreement includes $102,000,000 for the Federal Judiciary's Court Security account as proposed by the Senate instead of $109,724,000 as proposed by the House.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $47,500,000 for the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $17,914,000 for the fiscal year 1996 salaries and expenses of the Federal Judicial Center instead of $18,828,000 as proposed by the House and $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that education and training functions performed by the Center should be maintained at current levels.

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FUNDS

PAYMENT TO THE JUDICIARY TRUST FUNDS

The conference agreement includes $32,900,000 for payment to the various Judicial retirement funds as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conferees have included $8,500,000 for the U.S. Sentencing Commission as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

THE JUDICIARY

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301.—The conference agreement includes section 301 as provided in both the House and Senate bills allowing appropriations to be used for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Sec. 302.—The conference agreement includes section 302 as provided in both the House and Senate bills which allows appropriations to be available to the Special Court established under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973.

Sec. 303.—The conference agreement includes section 303, included in both the House and Senate bills, providing the Judiciary with the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts. The conference agreement also includes new language exempting the Judiciary's Defender Services account from the 10 percent increase ceiling set by this provision. The conferees have included this exemption because of concerns expressed by the Federal Judiciary that the total requirements for the Defender Services account will exceed $295,000,000. Because the demands for Federal defender services fluctuate, the conferees have included this provision which will allow additional funds to be transferred to this account from other budgetary resources available to the Judiciary, should additional resources be required, subject to the reprogramming guidelines set forth in section 605 of this Act.

Sec. 304.—The conference agreement includes section 304, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, allowing up to $10,000 of salaries and expenses funds provided in this title to be used for official reception representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Sec. 305.—The conference agreement deletes section 306 as proposed by the Senate, which would have required (1) that judicial circuit conferences or meetings authorized under section 333 of title 28, United States Code, be held within the geographic boundaries of the court over which the chief judge presides, and (2) that no circuit would receive more than $100,000 for such conferences. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conferees strongly agree that the Judiciary should make every effort to hold down the cost of judicial circuit conferences, including the use of new communications technologies such as video teleconferencing.

The conference agreement includes a new section 305, similar to section 306 included in the Senate bill, revising section 333 of title 28 of the United States Code to make the holding of judicial conferences optional and to make attendance by judges at these conferences discretionary. Section 306 of the Senate bill included these provisions, as well as a sense of the Senate that the Federal Judiciary should use new communications

technologies to conduct judicial conferences and a provision making this section applicable only to contracts entered into after the date of enactment of this Act. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement deletes section 308 regarding the National Fine Center, as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. The conferees understand that the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has committed to conducting a time-out and review of the National Fine Center program. The conferees expect the Administrative Office to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate a report on the results of this independent review by March 1, 1996.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

The conference agreement includes a total of $1,719,220,000 for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, instead of $1,727,298,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,698,220,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes $9,720,000 for security enhancement and $700,000 to be derived from registration fees, as proposed in both the House and Senate bills.

The conference agreement includes language that allows, through April 1, 1996, continued collection of Machine Readable Visa (MRV) fees as an offsetting collection for the cost of consular services. The Senate bill provided this authority for the full fiscal year, and the House bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement also allows MRV fees to be collected from North American Free Trade Agreement countries during the same time period, which was not proposed in either bill, consistent with the pending House and Senate foreign affairs authorization bills.

The conference agreement also provides $24,856,000 from within this account for the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service, as proposed by the House and the Senate. The conference agreement modifies the language to make the funds available until expended, and to allow $7,544,000 of enhancement funds to be expended prior to submission of the pilot project report. Both the House and Senate bills withheld all enhancement funds until submission of the report.

The conference agreement also includes language relating to fees from the operation of the International Center and the use of Blair House facilities, and allowing transfers between the Diplomatic and Consular Programs and the Salaries and Expenses accounts, as proposed by both the House and Senate.

The conference agreement also includes language that was included in both the House and Senate bills requiring that in fiscal year 1997, a system be in place that allocates to each department and agency the full cost of its presence outside the United States. To carry out this provision, the conferees direct the Office of Management and Budget to ensure that in the President's budget requests for fiscal year 1997, the full cost of each Federal agency's overseas presence is clearly reflected within its budget request to Congress.

The conference agreement deletes language included by the Senate, requiring the State Department to report to the President and the Congress on potential cost savings generated by extending foreign service officer tours of duty in nations that require two-year language study programs. The conferees note that some overseas missions, such as those in China and Japan, require language preparation and extended tours in such countries may be justified. Longer tours may yield significant savings and improve personnel management. Accordingly, the Department of State is directed to conduct the study called for in the Senate bill and to submit the study to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than May 15, 1996.

The conferees agree that the language in both the House and Senate reports under this heading is to be followed in expending fiscal year 1996 funds. The continuations noted in the House report can be provided through either a grant or contract mechanism.

The conferees believe that U.S. economic and commercial interests are an integral component of our diplomatic relations, and in many overseas diplomatic posts, the cornerstone of our bilateral and multilateral relationships. It is critical that these interests be actively promoted at the highest level. The conferees note that while foreign service officers from other non-State Department agencies have been elevated to ambassadorial rank, no senior officer from the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service (US&FCS) has been selected as an ambassador. The conferees believe that senior officers of the US&FCS have the understanding and skills necessary to effectively represent U.S. interests at the highest level, particularly in posts of strategic commercial interest to the United States. Therefore, the conferees expect the Administration to nominate at least one senior officer of the US&FCS to ambassadorial rank as soon as possible.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes a total of $365,146,000 for Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $369,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes $1,870,000 for security enhancements, as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REORGANIZATION TRANSITION FUND

The conference agreement does not include $5,000,000 for the Foreign Affairs Reorganization Transition Fund, as proposed by the Senate. The disposition of the Fund is discussed under section 404.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

The conference agreement includes $16,400,000 for the Capital Investment Fund, as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes $27,369,000 for the combined State and United States Information Agency Inspector General, instead of $27,669,000 for the combined office, as proposed by the House, and $24,350,000 for the combined office, as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes new language exempting the Inspector General from the existing requirement to inspect all posts every five years. This language is intended to result in budget savings that will help the Office carry out its mission within the funding level provided in the conference agreement.

Upon enactment of this legislation, the Inspector General of the Department of State will have responsibility for preparing semi-annual reports for three separate organizations—the Department of State, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the United States Information Agency—and international broadcasting programs. The Inspector General should consult with the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the format and content of the Inspector General's semi-annual report prior to submitting that report to Congress. This consolidated report will comply with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and will allow the State Department Inspector General to achieve cost savings and efficiencies in the preparation of these reports.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

The conference agreement includes $4,500,000 for Representation Allowances, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,780,000 as proposed by the House.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

The conference agreement includes $8,579,000 for Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials, as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE OF UNITED STATES MISSIONS

The conference agreement includes $385,760,000 for this account, instead of $391,760,000, as proposed by the House, and $369,860,000, as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to rename this account from ''Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad'' to ''Security and Maintenance of United States Missions''. The conferees believe this name more accurately reflects the activities funded by this account, which are primarily related to the management of over $10,000,000,000 of U.S. Government real property located overseas and used in carrying out the mission not only of the Department of State, but of the approximately 35 Departments and agencies that carry out programs overseas, including the Department of Justice, the Department of Treasury, and the Department of Defense, to name just a few. These properties include housing for all U.S. Government employees overseas, both U.S. owned and leased. Substantial funds are expended for security upgrades, providing security on all construction projects, and for assuring the safety of U.S. Government employees and their families at their workplace and in their living quarters.

Of the recommended funds, $369,800,000 are required to maintain current activities. The additional $15,900,000 may be used to address the backlog in maintenance projects estimated in excess of $400,000,000. No funding for any new construction projects is provided.

Under title VII of the bill, the conferees have inclued a rescission of $60,000,000 from carryover balances in this account.

The Department's ability to address housing and facility needs in the least costly manner possible is potentially limited by the current inability to use lease-purchase agreements. As called for in the House report, the Department is expected to report back on the benefits of the lease-purchase option in managing overseas property needs. Within funds appropriated under this account or carryover from any source, the conferees expect that $3,500,000 will be made available for architectural and engineering plans associated with a consolidated chancery complex in Kingston. These operations are currently housed in five leased facilities. The conferees believe that consolidation of existing U.S. Government owned property should result in lower operating costs. On-site housing should yield additional savings of up to $2,000,000 per year in residential security. The plans should be compatible with either a standard construction or with a lease-purchase option. The Department should report to the Committee on Appropriations on the relative costs and benefits of these two options by March 1, 1996.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

The conference agreement includes $6,000,000 for Emergencies in the Diplomatic

and Consular Service account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement includes a total appropriation of $776,000 for the Repatriation Loans Program Account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

The conference agreement includes $15,165,000 for the Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The conference agreement includes $125,402,000 for the Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund account, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The conference agreement includes $700,000,000 for Contributions to International Organizations to pay the costs assessed to the United States for membership in fifty international organizations, compared to $858,000,000, as provided in the House bill, and $550,000,000, as provided in the Senate bill.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed in the Senate bill to permit funding for the International Labor Organization. The House bill had no similar provision. Funding for the International Labor Organization will be decided by the Administration as part of its overall allocation of funds.

The conference agreement includes language contained in both the House and Senate bills regarding withholding of 20 percent of the contribution to the United Nations until a certification is made relating to the establishment of an independent Office of Inspector General at the United Nations, a prohibition on use of funds for interest payments, and limiting the payment of arrearages to uses agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organizations.

The conferees are agreed that no funds are provided for assessments to be paid to the United Nations International Development Organization.

The conferees have agreed, with respect to the Interparliamentary Union (IPU), that no funds should be provided until the IPU adjusts the schedule of IPU meetings to accommodate U.S. participation, and until the IPU reverses its decision to increase the U.S. assessment level from 12.8 percent to 15 percent. In so doing, the IPU should make such adjustments as necessary to ensure that the U.S. is not held accountable for any arrearage resulting from the aforementioned increase. In addition, funds should be provided on the condition that measurable steps are taken to reduce the budget and expenses of IPU. The final decision whether or not to provide funds for continued U.S. membership in IPU should be made by the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the President and Vice President of the U.S. Group of the IPU.

Funding for the U.S. assessment for the Chemical Weapons Convention, should be ratified by the U.S., is to be considered under this account, as provided in the House report.

Allocation of the funds included in the conference agreement is to be made in conjunction with an assessment of the importance of the fifty international organizations to the national interest of the United States. The Department is expected to report the results of its review of these organizations to the Appropriations Committees no later than January 30, 1996.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement provides $225,000,000 for Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $425,000,000 as proposed by the House. The overall conference 602(b) allocation of funds to the Subcommittee was not sufficient to permit funding at any other level.

The conference agreement includes language included in both the House and Senate bills requiring a 15 day advance notice of votes in the United Nations Security Council for new or expanded peacekeeping missions and requiring a certification that American businesses are being given equal procurement opportunities.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CONTINGENCIES

The conference agreement includes $3,000,000 for International Conferences and Contingencies, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $12,058,000 for Salaries and Expenses of the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC), instead of $12,358,00 as proposed by the House and $11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes $6,644,000 for the Construction account of the IBWC, as proposed by the House, instead of $8,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that both House and Senate reports contain identical language calling on the IBWC to fulfill its existing agreements to reimburse local governments and to provide a report within 60 days of enactment of this legislation.

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

The conference agreement includes $5,800,000 for the U.S. share of expenses of the International Boundary Commission, the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

The conference agreement includes $14,669,000 for the U.S. share of the expenses of the International Fisheries Commissions and related activities, as proposed by the House, instead of $15,119,000, as proposed by the Senate. Allocation of funds is to be made as provided in the House report.

OTHER

PAYMENT TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for the Payment to the Asia Foundation account, instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the House and no funding, as proposed by the Senate.

RELATED AGENCIES

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement includes $35,700,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $22,700,000, as proposed by the Senate. To the maximum extent possible, reductions should be taken from administrative functions, rather than from programmatic staff involved in technical aspects of ACDA's activities, including monitoring functions. The conferees note that ACDA also has the option of seeking to change the status of its considerable number of detailees from other agencies from a reimbursable to a non-reimbursable status.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $445,645,000 for Salaries and Expenses of the United States Information Agency (USIA), as proposed by the House, instead of $429,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. All other bill language, which is identical in the House and Senate bills, is included in the conference agreement.

The conferees note that even at the higher House level, substantial reductions will be required, including a reduction approaching 600 positions, and the closing of up to 20 posts and installations, reducing USIA's field presence by approximately 10 percent. Both House and Senate reports included a recommendation that operations in western Europe and Canada be looked at for further reductions, because these are parts of the world that have the greatest access to information and are most likely to be exposed to the American point of view from other sources. In addition, USIA will need to reexamine all of its major operations and downsize those posts where staffing is not in accord with USIA's resource allocation grouping model.

The conference agreement includes sufficient funding for the phase out of the Latin America data base, as provided in the Senate report.

TECHNOLOGY FUND

The conference agreement includes $5,050,000 for the Technology Fund, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

The conference agreement includes $200,000,000 for Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs, instead of $192,090,000, as proposed by the House, and $210,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. Of the total, the conferees intend that $102,500,000 be allocated for the Fulbright program, and $97,500,000 be allocated for other programs, including $5,000,000 for international exchange events involving disability issues associated with the Tenth Paralympiad to be held in 1996.

To the maximum extent possible, the conferees urge that the following exchange programs be supported: the International Visitors Program, the Pepper Scholarships, including the Executive Education Program for Central European Business and Professional Leaders, the Muskie Fellowships, the Humphrey Fellowships, the Disability Exchange Clearinghouse, the Congress Bundestag Exchanges, the South Pacific Exchanges, the East Timorese Scholarships, the Cambodian Scholarships, the Tibetan Exchanges, the United States/Mexico Conflict Resolution Center, the Institute for Representative Government, the American Institute of Indian Studies and the British Parliamentarian Exchange.

Within the total amount of funding provided, funding for exchange support activities is included.

The conferees expect that a proposal for the distribution of the available resources among exchange programs, as well as proposed enhancements for exchanges with the Newly Independent States, will be submitted through the normal reprogramming process prior to final decisions being made.

The USIA should disburse funds in the amount of $1,800,000 to Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs to cover the Center's costs in fully implementing the Mike Mansfield Fellowships including the posting of seven 1995 fellows and their immediate families in Japan in order that the fellows may work in a Japanese government agency for one year, preparation and training for ten 1996 fellows, the recruitment and selection of the ten 1997 fellows, and attendant administrative costs.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM TRUST FUND

The conference agreement includes language as provided in both the House and Senate bills, allowing all interest and earnings accruing to the Trust Fund in fiscal year 1996 to be used for necessary expenses of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships. Further issues with respect to this program are dealt with under section 412.

ISRAELI ARAB SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

The conference agreement includes language as provided in both the House and Senate bills, allowing all interest and earnings accruing to the Scholarship Fund in fiscal year 1996 to be used for necessary expenses of the Israeli Arab Scholarship Program.

AMERICAN STUDIES COLLECTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

The conference agreement includes language as provided in both the House and Senate bills, allowing all interest and earnings accruing to the Endowment Fund in fiscal year 1996 to be used for necessary expenses of American Studies Collections.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

The conference agreement includes $325,191,000 for International Broadcasting Operations, instead of $341,000,000 as proposed by the House and $294,191,000, as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include funds for Broadcasting to Cuba under this account, as proposed by the House, but rather includes it in under a separate account, as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate that would have limited funding for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) to $29,000,000. The House had no similar provision. Under current law, funding for RFE/RL programming cannot exceed $75,000,000.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the House to allow funds to be used for equipment and transmission facilities for Broadcasting to Cuba, but similar language is included under the Broadcasting to Cuba account.

The conference agreement includes language, not in either the House or Senate bill, which allows USIA to use not to exceed $1,000,000 in funds received in connection with its broadcasting resources, including receipts from advertising, for authorized purposes.

All other language, identical in both House and Senate bills, is included in the conference agreement.

The conference agreement assumes $5,000,000 in funding for Radio Free Asia, under this account, as did both the House and Senate bills.

The exact distribution of funds under this account for broadcasting operations, associated technical activities and administration is to be decided upon by USIA under the new administrative structure for international broadcasting, authorized by the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994. The conferees understand that the new Broadcasting Board of Governors has been confirmed. Clarification appears to be required as to how the Broadcasting Board of Governors will operate, how it will interact with USIA, and where ultimate operating authority for international broadcasting lies. All relevant House and Senate Committees should be provided that clarication as soon as possible.

The conferees expect that the Committees will be notified of the final distribution of funding among the activities under this account pursuant to the normal reprogramming procedures.

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

The conference agreement includes $24,809,000 for Broadcasting to Cuba under a separate account, as proposed by the Senate, instead of within the total for International Broadcasting Operations, as proposed by the House.

The agreement also includes language requiring the relocation of the headquarters of the Office of Cuba Broadcasting from Washington, D.C., to south Florida by April 1, 1996, and permits funds from three accounts, International Broadcasting Operations, Broadcasting to Cuba, and Radio Construction, to be used to carry out the relocation. The Senate bill proposed the relocation, but allowed any USIA funds to be used to carry out the relocation. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes language permitting use of funds under this account for equipment and transmission facilities, as proposed by the Senate, and similar to language proposed by the House under International Broadcasting Operations.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate to allow funds to be used to purchase or lease, maintain and operate aircraft, including aerostats, required to house and operate television broadcasting equipment.

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

The conference agreement includes $40,000,000 for Radio Construction, instead of $70,164,000, as proposed by the House, and $22,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. This account provides funding for the following activities: maintenance, improvements, replacements and repairs; satellite and terrestrial program feeds; engineering support activities; and broadcast facility leases and land rentals.

The conferees reiterate that Congress has made clear its intent on a number of occasions that, to the maximum extend possible, contracts for radio construction projects should be awarded on the basis of a strong preference to American firms and content.

The conferees expect USIA to report on the expected distribution of funds in fiscal year 1996, including carryover.

The conference agreement also includes a rescission of funds from this account under title VII.

EAST-WEST CENTER

The conference agreement includes $11,750,000 for operations of the East-West Center, instead of no funds, as proposed by the House, and $18,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

The conference agreement includes $2,000,000 for operations of the North/South Center, instead of no funds, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

The conference agreement includes $30,000,000 for the National Endowment for Democracy, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes General Provisions for title IV of this location, as provided in the Senate bill, instead of immediately after the State Department funding paragraphs, as provided in the House bill. The General Provisions heading is retitled to include reference to Related Agencies.

Section 401.—The conference agreement includes section 401, as provided in both the House and Senate bills, permitting use of funds for allowances, differentials, and transportation.

Sec. 402.—The conference agreement includes secton 402, as provided in both the House and Senate bills, dealing with transfer authority.

Sec. 403.—The conference agreement includes section 403, as provided in both the House and Senate bills, dealing with the compensation of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada.

Sec. 404.—The conference agreement includes a provision: (a) requiring that 90 days after enactment of any legislation consolidating, reorganizing, or downsizing the functions of the Department of State, the United States Information Agency (USIA), and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), the heads of those agencies are to submit proposals for transferring or rescinding funds appropriated in this bill for functions that are affected by such legislation; and (b) providing those agencies with transfer authority to cover the costs of actions to consolidate, reorganize or downsize the functions under their authority required by such legislation, and of any related personnel action, including voluntary separation incentives, if authorized by such legislation. These actions are subject to reprogramming authority.

The Senate bill contained a provision giving the Director of the Office of Management and Budget broad authority to eliminate redundancies and consolidate functions among the State Department, USIA and ACDA; authorizing employee buy-outs through December 15, 1995; and establishing a Foreign Affairs Reorganization Transition Fund to cover the costs of consolidation and employee buy-outs. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 405.—The conference agreement includes a provision waiving, through April 1, 1996, provisions of existing legislation that require authorizations to be in place for State Department, United States Information Agency, including International Broadcasting Operations, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency activities prior to the expenditure of any appropriated funds. The Senate bill included a provision waiving through December 1, 1995, the authorization requirement for State Department activities. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement does not include a provision proposed in the Senate bill as section 406 to earmark $5,000,000 for the Tenth Paralympiad Games out of amounts provided under three United States Information Agency (USIA) accounts. This issue is addressed under the USIA Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs account. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 406.—The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate as section 408, renumbered as section 406, to amend the State Department Authorities Act of 1956 with respect to reward authority, to mandate the Department to establish and publicize its reward program. Under current law, the reward program is discretionary. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 407.—The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate as section 411, renumbered as section 407, to extend the authorization for the Au Pair program through fiscal year 1999. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 408.—The conference agreement includes a provision that expands the authorization for the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program to permit the program to extend its activities to areas of the world other than emerging democracies in Europe. The Senate bill contained this provision, proposed as section 412, as well as a proposal to allow the program to use any earned but unused trust income from the period 1992 through 1995, which is not included in the conference agreement. The House bill contained no Similar provision.

Sec. 409.—The conference agreement includes a provision, proposed in the Senate bill as section 413, renumbered to read section 409, that states the sense of the Senate that none of the funds in this Act should be used for the deployment of U.S. forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless approved in advance by Congress, with certain exceptions in case of emergency. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement does not include a provision, proposed in the Senate bill as section 414, stating the sense of the Senate that the President should insist on full compliance of the Russian Federation with the terms of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and seek the advice and consent of the Senate for any treaty modifications. The conferees consider compliance with the terms of the Treaty to be a high priority in U.S. relations with the Russian Federation, and further understand that there are ongoing negotiations relating to Russian compliance, which are the subject of ongoing meetings involving the Russian Federation, the U.S., and the Treaty's 30 signatories, and therefore reserve judgment until the conclusion of these events. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement does not include a provision, proposed by the Senate as section 415, requiring sanctions on Serbia and Montenegro to remain in effect until the President certified that certain conditions had been met. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Sec. 410.—The conference agreement includes a new section, not proposed in either the House or Senate bill, providing that any personnel costs incurred by any Department or agency funded under this title as a result of funding reductions be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to the Department or agency, and providing authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts for that purpose. Transfers are to be subject to standard reprogramming procedures. The Senate bill proposed to establish a Foreign Affairs Reorganization Transition Fund under section 404, with a separate appropriation, to pay for consolidation costs. The House bill contained no similar provision.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

The conference agreement includes $162,610,000 for payment of obligations incurred for the Maritime Administration (MARAD) operating differential subsidy program as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

MARITIME NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The conference agreement includes $46,000,000, available upon enactment of an authorization, for a new Maritime National Security Program to provide payments to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States as determined by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation. The Senate bill included $46,000,000 for necessary expenses of maritime security services as authorized by law. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. This program is funded under the allocation for national security programs. The conferees expect MARAD to submit a notification of the proposed distribution of these funds to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by April 1, 1996.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

The conference agreement includes $66,600,000 for the Maritime Administration Operations and Training account instead of $64,600,000 as proposed by the House and instead of $68,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees intend that these funds will be distributed as follows: $30,900,000 for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, $6,700,000 for State maritime academies, and $29,900,000 for additional training, operating programs and general administration of the Maritime Administration.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate, allowing proceeds from the sale or disposal of National Defense Reserve Vessels to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for use as provided in the National Maritime Heritage Act (Public Law 103–451). The House bill contained no similar provision.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement provides $40,000,000 in subsidy appropriations for the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program instead of $48,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount will subsidize a program level of not more than $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have also included $3,500,000 for administrative expenses associated with the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate bill included no funds for this purpose. These amounts may be transferred to and merged with amounts under the MARAD Operations and Training account.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes provisions contained in both the House and Senate bills involving Government property controlled by MARAD, the accounting for certain funds received by MARAD, and a prohibition on obligations from the MARAD construction fund.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement provides $206,000 for the Preservation for America's Heritage Abroad as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $8,750,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House and $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $1,894,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,377,000 as proposed by the House.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The conferees provide $1,090,000 for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe as proposed by both the House and Senate.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $233,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as proposed by both the House and Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement provides a total of $175,709,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission instead of $185,232,000 as proposed by the House and $166,185,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also provides for the collection and retention of $116,400,000 in offsetting fee collections, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

Within the amount provided, the conferees intend that the FCC continue the restructuring proposal initiated in June, 1995, including the closure of certain field offices as proposed by the Commission to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on October 20, 1995. The conferees have included, within the amount provided, $3,000,000 to begin to acquire the equipment necessary to carry out these proposed field office reductions.

The conferees expect remaining reductions to be carried out within FCC headquarters operations through the streamlining and elimination of redundant offices and functions. The conferees expect the FCC to consider first for reductions those offices which have experienced significant growth in recent years, but to hold harmless those activities supported by fees. The FCC should submit a notification in accordance with section 605 of this Act prior to implementing these reductions.

The conferees are aware that concerns have been expressed about actions taken by the FCC to challenge radio license applications or renewals for religious broadcasters on the grounds that requiring religious knowledge, training, or expertise for employees is discriminatory. These concerns have arisen because of the potential impact of such actions on legitimate religious free speech. The conferees expect the FCC not to deny any license application or renewal on these grounds inconsistent with the right to exercise this free speech in recruitment and hiring practices, and to report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by not later than March 1, 1996 on the Commission's policy in these cases, and its intention to follow such a policy that recognizes and preserves such religious freedom. If the FCC does move to deny a license application or renewal for a religious broadcaster according to its policy, it shall report to the Committees to demonstrate that it is not abridging the free speech of religious broadcasters.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $14,855,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement allows a total operating level of $98,928,000 for the Federal Trade Commission as proposed by the House instead of $89,035,000 as proposed by the Senate, and includes language provided in both bills allowing $48,262,000 in offsetting collections from Hart-Scott-Rodino Act premerger filing fees. The conference agreement also assumes the availability of carryover fee balances of $19,360,000 to offset the appropriations level instead of $16,000,000 as assumed

in both the House and Senate bills. This amount is based on actual carryover balances identified by the FTC. These actions result in a final appropriated level of $31,306,000 instead of $34,666,000 as proposed by the House and $24,773,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate allowing the FTC to use up to $300,000 of available funds to contract for debt collection services. The House contained no similar provision.

The conferees concur with House language regarding FTC's involvement in areas more appropriately addressed by States and localities.

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP TRUST FUND

The conference agreement provides $1,247,000 for the expenses of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission from the U.S. currency account, and provides for an amount from the Japanese currency account not to exceed the equivalent of $1,420,000 as provided in both the House and Senate Bills.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

The conference agreement includes $278,000,000 for payment to the Legal Services Corporation, the same level proposed by the House bill, instead of $340,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement designates $198,750,000 of the amount provided for basic field programs to be used only for competitively awarded grants and contracts, instead of $115,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, reflecting a provision in the conference agreement setting April 1, 1996 as the deadline for implementation of competition, rather than September 1, 1996 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $13,000,000 for the management and oversight functions of the program and designates $6,000,000 for management and administration, and $7,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General, of which $5,500,000 is to be used to contract with independent external auditors for financial and compliance audits. The conference agreement reflects the transfer of functions and the corresponding resources for compliance monitoring and enforcement to the Inspector General, while retaining the administration of the grant program within the Corporation, as proposed by the House. The Senate did not designate funding for each activity.

The following table shows a funding distribution by activity:

	Fiscal year 1995	House	Senate	Conference
Basic field programs	$345,903,013	$265,000,000	$327,000,000	$265,000,000
Supplental programs:				
Native American [1]	8,867,000	0	0	0
Migrant	12,759,000	0	0	0
National support	8,109,000	0	0	0
State support	9,373,000	0	0	0
Supplemental field	1,274,000	0	0	0
Regional training centers	711,000	0	0	0
Computer assisted legal research	582,000	0	0	0
Clearinghouse	985,000	0	0	0
Law schools	726,000	0	0	0
Subtotal	43,386,000	0	0	0
Administration and oversight:				
Management and administration	9,710,987	5,000,000	.....	6,000,000
Inspector General	1,000,000	2,250,000	.....	1,500,000
External auditing	0	5,750,000	.....	5,500,000
Subtotal	10,710,987	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Total	400,000,000	278,000,000	340,000,000	278,000,000

[1] The conference agreement addresses service for Native American communities through adjustments in the basic field program, included under Administrative Provisions.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The conference agreement provides for the continuance of funding for basic legal services to ensure that poor individuals have access to the civil justice system. This program has been unauthorized for a number of years, which has required these issues to be dealt with through the inclusion of a number of administrative provisions in Appropriations Acts. The conferees hope that an authorization will be enacted obviating the need for this practice. In the interim, and in keeping with past practices, the conference agreement includes numerous administrative provisions, as proposed by both the House and Senate, governing the allowable use of the funds provided, in many cases significantly current law provisions, and in all cases applying the provisions to all funds, Federal and non-Federal, received by a grantee.

The conference agreement includes language, as proposed by the House, that upon enactment of an authorization, all contradictory provisions will supersede the provisions in this Act. The Senate bill contained no provision on this matter.

As proposed by both the House and Senate, the conference agreement distributes funding for basic field programs by formula, based on the number of poor people residing in an area. A provision is included, as proposed by the Senate, to continue current practice of making certain adjustments to the formula for certain isolated states and territories. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement provides that funding shall be used only for basic field programs, as proposed by the House, instead of the Senate proposal which may have allowed funding for uses other than basic field programs. The conference agreement also includes a provision, as proposed by the Senate, to mitigate disproportionate funding reductions for services to Native American communities due to the elimination of the supplemental programs which had previously served Native Americans. The conferees have taken this action because of the unique relationship between the U.S. government and Native American tribes through longstanding treaty obligations, the complexity of Indian tribal law, and the unique challenges facing programs which must provide representation in both U.S. and tribal court systems. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement extends the deadline for implementation of competition to April 1, 1996, and allows interim funding for grants to basic field programs prior to that date. The House proposed that all grants be awarded competitively on January 1, 1996, and did not propose any interim funding mechanism. The Senate proposed that a portion of basic field programs be awarded competitively by September 1, 1996, and allowed the remaining basic field program grants to be distributed to basic field programs in existence prior to that date.

The conference agreement includes provisions as proposed by the House that: (1) the Corporation be considered a Federal agency, (2) all funds provided be considered Federal funds, and (3) all grantees be subject to all Federal laws regarding the proper use of Federal funds, and that any violations of Federal laws shall result in termination of the contract. The Senate bill contained no provision on this matter.

Both the House and Senate bills proposed many similar requirements and restrictions on funds provided to the LSC grantees from Federal, non-Federal, and private sources. As proposed in both the House and Senate bills, the conference agreement requires that an LSC grantee, must agree not to engage in litigation and related activities with respect to (1) abortion; (2) redistricting; (3) welfare reform; (4) political activities, including union organizing and strikes; (5) representation of illegal aliens; (6) representation of Federal and state prisoners in civil actions; and (7) representation of individuals charged with drug-trafficking in eviction proceedings brought by a public housing authority. In addition, the grantee must agree to submit to timekeeping requirements proposed by both the House and Senate.

The conference agreement incorporates a provision, proposed by the Senate, to require that the Corporation and its grantees provide written notification to non-Federal funding sources, of the restrictions in this Act or other Acts, prior to accepting non-Federal funding. The conference agreement provides an exception to this and certain other requirements in this Act with respect to the uses of Indian tribal funds. In addition, the conference agreement deletes a provision included in the Senate bill which could have allowed non-Federal funds to be used by LSC grantees to represent prisoners, illegal aliens, and individuals charged with drug-trafficking and facing eviction from public housing.

In addition, the conference agreement includes the following additional items:

The conference agreement includes language, as proposed by the Senate, to prohibit LSC grantees from participating in or bringing any class action suits. The House bill proposed to prohibit LSC grantees from bringing class action suits against Federal, State, and local governments.

The conference agreement allows LSC grantees to represent clients in fee-generating and fee-shifting cases if no private attorney is available to accept such cases, but prohibits LSC grantees from claiming or accepting any attorneys' fees. The House proposed to prohibit LSC grantees from any involvement in such cases, while the Senate proposed to allow LSC grantees, under very limited circumstances, to represent such cases and collect attorneys' fees.

The conference agreement prohibits LSC grantees from collecting any attorneys' fees for all pending and future cases, as proposed by the House. The Senate proposed to prohibit attorneys' fees for all cases initiated after January 1, 1996.

The conference agreement includes provisions, proposed by both the House and Senate, prohibiting LSC grantees from engaging in any activities related to legislative or administrative lobbying or rulemaking.

The conference agreement prohibits LSC grantees from soliciting clients, as proposed by the House. The Senate proposed a similar provision.

The conference agreement adopts a provision, proposed by the Senate, to permit LSC grantees to use non-LSC funds to communicate with State or local entities regarding funding by State or local entities. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement includes language clarifying that grantees are permitted to receive funding from non-Federal sources designated for programs serving specific populations, such as people with disabilities, provided that the clients served are not otherwise ineligible, and the purposes for which the funding is provided are allowable under this Act, and the underlying statute and regulations.

In addition, the conference agreement incorporates a provision, as proposed by the House, to prohibit funds provided in this Act from being used to pursue lawsuits against the Corporation.

The conference agreement applies all restrictions and requirements in this Act to all new cases undertaken after enactment of this Act and to additional actions on pending cases which are initiated after the enactment of this Act. The agreement allows LSC grantees up to six months to dispose of all pending cases, initiated prior to enactment of this Act, which are in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Senate proposed to apply the restrictions in this Act only to new cases undertaken or additional matters addressed in pending cases after January 1, 1996. The House proposed to apply the restrictions to all pending and new cases effective upon enactment. To ensure that clients are adequately represented, and to allow attorneys to maintain their ethical and professional responsibilities, the conferees have agreed to provide a limited amount of additional time for LSC-funded grantees to withdraw from cases and matters which would now be restricted under this Act. The Corporation shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations every sixty days as to the status of the disposition of pending cases. Further, while the conference agreement had provided for a transition period for disposition of pending cases, the agreement applies all requirements of disclosure and timekeeping to all activities.

The conference agreement includes language to clarify financial audit requirements to LSC-funded grantees, and ensure that auditors have appropriate access to necessary records. These provisions will ensure that LSC-funded grantees are subject to auditing requirements similar to other nonprofit entities receiving Federal funding. Neither the House nor Senate bills contained these provisions.

The conferees understand the importance of proper training of attorneys and paralegals. Such training, which is technical in nature and necessary to ensure attorneys and paralegals have access to current information pertaining to statutes, regulations, and case law, is permitted. However, the conference agreement prohibits grantees from conducting training programs, or providing training materials, which are designed to facilitate or advocate particular public policies or political activities.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $1,190,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and instead of $1,384,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $350,000 for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission for fiscal year 1996 as proposed by the Senate instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House. Bill language has been added, consistent with the Commission's vote on May 23, 1995 to sunset operations at the end of fiscal year 1996, stating that this represents the final year of Federal funding for the Commission.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes a direct appropriation of $103,445,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), as proposed by the House, instead of $134,997,000, as proposed by the Senate. It also includes an extension of registration fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 at one twenty-ninth of one percent, expected to generate $184,293,000, as proposed by the House, instead of one thirty-fourth of one percent, expected to generate $123,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. Together with carryover from fiscal year 1995 estimated at $9,667,000, this is estimated to provide an overall operating level of $297,405,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $267,664,000 as proposed by the Senate.

1996 Funding Summary

Net General Fund Appropriation	$103,445,000
Offsetting Collections—Section 6(b)	184,293,000
Total Appropriation	287,738,000
Carry-over from Prior Year	9,667,000
Total Funding	297,405,000

The conference agreement includes technical language, not in either the House or Senate bill, which appropriates a total of $287,738,000 to the SEC, and then requires the appropriation to be reduced as registration fees are collected, to the level of $103,445,000 that the conferees have agreed to provide. Any fees collected in excess of $184,293,000 are to remain available until expended and are not available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

The conference agreement includes language earmarking $3,000,000 for the Office of Economics, to be headed by the Chief Economist of the Commission, instead of $3,600,000, as proposed by the Senate, and no language, as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes language earmarking $1,000,000 for Investment Advisers Act enforcement, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and no language, as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate to prohibit funds from being used for the Office of Investor Education and Assistance. The House bill contained no similar provision.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides a total of $589,578,000 for the Small Business Administration, instead of $590,369,000 as proposed by the House and $588,091,000 as proposed by the Senate. The distribution of these funds by account is detailed below.

The conference agreement deletes a provision contained in the Senate bill which appropriated $30,000,000, in addition to sums provided elsewhere in the bill, for the Small Business Administration. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conferees have addressed these additional funds within the context of each individual account.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement provides an appropriation of $219,190,000 for the SBA Salaries and Expenses account, instead of $222,325,000 as provided in the House bill and $211,881,000 as provided by the Senate. In addition, the conference agreement allows for the collection of $3,300,000 in offsetting fees to offset this appropriation, as provided by both the House and the Senate, making $222,490,000 available under this account.

In addition to amounts made available under this heading, the conference agreement includes $92,622,000 for administrative expenses under the Business Loans Program Account and $71,578,000 for administrative provisions under the Disaster Loans Program Account. These amounts may be transferred to and merged with amounts available under Salaries and Expenses, resulting in a total level of $386,690,000 for SBA operating program and noncredit initiatives rather than $396,247,000 as provided by the House and $370,203,000 as provided by the Senate.

The conferees understand that funding levels provided for SBA operating programs will require additional office downsizing and closures, and expect SBA to continue to work with the House and Senate Appropriations and Small Business Committees in a consultative manner to develop criteria for determining further headquarters and field office reductions.

The conferees note that the SBA has proposed to centralize LowDoc application processing by establishing one to four centers. While centralized processing may warrant further consideration, the conferees believe that it is inappropriate at this time to establish four centers without further study. Therefore, the conferees would consider a proposal to establish two pilot centers designed to achieve long-term cost savings, taking into account concerns previously expressed by the conferees, subject to the reprogramming procedures in section 605 of this Act.

The conference agreement includes the following amounts for noncredit programs:

SBDCs	$73,500,000
Section 7(j) grants	2,570,000
SCORE	3,250,000
Women's outreach	4,000,000
Women's council	200,000
Microloan Tech. Asst	9,000,000
EZ One Stop Shops	2,767,000
Export Asst. Centers	3,202,000
Business Info. Cts	500,000

The amounts provided for EZ One Stop Shops include funding for staffing, equipment, rent, and related overhead expenses.

The conferees encourage the SBA to continue to work with the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences towards implementation of section 303 of Public Law 103–403.

The conferees expect the Administrator to allocate sufficient funds in order to implement biennial examinations of small business development centers as mandated by P.L. 103–403.

Within the amounts provided under this account, the conferees expect the SBA to continue the existing pilot project designed to help small businesses adapt to a paperless procurement environment.

The conferees agree with the emphasis in the Senate report regarding elimination of duplication and the need to study moving toward privatization of certain functions currently undertaken by the SBA.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conferees have provided $8,500,000 for the SBA Office of Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,750,000 as proposed by the House.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement includes a total of $160,726,000 in subsidy appropriations under the SBA Business Loans Program Account, of which $4,500,000 is for the direct loan program (for the Microloan direct program only) instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and a total of $156,226,000 is for various guaranteed loan programs. The conference agreement further designates that $1,216,000 of the guaranteed subsidy is for the Microloan guarantee program and is available until expended, as proposed by the Senate. The House bill provided $1,700,000 for the Microloan guarantee program. The conference agreement also designates that $40,510,000 of the total amount provided shall be available until September 30, 1997, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

The conference agreement includes $114,500,000 for the SBA 7(a) general business loan program, instead of $104,500,000 as proposed by the House and $133,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Along with prior year carryover balances, this amount will subsidize almost $11,000,000,000 in new small business loan activity under recently enacted changes in the subsidy rate for this account. The conference agreement includes a total of $40,510,000 for the small business investment corporation (SBIC) debenture and participating securities programs as proposed by both the House and the Senate. In an effort to minimize the impact of budget cutbacks on popular SBA programs, the conferees intend that no funds provided in this Act be used for the specialized SBIC (SSBIC) program, which has a credit subsidy rate of 30 percent and costs the taxpayers more than twice as much to support as the regular SBIC program.

The conference agreement includes new language, not in either bill, allowing SBA to make up to $2,500,000 in loans under the 504 Development Company program, in accordance with recently enacted authorizing legislation requiring no subsidy amounts to be appropriated. Both the House and the Senate bills had assumed that such legislation would be enacted, and language was included in the House and Senate reports that would allow a 504 Development Company program level of up to $2,500,000,000.

In addition, the conference agreement includes $92,622,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs as provided in the House bill. The Senate bill included a total of $92,622,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program only, of which $77,600,000 was provided under this account and the remaining $15,022,000 was designated under the separate $30,000,000 appropriation discussed above. The amount provided for administrative expenses is available to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement includes $34,432,000 for subsidy costs associated with the SBA Disaster Loans Program as provided in both the House and Senate bills. The conferees note that this subsidy amount assumes enactment of changes to the SBA disaster loan program that have not yet been considered by the Congress and urge expeditious consideration of the proposed changes to this program so that additional appropriations for this program will not be required.

In addition, the conferees have included $71,578,000 for administrative expenses under this account, instead of $78,000,000 as proposed by the House and $62,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. These amounts are to be merged with amounts provided for SBA salaries and expenses.

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

The conference agreement includes $2,530,000 for additional capital for the SBA Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The conference agreement includes section 510, providing SBA with the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement provides $5,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Senate Justice Institute as proposed by the Senate, instead of no funds as proposed by the House.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes the following general provisions:

Section 601.—The conference agreement includes section 601, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, regarding the use of appropriations for publicity or propaganda purposes.

Sec. 602.—The conference agreement includes section 602, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, regarding the availability of appropriations for obligation beyond the current fiscal year.

Sec. 603.—The conference agreement includes section 603, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, regarding the use of funds for consulting services.

Sec. 604.—The conference agreement includes section 604, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bill, providing that should any provision of the Act be held to be invalid, the remainder of the Act would not be affected.

Sec. 605.—The conference agreement includes section 605, identical in both the House and Senate versions of the bills, establishing the policy by which funding available to the agencies funded under this Act may be reprogrammed for other purposes.

Sec. 606.—The conference agreement includes section 606, proposed by the House but deleted by the Senate, regarding the construction, repair of modification of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessels in overseas shipyards.

Sec. 607.—The conference agreement includes section 607 regarding the purchase of American-made products as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

Sec. 608.—The conference agreement includes section 608 which prohibits funds in the bill from being used to implement, administer, or enforce any guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission covering harassment based on religion similar to proposed guidelines published by the EEOC in October, 1993, as provided in both the House and Senate bills.

Sec. 609.—The conferees have added language to the provision proposed by the House to limit the use of funds to expand the U.S. diplomatic presence in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which provides a waiver of the provision if the President certifies that Vietnam is fully cooperating with the U.S. in four areas relating to POW/MIA's. The Senate bill included no provision on this matter.

Sec. 610.—The conference agreement includes a provision that prohibits the use of funds for any United Nations peacekeeping mission that involves U.S. Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national, unless the President certifies that the involvement is in the national security interest. This provision was included as section 610 in the House bill and as section 609 in the Senate bill.

Sec. 611.—The conference agreement includes section 611 which prohibits the use of funds to provide certain amenities for Federal prisoners as provided for in both the House bill as section 611 and in the Senate bill as section 610.

Sec. 612.—The conference agreement includes section 612 restricting the use of funds provided under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fleet Modernization account included in the House bill as section 612 and in the Senate bill as section 611.

Sec. 613.—The conference agreement includes section 613 imposing a limitation on funding for TV Marti, as proposed by the House as section 613 and the Senate as section 612.

Sec. 614.—The conference agreement includes section 614 repealing the authorization for the Advisory Corrections Council, making changes in the table of sections for chapter 401 of title 18 of the United States code to reflect the repeal of that council, and making this section effective 30 days after enactment of this Act. The Senate bill proposed this repeal as section 613, and also proposed termination of the Regulatory Coordination Advisory Committee for the Commodities Future Trading Commission and the repeal of section 5(h) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, which have not been agreed to. The House bill included no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement deletes section 614 as proposed by the Senate, which stated the sense of the Senate that a joint United States-Canadian technical committee should be established to review the impact of creating an outlet from Devils Lake, N.D. under the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909. The House bill included no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement deletes section 615 proposed by the Senate which would have required competitive bidding to determine the disposition of certain portions of the spectrum related to the assignment of DBS licenses. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conferees have dropped this language because the Federal Communications Commission has taken action to require a competitive bidding process for the portions of the spectrum addressed in this amendment. The conferees support this decision by the FCC since it should result in the maximum return to the Treasury.

The conference agreement deletes section 616, as proposed by the Senate, which would have given direction to the head of each agency for which funds are directed under this Act, to take all necessary actions to achieve a 5 percent reduction from fiscal year 1995 levels in the energy costs of facilities used by the agency. A government-wide policy on this issue was established in the FY 1996 Treasury-Postal Appropriation Act.

Sec. 615.—The conference agreement includes a new general provision, not in either the House or Senate bill, requiring agencies and Departments funded in this Act to absorb any necessary costs related to downsizing or consolidations within the amounts provided to the agency or Department.

TITLE VII—RESCISSIONS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

The conference agreement includes a rescission of $65,000,000 from unobligated balances under this heading, instead of $55,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and no rescission, as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

(RESCISSION)

The conference agreement does not include the proposed rescission of $36,769,000 proposed by the Senate from anticipated unobligated balances under the NTIA Information Infrastructure Grant program. Prior to the end of fiscal year 1995, these funds were obligated and are no longer available for rescission. The House bill did not include a rescission of funds under this program.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

(RESCISSION)

The conference agreement includes a rescission of $60,000,000 from unobligated balances available under this heading, instead of $140,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and no rescission, as proposed by the House. The conferees intend that this rescission be applied against any unanticipated carryover funds that are not associated with a specific project, or against the lowest priority projects for which the remainder of the carryover in currently reserved. The conferees expect the Department to report on the manner in which it intends to apply this rescission.

RELATED AGENCIES

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

The conference agreement includes a rescission of $7,400,000 against unobligated balances available under the Radio Construction account, as proposed by the Senate, instead of no rescission, as proposed by the House.

The conferees expect the United States Information Agency to report on the manner in which it intends to apply this rescission.

TITLE VIII—PRISON LITIGATION REFORM

The conference agreement includes a separate title containing legislative language to carry out prison litigation reform and is similar to the language proposed by the Senate bill to limit the remedies for prison condition lawsuits and discourage frivolous and abusive prison lawsuits.

Section 801 contains the short title of the bill, the ''Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995'', as proposed by the Senate.

Prison conditions remedies.—Section 802 amends 18 U.S.C. 3626 to require that prison condition remedies do not go beyond the measures necessary to remedy federal rights violations and that public safety and criminal justice needs are given appropriate weight in framing such remedies. Specifically, the section places, limits on the type of prospective relief available to inmate litigants. The relief is generally limited to the minimum necessary to correct the violation of a federal right. Measures limiting prison population such as prison caps or prison release orders can only be imposed as last resort measures after less drastic remedies had proven ineffective. A prison cap in federal proceeding can be ordered only by a three-judge court. These same limitations on prospective relief are applied to preliminary injunctive relief and such relief would expire after a ninety-day period. Prior consent decrees are made terminable upon the motion of either party, and can be continued only if the court finds that the imposed relief is necessary to correct the violation of the federal right. The section also permits the appointment of a disinterested special master to monitor the imposed relief. The special master is intended to assist the court in finding facts and is to place those findings in the record. In addition, the conference agreement contains language, not included in the Senate bill, that provided standing to State legislators to intervene in prison lawsuits.

Prisoner litigation.—The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate, with the addition of provisions relating to victim notification and restitution requirements for monetary awards and severability. Section 803 amends the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997a(c)) to require that administrative remedies be exhausted prior to any prison conditions action being brought under any federal law by an inmate in federal court. It also directs the courts to dismiss suits if they are frivolous, malicious, or fail to state a claim and permits the State to waive its right of reply to any action brought by a prisoner.

Section 804 amends 28 U.S.C. 1915 to require the prisoner to list all assets when filing *in forma pauperis* suits. Section 805 adds a new section 1915A to 28 U.S.C. to require early judicial screening and prompt dismissal of clearly meritless suits against governmental entities or employees. Section 806 amends 28 U.S.C. 1346(b) to limit prisoner suits against the Federal government for mental or emotional injury under the Federal Tort Claims Act to instances where the prisoner shows physical injury as well. The legislation also includes new language in Sections 807 and 808, not included in the Senate bill, that mandates that restitution payments must be taken from any award won by the prisoner and that requires victims to be notified whenever a prisoner receives a monetary award from the State. Section 809 adds a new section 1932 to 28 U.S.C. to allow the court to revoke the prisoner's ''good time'' credit if he files repetitive frivolous, or malicious suits designed to misuse the justice system. The conference agreement also includes a provision on severability in Section 810, which was not included in the Senate bill.

The conferees also understand that approximately eight percent, or 800,000 of the 10.1 million admittances to jails annually, suffer from severe mental illness such as schizophrenia and manic depressive illness. Most of these individuals have not committed violent or serious felonies but rather misdemeanors, or other non-violent offenses. The conferees further understand that eight percent, or 80,000 of the approximately one million people currently incarcerated in our nation's prisons, suffer from severe mental illness. The conferees agree that the care and treatment provided to these individuals is essential to their health and do not intend for any of the provisions in this title to impact adversely on the availability of this care and treatment.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1996 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	$26,698,336,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	31,158,679,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	27,585,240,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	27,033,679,665
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	27,287,525,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	+589,189,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	−3,871,154,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	−297,715,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	+253,845,335

HAROLD ROGERS,
JIM KOLBE,
CHARLES H. TAYLOR,
RALPH REGULA,
MIKE FORBES,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JUDD GREGG,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS (with reservations),
ROBERT C. BYRD,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, 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 Mr. SKELTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. WAXMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BASS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. SOLOMON.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that

committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On November 30, 1995:

H.R. 2519. An act to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2525. An act to modify the operation of the antitrust laws, and of State laws similar to the antitrust laws, with respect to charitable gift annuities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1743. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's first special impoundment message for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 104–140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1744. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department intends to renew lease of one naval vessel to the Government of Greece, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1745. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1746. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—student assistance general provisions regulations—ability to benefit, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1747. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending September 30, 1995, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

1748. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–07), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1749. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2376(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1750. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1751. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1752. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the authority's report pursuant to section 203(a)(1) of Public Law 104–8; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1753. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1754. A letter from the Director, Norfolk Naval Shipyard Co-operative Association, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1993, for the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Co-operative Association, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1755. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1756. A letter from the Secretary of Education, 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.

1757. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1758. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1759. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1760. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1761. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on tanker navigation safety standards, pursuant to Public Law 101–380, section 4111(c) (104 Stat. 516); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1763. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's review and assessment on the safety of the marine environment and the economic viability and operational makeup of the maritime oil transportation industry, pursuant to Public Law 101–380, section 4115(e)(2)(C) (104 Stat. 521); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of November 30, 1995]

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2064. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment of the Historic Chattahoochee Compact between the States of Alabama and Georgia (Rept. 104–376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 78. Resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois; with an amendment (Rept. 104–377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to the order of the House on November 30, 1995, the following report was filed on December 1, 1995]

Mr. ROGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2076. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–378). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted December 4, 1995]

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2684. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in the amounts of allowable earnings under the Social Security earnings limit for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on December 1, 1995]

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than December 15, 1995.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

180. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to urging the U.S. Congress to propose and submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no court shall have the power to levy or increase taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

181. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to supporting an exemption from the Jones Act for bulk commodities, such as coal and coal derived

fuels, produced in Alaska; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1046: Mr. GORDON, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1202: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1341: Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HOYER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1547: Mr. YATES and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 2450: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2627: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr HANCOCK, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MICA, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. TATE, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WARD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 2664: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WARD, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. GORDON.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 39: Mr. CLAY.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *104th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1995 *No. 191*

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign Lord, help us to see our work here in Government as our divine calling and mission. Whatever we are called to do today, we want to do our very best for Your glory. Our desire is not just to do different things, but to do the same old things differently: with freedom, joy, and excellence. Give us new delight for matters of drudgery, new patience for people who are difficult, new zest for unfinished details. Be our lifeline in the pressures of deadlines, our rejuvenation in routines, and our endurance whenever we feel enervated. May we spend more time talking to You about issues than we do talking about issues to others. So may our communion with You give us deep convictions and high courage to defend them. Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on us so we may serve with fresh dedication today. In the Lord's name. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. I understand there are two bills due for their second reading that are at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1438

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read S. 1438 by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1438) to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1441

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, concerning the second bill, I ask that the clerk read the second bill by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The clerk will read the second bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1441) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 1996 through 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings on this matter at this time as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I understand there is a 5-minute limitation. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for no more than 10 minutes.

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

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as the Congress comes back from the weekend recess, a lot of people I know throughout the country, and in my State of Louisiana in particular, have been wondering whether Congress is going to be able to get together to solve the budget crisis. We do not have a lot of time before December 15, and there is the prospect of yet another shutdown of the Federal Government because Congress has not been able to resolve how to come together on a plan to balance the budget over a specified period of time.

Mr. President, I will make a couple of comments about that impasse because I think indeed it is very serious. I remember looking at the New York Times on Saturday morning. It was a report on the progress that Congress has made on this effort to balance the budget. I will read perhaps a couple of sentences from that article on Saturday by Mr. David Rosenbaum:

The budget negotiations this week between Congress and the White House were a complete bust. For 3 days in a row, lawmakers and administration officials met around a table in a conference room in the Capitol of the United States, closed the doors, accomplished absolutely nothing, and came out and accused each other of refusing to negotiate in good faith. Then, on Thursday afternoon, they adjourned until next week. No one savvy about Washington politics was surprised.

Mr. President, at a time when President Clinton can bring all the heads of the territories in Bosnia to Dayton, OH, and ask them to sit in a room until they reach an agreement ending a war that has been going on for centuries, can we not bring together the parties in this body called Congress to agree on what we should do with the budget?

I mentioned another article, which I think is right on target. It is by our distinguished leader, Senator TOM DASCHLE, the Democratic leader. He

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

pointed out in this article, which appeared in Roll Call:

People of this country are sick and tired of a Government that does not understand their problems or their neighbors' problems, sick and tired of politicians fighting over things that the rest of the country cannot understand, and, most of all, they are sick and tired of the fact that it seems impossible to get anything done in Washington.

Mr. President, I think that it is time, when we talk about the budget, for the moderates in both parties to come together and help resolve this problem. I am absolutely convinced that you cannot put people in a room who have visions of what the future of this country should be like that are as different as night and day. It is my opinion that the most difficult problems cannot be solved from the left working in, nor from the right working toward the center. I am absolutely convinced that you cannot take the fringes of any political party and try and use that methodology to solve difficult problems, such as a budget problem.

I know that all the folks that are working on the budget are people of good faith and have strong beliefs about what a budget agreement should accomplish and what it should contain. Mr. President, I am suggesting today that there are moderates on the Democratic side—moderates in the Democratic Party, both in the House and in the Senate, that really want to have a budget agreement. I think it is now time for the moderates on both sides of our political parties to try and band together to help resolve this problem. I am very concerned that as the days go by and hours keep ticking off the clock, that we are not making the progress needed and necessary in order to solve this problem before yet another deadline occurs.

As it was said in the Saturday article I quoted, the talks so far between Congress and the White House were a complete bust. Mr. President, we owe to the American people much more than that. We owe the best talent, the best minds, and the best dedicated public servants to work together across party lines to bring this debate to a closure. Let me suggest a couple of things I think moderates can agree to.

First, I think it is certainly possible that we can agree that there should be a balanced budget and it should be in 7 years. Point No. 1.

Second, I think that all of this debate about which economic assumptions we are going to use to help solve this problem almost border on the point of being ridiculous. The Congressional Budget Office has suggested that growth is going to be about 2.3 percent next year. The Office of Management and Budget suggested that growth rate will be about 2.5 percent. Is there not a middle ground between those two numbers, a figure between 2.3 and 2.5 that people with good intentions cannot agree to? I suggest that we split the differences between those, and I think that is something that can be done. I think it can be done in a way that brings about the best economic assumptions that we need in order to fix this problem.

Third, I think people should be able to agree on a Consumer Price Index adjustment. The people who have looked at this issue have recommended that, clearly, the Consumer Price Index on which we base so many of our economic programs is overstating the cost of products that consumers buy and that an adjustment of somewhere up to 1 percent perhaps is a reasonable and rational adjustment.

I suggest that we could take a point, a percent adjustment, and by doing that really allow us a great deal more flexibility in solving this budget impasse.

Fourth, I think we ought to be able to agree on a tax cut that is reasonable and fair. Some have suggested no tax cut at all, zero. Some have suggested we absolutely have to have $245 billion in tax cuts. Is there not, again, a middle ground that we could agree on that comes up with a reasonable tax cut and save somewhere in the range of $100 to $150 billion over the 7-year period? Is that not a fair compromise to those who say we should have none and those who say we should have the higher amount? I suggest it is.

The fifth point I think we should be able to come together on is the fact that the savings we have from these procedures I just outlined should be utilized to put back money in Medicare and Medicaid and the earned income tax credit and the welfare program, environmental programs, and yes, equally if not more important, the education programs which determine the future of the people of this country and use those extra funds to increase some of those drastic, suggested cuts in those programs.

Mr. President, I think reasonable people in both parties who could call ourselves moderate should be able to get together and do these things. I think it is more difficult when you have people who are on the left in their party, or on the right in their party trying to resolve these differences. Is it not better to have a group of people in the middle who are moderates who can agree, and once we get an agreement which I think is pretty easy to get to, work it out so that we then move toward the outside to solve the problem?

The way to solve this problem is working from the center out, not from the left end or from the right end, but, rather, working out the principles. These five principles I outlined I think give us the strong basis for trying to reach a balanced budget in 7 years, one that, hopefully, this President would be able to see meets the needs that he has outlined, solves the problem, and everybody comes away a winner.

I do not see how anybody wins if we have another stalemate. Everybody loses. Yet if we do reach an agreement, everybody should win. And winners or losers in the Congress is not really what it is all about; it is whether we will craft a program that the American people can win with and the future generations can say that Congress did the right thing when they were called upon to meet this challenge.

I strongly suggest that now is the time for moderates in the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to start talking to each other. There is nothing wrong with that. That is what a democratic Government is all about—compromises, meeting together, solving the problems in the center, and then working it away, and these agreements are received by more people in order to reach a majority.

I am just very concerned if we do not do that, if we try and solve this problem from the left working in or from the right working in, we will just have a stalemate. I do not think there is any political capital in bringing this Government to a closure again because we at that time will be admitting once again we cannot make Government work. That is not why we were sent to Congress. Just the opposite is the reason we are here.

I call today upon moderates in both parties to start talking, to meeting, to see if we cannot agree on these five principles I have tried to outline and take it from there and see where it leads us.

I suggest, in conclusion, we might be very surprised that it leads us to a balanced budget agreement that the Congress can pass with great enthusiasm, and this President will find that he will be able to support it as well.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN SIMPSON

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I was very saddened to learn of the retirement of Senator ALAN SIMPSON of Wyoming. He and I came here together in the class of 1978 and have served with each other on the Judiciary Committee, tackling some contentious nominations and other high-profile issues. He has emerged as a true leader on many issues including immigration and population issues. He is someone I would term a ''character,'' for he is certainly one of the more colorful and humorous individuals to have ever served in the Senate. His quick wit is legend, and many of us—Democrat and Republican alike—have been victims of it at one time or another over the years, but, much more often the beneficiaries of it. He uses it both ways—to score a point but more often to break an unresolved impasse.

Senator SIMPSON is the son of former Wyoming Governor and Senator Milward Simpson and has been in and around politics all his life. Born in Denver, CO, in 1931, he earned both his bachelor of science and law degrees at the University of Wyoming in Laramie. He served in the U.S. Army from 1954 to 1956 and began his career as a litigator, raising his family in Cody, WY,

and serving as assistant attorney general of Wyoming and in the State legislature. He was elected to the Senate in 1978 and quickly became a rising star in his party. He was seriously considered for the Vice Presidential nomination in 1988 and has led the fight for passage of many major legislative efforts. His service as his party's whip was outstanding, but in matters of conscience, he never lost his independence.

Of course, our friend from Wyoming is best known here and throughout the country for his colorful personality. He is widely known for having one of the best senses of humor in Washington and one of its most acerbic tongues on occasion. He has entertained friends with his keen sense of comic timing, his witty delivery, and a standard portfolio of jokes and anecdotes, many of which could not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or other reputable publications. When he leaves the Senate, he could pursue a number of different careers. He has the talent to be another Johnny Carson. He could successfully pursue many other fields, for he has a brilliant legal mind and has the ability to get to the core of an issue rapidly.

I count him as one of my closest friends. His beautiful, thoughtful, and gracious wife, Ann, is likewise a superb individual and my wife and I will never forget their genuine kindness and concern when Elizabeth Ann suddenly became ill on an overseas trip earlier this year.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve with Senator ALAN SIMPSON over the last 17 years, and I look forward to our last year here together. I congratulate him on an outstanding career, and hope that we have not seen the last of him in the public arena. We need his leadership, his passion for the issues, and his humor to help lighten our load.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MARK HATFIELD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, while MARK HATFIELD's retirement announcement did not take me by complete surprise—for such decisions have become virtually a weekly event here in the Congress—I was nonetheless disappointed and saddened to learn that he would not be seeking reelection to the Senate next year. He is one of the senior Members of this body, and has been a national leader of uncommon earnestness, moderation, honesty, and principle. He is known for his lack of excessive partisanship and for always yielding to his conscience on the many difficult matters that come before us. He is thoughtful, deliberative, intellectual, and never fails to do what he believes to be right and in the best interest of his State and country.

The people of Oregon have entrusted Senator HATFIELD with its reins of leadership through State or national office since 1956, when he was elected secretary of state at the age of 34. In 1958, he was elected Governor, serving for 8 years. In 1966, he was elected to the Senate and has been here ever since.

He is a deeply religious man who has been a spiritual leader as well as a public one. His leadership of our Senate Prayer Breakfast group over the years has been nothing short of inspirational. I have also enjoyed working with him on the National Prayer Breakfasts each year, something he had been involved with even at the State level when he was Governor back in Oregon. Our friend from Oregon has led by example; his religious convictions and quiet, friendly manner have been a powerful demonstration of how an ideal public official should conduct himself. He has been one for us to look at and emulate, regardless of our own political views.

As a young serviceman, he was one of the first Americans to see Hiroshima after it was bombed. This experience left its mark, and Senator HATFIELD has been an unfailing leader on issues relating to nuclear deterrence and nonproliferation.

MARK HATFIELD was born in Dallas, OR in 1922, and graduated from Willamette and Stanford Universities. He served in the Navy during World War II, commanding landing craft at Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Early in his career, he was a teacher of political science and has written extensively on public policy issues. Since January, he has chaired the Senate Appropriations Committee, a daunting task in its own right, but particularly challenging this year. He had previously served in that capacity. His graciousness and earnestness have not been diminished by the fierce budget wrangling this year.

Senator HATFIELD and I will be leaving the Senate at the same time, so I will not be serving here once he is gone. But I do know that those Members who do remain after him will find it a much lesser place in his absence. I am proud to call him a friend, I congratulate him on his outstanding career and for the way he has always conducted himself, and wish him and Antoinette all the best for a happy, healthy, and lengthy retirement. I also look forward to serving with him over the next year.

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. SIMON. 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 RETIREMENTS OF ALAN SIMPSON, MARK HATFIELD, AND NANCY KASSEBAUM

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, three of our colleagues have just recently announced they are not running again for reelection. The most recent is Senator SIMPSON.

I got to know AL SIMPSON when I was a State legislator and he was a State legislator. We were at a meeting that a foundation pulled together of what they, accurately or inaccurately, called the outstanding legislators from various States, and I got to know ALAN SIMPSON there.

I have worked with him over the years. He and I differ on some things, but he is a legislator's legislator. He really legislates. He sits down and works things out. He is a man of reason. He is not frightened by a new idea. I think he has made a tremendous contribution to the Senate, to his State of Wyoming, and to the Nation, and I am very proud to have served with him.

I will add, one of the things that characterizes Senator SIMPSON, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator KASSEBAUM is something the Presiding Officer has heard me talk about before, and that is there is not excessive partisanship. One of the things that has changed in my 21 years, soon to be 22 years here in Congress, is that we have become gradually more partisan. Both parties share the blame on this, and it is not a good thing. It is like the budget process. We issue statements, we have press conferences, we denounce each other instead of sitting around a table, working things out. ALAN SIMPSON, MARK HATFIELD, and NANCY KASSEBAUM were the kind of people who worked things out.

I have, up until the last election, served as chairman of three subcommittees. I do not think we ever had a party-line vote in any of my subcommittees. That meant sometimes I had to give a little more than I wanted. Sometimes others did. But I think the net effect was a good one for the Nation and, strangely, I think, good for the two parties. I think the public senses that we are excessively partisan and there is a negative attitude toward both the Democratic and Republican Parties out there. I hope we can move away from that.

The second person who recently announced that he is retiring is Senator MARK HATFIELD. Most people think about MARK HATFIELD in connection with chairing the Appropriations Committee, or a hundred and one other things that he does. I think of MARK HATFIELD particularly for his leadership in the area of arms control. Long before others raised the flag that maybe we should not be spending so much money on arms, MARK HATFIELD was telling us that.

Even today we spend more on our defense budget than the next eight countries combined. It does not make sense. If we take the 1973 budget on defense and add the inflation factor, we are spending more today than we were in 1973. In 1973 we were involved in Vietnam, we faced the cold war with what was then the Soviet Union and a nuclear threat there. We ought to be paring it down. MARK HATFIELD has been a

voice of reason. Again, like ALAN SIMPSON, he has been one who has been willing to work with people on the other side.

Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM is the same. I read the stories about her, as I did about all of my colleagues and their contributions. One of the contributions NANCY KASSEBAUM has made has been on the Subcommittee on Africa, in the Foreign Relations Committee. She chaired that for a while. NANCY KASSEBAUM did not get any votes back home in Kansas by chairing the Subcommittee on African Affairs, but made an immense contribution in the very same way that ALAN SIMPSON gets no votes in Wyoming by chairing the Subcommittee on Immigration.

One of the things that we have in this body are people of real ability who have a sense of public service. And we need more of that, and a little less, as I indicated, partisanship and power grabbing. But Senator KASSEBAUM is primarily thought of by her work on the Labor and Human Resources Committee in which the Presiding Officer serves. And she has done a superb job there over the years, part of it in these years as chairman where she has had to make some very difficult decisions as we passed a budget resolution that cuts back on some of the things that she favors. But the contributions that she has made over the years have been very significant.

I have been proud to serve with all three. The people of Wyoming, Oregon, and Kansas can be very proud of these three Senators—Senator SIMPSON, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator KASSEBAUM.

Mr. President, I do not see anyone seeking the floor, so 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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Are we in morning business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we are.

SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I, like many people, have been distressed over the weekend listening to a lot of the comments as to what is going on in Bosnia, and this seems to be—and it is portrayed by this administration that it is—a done deal. Many Republicans and many Democrats are also saying that it is a done deal; that the troops are going to go; the President has made up his mind. The President, back in February 1993, made a commitment of 25,000 American troops on the ground in Bosnia, and he has decided they are going to go. So I guess the easy thing is to say, well, the President made the decision; I may not agree with it or I may agree with it but nonetheless the decision is made, and we want to support our troops that are over there.

I am really getting tired of the demagoging that is going on about supporting the troops that are over there, as if this thing is a done deal. I grant you, Mr. President, I agree that the President of the United States does have the constitutional right to deploy troops. I think it is wrong, and historically it has not been done. The Presidents have come to the American people and have come through Congress for resolutions of approval, and this President has chosen not to do this.

Of course, I will remind all America that the House of Representatives, the other body, has already on two occasions expressed itself in a very, very strong vote in opposition to the deployment of ground troops to Bosnia. So we turn on the talk radio shows and we look at the news accounts, and they say, well, it is already a done deal and Congress has no role; Congress is not relevant in this debate.

I just do not buy that. I think this is still America, and the American people can be heard, and the best way for the American people to be heard is through their elected representatives. I think we have just a few hours to stop this thing. I am talking now about the mass deployment.

Yes, the President has already sent several hundred troops into the area of Tuzla, which is the northeastern sector, in which I had occasion to spend quite a bit of time, and I see an environment which is the most hostile environment that perhaps we have ever had the occasion to deploy any American troop into in the history of this country. We talk about and can identify that there are more than 6 million mines of all shapes and sizes that are out there, and you cannot do anything about rendering those mines harmless because the ground is now frozen and they will not appear really until a heavy vehicle gets on top of them. Of course, we are talking about the deployment of 130 M1 tanks and several other armored vehicles, so it is a very frightening thing. It is a frightening thing to think it is not just a matter of three factions that do not like each other in the former Yugoslavia. It is not just the Serbs and the Croats and the Moslems, because in addition to that you have the Bosnian Serbs, you have the Bosnian Moslems, you have the Arkan Tigers, you have the Black Swans, you have the Afghanistans, you have the Iranians. You have all of these, what we call rogue factions over there. And yet they say it is a done deal.

I think it is too easy to say that. I hope that everyone in America will demand that their Senator get on record on this issue. Mr. President, we are going to give them the opportunity to get on record on this issue. Last week, I served notice that there is going to be an up-or-down vote on the sending of troops into Bosnia.

It is not a matter of supporting our troops that are there. You bet we support them. I know something about being a troop. I used to be in a troop, and I wanted the support of the American people and got it. I think every Member of this Senate, every Member of the other body, is going to support our troops wherever they are.

That is not the issue. That is a copout. The issue is, should they be over there to begin with? I can remember so well when Michael Rose, who was the commanding general of the troops, the U.N. troops, in Bosnia said, if America sends troops over there, they will have more casualties than they had in the Persian Gulf. That was 390.

In the Senate Armed Services Committee, when I asked Secretary Perry and Secretary Christopher and General Shalikashvili—I said, ''Is that mission to contain a civil war and to protect the integrity of NATO worth more than 400 American lives?'' And Secretary Perry said yes; Secretary Christopher said yes; General Shalikashvili said yes. But I say no, because, you see, Mr. President, they were speaking on behalf of the President of the United States, the top people, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and, of course, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So now we say it is a done deal and that Congress is not relevant. But I say we are going to have a vote on this, and people are going to have to be responsible for it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at this point an editorial be printed in the RECORD, a December 1 editorial by Abraham Sofaer.

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

CLINTON NEEDS CONGRESS ON BOSNIA

(By Abraham D. Sofaer)

President Clinton has appealed to Congress and the American people to support his policy committing 20,000 ground troops to implement the peace agreement reached between Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia. It is a tribute to the American people that the president is accorded the greatest deference when he calls for the greatest sacrifice. Americans respond, at least initially, to such appeals from their President.

But Mr. Clinton is exploiting this quality. He has presented the agreement and the American role in its enforcement as an accomplished fact, though the documents have yet to be signed by the parties, and numerous preconditions to U.S. involvement have yet to be fulfilled. He is consulting with Congress, but he is already sending troops to the area without any form of legislative approval. Indeed, he claims that, while he would welcome Congress's approval, he plans to go ahead regardless.

Presidents often try to get what they want by leading aggressively. Congress nevertheless has a duty to study carefully the proposed operation and then express its view. The essential first step in that debate is to read the documents signed recently in Dayton. The complex agreement, with 12 annexes, calls for Bosnia to remain a single but divided nation, and all the warring factions

to withdraw to specific lines. The agreement covers virtually all aspects of future life in Bosnia, including the division of its governments, the contents of its constitution, the selection of its judges, and the manner in which its police force is to be chosen and trained. Of principal interest to Congress, though, are those aspects of the agreement that create obligations and expectations for the U.S. to fulfill.

OUR OBLIGATIONS

These obligations, when carefully examined in context, carry to the ultimate extreme the policy of forcing a settlement on the Bosnians, rather than attempting to create an internal situation that is militarily balanced. Most significantly, the agreement makes the U.S., through the ''implementation force'' (IFOR), the military guarantor of the overall arrangement.

The role of U.S. troops cannot be characterized as ''peacekeeping.'' Even ''implementation'' understates our obligation, IFOR will be close to an occupying army, in a conflict that has merely been suspended. We are likely to have as many difficulties acting as occupiers without having won a victory as the U.N.'s war crimes tribunal is having in attempting to apply its decisions in Bosnia without the power to enforce them.

IFOR's principal responsibilities are set out in Annex 1(a) of the agreement:

The parties agree to cease hostilities and to withdraw all forces to agreed lines in three phases. Detailed rules have been agreed upon, including special provisions regarding Sarajevo and Gorazde. But IFOR is responsible for marking the cease-fire lines and the ''inter-entity boundary line and its zone of separation,'' which in effect will divide the Bosnian Muslims and Croats from the Bosnian Serbs. The parties agree that IFOR may use all necessary force to ensure their compliance with these disengagement rules.

The parties agree to ''strictly avoid committing any reprisals, counterattacks, or any unilateral actions in response to violations of this annex by another party.'' The only response allowed to alleged violations is through the procedures provided in Article VIII of the Annex, which establishes a ''joint military commission''—made up of all the parties—to consider military complaints, questions and problems. But the commission is only ''a consultative body for the IFOR commander,'' an American general who is explicitly deemed ''the final authority in theater regarding interpretation of this agreement. . . .'' This enormous power—to prevent even acts of self defense—will carry proportionate responsibility for harm that any party may attribute to IFOR's lack of responsiveness or fairness.

IFOR is also given the responsibility to support various nonmilitary tasks, including creating conditions for free and fair elections; assisting humanitarian organizations; observing and preventing ''interference with the movement of civilian populations, refugees, and displaced persons''; clearing the roads of mines; controlling all airspace (even for civilian air travel); and ensuring access to all areas unimpeded by checkpoints, roadblocks or other obstacles. Taken together, these duties essentially give IFOR control of the physical infrastructure of both parts of the Bosnian state. It seems doubtful that the 60,000-man force could meet these expectations.

Article IX of the agreement recognizes the ''obligation of all parties to cooperate in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law.'' This is an especially sensitive matter. Yet there is no mechanism in the accord for bringing to justice men who haven't been defeated in battle and who aren't in custody. This means that IFOR is almost certain to come under pressure by victims and human rights advocates to capture and deliver up the principal villains. Will it do better than we did in fulfilling our promise to capture Mohammed Farah Aidid in Somalia?

The agreement makes vague promises about reversing ''ethnic cleansing'' by guaranteeing refugees the right to return to their homes. Since this is in practice impossible, the West will end up paying billions in compensation awards promised in the agreement.

The agreement contains numerous provisions regarding the manner in which Bosnia is to be governed, with checks and balances built in that are based on ethnic or geographic terms. But Americans traditionally have not believed in such divisions of political authority. We fought the Civil War to put into place an undivided nation based on the principle that all people are of equal worth, and all must live in accordance with the law. It took a Tito to keep the ethnically divided Yugoslavia together. Will IFOR now assume his role of enforcing a constitution based on principles abhorrent to Western values? Even if the basic structure of the government works, what role will IFOR have to play in resolving disputes over the numerous sensitive areas that the parties have seen fit to write into the accords? If the parties don't resolve some matters successfully, they are likely to blame IFOR for these failures.

Finally, the agreement draws a vague distinction between ''military'' and ''civilian'' matters. Ultimate authority over the latter is allocated to a U.N. high representative, who is to act through a ''joint civilian commission'' consisting of senior political representatives of the parties and the IFOR commander or his representative. The high representative is to exchange information and maintain liaison on a regular basis with IFOR, and shall attend or be represented at meetings of the joint military commission and offer advice ''particularly on matters of a political-military nature.'' But it is also made clear that the high representative ''shall have no authority over the IFOR and shall not in any way interfere in the conduct of military operations or the IFOR chain of command.''

This may seem a reassuring confirmation of IFOR's power to avoid U.N. restrictions on the use of force. Ultimately, however, IFOR's role could be made untenable if it finds itself in a confrontation with the U.N.'s designated representative about the proper handling of a ''political'' matter. What would happen, for example, if the U.N. high representative determined that U.S. forces had gone too far in defending themselves under President Clinton's policy of effectively responding to attacks ''and then some''?

EITHER/OR

Congress cannot redo the agreement reached by the parties. But there is no need for lawmakers to accept President Clinton's either/or approach—either support his plan to implement the agreement, or pull out entirely. If the agreement represents a genuine desire for peace among the warring parties, then presumably the accord is not so fragile as to depend on the oral commitment of U.S. troops made by the administration (and which isn't even part of the agreement). Congress can and should consider other options. The U.S., for example, could assist European forces in demarcating the boundary lines, and could enforce peace in the area through the threat of air strikes on important targets. Or the U.S. could offer greater monetary and diplomatic support for the agreement but not any ground troops.

Whatever happens with the troop commitment, Congress should insist that the agreement's provisions allowing the training and arming of the Bosnian Muslims be rigorously adhered to. A balance of power among the hostile parties is ultimately the only basis for long-term stability in the region. And if American troops are sent to Bosnia, they will be unable to leave responsibly until such a balance has been developed. That would certainly take longer than the yearlong limit imposed by the administration.

Mr. INHOFE. This is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution who took the time to read the some 12 annexes that we have to this agreement that has been initialed and all that was said.

We realize the responsibility that we have in the United States for this so-called peacekeeping effort. But stop and think. This is not peacekeeping; this is peace implementation. There is a little thing called mission creep. We saw it in Vietnam. We saw it in Somalia. It is a thing where you go in and tell the American people, ''We are just keeping peace. There is no war on over there.''

Mr. President, I was in the northeast sector of Bosnia. There is a war going on over there. The firing did not stop. The firepower is going on right now. You can hear it. You are walking around with a shrapnel jacket and helmet. You are not doing that to keep warm even though you are doing anything you can to keep warm in that area. There was a blizzard 3 weeks ago when I was there.

Nonetheless, when this scholar read the accords, not only are we responsible for implementing, that is, making peace; but we also are responsible for rebuilding the infrastructure. This $2 billion they bandy around is not even a drop in the bucket of what we are going to have to spend if the President has his way and has a mass deployment into Bosnia.

I had a telephone conversation not more than just 10 minutes ago with a retired captain, Jim Smith, who lost his leg in Vietnam and lost his son in Somalia. His son was one of those soldiers, one of those 18 Rangers that were sent over there originally for some type of a humanitarian mission that was supposed to open up the roads so we could send humanitarian goods in to some of the Somalian people.

Yes, that seemed to be a good idea. It was a 45-day mission to start with. Then President Clinton was elected. I was serving in the other body at the time, and every month we sent a resolution that said, ''Mr. President, bring our troops home from Somalia. We do not have anything at stake there in terms of our Nation's security.'' He did not do it and did not do it and did not do it until finally 18 of our Rangers were murdered in cold blood, their corpses were mutilated and dragged through the streets of Mogadishu. And one of those corpses was Cpl. Jim Smith, the son of Capt. Jim Smith.

I talked to Capt. Jim Smith, who spent a career in the military and knows a lot more about it than I do. Captain Smith said there are so many parallels between what happened to his -

son and what is going to happen to many other sons and daughters if we allow the mass deployment of troops into Bosnia.

He said one of the things that stuck in his mind was the last letter that he got from his son, Cpl. Jim Smith, who said, ''Dad, the biggest problem we have is we don't know who the good guys and the bad guys are.'' This was in Somalia. This was one of the last letters, maybe the last letter, written by Cpl. Jim Smith before his body was dragged through the streets of Mogadishu. He said, ''We don't know who the good guys and the bad guys are.''

That is exactly what happened 2½ years ago when President Clinton made the first decision for airdrops. I asked the person—and I cannot use his name in this public forum because it was a restricted meeting—I said, ''How do you know when we drop the stuff whether it's going to get to the good guys or the bad guys?'' He scratched his head and said, ''You know, I don't think we know that. Come to think of it, I'm not sure we know who the good guys and the bad guys are.''

That is because if you take a snapshot of any time in the history of Bosnia or the former Yugoslavia, you will find that at one time the Croats are the bad guys and the Serbs are the good guys; another time the Moslems have just finished butchering several thousand people, they are the bad guys, the Croats are the good guys. Most recently we assume the Serbs are the bad guys, so we, under the direction of President Clinton, chose sides in that civil war. At that time, many of us said, as soon as they do airdrops, then there will be airstrikes, and then they will want to send troops in. And that is exactly what has happened.

So this not over. It is not a done deal. I know the President right now is on a wave. His numbers look good. Mr. President, I can understand that, because you are an excellent politician. You just came back from Europe. You were talking about how everyone was cheering you over there. No wonder they are cheering over in Europe. You are saying we are committing 70 percent of the cost for this, and we are committing 30 percent of our troops to fight with your other troops, to fight your battles for you.

That is not our battle over there. That is relative to the security interests of Western Europe and Eastern Europe, not the United States.

I saw the accounts on television when President Clinton was talking to the troops over there. I can remember when I was a troop, so I know how a troop thinks. When I was over there talking to those same troops just a few days before the President was there, they had one question. They said, ''What is our mission? Why are we going to this hostile area? Why is the President obsessed in sending us into Bosnia?''

I only say this today. I know we are out of time, Mr. President. I just want to say that I do not see how we allow the mass deployment of troops into Bosnia. I emphasize there will be no free rides. There is going to be a vote. Most likely it will be Wednesday, not the vote that the leader has that is going to be a watered-down version of conciliatory remarks about what has gone on over there and about protecting our troops. We all know we are going to support our troops.

But this is going to be a vote on, Are we going to have a mass deployment of troops into Bosnia? Yes or no. And every Senator on this floor is going to have to make a record and stand up and say how he feels so that the people at home will know.

I do not know, Mr. President, how your calls are coming in in your office back in Tennessee. But I can tell you what mine are in Oklahoma. They are about 100 to 1 against it. That is because there is an infinite wisdom of the people of this country once left alone to make up their mind and make that judgment. It is not a beltway decision. It is not a Washington, DC, decision. It is not the kind of wisdom you get in the White House or within the beltway. It is back in real America where real people, real fathers and mothers are, sons and daughters who are going to be over there, shipped over to this endless war in Bosnia.

It is not going to be 12 months, Mr. President. When we were up in the area of Tuzla where our troops are going to be deployed, I said something about 12 months, and they all laughed. They said, ''You mean 12 years.'' This is the time for it to be stopped. If Somalia had been stopped before the murder of the 18 Rangers over there and their mutilated bodies were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, that would not have happened. This is the time to stop this before the mutilated bodies of Americans are dragged through the streets of Tuzla.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

BOSNIA AND HAITI

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, we are now debating in this country the question of deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. As we engage in that discussion this week, I think it would be appropriate if we take a moment to go back and talk about the last major U.S. deployment of troops in a trouble spot situation. Of course, I am talking about Haiti.

Today, Mr. President, there are approximately 2,500 United States troops in Haiti, down from a much higher figure previously. These troops, Mr. President, were deployed in the interest of the future of peace and democracy in Haiti. It is vitally important to Haitian democracy that there be an orderly transfer of power in Haiti in the coming weeks.

On December 17 of this year—in just a few days—elections are scheduled to take place. These elections on December 17 are to be followed, on February 7, by the swearing in of a new President of Haiti. Mr. President, all over the world the orderly transition of power is considered the true hallmark of democracy.

This orderly, routine transfer of power is what separates true democracy from pseudodemocracy. It is what separates the democratic countries in the world from other countries. And there is no truer test of a democracy than its ability routinely to carry out this awesome transfer of power.

Mr. President, in the past, President Aristide has indicated that he understands this and that he understands the importance of this. In fact, on May 29 of this year, Senator SPECTER and I met with President Aristide at the White House in Haiti. We asked him at that time in a fairly lengthy conversation if he can envision any circumstances under which he would retain power. His answer was an unequivocal no. Senator SPECTER asked him again, could he envision any circumstances that he would retain power, stay in office. His answer, no.

Then I asked President Aristide, ''Mr. President, many of your supporters may urge you to stay on, they may appeal to your patriotism, they may tell you that you are the only one who can carry out the duties of the Presidency, that your country needs you. How will you be able to resist those comments? How will you be able to resist those pleas?''

President Aristide's answer was very simple. He said, ''Senator, I have no choice. The Constitution takes precedence over the wishes of my supporters.''

Over the last couple of weeks, there has been some confusion about whether President Aristide will leave office. There has been some indication that he might not step down as scheduled. His views on this matter appear to be a moving target. The most recent accounts over the weekend, last Friday specifically, are that he said that he will step down after all and that he was really misunderstood in the comments that he made a few days prior to that.

Mr. President, it is vitally important that President Aristide does, in fact, step down, that he follows his Constitution, the Constitution of Haiti.

I cannot emphasize enough the vital importance of President Aristide's routine departure from office. Last year, the United States went to the brink of a full-scale invasion in support of constitutional democracy in Haiti. We want and the Haitian people want a strong and stable democracy in Haiti. To achieve that, there has to be an orderly transfer of power. The Haitian people deserve it.

Earlier in this century, William Faulkner described Haiti as ''homeless and desperate on the lonely ocean, a little lost island'' that had suffered ''200 years of oppression and exploitation.''

Faulkner's words could have just as well have been uttered last year, with the addition of several decades. The people of Haiti deserve hope. They need to know that the world shares their aspiration to be a full member of the community of nations. They have waited a long time. They have waited long enough.

I believe it is important that all of us—this country, other countries of the world—put President Aristide on notice that to flirt with the idea of clinging to power in violation of his country's Constitution would be to risk a huge step backward for the Haitian people. It is long past time to break the cycle of oppression in Haiti. The routine, orderly departure from office of President Aristide will be a major step in that direction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and pay tribute to a great friend to the Senate. The former Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Richard C. Halverson passed away last week. For 14 years he tended to the spiritual needs of this body and all the people who make it work.

Educated at Wheaton College and Princeton Theological Seminary, Reverend Halverson worked in several places including California, his last place of ministry prior to moving to Washington. As the 60th Chaplain of the Senate most of our Nation knew Reverend Halverson from the prayer he delivered every morning. His respectful and quiet manner was a example to us all for how to conduct ourselves and treat others with dignity. I remember with fondness the mornings when I sat as the acting President of this chamber, and listened to Reverend Halverson speak, urge and console not only the Members of this body but everybody listening throughout the Nation.

Besides his duties as Chaplain of the Senate Reverend Halverson also was a minister to the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Bethesda, MD, and an author of several books. He took a lifetime interest in trying speak to the improvement of the moral being of individuals, and the moral health of our Nation. I will miss Reverend Halverson, our country will miss Reverend Halverson, and this body will miss Reverend Halverson, but we are all better because of his life. I hope the example of his life will continue to set a standard for us all.

I know that Reverend Halverson's wife Doris and all the members of his family know better than all of us what an exceptional and spiritual man he was. I want to express my sympathy to them with this loss.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to honor the memory of our long-time Senate Chaplain and spiritual leader, Dr. Richard Halverson, who passed away November 28. Dr. Halverson served as Chaplain for 14 years, joining the Senate in 1981 shortly after I, too, entered the Senate. He retired this past March after distinguished service to this body and to the Nation.

As Senate Chaplain, Dr. Halverson played many roles. His prayers would open each daily session of the Senate, often reminding Senators of the higher objectives of our work. When passions ran high over controversial legislation, Dr. Halverson's opening prayers would give Senators pause for reflection and helped maintain the Senate's tradition of reasoned, respectful debate.

I came to know Dr. Halverson well through his attendance at our Bible study sessions, where he came to learn and share his thoughts on the Old Testament. He was a gracious, valued participant and we benefited from his spiritual insight.

As many know, Dr. Halverson established himself as a Chaplain who never tired of selfless service. He was always available to spend time with someone who needed his time, either for spiritual guidance or counsel. His energies were not just directed at Senators, but at their spouses and staffs, and hundreds of Senate employees. In this role, he played a vital role in keeping the fabric of the U.S. Senate together.

The Senate was a better place for having had the compassionate service of Dr. Halverson as its Chaplain for 14 years, and the Nation owes him its gratitude for the role he played in our midst.

My wife, Joan, and I extend our heartfelt condolences to Dr. Halverson's wife, Doris, and his many children and grandchildren. We will all miss his faithful, caring presence.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business Friday, December 1, the Federal debt stood at $4,989,268,168,883.55. We are still about $11 billion away from the $5 trillion mark. Unfortunately, we anticipate hitting this mark sometime later this year or early next year.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,939.35 as his or her share of that debt.

CHARITABLE GIFT ANNUITY LEGISLATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate passed two important bills impacting the charitable community—H.R. 2525 and H.R. 2519. Enactment of these bills was urgently needed to put a stop to unwarranted litigation and ensure that charities can continue to accept gift annuities from generous donors across the country. For these reasons it was important for me to clear the way to immediate passage of the bills.

Charities are critical to the Nation and to communities across the country. And charitable gift annuities are an important method for them to raise much-needed funds. This legislation will allow universities, hospitals, and other important local and national charities to continue their significant contributions to communities and the needy.

I commend my colleagues in the House and Senate for working quickly to craft this legislation. Almost 2,000 charities across the country have been defendants in unnecessary and unwarranted litigation. This congressional act will end the litigation, freeing charities to continue their important work.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator starts, the Chair will announce morning business is closed.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1833, which the clerk will now report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is now recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1833, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995.

I understand that many people on both sides of this issue have very strongly held beliefs. I respect those whose views differ from my own. And, I condemn the use of violence or any other illegal method to express any point of view on this issue.

This bill, however, presents a very narrow issue: whether one rogue abortion procedure that has probably been performed only by a handful of abortion doctors in this country, that is never medically necessary, that is not the safest medical procedure available under any circumstances, and that is morally reprehensible, should be banned.

This bill does not address whether all abortions after a certain week of pregnancy should be banned, or whether late-term abortions should only be permitted in certain circumstances. It bans one particular abortion procedure.

I chaired the Judiciary Committee hearing on this bill that was held on November 17. After hearing the testimony presented there, as well as seeing some of the submitted material, I must say that I find it difficult to comprehend how any reasonable person could examine the evidence and continue to defend the partial-birth abortion procedure.

That procedure involves the partial delivery, in the late second or third trimester of pregnancy, of an intact fetus into the birth canal. The fetus is delivered from its feet through its shoulders, so that only its head remains in the uterus. Then, either scissors or another instrument is used to poke a hole in the base of the skull. This is a living baby at this point, in a late trimester of living. Once they poke that hole in the base of the skull, at that point, a suction catheter is inserted to suck out the brains. This bill would simply ban that procedure.

The bill was first brought up on the Senate floor in early November. On November 8, the Senate voted to commit the bill to the Judiciary Committee for a hearing and a report of the bill within 19 days, which included a holiday recess.

We held a comprehensive, 6½-hour hearing on the bill on November 17. To facilitate consideration on the floor, I have directed that a hearing record be printed on an expedited basis.

In addition, so that all Senators can have immediate access to the testimony and other evidence adduced at the hearing, last week I had the committee distribute to each Senator a photocopied set of the entire hearing record, including inserts and written submissions.

The committee heard testimony from a total of 12 witnesses presenting a variety of perspectives on the bill. I wanted to ensure that both sides of this debate had a full opportunity to present their arguments on this issue, and I think that the hearing bore that out.

Brenda Shafer, a registered nurse who worked in Dr. Martin Haskell's Ohio abortion clinic for 3 days as a temporary nurse in September 1993, testified as to her personal experience in observing Dr. Haskell perform the procedure that would be banned by this bill. Dr. Haskell is one of only two—maybe four doctors who have acknowledged performing the procedure—only two have acknowledged it, but there may be four of them who do this procedure.

The committee also heard testimony from four ob-gyn doctors—two in favor of the bill and two against, from an anesthesiologist, from an ethicist, and from three women who had personal experiences either with having a late-term abortion or with declining to have a late-term abortion. Finally, the committee also heard from two law professors who discussed constitutional and other legal issues raised by the bill.

The hearing was significant in that it permitted the issues raised by this bill to be fully aired. I think that the most important contribution of the hearing to this debate is that the hearing record puts to rest a number of inaccurate statements that have been made by opponents of the bill and that have unfortunately been widely covered in the press.

Because the Judiciary Committee hearing brought out many of the facts on this issue, I would like to go through the most important of those for my colleagues to clear up what I think have been some of the major misrepresentations—and simply points of confusion—on this bill.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 1

The first and foremost inaccuracy that we must correct once and for all concerns the effects of anesthesia on the fetus of a pregnant woman. I must say that I am personally shocked at the irresponsibility that led some opponents of this bill to spread the myth that anesthesia given to the mother during a partial-birth abortion is what kills the fetus.

Opponents of this measure presumably wanted to make this procedure appear less barbaric and make it more palatable. In doing so, however, they have not only misrepresented the procedure—which is bad enough—but they have spread potentially life-threatening misinformation that could prove catastrophic to women's health.

By claiming that anesthesia kills the fetus, opponents have spread misinformation that could deter pregnant women who might desperately need surgery from undergoing surgery for fear that the anesthesia could kill or brain-damage their unborn children.

Let me illustrate how widespread this misinformation has become:

In a June 23, 1995, submission to the House Judiciary Constitution Subcommittee, the late Dr. James McMahon, the other of the two doctors who has admitted performing the procedure, wrote that anesthesia given to the mother during the procedure caused fetal demise.

Syndicated columnist Ellen Goodman wrote that, when statements of supporters of the bill are reviewed, ''You wouldn't even know that anesthesia ends the life of such a fetus before it comes down the birth canal.''

Let me note also that, of course, if the fetus was dead before being brought down the birth canal, then this bill by definition would not cover the procedure performed to abort that fetus. The bill covers only procedures in which a living fetus is partially delivered.

All but the head of this living fetus is outside, and then they puncture the back of the skull and suck out the brain so that the skull collapses and the baby can then be pulled out. There is no doubt in my mind that the reason the head is in is so that they will not be accused of infanticide.

An editorial in USA Today on November 3, 1995, also stated, ''The fetus dies from an overdose of anesthesia given to its mother.''

In a self-described fact sheet circulated to Members of the House, Dr. Mary Campbell—the medical director of Planned Parenthood who testified at the Judiciary Committee hearing—wrote:

> The fetus dies of an overdose of anesthesia given to the mother intravenously. A dose is calculated for the mother's weight which is 50 to 100 times the weight of the fetus. The mother gets the anesthesia for each insertion of the dilators, twice a day. This induces brain death in a fetus in a matter of minutes. Fetal demise therefore occurs at the beginning of the procedure while the fetus is still in the womb.

When that statement was referenced to the medical panel at the Judiciary Committee hearing by Senator ABRAHAM, the president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Dr. Norig Ellison, flatly responded, ''There is absolutely no basis in scientific fact for that statement.''

The American Society of Anesthesiologists was invited to testify at our hearing precisely to clear up this obvious misrepresentation. They sought the opportunity to set the record straight.

What was terribly disturbing about this distortion was that it could endanger women's health and women's lives. The American Society of Anesthesiologists has made clear that they do not take a position on this legislation, but that they came forward out of concern for this harmful misinformation.

The spreading of this misinformation strikes me as a very sad commentary on the lengths that those who support abortion on demand, for any reason, at virtually any time during pregnancy, and apparently regardless of the method, will do to defend each and any procedure, and certainly this procedure. The sacrifice of intellectual honesty is very disheartening.

As Dr. Ellison testified, he was

> Deeply concerned . . . that the widespread publicity given to Dr. McMahon's testimony may cause pregnant women to delay necessary and perhaps lifesaving medical procedures, totally unrelated to the birthing process, due to misinformation regarding the effect of anesthetics on the fetus.

He stated that the American Society of Anesthesiologists, while not taking a position on the bill,

> . . . have nonetheless felt it our responsibility as physicians specializing in the provision of anesthesia care to seek every available forum in which to contradict Dr. McMahon's testimony. Only in that way, we believe, can we provide assurance to pregnant women that they can undergo necessary surgical procedures safely, both for mother and unborn child.

Dr. Ellison also noted that, in his medical judgment, in order to achieve neurological demise of the fetus in a partial-birth abortion procedure, it would be necessary to anesthetize the mother to such a degree as to place her own health in jeopardy.

In short, in a partial-birth abortion, the anesthesia does not kill the fetus. The baby will generally be alive after

partly being delivered into the birth canal and before having his or her skull opened and brain sucked out.

That is also consistent with evidence provided by Dr. Haskell describing his use of the procedure. In his 1992 paper presented before the National Abortion Federation, which is part of the hearing record, Dr. Haskell described the procedure as first involving the forceps-assisted delivery into the birth canal of an intact fetus from the feet up to the shoulders, with the head remaining in the uterus. He does not describe taking any action to kill the fetus up until that point.

In a 1993 interview with the American Medical News, Dr. Haskell acknowledged that roughly two-thirds of the fetuses he aborts using the partial-birth abortion procedure are alive at the point at which he kills them by inserting a scissors in the back of the head and suctioning out the brain.

Finally, in a letter to me dated November 9, 1995, Dr. Watson Bowes of the University of North Carolina Medical School wrote,

> Although I have never witnessed this procedure, it seems likely from the description of the procedure by Dr. Haskell that many if not all of the fetuses are alive until the scissors and the suction catheter are used to remove brain tissue.

Simply put, anesthesia given to a mother does not kill the baby she is carrying.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 2

Let me move on to the next misrepresentation. Another myth that the hearing record debunks is that the procedure can be medically necessary in late-term pregnancies where the health of the mother is in danger or where the fetus has severe abnormalities.

Now, there were two witnesses at the hearing who testified as to their experiences with late-abortions in circumstances in which Dr. McMahon performed the procedure. Both women, Coreen Costello and Viki Wilson, received terrible news late in their pregnancies that the children they were carrying were severely deformed and would be unable to survive for very long.

I would like to make it absolutely clear that nothing in the bill before us would prevent women in Ms. Costello's and Ms. Wilson's situations from choosing to abort their children. That question is not before us, and it is not one that we face in considering this narrow bill.

I also would like to point out that I have the utmost sympathy for women—and their husbands and families—who find themselves receiving the same tragic news that those women received.

Regardless of whether they aborted the child or decided to go through with the pregnancy, which is what another courageous witness at our hearing, Jeannie French of Oak Park, IL, chose to do—and as a result, her daughter Mary's heart valves were donated to other infants—their experiences are horrendous ones that no one should have to go through.

The testimony of all three witnesses was among the most heart-wrenching and painful testimony I have ever heard before the committee. My heart goes out to those three women and their families as well as any others in similar situations.

However, the fact is that medical testimony in the record indicates that even if an abortion were to be performed under such circumstances, a number of other procedures could be performed, such as the far more common classical D&E procedure or an induction procedure.

When asked whether the exact procedure Dr. McMahon used would ever be medically necessary—even in cases like those described by Ms. Costello and Ms. Wilson, several doctors at our hearing explained that it would not. Dr. Nancy Romer, a practicing Ob-Gyn and clinical professor in Dayton, Ohio, stated that she had never had to resort to that procedure and that none of the physicians that she worked with had ever had to use it.

Dr. Pamela Smith, the director of medical education in the department of obstetrics and gynecology at the Mount Sinai Medical Hospital Center in Chicago, stated that a doctor would never need to resort to the partial-birth abortion procedure.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 3

This ties in closely to what I consider the next misrepresentation made about the partial-birth abortion procedure: the claim that in some circumstances a partial-birth abortion will be the safest option available for a late-term abortion. Testimony and other evidence adduced at the Judiciary Committee hearing amply demonstrate that this is not the case.

An article published in the November 20, 1995, issue of the American Medical News quoted Dr. Warren Hern as stating, ''I would dispute any statement that this is the safest procedure to use.'' Dr. Hern is the author of ''Abortion Practice,'' the Nation's most widely used textbook on abortion standards and procedures. He also stated in that interview that he ''has very strong reservations'' about the partial-birth abortion procedure banned by this bill.

Indeed, referring to the procedure, he stated, ''You really can't defend it. I'm not going to tell somebody else that they should not do this procedure. But I'm not going to do it.''

In fairness to Dr. Hern, I note that he does not support this bill in part because he feels this is the beginning of legislative efforts to chip away at abortion rights. We have included a statement from him in the RECORD. His opinion on the procedure, however, is highly instructive.

I think Dr. Nancy Romer, a professor in the department of obstetrics and gynecology at the Wright State University School of Medicine and the vice chair of the department of obstetrics and gynecology at Miami Valley Hospital, both in Dayton, OH, explained it best. I will quote her entire statement on this point:

> If this procedure were absolutely necessary, then I would ask you, why does no one that I work with do it? We have two high-risk obstetricians, and a medical department of about 40 obstetricians, and nobody does it. We care for and do second-trimester abortions, and we have peer review. We are watching each other, and if we truly were doing alternative procedures that were killing women left and right, we would be out there looking for something better. We would be going to Dr. Haskell and saying, please, come help us do this. And we are not. We are satisfied with what we do. We are watching each other and we know that the care that we provide is adequate and safe.

I think that says it all as far as safety is concerned.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 4

Another misrepresentation that should be set straight concerns claims that the partial-birth abortion procedure that would be banned by this bill is in fact performed only in late-term pregnancies where the life of the mother is at risk or where the fetus is suffering from severe abnormalities that are incompatible with life.

I certainly do not dispute that in a number of cases the partial-birth abortion procedure has been performed where the life of the mother was at risk or where the fetus was severely deformed.

Substantial available evidence indicates, however, that the procedure is not performed solely or primarily where the mother's life is in danger, where the mother's health is gravely at risk, or where the fetus is seriously malformed in a manner incompatible with life.

The fact of the matter is—and I know this is something that opponents of the bill have not faced—this procedure is being performed where there are only minor problems with the fetus, and for purely elective reasons.

Dr. Haskell stated in testimony given under oath last month, on November 8, 1995, in Federal district court in Ohio, that he performs the procedure on second trimester patients for some medical and some not so medical reasons. [See Dist. Ct. Tr. at 104.] That court transcript is part of the hearing record.

In transcripts from Dr. Haskell's 1993 interview with the American Medical News—also part of the hearing record—Dr. Haskell states ''most of my abortions are elective in the 20–24 week range. In my particular case, probably 20 percent are for genetic reasons [and] the other 80 percent are purely elective.'' Meaning that 80 percent of those kids that are destroyed are normal kids.

Dr. Romer testified that she has cared for patients who had received a partial-birth abortion from Dr. Haskell for reasons that were purely based on the woman not wanting a baby, for—as she put it—social reasons.

Most important, however, medical testimony at our hearing indicated that a health exception in this bill is

not necessary because other abortion procedures are in fact safer and better for women's health.

As for examples of overly broad health rationales for this procedure, Dr. McMahon indicated—in a 1995 letter submitted to Congress and in a 1993 interview with the American Medical News—that, although all of the third trimester abortions he performed were nonelective, approximately 80 percent of the abortions he performed after 20 weeks of pregnancy were therapeutic.

Dr. McMahon then provided the House Judiciary Committee with a listing of the so-called therapeutic indications for which he performed the procedure. That list is a real eye opener.

The single most common reason for which the partial-birth abortion was performed by him was maternal depression. He also listed substance abuse on the part of the mother as a therapeutic reason for which he performed the procedure.

In terms of fetal so-called abnormalities, Dr. McMahon's own list indicates that he performed the procedure numerous times in cases in which the fetus had no more serious a problem than a cleft lip.

Dr. Haskell has similarly acknowledged that he is not performing the procedure in critical instances of maternal or fetal health. In Dr. Haskell's testimony in Federal district court in Ohio last month, Dr. Haskell stated: ''Patients that are critically ill at the time they're referred for termination, I probably would not see. Most of the patients that are referred to me for termination are at least healthy enough to undergo an operation on an outpatient basis or else I would not undertake it.''

When asked about the specific health-related reasons for which he performed the partial-birth abortion procedure, Dr. Haskell specified that he has performed the procedure in cases involving high blood pressure, diabetes, and agoraphobia on the part of the mother. [See Dist. Ct. Tr. at 105.] Of course, agoraphobia is the fear of going outside. Dr. Haskell acknowledged that in district court. That, to me, is outrageous.

Now, let me be perfectly clear that I do not doubt that in some cases this procedure was done where there were life-threatening indications.

However, I simply must emphasize two points.

First, those cases are by far in the minority. We should get the facts straight so that our colleagues and the American people understand what is going on here.

Second, the most credible testimony at our hearing—confirmed by other available evidence—indicates that even where serious maternal health issues exist or severe fetal abnormalities arise, there will always be other, safer abortion procedures available that this bill does not touch.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 5

Finally, the next misrepresentation I would like to correct concerns whether this procedure exists. That claim should be put to rest once and for all.

Some opponents of this measure still insist on claiming that the procedure banned by this bill—the partial-birth abortion procedure—does not exist solely because the two doctors who have admitted performing the procedure—the late Dr. McMahon of Los Angeles and Dr. Haskell of Ohio—used different terms for the procedure.

The bill clearly defines the term partial-birth abortion as ''an abortion in which the person performing the abortion partially vaginally delivers a living fetus before killing the fetus and completing the delivery.'' I think that the term partial-birth abortion does provide an accurate, shorthand description of that full definition.

Dr. Haskell refers to the procedure as a D&X, while the late Dr. McMahon referred to the procedure as an intact D&E. As medical witnesses at the hearing pointed out, the procedures—by whatever name—are virtually unheard of in the medical and scientific literature.

As Dr. Watson Bowes of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill wrote to me, ''The term 'partial-birth abortion' is accurate as applied to the procedure described by Dr. Martin Haskell in his 1992 paper. There is no standard medical term for this method.''

I submit that there is no medically accepted terminology for the procedure because the procedure has not been medically accepted.

There can be no question, however, that the procedure banned by this bill does exist and has been performed repeatedly. That is disturbing. It is troubling.

We should be confronting the ethical dilemmas the procedure raises rather than sticking our heads in the sand and quibbling about whether the procedure exists under any particular name or another.

On that note, I would like to close by highlighting a statement made at our hearing by Helen Alvare of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. She remarked that opponents of this bill keep asking whether enacting it would be the first step in an effort to ban all abortions.

In her view, however, the real question should be whether allowing this procedure would serve as a first step toward legalized infanticide. I urge the bill's opponents to ask themselves this question. What is the real purpose of this procedure?

That is the fundamental problem with this procedure. It involves killing a partially delivered baby.

The previous debate on this bill ended when the Senate voted to require a Judiciary Committee hearing. Let me say to my colleagues in the Senate that the testimony presented during this hearing more than confirmed my view that this procedure is never medically necessary and should be banned.

This testimony, regardless of one's view on the broader issue of abortion, provides ample justification for an ''aye'' vote on H.R. 1833.

Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator BOXER and I have an informal agreement that after approximately 30 minutes I would yield the floor to her, if the Chair would be kind enough to remind me if I get carried away.

Mr. President, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 1833, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995. I at this time would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, first, for his splendid leadership on the issue of protecting the rights of the unborn. He has long been a champion of that issue, long before this Senator came to the Senate. But, also, I thank him for conducting the hearing, doing it in a fair manner, allowing all witnesses on both sides of the issue to be heard. He certainly performed a very valuable service, and I very much owe him a debt of gratitude for that.

Mr. President, as I am sure you know, initially I opposed the motion to refer this bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee for a hearing given the full record developed during the House's consideration of the bill. I did not really believe that the Senate needed to have a hearing. The House had extensive hearings on the bill, as you know, and quite a bit of debate.

Ultimately, however, I agreed to support the motion to refer the bill to the committee for the hearing because I was convinced that the more my colleagues could learn about this procedure about the brutality and the inhumaneness of it, the so-called partial-birth abortion procedure, I believed that the more my colleagues learned, the more I would have an opportunity to get more votes, frankly, in opposition to it. I believe that the bill will garner support, in other words, garner support to outlaw this procedure.

Later in my remarks today I am going to comment in some detail about the excellent hearing held by Senator HATCH and the Judiciary Committee on H.R. 1833. That hearing was held on November 17.

But first, Mr. President, I would like to remind my colleagues of just why it is that we are here. I want to focus again one more time on exactly what a partial-birth abortion is. The term ''birth'' involved in this procedure is somewhat interesting in the sense that it is called a partial birth, yet it is an abortion. I want to remind my colleagues of why a supermajority, a two-thirds majority, of the House of Representatives voted to pass this bill on November 1—two-thirds. And I would also like to remind my colleagues of why that supermajority encompassed both party and ideological lines on both sides, why it crossed those party

and ideological lines, why it included such people as House minority leader RICHARD GEPHARDT, Speaker GINGRICH, House minority whip DAVID BONIOR, and House majority leader DICK ARMEY, pro-choice Democrat PATRICK KENNEDY, and pro-choice Republican SUSAN MOLINARI.

Mr. President, the sole purpose of H.R. 1833 is to ban a very specific method of abortion that is performed at a time in the gestation period of about 5 months and continues on through the ninth month of gestation. So at any period of time between the fifth and the ninth month of gestation right up until the day of birth, these abortions can be and are performed.

These are late-term babies, Mr. President. There really is not any other term for it. You can cover it up and coat it a little bit by using other terms. But they are late-term babies, the youngest of whom—the youngest of whom—at 5 months may have a fighting chance to live on their own outside of the womb, and the older of whom unquestionably, unless there were severe abnormalities or birth defects, could live outside the womb.

So this specific abortion method called partial-birth abortion—that is what it is called—it is a straightforward, plain English term for a procedure in which a living baby's body is brought entirely into the birth canal, except for the child's head, which the abortionist holds inside the mother's womb, in other words, keeps the child from coming completely out of the womb, restrains the child, keeping the head inside the womb before he punctures the baby's head with scissors and inserts a suction catheter inside that incision and literally sucks the brains out of the child.

It is understandable that the defenders of partial-birth abortions do not like the clearly descriptive and entirely accurate term ''partial-birth abortion.'' I think most people on both sides of the aisle would, if they do not always agree with, certainly respect the words of Pulitzer Prize winning commentator George Will, who points out in an excellent column in the latest issue of Newsweek—he says, ''Pro-abortion extremists object to that name, preferring,'' instead now of partial-birth abortion, ''preferring 'intact dilation and evacuation' for the same reason that the pro-abortion movement prefers to be called pro-choice.''

Mr. Will goes on to conclude that what is intact here is a baby. That is what is intact, a baby. So, instead of ''partial-birth abortion,'' we call it ''intact dilation and evacuation,'' the removal of a child from the womb after taking the child's life by inserting a catheter into the back of the head through an incision made by scissors, with no anesthetic, and suck the brains out.

As I remind my colleagues today what a partial-birth abortion is, I am going to again use a series of illustrations that depict the partial-birth abortion procedure. I have done this before on the floor. I have been criticized for it. The press has not gotten it right. Some of them have not gotten it right. I was accused of showing photographs of aborted babies. I was accused of displaying a rubber fetus, whatever that is, all kinds of distortions of the record.

But what I have here are simple medical diagrams. That is all they are. They simply say what the procedure is and simply show it in pictures. I am going to show it again briefly here to show what we mean by partial-birth abortion because I think we should understand what it is.

As I do it, keep in mind that these illustrations have appeared in the American Medical Association's official newspaper, the AMA News. These are not my drawings. They are not drawn by the pro-life movement. They are not drawn by anyone other than they appeared in the AMA News. So they are medically accurate, they are straightforward, they are honest depictions of the partial-birth abortion procedure as described in an 8-page paper written in 1992 by Dr. Martin Haskell who has confessed, admitted, to performing more than 1,000—1,000—of these abortions—1,000 by one doctor, 1,000 abortions between the 5th and 9th month, Mr. President. Dr. Haskell's papers are included in the Judiciary Committee's official record of its November 17 hearing on this bill.

In a tape recorded interview with the AMA News on July 5, 1993, Dr. Haskell himself said:

> The drawings are accurate from a technical point of view.

Moreover, during a June 15, 1995 hearing before the House Judiciary Committee's Constitution Subcommittee, Johns Hopkins University Medical School Prof. Courtland Robinson, testifying on behalf of the National Abortion Federation, was questioned by Congressman CHARLES CANADY about the same illustrations of the partial-birth abortion procedure that I will be showing my colleagues again today. Dr. Robinson agreed that they were technically accurate, commenting ''this is exactly probably what is occurring at the hands of the physicians involved.''

This is a person who testified for the National Abortion Federation. So I think we ought to lay to rest the misrepresentations and the distortions and, frankly, the outright lies that have been perpetrated about me and about what I have presented on this floor. These are medically approved drawings that even the other side says are technically accurate.

Dr. Watson Bowes, a professor of obstetrics and gynecology at the medical school of the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, also, in his own right, an internationally recognized expert on fetal and maternal medicine, wrote a letter to Congressman CANADY:

> Having read Dr. Haskell's paper, I can assure you that these drawings accurately represent the procedure described therein.

Let us look at the first illustration. With the aid of ultrasound, the abortionist determines the position the baby is in, and after he determines that, he reaches in with the forceps and takes the child by the feet with the forceps and turns it around inside the womb. Keep in mind that this is a late-term living baby.

Then, as you can see, Mr. President, the baby's leg is pulled out into the birth canal with the aid of the forceps. The baby is turned around so that it is a breech birth, because, obviously, if the head comes out first, it becomes a breathing child. If the feet come out first, it can be aborted, not a living thing. That is what we are told.

So the abortionist has to turn the child around. Usually it is the other way around, but now we turn the child around and make a breech birth here. So the baby's leg comes through the cervical opening and into the birth canal.

In the third illustration, we see that the abortionist now has the child enough removed from the forceps to be able to take the child in his or her hands from, as you can see in the drawing here, somewhere about midtorso. The abortionist takes ahold of this child, and he or she begins to pull the child all the way out of the womb and into the birth canal, with the exception of the head.

Let me just pause here for a moment to reflect on what is happening. If this were a doctor and this were a happy time, a woman wanting this child for whatever reason, this little child would be a patient—a patient, Mr. President. But this child is not a patient here, not in this procedure. There is no choice of his or her own. This child is not a patient. This child is a victim of the abortionist's hands. What could be kind, loving, gentle hands are now the hands of death, because, sadly, the abortionist's purpose we now see coming in the fourth illustration.

The horror of this is beyond all imagination, as far as I am concerned, having witnessed the birth of three of my own children, knowing what a beautiful experience that is to see. The abortionist holds the baby by the shoulders—I mean holds the baby by the shoulders—to prevent the child from being born, because the moment the head comes through the birth canal and out into the world, it has the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

So this doctor has to be very sure that this little head does not slip out, so he holds the child, he prevents the child from being born, because—and this may be a little girl or a little boy, but let us, just for the sake of argument, call it a little girl—if her head slips out, she is born alive. We cannot let that happen if we are abortionists, can we? That is a problem.

The columnist, John Leo, pointed out in his excellent article in the November 20 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

Stopping the head just short of birth is a legal figleaf for a procedure that doesn't look like abortion at all. It sounds like infanticide.

So, as I said, Mr. President, the abortionist holds the baby's head with the hand tightly. Obviously, the muscular action here, the contractions move this child from the womb. That is natural. But after the gripping at the shoulders with these hands in an unspeakably brutal act of, I believe, inhumanity, the abortionist jams a pair of scissors into the baby's skull. This is a late-term baby, fully capable of pain and feeling pain, and before he withdraws those scissors, which he opens to separate the wound, he enlarges that hole at the base of the baby's skull and inserts that catheter.

As you can see in the last drawing, what was moments before a living baby now hangs limp in the hands of the abortionist.

Remember what happens: Catheter in, suck out the contents of the—it is interesting, some of the pro-choice, pro-abortion people call it the contents, the contents of the head, not the brains.

You see, it sounds too much like a baby or a child to say ''brains,'' so you say ''contents,'' as if we were talking about a can of beans or something that you empty. Then in order to kill this baby, he uses that suction catheter to suck the baby's brains out—not the contents of some inanimate object—and the dead baby then is removed.

I ask my colleagues, if that is not a baby there, what is it? I ask anybody who wants to take the floor today and say to me that you support this procedure, tell me what it is if it is not a baby. And if it is a baby, then we are killing it, are we not? If it is not a baby, what is it? What is it?

I ask my colleagues and anyone else who may be listening, if you picked up the newspaper tomorrow morning in your hometown, wherever that may be—Anywhere, U.S.A.—and the front page of that paper said that the local pound decided to kill 100 unwanted puppies and kittens, with no anesthetic, by putting scissors in the back of the neck, by inserting a catheter in the back of the head and sucking the brains out, what would you think? My colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, American people, I think you would be outraged, I think you would be protesting probably in front of the SPCA; you would be calling it horrible, disgraceful, and saying, ''What are we doing? Why would I put my dog to sleep in such an inhumane manner?''

Well, Mr. President, we are doing it to children. We are doing this to children. There you have it. But for the decision of someone else, not the baby, what could have been that beautiful journey in the process of birth, through the birth canal and into the world, which each and every one of us took because nobody got here without being born—there may have been other procedures, I grant, such as a cesarean, where you may have been born, but in most cases through the birth canal. But that beautiful journey from our mother's safe, warm womb in the birth canal and out into the wonderful world. But that is not what happens here. It is perverted by the abortionist into a savage rendezvous with death. That is exactly what it is. It is a rendezvous with death.

Do you know what? I have been called an extremist because I have said that, because I have been down here on the floor showing these drawings, pointing out to the American people what this is. I am accused of being an extremist. What is the person who performs this act? What is that person? In a partial-birth abortion, the journey of life, the beautiful process of birth—birth—this is not the average abortion we are talking about. They are bad enough, and everybody knows how I feel about those, but that is not the issue here. This is the issue of late-term abortions, which is why so many pro-choice, clear-thinking, sensible Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, in the House of Representatives voted to stop it, because they were horrified by it.

The people who do it are the extremists. That is who the extremists are. This journey of life is interrupted in the ultimate act of violent oppression. The abortionist uses his brute strength, his powerful hands, against an innocent little child, helpless, defenseless child. He stops her journey into life, holds her by the shoulders and jams scissors into her head and removes her brains.

Mr. President, this is the United States of America. When I came to the Senate in 1991, I never really dreamed that I would have to take the floor of the Senate and defend the right of a child, perhaps as old as 8½ to 8¾ months in the uterus, to have to stand here and defend this child. What a sick, horrible perversion.

How could this be in this country? How could we possibly stand by in this country and let this happen? But then, again, there is great precedent for this, Mr. President, because we saw it in the Civil War, prior to the Civil War, a couple hundred years prior to the Civil War—almost 300 years prior to the Civil War—well, 200 anyway. Slavery, which was a brutal act against our fellow mankind. We stood around for a couple hundred years before we stopped that. But here we are.

What have we come to as a people? We stand here on the floor day after day, month after month, year after year and talk about the great issues of the day—the deficit, the debt, whether or not we ought to send troops to Bosnia, the Persian Gulf, nominations of Supreme Court Justices, great issues. We have had some great debates here. But what have we come to, to be here on the floor, to have to try to stop something as barbaric as this? It should be stopped. It should not be happening. We should not have to be here.

A little baby has a right to be born. In a partial-birth abortion, a doctor who swore to the Hippocratic oath ''to do no harm'' does the worst possible harm to the youngest, most defenseless little patient that he could ever have. No wonder the foremost expert practitioner of this procedure, Dr. Martin Haskell, the man who admittedly performed a thousand of them, did not have the guts to accept Chairman HATCH's invitation to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee to defend his procedure.

Mr. President, we spent hours on the floor of the Senate in the early part of November with my colleagues on the other side of this issue demanding a hearing. ''We must have a hearing,'' I heard said. ''We must have these people come in and tell us about this procedure, because we can defend it.'' But Dr. Haskell did not come.

In the November 20 issue of the American Medical Association's AMA News, one of Dr. Haskell's fellow abortionists really told us why Dr. Haskell did not have the guts to appear at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing. Here is what he said, speaking of the procedure, and this is Dr. Warren Hearn, author of ''Abortion Practice,'' the Nation's most widely used textbook on abortion standards and procedures: ''You can't defend it.'' He said, ''You can't defend it.''

That is why he did not show up. You cannot defend it.

Thankfully, however, Mr. President, a nurse who once witnessed one of Dr. Haskell's partial-birth abortions, Brenda Pratt Shafer, did have the guts to appear before the Judiciary Committee. This is how she described what she saw:

I am Brenda Pratt Shafer, a registered nurse with 13 years of experience. One day in September, 1993, my nursing agency assigned me to work at a Dayton, Ohio, abortion clinic. I had often expressed pro-choice views to my two teenage daughters, so I thought this assignment would be no problem for me. But I was wrong. I stood at a doctor's side as he performed the partial-birth abortion procedure, and what I saw is branded forever on my mind. The mother was 6 months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was visible, clearly, on the ultrasound. The doctor went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down through the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms, everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clasping and unclasping and his feet were swinging.

Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinched, startled reaction, like a baby does when he thinks he might fall. The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening, and sucked the baby's brains out. Now, the baby was completely limp.

Then, the last line—and I am going to end here and yield the floor to Senator BOXER—the last, most compelling line, ''I never went back to that clinic, but I am still haunted by the face of that little boy—it was the most perfect, angelic face I have ever seen.'' Brenda Pratt Shafer.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to take to the floor this evening in a tough debate and one that I hope will lead the Senate to amend this bill.

This bill is flawed because it makes no exception, even for the life of the mother. It criminalizes a procedure, which means that doctors, by virtue of using it without having a chance to even explain it, will be hauled into court, perhaps into jail. It sets us on a slippery slope that greatly concerns me.

I speak as a mother. I speak as a grandmother. I speak as someone who came here in part to protect people without a voice, the most vulnerable among us.

We hear similar arguments that my friend engaged in the last time that this was brought to the floor, and the Senate wisely referred it to the Judiciary Committee. I want to thank my colleagues for voting with us on that. We had to fight to get an agreement. This was going to be rushed through, without hearing from the women who had a story to tell, without hearing from the doctors who think it is necessary, without hearing from the constitutional lawyers.

Very wisely, we took a deep breath and we sent this to the committee. It was a good hearing. It was a balanced hearing. I hope Members will read the record very closely. Then I hope they will support amending this bill.

I want to make a couple of comments before I go into a presentation that I hope will pinpoint my arguments.

Mr. President, not every birth is a beautiful journey. We pray to God that everyone we know and love—everyone, every woman, every family—can experience the beautiful journey of birth without problem. I know a lot of women have had problems. It is not always easy. Not every fetus finds a safe and warm womb. No, they do not. Some are born very early. Some develop terrible diseases and problems. Some women are diagnosed with serious cancer, and they know they could lose their life if they proceed to term.

Life is not always, as somebody once said, a bowl of cherries. Sometimes it is very hard.

Here we stand as Senators—not as doctors—outlawing a procedure, a medical procedure. I daresay if you were at home and you had never heard anything about this before and you came back from, say, another planet, and you turned on your TV and you were channel surfing and came to a station and were watching us, you would probably think this is a medical school lecture. I watched the beginning of this debate on TV, and it was just like a medical lecture. There was talk about what anesthesia does. There was talk about what kind of instruments are used. There was talk about things that we have no knowledge of. We see medical drawings—admittedly, done by physicians—medical drawings. What are we doing? This is not a medical school. This is not an ethical panel of a medicine school.

Senator KENNEDY, I thought, had a very important sentence in his prepared remarks. He said some Senators could be accused of practicing medicine without a license. That is not our job. I was not sent here to be a physician, to judge medical procedures, or to be God. That is for sure.

I also take great exception to certain things that were said in this debate. I want to put those right out there because this will be a long-heated argument. I just want to go on record. It will not make a bit of difference that I am particularly offended, but I want to put it on the record.

I want to say to my friends on the other side who are leading the charge for criminalizing a medical procedure, that doctors who perform abortions are doctors. They are not abortionists. They are physicians. Many of them have saved women's lives. And you call them abortionists?

Abortion is legal in this country. They are doctors who perform abortions. They are being harassed. They are being threatened. This kind of rhetoric on this floor adds to the problem.

Case in point: My colleague said Dr. So-and-so confessed that he performed abortions. He confessed. Notice the word. Who confesses? Somebody who is guilty of a crime. Abortion is not a crime in this Nation.

Yes, there are those who want to make it a crime. They want to put the women in jail. We will get to that another day, I assure you. If they win this one, that is coming down the road.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of this issue, do not use the term ''abortionist'' if you can help yourself. Say doctors who perform abortion. And do not say, he confessed. Then, my colleague said, He admitted.

Yes, you are right, this doctor did not come before the panel. Other doctors did. They defended this procedure, said it was the safest procedure, and said that other procedures were 14 times more dangerous for the woman.

Maybe you do not care about the woman. We do not see on that chart the face of the woman. Why is that? I say it is on purpose. It is a woman carrying a baby. I say the word ''baby.'' It is a woman carrying a baby who finds out in the late term some horrible thing she is faced with, with her family.

So do not talk about confessing, and do not talk about admitting.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Haskell's attorney at this point.

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

THE CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE LAW & POLICY,

New York, NY.

Senator ORRIN G. HATCH,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am writing on behalf of Martin Haskell, M.D., whom I currently represent in litigation challenging Ohio House Bill 135, which like H.R. 1833, bans certain methods of abortion. Because of the pending litigation, Dr. Haskell must decline your kind invitation to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Friday, November 17, 1995 about the federal ban on ''partial birth abortions.'' Nevertheless, he asked me to convey you his ardent opposition to the legislation, which will prevent him from providing safe and appropriate medical services to his patients needing second trimester abortions.

Unfortunately, over the last several years, Dr. Haskell has been the object of unlawful violence and intimidation by those who oppose abortion. In addition to physical harassment at home and work, which have included blockages and threats by abortion opponents, he has been the victim of a firebomb that extensively damaged one of his clinics. As a result, Dr. Haskell has recently refused public and media appearances that my increase the risk of violence against him.

While Dr. Haskell is mindful that his appearance before your Committee might clarify much of this misinformation currently circulating about his medical practice and about the purpose and effect of his legislation, he regrets that he will be unable to attend. Please feel free to contact me if I may be of further assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

KATHRYN KOLBERT,

Vice President.

Mrs. BOXER. In this, the attorney explains why the doctor did not come and references the fact that this doctor, unfortunately, has been the object of unlawful violence and intimidation by those who oppose abortion. In addition to physical harassment at home and at work, which have included blockades and threats by abortion opponents, he has been the victim of a firebomb that extensively damaged one of his clinics, and he has not made public appearances because there are some people who happen to love him.

So, please choose your words carefully here. It could have an impact well beyond your meaning.

I read the committee's hearing, the transcript, every word. I am very glad we had that hearing. It is not surprising, the doctors who testified were split on the issue. Some said it is not a necessary procedure. Others said it is quite necessary, it is the safest procedure. Some said we need to have that procedure to save a woman's life. Others said, ''We disagree.''

We do know one thing. The 35,000-member organization of the OB/GYN's, the obstetricians and gynecologists, say no to this bill. The experts, the legal experts are split on the constitutionality.

So, I say we need to look at the real-life people who have had this procedure because they come to us with a real story, not some philosophical point of view—and we all have them. As a matter of fact, one of these women who came before us describes herself as a conservative Republican pro-life person. Imagine. And that testimony cannot be derided by anyone in this Chamber, regardless of his or her view. Those people told the truth about their lives, and they were backed up by their families, and no one could contradict them.

That is the face that has been missing from this debate, the face that has been missing, the mother's face.

I was very glad that we had the hearing because this mother came out and told her story. I am going to show you a photograph of this woman and her family: Coreen Costello, of Agoura, CA, she is 31, a full-time wife and mother of two. Her husband Jim is 33. He is a chiropractor. Children: Chad 7, Carlin 5. She is now pregnant. She is in the third month of her pregnancy. I want you to keep that face in mind and the faces of this family in mind. I want to tell you about her and her story.

This is her statement. I am going to read it. It is brief. I want you to listen to the words and then I want you to think about what has been said here, the cruelty expressed toward the medical profession that took a Hippocratic oath to help a family like this.

Ms. COSTELLO. Senator Hatch, Senator Kennedy, and members of the committee, I would like to really thank you for allowing me to speak to you today. My name is Coreen Costello. I live in Agoura, California, with my husband, Jim; my son, Chad; and my daughter, Carlin. Jim is a chiropractor and I am a full-time wife and mother.

I am a registered Republican and very conservative. I do not believe in abortion. Because of my deeply held Christian beliefs, I knew that I would never have an abortion. Then on March 24th of this year when I was 7 months pregnant, I was having premature contractions and my husband and I rushed to the hospital.

During an ultrasound, the physician became very silent. Soon, more physicians came in. I knew in my heart that there was something terribly wrong. I went into the bathroom and I sobbed. I begged God to let my baby be okay. I prayed like I have never prayed before in my life. My husband reassured me that we could deal with whatever was wrong. We had talked about raising a child with disabilities. We were willing to take whatever God gave us. I had no problem with that.

My doctor arrived at 2:00 in the morning. He held my hand and informed me that they did not expect our baby to live. She was unable to absorb any amniotic fluid and it was puddling into my uterus. That was causing my contractions. This poor precious child had a lethal neurological disorder and had been unable to move for almost 2 months. The movements I had been feeling over the past months had been nothing more than bubbles and fluid.

Her chest cavity had been unable to rise and fall to stretch her lungs to prepare them for air. Therefore, they were left severely underdeveloped, almost to the point of not existing. Her vital organs were atrophying. Our darling little girl was dying.

A peri—peri—a specialist recommended terminating the pregnancy. This is not a medical school class, so I do not know the names of the specialties.

A perinatologist recommended terminating the pregnancy. For my husband and me, this was not an option. I chose to go into labor naturally. I wanted her to come on God's time. I did not want to interfere. It was so difficult to go home and be pregnant and go on with life knowing my baby was dying. I wanted to stay in bed. My husband looked at me and said, Coreen, this baby is still with us; she is still alive; let's be proud of her; let's make these last days of her life as special as possible. I felt her life inside of me and somehow I still glowed.

At this time, we chose our daughter's name. We named her Katherine Grace, Katherine meaning pure, Grace representing God's mercy. Then we had her baptized in utero. We went to many more experts over the next 2 weeks. It was discovered that Katherine's body was rigid and she was stuck in a transverse position. Due to swelling, her head was already larger than that of a full-term baby. Natural birth or induced labor were not possible; they were impossible.

I considered a Cesarean section, but experts at Cedars-Sinai Hospital were adamant that the risks to my health and possibly my life were too great. There was no reason to risk leaving my children motherless if there was no hope of saving Katherine. The doctors all agreed that our only option was the intact D&E procedure.

That is the procedure this bill will outlaw.

I was devastated. The thought of an abortion sent chills down my spine. I remember patting my tummy, promising my little girl that I would never let anyone hurt or devalue her.

After Dr. McMahon explained the procedure to us, I was so comforted. He and his staff understood the pain and anguish we were feeling. I realized I was in the right place. This was the safest way for me to deliver. This left open the possibility of more children, it greatly lowered the risk of my death, and most important to me, it offered a peaceful, painless passing for Katherine Grace.

When I was put under anesthesia, Katherine's heart stopped. She was able to pass away peacefully inside my womb, which was the most comfortable place for her to be. Even if regular birth or a Cesarean had been medically possible, my daughter would have died an agonizing death.

When I awoke a few hours later, she was brought in to us. She was beautiful. She was not missing any part of her brain. She had not been stabbed in the head with scissors. She looked peaceful. My husband and I held her tight and sobbed. We stayed with her for hours, praying and singing lullabies. Giving her back was the hardest moment of my life.

Due to the safety of this procedure, I am again pregnant now. Fortunately, most of you will never have to walk through the valley we have walked. It deeply saddens me that you are making a decision having never walked in our shoes.

When families like ours are given this kind of tragic news, the last people we want to seek advice from are politicians.

I am going to read it again.

When families like ours are given this kind of tragic news, the last people we want to seek advice from are politicians. We talk to our doctors, lots of doctors. We talk to our families and other loved ones, and we ponder long and hard into the night with God.

What happened to our family is heartbreaking and it is private, but we have chosen to share our story with you because we hope it will help you act with wisdom and compassion. I hope you can put aside your political differences, your positions on abortion, and your party affiliations and just try to remember us. We are the ones who know. We are the families that ache to hold our babies, to love them, to nurture them. We are the families who will forever have a hole in our hearts. We are the families that had to choose how our babies would die. Each one of you should be grateful that you and your families have not had to face such a choice. I pray that no one you love ever does.

Please put a stop to this terrible bill. Families like mine are counting on you. Thank you very much.

I say we need to look at the real-life people who have had this procedure. We have to put a mother's face on that drawing and into this debate because we know what will happen.

Some doctors say that this procedure is absolutely necessary to save a woman's life and protect her health. Others say no. What if the ones who say it is necessary are right? You know who is going to pay the price. Not the doctor, because he or she is going to stop doing this procedure. There is no exception in this bill for the life and health of the mother. There is an affirmative defense. That means the doctor has to go into court and defend himself or herself. The burden is on the physician to prove that he was acting or she was acting to save the woman's life and health. So the doctors will stop doing this procedure.

That is what this bill is all about. So who is left with fewer options? The women. It is like telling women—we have seen this—they had better not take a mammogram. We are going to say you do not really need it until you are 50. We faced that debate. Well, that is the only tool we have to save her life. And we fought against that recommendation, and we said to women who are 40 to go get those mammograms. Maybe we will only save 15 percent of you instead of a larger number when you are 50. But that is the only tool we have.

So when we take a tool away, who will be hurt? Not the doctor. It will be your wives. It will be your sisters. It will be your children and mine and their families.

We are over 90 percent men in this Senate. And I want to appeal to those men in this Senate who talk about the beauty of the baby going through the birth canal as if they have ever experienced this themselves. I take offense when you say you are the only ones who care about babies and you denigrate people on the other side and say that we will not talk about the babies. Well, I want to talk about the babies. And I want to talk about these babies who could have lost their mother, a pro-life Republican woman who came here to testify.

So what I am going to do during this debate is concentrate on putting a mother's face on the screen and putting her family's face on the screen, and tell her story because it has been left out of this debate. I plan to talk about the chamber of horrors a doctor would have to go through if he did feel that this was the only option—and when he took his Hippocratic oath, he said, to save the life of his patient—and if he feels that is the only procedure; the chamber of horrors that he would have to go through to protect a woman's health and even her life. I will lead you through what would happen to such a physician.

This is America. What are politicians doing in the hospital room? What are

politicians doing telling this religious woman how to lead her life and what to do? It is an outrage to me.

Roe v. Wade clearly says in late term the State shall regulate abortion, and here is a crowd who comes in here saying we are going to make welfare be run by the State. Fine. Medicaid by the States—we are going to have medical savings accounts. We are going to let Medicare ''wither on the vine,'' a well-known quote of NEWT GINGRICH. We do not need a Federal Government. But now all the doctors in here—as far as I know we only have one, and he was never an ob-gyn—are going to decide what procedure should be banned and what procedure should not be banned.

So I am going to put the face of the mother on this debate. I have many other stories we will tell in the course of time. I am going to take you through what happens to a physician—physicians most of whom who have brought thousands of babies into this world but may believe that this is the safest procedure to use so that this beautiful mother can get pregnant again and can stay alive for her husband and her children.

My colleagues, we have a lot of work to do. We do not even have a budget, and they are talking over there in the House about shutting the Government down again. Why do we not do what we are supposed to do? Why do we not stay out of things that are better left to the family? As she said, the last thing she wants is a politician involved in this tragedy. I think she wants us to do our job. Get a budget. Get a budget. Sit down around the table. Let us negotiate. Let us decide if Medicare and Medicaid are important. Let us decide if environmental protection and education are important. Let us decide how to balance this budget in 7 years with a touch of humanity. So, yes, babies and kids can get health care and can get an education.

That is what we are supposed to do. But, no. We are here with medical drawings. And do you want to know why people on the other side voted overwhelmingly for this bill? Because they never had a chance to amend it. We will give you that chance. We will give you the chance to show your support for States rights. We will give you that chance to stand up for the life and health of the mother.

This is a different place than the House where the Speaker controls the way things come to the floor. I know. I served there for 10 years. It is real difficult.

We have a chance. We have a chance to think about these women and their families and craft a bill that will not put people like this at risk.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this legislation that I know is well intended. But I think it is wrong. Our colleague from California mentioned one witness. Let me read just a part of the testimony of another witness, Mrs. Viki Wilson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that her full statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF VIKI WILSON TO THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1833/S. 939, NOVEMBER 17, 1995

I'd like to thank the Judiciary committee for allowing me to testify today. My name is Viki Wilson. I am a registered nurse, with eighteen years experience, ten in pediatrics. My husband Bill is an emergency room physician. We have three beautiful children: Jon is 10, Katie is 8, and Abigail is in heaven with God.

In the spring of 1994 I was pregnant and expecting my third child on Mother's Day. The nursery was ready and we were excited anticipating the arrival of our baby. Bill had delivered our other two children, and he was going to deliver Abigail. Jon was going to get to cut the cord and Katie was going to be the first to hold her. She had already become a very important part of our family.

At 36 weeks of pregnancy all of our dreams and happy expectations came crashing down around us. My doctor ordered an ultrasound that detected what all my previous prenatal testing, including a chorionic villus sampling, an alphafetoprotein and an earlier ultrasound had failed to detect, an encephalocoele. Approximately 2/3 of my daughter's brain had formed on the outside of her skull. I literally fell to my knees from the shock. I immediately knew that she would not be able to survive outside by womb. My doctor sent me to a perinatologist, a pediatric radiologist and a geneticist all desperately trying to find a way to save her. My husband and I were praying that there would be some new surgical technique to fix her brain. But all the experts concurred. Abigail would not survive outside my womb. And she could not survive the birthing process, because of the size of her anomaly her head would be crushed and she would suffocate. Because of the size of her anomaly, the doctors also feared that my uterus would rupture in the birthing process most likely rendering me sterile. It was also discovered that what I thought were big healthy strong baby movements were in fact seizures. They were being caused by compression of the encephalocoele that continued to increase as she continued to grow inside my womb. I asked, ''What about a c-section?'' Sadly, my doctor told me ''Viki, we do c-sections to save babies. We can't save her. A c-section is dangerous for you and I can't justify those risks.

The biggest question for me and my husband was not ''Is she going to die?'' A higher power had already decided that for us. The question now was ''How is she going to die?'' We wanted to help her leave this world as painlessly and peacefully as possible, and in a way that protected my life and health and allowed us to try again to have children. We agonized over these options, and kept praying for a miracle. After discussing our situation extensively, our doctors referred us to Dr. McMahon. It was during our drive to Los Angeles that we chose our daughter's name. We named her Abigail, the name my grandmother had always wanted for a grandchild. We decided that if she were named Abigail, her great-grandma would be able to recognize her in heaven.

My husband grilled Dr. McMahon with all the same questions that many of you probably have asked about the procedure. We would never have let anything happen to our baby that was cruel, or unnecessary . . . and Bill as my husband, loving me, wanted to be sure it was safe for me.

Dr. McMahon and this procedure were our salvation. My daughter died with dignity inside my womb. She was not stabbed in the back of the head with scissors, no one dragged her out half alive and then killed her, we would never have allowed that to happen.

Losing Abigail was the hardest thing that's ever happened to us in our life. After we went home, I went into the nursery and sat there holding her baby clothes crying and thinking she'll never get to hear me tell her that I love her.

I've often wondered why this had happened to us, what we had done to deserve such pain. I am a practicing Catholic, and I couldn't help believing that God had to have some reason for giving us such a burden. Then I found out about this legislation, and I know then and there that Abigail's life had a special meaning. God knew I would be strong enough to come here and tell you our story, to try to stop this legislation from passing and causing incredible devastation for other families like ours. There will be families in the future faced with this tragedy because pre-natal testing is not infallible. I urge you, please don't take away the safest procedure available.

I told the Monsignor at my parish that I was coming here, and he supports me. He said, ''Viki, what happened to you wasn't about choice. You didn't have a choice. What you did was about preserving your life.'' I was grateful for his words. This issue isn't about choice, it's about a medical necessity. It's about life and health.

My kids attend a Catholic school where a playground was built and named in Abigail's honor. I believe that God gave me the intelligence to make my own decisions knowing I'm the one that has to live with the consequences. My husband said to me as I was getting on the plane to come to Washington ''Viki, make sure this Congress realizes this is truly a Cruelty to Families Act.''

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, here is what she said.

My name is Viki Wilson. I am a registered nurse with eighteen years experience, ten in pediatrics. My husband Bill is an emergency room physician. We have three beautiful children. Jon is 10. Katie is 8, and Abigail is in heaven with God.

At 36 weeks of pregnancy all of our dreams and happy expectations came crashing down around us. . . . . Approximately 2/3 of my daughter's brain had formed on the outside of her skull. I literally fell to my knees from shock [when told about this by the doctor]. I immediately knew that she would not be able to survive outside my womb. . . . My husband and I were praying that there would be some new surgical technique to fix her brain. But all the experts concurred. Abigail would NOT survive outside my womb. And she could not survive the birthing process. Because of the size of her anomaly her head would be crushed and she would suffocate. Because of the size of her anomaly, the doctors also feared that my uterus would rupture in the birthing process most likely rendering me sterile. It was also discovered that what I thought were big, healthy, strong baby movements were in fact seizures.

. . . My daughter died with dignity inside my womb. She was not stabbed in the back of the head with scissors. No one dragged her out half alive and then killed her. We would never have allowed that to happen.

Losing Abigail was the hardest thing that's ever happened to us in our life. After we

went home, I went into the nursery and sat there holding her baby clothes crying and thinking she'll never get to hear me tell her that I love her.

I've often wondered why this had happened to us, what we had done to deserve such pain. I am a practicing Catholic. I couldn't help believing that God had to have some reason for giving us such a burden. Then I found out about this legislation, and I knew then and there that Abigail's life had a special meaning. God knew I would be strong enough to come here and tell you our story, to try to stop this legislation from passing and causing incredible devastation for other families like ours.

. . . My kids attend a Catholic school where a playground was built and named in Abigail's honor. I believe that God gave me the intelligence to make my own decisions knowing I'm the one that has to live with the consequences. My husband said to me as I was getting on the plane to come to Washington, ''Viki, make sure this Congress realizes this is truly a Cruelty to Families Act.''

What we are asked to do in this legislation is to say to the physicians that helped Viki Wilson and Coreen Costello and their families, if you assist these families, you will go to prison for 2 years.

That is a decision we should not make.

In the hearing, I said to the one physician who testified against this bill, who incidentally served 11 years as a missionary in Korea, who now is on the faculty at Johns Hopkins, I have been thinking about it, done exactly 30 minutes of research, and maybe we should—because a brain tumor is a life and death matter, just as this is a life and death matter—maybe we should introduce legislation that says what kind of brain tumor surgery physicians can perform. And I said to him, what do you think about that? He said, of course, it would be a terrible idea. And he followed through because he recognized the analogy that I was making.

For the first time in the history of the United States, if this is adopted, we will be saying to physicians, this is what you have to do; these are the procedures you have to follow.

I frankly have no ability to make that decision.

I wrote to the departments of obstetrics and gynecology of the medical schools in Illinois and asked the people who were in charge what they thought of this legislation. I enclosed a copy of the legislation, and I asked three questions.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these letters be printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY, THE CHICAGO LYING-IN HOSPITAL,

Chicago, IL, November 14, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senator, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: Thank you very much for your letter of November 9 regarding H.R. 1833, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion'' bill. I shall address your questions in order.

1. The term ''partial birth abortion'' appears in the bill to be a loosely defined entity and that makes interpretation difficult. There is a procedure known as ''Dilatation and Evacuation'' (D & E) which is done to interrupt late second trimester pregnancies. Presumably this medically acceptable procedure is not being addressed in the bill, but the language is sufficiently vague that I cannot be certain. Unquestionably, that procedure should never be outlawed. I believe there have been rare instances in which some physicians have done early third trimester interruption of pregnancy, presumably for late-discovered lethal or serious genetic defects, but I am not familiar with this procedure. However, I assume these are done for medically appropriate reasons.

2. I am strongly opposed and extremely concerned about the Federal Government deciding the acceptability of medical procedures in practice. These should be decided based on medical information and not by a legislative process. It appears ironic to me that the current emphasis in Washington is to reduce the Federal Government's involvement in our lives. The proposed legislation goes alarmingly in the opposite direction.

3. A physician should obviously practice medicine ethically and legally. I oppose the notion that criminal or civil penalties be introduced into the practice of medicine in the United States.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on these issues. Please do not hesitate to contact me again, should you desire.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. HERBST, M.D.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AT WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY,

St. Louis, MO, November 22, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: Thank you very much for your letter of November 9, 1995, concerning the legislation H.R. 1833. I will attempt to answer the questions as you have posed them.

One, I am familiar with the procedure, even though I have never performed it myself. I do not agree with those who support the bill. There are instances in which I think that this procedure is appropriate. Two specific instances come to mind. One would be when the life of the woman is in danger and the most expeditious delivery of the fetus would be the safest method for her. This method allows for that, since the fetus can be delivered through a partially dilated cervix. The other instance would be a fetus that is doomed to die after delivery or has a series of severe malformations. Examples of this would be fetuses that have no lungs or no kidneys. Again, this technique of abortion can be safest for the mother because it can be performed when the cervix is not fully dilated. I believe it is cruel to force a woman to carry a fetus to term when she knows that the baby will die after delivery. One can imagine the psychological distress that a woman would have when she is obviously pregnant and people continuously inquire how she and the baby are doing. Imagine having either to hide the problems of the fetus or to not tell the inquiring person. Many times, the inquiries to the pregnant woman are simply part of a normal conversation between persons, but a woman who is carrying a fetus doomed to die would find this a very stressful situation. The instance in which this procedure would be useful is when the discovery is made after 20-22 weeks of pregnancy. It can become the safest procedure for the mother. I must also add that I find it appropriate to perform this procedure when the mother and fetus are both normal. I personally would never do that, and I would have difficulty watching such a procedure being performed on a normal fetus as an elective termination.

In answer to your second question, I have great worries about the federal government having a say on what medical procedures can and cannot be performed. This procedure is an excellent example of why I think the federal government would have problems directing the care of individual patients. There are so many possibilities concerning threats to the pregnant woman's life or fetal malformations that may or may not lead to problems in the future. This also becomes even more complicated because the state of medical art is continually changing and what would be a threat to a woman's life one year might cease to be one in future years, as medical technologies improve. I believe that the federal government is simply too cumbersome to micro-manage the care of individual patients by individual physicians.

In answer to your third question, I have worries about the imposition by Congress of criminal and civil penalties on doctors performing certain medical procedures. It really is tied to the answer to the second question, in that this is a complex area and it is difficult to micro-manage from a distance. I must say that I am very troubled by Section (e) on page 3 of the bill. Physicians would find very little comfort from the fact that ''it is an affirmative defense to a prosecution or a civil action under this section, which must be proved by a preponderance of evidence, that the partial-birth abortion was performed by a physician who reasonably believed the partial-birth abortion was necessary to save the life of the mother; and no other procedure would suffice for that purpose.'' Very few physicians would risk prolonged civil or criminal proceedings, particularly in an area that is so charged as abortion. The other problem with this is that it is absolute in that no other procedure would suffice for that purpose. It would be difficult in any clinical situation to come to the conclusion the only one procedure would suffice.

My greatest problem with this legislation is that we could so frighten physicians that the best procedure for the pregnant woman would be precluded by the legislation. We physicians always wish to place the welfare of our patients first, and bills such as this would make us weigh what we believe to be best for patients against protection for ourselves. I, as a physician, would like never to be put in such a position. The welfare of the patient should always come first.

I hope that my thoughts have been helpful to you, and I appreciate it very much and am indeed honored that you would seek my thoughts on this important and controversial issue. If I can be of further help to you, please feel free to contact me about this or any other medical issue concerned with Obstetrics and Gyncelogy.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. SCHREIBER, M.D.,
PROFESSOR AND HEAD,
Obstetrics and Gynecology.

ROCKFORD HEALTH SYSTEM,
ROCKFORD MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,

Rockford, IL, November 14, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senator, Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: This letter is a response to your inquiry of November 9, 1995, regarding Bill H.R. 1833 which is to be discussed on November 17, 1995. You raised three issues concerning the legislation and the procedure which I will attempt to respond to.

Although I am not an obstetrician, I am somewhat familiar with the procedure. The procedure that is performed is generally done somewhat differently than described in the Bill that was attached to your letter. The procedure apparently is rarely done and is not done at all at this institution. However, there are solid medical indications for doing this procedure when it is deemed safer to perform this than an operative procedure to remove the fetus either if it is non-viable or the mother's life is in danger. Abortions are not performed at this institution for a variety of reasons. Therefore, the outcome of this legislation will have very little impact at this level.

You did raise the question about how I feel about the federal government having a say in what medical procedures can and cannot be performed. I, as my colleagues do, feel quite strongly that the role of the government should not stray into the medical arena regarding what is appropriate or non-appropriate therapy. As you know, all of the ramifications from legislating at this level simply cannot be understood or realized prior to the event and the results may be completely different than those intended. Determining which medical procedures should and should not be done should lie within the confines of the institution performing these procedures. This should be decided by sound medical judgement and where appropriate, the ethical and moral considerations will be discussed at a local level with the Ethics Committee.

In a similar vein, I feel that Congress imposing criminal and civil penalties upon physicians performing medical procedures borders on the ridiculous. If Congress begins to legislate at this level, where can it possibly end?

I hope these comments are of help, and if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to ask me.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. MCCANSE, M.D.,
Vice-President, Medical Affairs.

EVANSTON HOSPITAL CORP.,
DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY,
Evanston, IL, November 13, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
Dirksen Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: In response to your letter of November 9th, I offer the following comments to your questions:

(1) Yes I am familiar with the procedure described in legislation, HR 1833, but have not seen or done one. We do not perform this procedure at this institution. In proper hands (i.e. qualified physician) the procedure does have a place in the armamentarium of termination procedures.

(2) The basic question is, does the federal government have a place in deciding what medical procedures should or should not be performed. I feel strongly not. This is a medical decision.

(3) Similarly, Congress has no business imposing penalties on physicians for performing a certain procedure. If any government sanction would be appropriate, it might be at the State Department of Professional Regulation.

The overall issue of freedom of choice in pregnancy termination should not be clouded or interfered with by dictation of how the termination is performed.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input into this important matter and thank you for asking for my opinion.

Respectfully,

DAVID W. CROMER, M.D.

MICHAEL REESE HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY,
Chicago, IL, November 21, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: I am an Associate Professor of Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Illinois and currently in active practice of Maternal Fetal Medicine or ''high risk'' obstetrics at both Michael Reese Hospital and the University of Illinois Hospital. Therefore, the issue at hand has great importance to me and to the patients for whom I provide care.

I would like to answer your questions by telling you that I am unfamiliar with the term ''Partial Birth Abortion.'' After reading about it from descriptions in the press, I do not find that it results in an outcome that is any different from other techniques of abortion and, therefore, since abortion is a legal procedure, I have no objection to it. I feel very strongly that the federal government should not have a say in defining which medical procedures should be performed. I also believe that the Congress should not impose criminal and additional civil penalties on doctors because they perform one medical procedure and not another to accomplish the same outcome for their patient.

Prior to discussion of H.R. 1833, I was unaware of the term ''Partial Birth Abortion.'' It is neither a term found in the ICD–9 catalog of medical diagnoses or medical procedures published by the American Medical Association nor can it be found in any medical text book with which I am familiar. After reviewing statements that have appeared in the press, I understand that the term has been used to describe one of several techniques that obstetric surgeons have used to accomplish an abortion by enlargement of the opening of the cervix or mouth of the womb (dilation) and removal of the fetus (evacuation). Dilation and evacuation (D&E), the accepted terminology, is used to perform an abortion after the first thirteen weeks (first trimester) of pregnancy. While many physicians perform abortions and have been required to be trained to do that procedure by the American Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology, only a few physicians perform D&E for which they have received additional training.

I present the option for D&E when I find, through the use of ultrasound and other prenatal diagnostic procedures, that the patient is carrying a fetus with severe congenital or chromosomal anomalies. These abnormalities would leave the fetus with severe structural or intellectual deficits, often being incompatible with life after birth. Since these diagnoses cannot be made until after the first trimester of gestation, the patients who have chosen to end their pregnancy require termination either by D&E or by induction of premature labor. The latter procedure requires agents to soften the cervix of the womb and then use of additional medication to cause uterine contractions which expel the fetus.

There are only two physicians of whom I am aware in the Chicago area who perform D&E on patients beyond 20 weeks gestation. I do not know if they at times use the technique of D&E referred to as ''Partial Birth Abortion.'' Most often D&E results in destruction of the fetus; however, one physician to whom I send patients is adept at surgically removing a fetus of late gestation (24 weeks or less) either intact or with only minimal distortion. This has great benefit for the patient because we are able to perform an autopsy on the fetus and confirm any of the suspected abnormalities for which the patient was referred. This information might have an influence on the patient's future childbearing since genetic patterns of inheritance may be identified. It also may provide the mother with an opportunity to see and hold this fetus if she wishes. This brief contact may help her with mourning and ease the burden of losing a pregnancy.

You have asked if I ''share the sense of those who support the bill that this procedure should not be allowed under any circumstance?'' I read the bill and found the definition of a ''Partial Birth Abortion'' contained within it extremely vague. Since this is not a medical term with which I am familiar and the description in the legislation lacks exactness, I cannot give you an answer.

I have another sense of the issue from reading accounts of the procedure in the press and understand that the term has been used to describe a D&E whereby the cervix is partially dilated and extraction of a fetus is performed by pulling down on the legs until the fetal head is just above the open cervix. Since the fetal head is larger that its chest, it does not pass through. An instrument is then used to compress the fetal head so that it can then be delivered without further opening of the cervix. It is unlikely that manipulation of the fetal skull takes place on a fetus that is alive since the umbilical cord which is attached to the fetal abdomen below the cervix and the placenta above has been compressed between the tight cervix and the fetal head resulting in fetal death prior to head decompression. It is true that this entire procedure results in fetal death, but how does this method differ from any of the other techniques of abortion? If abortion is allowed, this technique should not be singled out as being any different than any other technique that achieves the same end.

In fact, D&E may be more desirable as an abortion procedure in that it takes only about 30 minutes to perform; less time to accomplish than the 9 to 12 hours required for induction of labor. This is an advantage to the mother since there is less chance for blood loss and infection. In the past, the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia found D&E to be the safest technique for abortion after the first trimester. With particular reference to a D&E where compression of the fetal head is performed, one can hypothesize that there is less trauma to the mother's cervix from further opening which would be required to deliver the fetal head without decompression. Greater trauma to the cervix has been implicated as a cause of an ''incompetent cervix'' which results in repeated pregnancy loss. I mentioned above the advantages of retrieving an intact specimen for pathologic diagnosis and also in some cases the possibility of helping the mother with the process of mourning.

I feel very strongly that the federal government should not have a say in the type of medical procedures performed by a physician. The advantages of one treatment plan, either medical or surgical, must be left to the process of peer review. It is only by this method that those procedures which have the greatest benefit and carry the least risk to the patient can be identified. Medicine is a discipline founded upon scientific principles and these principles would be superseded if government intervened.

I feel equally as strong about Congress imposing criminal and additional civil penalties upon doctors because of a certain procedure that he or she performs. If the goal of the procedure is to accomplish an end that is within the law, how can Congress possibly call one procedure legal and another illegal? The value of the procedure must be determined by the medical community who can best judge its merit by its risk and benefit to the patient. If the procedure endangers the patient, the medical community, through

the process of peer review, will prohibit that procedure from being performed. Physicians who perform procedures outside of the standard of care can and do face civil and, even at times, criminal penalties; but, the issue does not have to do with the procedure they perform, it concerns the adherence to the standard of care.

I hope my response has been of help. As I have indicated, the term ''Partial Birth Abortion'' is not a medical term with which I am familiar. If abortion is legal, I favor the technique that will accomplish the goal with the least risk and the greatest benefit to the mother. I feel strongly that the federal government cannot decide the scientific merit of one medical procedure over another and, therefore, should not have jurisdiction over which medical procedures should or should not be performed. Congress certainly should not impose civil or criminal penalties on a physician for performing one or another procedure.

I am most grateful to have the opportunity to respond to this issue.

Cordially,

LAURENCE I. BURD, MD
Associate Professor, Clinical Obstetrics & Gynecology.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY (M/C 808) COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Chicago, IL, November 20, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SIMON: I regret to have been unable to answer your recent letter sooner but I was away and only today on my return in the office, I found your letter.

I am still responding to your request just in case in view of a budget impasse, the hearings of your committee have been held as yet. Thus, I hope that this letter may be helpful to you and your committee.

As to the issues raised in your letter regarding ''Partial Birth Abortion, yes I am familiar with the procedure. Such procedures are used very rarely and its proposed prohibition is a thinly disguised assault on the women's reproductive freedom and the physician's freedom in his or her profession. Such a proposed legislation would be injurious to women's health.

I vividly recall a patient many years ago who presented herself to the labor room in premature labor, infected, sick with high fever, and with her premature fetus partially expelled in the vagina through an incompletely dilated cervix. After administration of antibiotics, the baby had to be delivered as rapidly as possible of this clearly now viable fetus. Thus, a head decompression measure such as the one described in the partial-birth abortion bill was used. In addition, the baby turned out to be hydrocephalic. If the proposed legislation was in effect, not allowing this procedure under any circumstances, the woman would have had to be exposed to a Cesarean Section for a non-viable fetus. The invasive operative objective abdominal delivery would have increased significantly for risk of spreading infection, affecting her future fertility and perhaps compromising her life. The democratic system of this Country expressed through our federal government in its three branches, has permitted the realization of a society that, if certainly not perfect, is clearly admired by most nations in the World. However, it is clearly inappropriate and dangerous for the federal government to try to regulate the practice of medicine. Professionals must be permitted to use their judgment on what is best in the care of the individual patients rather than fitting everyone in a procrustean bed made in Washington! Imposing criminal and civil penalties on doctors performing a medical procedure would have clearly a chilling effect on the performance of any procedure, even when ''the physician reasonably believed that the procedure was necessary to save the life of the mother and no other procedure would suffice.'' The law would clearly expose the physician's judgment to second guessing by others whose opinions may be colored by ethical standards not universally shared. This legislative approach has no place in a pluralistic society such as ours and it may result in health damage to many women among our citizens.

Again, I apologize for the lateness in my response and hope that this letter is useful for you and the committee in which you serve.

Sincerely yours,

ANTONIO SCOMMEGNA, MD.

COOK COUNTY HOSPITAL, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY
Chicago, IL, November 21, 1995.

Hon. SENATOR PAUL SIMON,
Dirksen Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: Thank you very much for asking me to comment on H.R. 1833, the bill which address vaginal delivery of late abortions. I am sorry that I was out of the office last week and could not answer your letter in an appropriate time and hope that this will not deter you from asking my thoughts on future issues.

To answer your specific questions:

1. Yes, as you can see I am familiar with the procedure. The issue of the vaginal extraction of late second trimester abortions is an important one, and an issue that cannot, because of its social, religious, and philosophical implications be considered solely on the basis of its medical justification. If we were to only judge the procedure on its medical merits and compared it to other methods of late second trimester abortion, it would be judged the safest method for the mother when carried out by an experienced operator. It is not however, an esthetically ''clean'' procedure, and not one that a caring physician would do except in the most demanding medically indicated situation. I do not agree with those who supported this bill that the procedure should not be allowed under any circumstance.

2. How do I feel about the federal government having a say in what medical procedure can and cannot be preformed? I feel that they should not dictate medical care and should not intervene between a person seeking medical care and the practitioner prescribing that care. Intervention of this type, in which a particular procedure is chosen to solve a medical problem, can only escalate to other procedures and situations that others find morally or religiously objectionable. There are many in this country who find male circumcision reprehensible, should we ban those also?

3. My thoughts on imposing criminal and additional civil penalties on doctors performing a medical procedure? Doctors performing procedures that are medically indicated, carried out without complication, and to the satisfaction of the patient and or their families, should not be subjected to criminal or civil penalties. The tort system, although decidedly not perfect, imposes strict penalties on physicians performing legal procedures in less than a satisfactory manner.

Senator Simon, you can see that I do feel strongly about government intervention between patient and physician. It simply should not occur. Thank you again for asking for my opinions and thoughts regarding H.R. 1833.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. SHERLINE, M.D.,
Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Let me read just a few paragraphs from some of the letters. Dr. Arthur Herbst, who is the chairman of the department at the University of Chicago:

I am strongly opposed and extremely concerned about the Federal Government deciding the acceptability of medical procedures in practice. These should be decided based on medical information and not by a legislative process. It appears ironic to me that the current emphasis in Washington is to reduce the Federal Government's involvement in our lives. The proposed legislation goes alarmingly in the opposite direction.

The chair of the department of obstetrics and gynecology at Washington University in St. Louis, just across the border from Illinois, Dr. James R. Schreiber:

In answer to your second question, I have great worries about the federal government having a say on what medical procedures can and cannot be performed. This procedure is an excellent example of why I think the federal government would have problems directing the care of individual patients. There are so many possibilities concerning threats to the woman's life . . .

My greatest problem with this legislation is that we could so frighten physicians that the best procedure for the pregnant woman would be precluded by the legislation.

The vice president for medical affairs of the Rockford Health System, which is affiliated with the University of Illinois Medical School, writes:

You did raise the question about how I feel about the federal government having a say in what medical procedures can and cannot be performed. I, as my colleagues do, feel quite strongly that the role of the government should not stray into the medical arena regarding what is appropriate or nonappropriate therapy. As you know, all of the ramifications from legislating at this level simply cannot be understood or realized prior to the event and the results may be completely different from those intended.

. . . I feel that Congress imposing criminal and civil penalties upon physicians performing medical procedures borders on the ridiculous. If Congress begins to legislate at this level, where can it possibly end?

Dr. David Cromer, of Evanston Hospital, which is affiliated with Northwestern University's Medical School, writes:

The basic question is, does the federal government have a place in deciding what medical procedures should or should not be performed. I feel strongly not. This is a medical decision.

Similarly, Congress has no business imposing penalties on physicians for performing a certain procedure.

The head of the department of obstetrics and gynecology at Michael Reese Hospital, which is affiliated with the University of Illinois College of Medicine, writes:

You have asked if I ''share the sense of those who support the bill that this procedure should not be allowed under any circumstance?'' I read the bill and found the definition of a ''Partial Birth Abortion'' contained within it extremely vague. Since this is not a medical term with which I am familiar and the description in the legislation lacks exactness, I cannot give you an answer.

. . . I feel very strongly that the federal government should not have a say in the

type of medical procedures performed by a physician.

. . . I feel equally as strong about Congress imposing criminal and additional civil penalties upon doctors because of a certain procedure that he or she performs.

Dr. Antonio Scommegna heads the department of obstetrics and gynecology at the University of Illinois at Chicago:

As to the issues raised in your letter regarding Partial Birth Abortion, yes I am familiar with the procedure. Such procedures are used very rarely and its proposed prohibition is a thinly disguised assault on the women's reproductive freedom and the physician's freedom in his or her profession. Such a proposed legislation would be injurious to women's health.

And a very similar letter from Dr. Donald M. Sherline, who heads that department at Cook County Hospital, which is a huge hospital in Chicago.

I think, Mr. President, that what we have here is something that is well-intended. I do not question the motivation of my colleague from New Hampshire. I would ask every Member of this body to read the testimony of these two women who testified before the Judiciary Committee. Anyone who reads that testimony and believes we should deny these women their right to safe health and put the physicians who give them their health and save their lives, put them in prison for 2 years, I think you have a hard heart indeed. At least I do not have the courage to say to those families, ''We're not going to let you protect yourselves.''

I think this is an example of the Federal Government running amok. If this passes—and I know politically maybe it is going to pass tomorrow—I trust that the President of the United States has the courage to veto this legislation and that we will protect the families of America from this political interference.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to address one aspect of the debate over the partial-birth abortion bill: the argument that the bill is unconstitutional.

Opponents of this bill raise arguments challenging its constitutionality that, I believe, reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of constitutional principles and of the Supreme Court's abortion jurisprudence. This is not only my view, but the view of numerous respected constitutional scholars at our Nation's finest law schools, such as, just to name a few, Michael McConnell, the Graham professor of law at the University of Chicago, and Douglas Kmiec of the Notre Dame Law School, and of other authorities on constitutional law, such as William Barr, former Attorney General of the United States. I believe that H.R. 1833 is constitutional.

Because of the timing in the birth process in which these abortions occur, these fetuses may actually qualify as persons under the Constitution. As such, they are entitled to all of the protections of the law that all other American citizens receive under the Bill of Rights, particularly the 5th and the 14th amendments to the Constitution.

This bill only applies to fetuses which are partially delivered. As such these partially born fetuses do not fall under the framework of Roe versus Wade and Planned Parenthood versus Casey, which apply only to the unborn.

Although State laws on homicide and infanticide generally protect only fully born children, at least 36 States allow recovery under wrongful death statutes for postviability prenatal injuries that cause stillbirth, and another one-third of the States consider killing an unborn child, other than through an abortion, as some form of homicide.

Given these statutes, some States logically have promulgated laws that protect children in the process of being born, such as Texas and California. In light of this existing law, as Professor Kmiec, a former Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, testified before the Judiciary Committee, it is entirely appropriate for Congress to pass a statute protecting such partially born children to clarify their status under the Constitution.

Opponents of this bill would have us believe that 3 inches and 3 seconds can make all the difference. In other words, they would have us believe that a living infant, capable of life outside the mother's womb, and actually in the process of birth, is not a person, entitled to the full panoply of constitutional protections and rights, because it is 3 inches and 3 seconds from birth. Would the Constitution fail to protect a fetus 2 inches and 2 seconds from life? One second and one inch?

Even if one believes that these children qualify as unborn, the Supreme Court's jurisprudence on abortion, principally articulated in Planned Parenthood versus Casey, fully permits Congress to pass this ban on partial-birth abortion. In Casey, the Court, speaking through a three-Justice plurality, Justices O'Connor, Kennedy, and Souter, tossed out Roe versus Wade's trimester framework and articulated three principles to guide courts in abortion cases. First, the woman has a right to terminate her pregnancy before fetal viability.—*Casey*, 112 S.Ct. at 2804.

Second, the interest of the State in promoting prenatal life permits the State to regulate, and even prohibit, abortions after fetal viability, subject to exceptions for the life or health of the mother.

Third, the State has legitimate interests throughout pregnancy in protecting the health of the mother and the life of the fetus.

Under this framework, this bill is constitutional because it only prohibits the abortion of living, viable fetuses, and only by one abortion procedure.

The medical testimony we heard in the Judiciary Committee indicated that about two-thirds of the fetuses aborted in this manner are alive, and that this procedure is generally used largely, if not exclusively, during the period of viability.

Further, H.R. 1833 is limited only to abortions in which a living fetus is partially delivered and then killed. The Casey right to a an abortion before viability is not implicated in this bill, because the bill exempts the abortion of nonviable fetuses and applies only to abortions after viability.

Opponents of the bill reduce our great Constitution to trivialities if they argue that the Constitution guarantees a right to a specific abortion procedure.

Nor does this bill somehow impose an undue burden upon the right to abortion, the test adopted by the three-Justice plurality which, I might add, is not the law of the Supreme Court until it receives a majority.

As Prof. Michael McConnell has written in a November 29, 1995, letter to the Judiciary Committee:

Since this bill would ban only one method of abortion—one that, according to testimony by medical experts, is quite rare—it seems evident that it meets this standard. It can hardly be an ''undue burden'' to require abortionists to conform to standard and accepted medical practice.

Although the undue burden standard is rather unclear, it is still difficult, if not illogical, to conclude that prohibiting one method of abortion, infrequently used, will interpose a ''substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion.''—112 S.Ct. at 2820.

Women seeking abortions previability still may resort to D&C and D&E procedures, which account for most abortions in this country. And, of course, women will have available the other methods of postviability abortion, which our hearings have shown are safer and more widely used.

The Justice Department and the bill's opponents have espoused two main criticisms of the bill.

First, they claim that the bill must have an explicit exception for abortions performed to preserve the health of the mother, which it currently does not have.

Second, they claim that the bill's provision for an exception for the life of the mother is unconstitutional because it is structured only as an affirmative defense.

Both arguments are, in the words of former Attorney General William Barr, meritless.

I will respond to them in turn, but let me note that legal experts of the highest reputation and credentials find these objections to be unconvincing and unsuccessful.

Let me take up the fist argument. In Casey, the Court rejected the trimester framework in favor of a bifurcated approach based on fetal viability, while reaffirming the core holding of Roe.

According to the Supreme Court, after the fetus becomes viable, the Government can prohibit abortion except in cases where the life or health of the mother is threatened.

This bill does not threaten a woman's right to have an abortion, nor does it threaten a woman's life or safety, because it leaves open alternative methods of abortion both before and after viability—methods which the top experts in the field have testified are safer than Dr. Haskell's method.

By banning this rogue method, we actually enhance the woman's safety, not injure it.

I think it is worth quoting the experts on this point, due to the great weight that opponents of this bill have placed on this weak argument.

As Professor Kmiec testified before the Judiciary Committee:

> The bill by its focussed, targeted structure implicitly provides for the health of the mother by not banning all abortion procedures at this later stage of the pregnancy, but only the one seen as patently and inhumanely offensive.

As Professor McConnell of Chicago concludes:

> In light of authoritative medical testimony that partial birth abortions are not necessary for preservation of the mother's health, the bill could not be invalidated on that ground.

According to Former Attorney General Barr:

> Congress could reasonably conclude from the record that the partial-birth abortion procedure is not safer for a mother's health than other available—and well-established—alternatives. It would therefore be pointless to include a health exception in H.R. 1833 because this exception could not be legitimately invoked.

It seems clear that a written exception for the health of the mother need be included only if Congress attempted to ban all postviability abortions, not just this single, rare, offensive method of killing partially born children.

The Supreme Court has recognized many legitimate interests that may justify abortion statutes such as the one before the Senate:

First, safeguarding health, maintaining medical standards, and in protecting potential life;

Second, protecting immature minors, promoting general health, promoting family integrity, and encouraging childbirth over abortion;

Third, protecting human life, protecting the dignity of human life, preventing both moral and legal confusion over the role of physicians in our society, and

Fourth, preventing cruel and inhumane treatment.

Clearly, this bill furthers these interests—recognized as constitutional by the Supreme Court.

The Clinton administration argues that this bill would force an increased medical risk on women, and hence would violate the Constitution.

The administration relies upon two cases, Thornburg versus American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and Planned Parenthood versus Danforth, for the proposition that any State regulation of abortion that might increase the medical risk to the woman is unconstitutional.

First, the factual basis for this argument is absent because there is no evidence that partial-birth abortions are ever necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

In fact, the evidence presented before the Senate Judiciary Committee and before the House Judiciary Committee demonstrated that this procedure is often more dangerous to the life or health of the mother than the other procedures used for late-term abortions.

Second, it is unclear whether Thornburgh and Danforth are any longer good law. Casey overruled much of the holdings of these cases, and scholarly commentary—not to mention pro-abortion activists—initially attacked Casey for overruling several such abortion cases.

Indeed, the very trimester framework employed by Thornburgh and Danforth was clearly overruled by Casey.

Third, the statutes in Thornburgh and Danforth were clearly and utterly different from the bill before us. The State law in Thornburgh required that a second physician be present during a postviability abortion and that a physician performing a postviability abortion had to attempt to preserve the life and health of the unborn child.

This bill does not place such an obligation upon the physician. Indeed, the physician is free to use any other abortion procedure he or she sees fit to protect the life and health of the mother, aside from the partial-birth method.

Indeed, should the life of the mother be threatened, this bill even permits the physician to employ partial-birth procedures.

In Danforth, the state law outlawed the safest and most common abortion procedure for first trimester abortions. The Court struck down that statute because it constituted a barely veiled attempt to outlaw first-trimester abortions entirely.

Here, there is nothing of the sort. In fact, the bill permits the continued use of the more popular, and safe, methods of late-term abortions.

Turning to the second main criticism, the administration and other opponents claim that the bill is unconstitutional because it permits a doctor to justify a partial-birth abortion only as an affirmative defense to a prosecution.

The fact that the bill provides the exception required by the caselaw in an affirmative defense does not unduly burden the right to an abortion.

As I noted when I spoke about this bill last month, many of our constitutional rights arise only as an affirmative defense. Many of the protections of the Bill of Rights sometimes can only be raised as a defense to a prosecution.

To claim that the right to an abortion is not protected by an affirmative defense demeans the explicit protections of the Bill of Rights; and it raises abortion above any other right in the Constitution.

Again, top legal experts I have consulted agree that there is nothing unusual in having one's personal rights evaluated by means of an affirmative defense.

As Professor Kmiec testified before the Judiciary Committee, the Supreme Court has approved the common practice of States to place upon criminal defendants the burden of proving affirmative defenses, such as insanity or killing in self-defense.

In fact, as both Professor Kmiec and former Attorney General Barr note, it makes sense for this burden to fall upon the doctor, for it is the doctor who is uniquely well-positioned to establish that he or she reasonably believed both that the abortion was necessary to save the mother's life and that no other procedure would suffice.

Let me address two other minor arguments that have arisen.

First, there are those who argue that Congress lacks power under the interstate commerce clause to regulate the practice of abortion.

It is incredible to me that those who were in favor of the Freedom of Choice Act and the Access to Clinics Act would raise such an argument. Nonetheless, I will give it the swift dismissal that it deserves.

Whatever one might think about the expansion of Federal power under the commerce clause, whether H.R. 1833 falls within this power ''poses an easy case under current interpretation,'' as Professor McConnell puts it.

We can all agree that the provision of medical services are commercial activities and that abortions are medical services. Even after the decision last Term in Lopez, the Court has been fairly clear that Congress may regulate all commercial activities, because they frequently involve an interstate market.

If Congress can regulate health care, which it does today in myriad different ways, it can regulate abortions. And, if this bill is unconstitutional, then a whole host of other laws, starting with the Access to Clinics Act, are unconstitutional as well.

Second, some argue that this bill will unfairly punish nonphysicians, even though only those performing the partial-birth abortion are subject to its criminal penalties. They claim that Federal aiding-and-abetting laws or misprison laws will hold liable nurses, anesthesiologists, or even rape counselors.

This argument does not even qualify as makeweight. For example, to be guilty of a misprison of felony, one must not just fail to report a crime; one must actually engage in an affirmative, overt act of concealment of a felony.

As Professor Kmiec concludes, ''Logic, prosecutorial discretion under the policies of the Department of Justice, and the strict scienter element necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the underlying offense, all suggest that any possible criminal liability . . . under freestanding conspiracy,

misprison, or aiding and abetting statutes is highly speculative, if not farfetched.'' One cannot help but agree with him.

The weight of both evidence and logic lead us to the conclusion that constitutional objections to this legislation are mere red herrings designed to throw the debate off of the real issue—whether or not this horrible procedure is justified.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1833, the partial-birth abortion ban bill. Mr. President, as you and the Members of the Senate know, on November 8, after 2 days of very spirited debate, this Senate voted to commit this bill to the Judiciary Committee for hearings. There were a number of concerns that had been raised on the Senate floor. A number of these concerns, quite frankly, were addressed during the Judiciary Committee hearing that I attended. So I would like for a moment to take the Members of the Senate back to the debate that we had on the Senate floor in regard to several of the points that were made by the opponents of this bill and see how the points that were made on that date, November 8, were, in fact, answered by the testimony that our Judiciary Committee, under Chairman HATCH, heard, the testimony that we heard at that committee, how it relates to the arguments made by the opponents.

Let me start, Mr. President, with Brenda Shafer. Brenda Shafer, as my colleagues will recall, is the nurse from the Dayton area who has described in great detail exactly what this procedure consists of. My colleague, Senator SMITH, has in great detail described that as well.

While we were debating this issue on the Senate floor the last time it was up, on November 8, Brenda Shafer's credibility was attacked, was attacked by the opponents of this bill. Let me say, Mr. President, after having watched Brenda Shafer testify, I do not believe anyone could have watched her testimony, could have listened to her testimony, could have observed her demeanor, and not come away with the conclusion that she was not only telling the truth, but that what she saw was etched and will be etched in her memory for the rest of her life.

Like some other Members of this body, Mr. President, I have been involved as an attorney in lawsuits. I was a county prosecutor for 4 years, assistant for 2½ years prior to that. I have seen hundreds, probably thousands, of witnesses on the stand. I cannot recall a more compelling witness than Brenda Shafer. If anyone doubts that, I would invite them to go back—do not just read the transcript that is available, but go back and get a video tape from C-SPAN of her testimony.

Let me take a couple points where nurse Shafer was attacked on this floor and talk about how those particular attacks were rebutted by her testimony. Nurse Shafer said that the partial-birth abortion procedure was performed past the 24th week of pregnancy. She was attacked on the Senate floor for saying that.

One Senator quoted from a letter from a supervising nurse at the clinic where Brenda Shafer worked to the effect that ''Dr. Haskell does not perform abortions past 24 weeks of pregnancy.'' This is a document entitled ''Second Trimester Abortion: From Every Angle, Fall Risk Management Seminar, September 13–14, 1992, Dallas, Texas.''

On page 27 of this transcript, there was a paper delivered by Dr. Martin Haskell, ''Dilation and Extraction for Late Second Trimester Abortion, presented at the National Abortion Federation Risk Management Seminar, September 13, 1992.''

On page 28 of this document—this is Dr. Haskell's own words—this is what he said, the author—now remember this is the same person that Brenda Shafer observed performing the abortion. ''The author,'' Dr. Haskell, referring to himself, ''performs the procedure on selected patients 25 through 26 weeks LMP.''

So Dr. Haskell, in his own writing, confirms what nurse Shafer said.

Let me turn to another point. The nurse was attacked also for her comments about ultrasound. On this floor from the same letter, a Senator quoted, ''Dr. Haskell does not use ultrasound.'' Again, in Dr. Haskell's own report, this is what he says: ''The surgical assistant places an ultrasound probe on the patient's abdomen * * *.'' Again, Dr. Haskell's own comments.

In conclusion, I would simply say that again I would invite my colleagues to listen to her testimony. Her testimony is compelling. It is shocking. It is sickening. And it also is backed up by the doctor who performed that abortion, that is, Dr. Haskell, in his own words.

Let me turn to another issue that was raised on this floor in the last debate. Anesthesia. After the bill was introduced, bill opponents argued, without medical evidence, that the anesthesia that was administered to the mother killed the baby, so the baby felt no pain. That was the statement that was made. One U.S. Senator said the following. Let me read directly from the Congressional RECORD. ''The fetus dies during the first dose of anesthesia.'' That is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That was said on this floor.

Further, Dr. Mary Campbell of Planned Parenthood in a fact sheet said the following, in answer to a question, ''When does the fetus die?'' ''The fetus dies of an overdose of anesthesia given to the mother intravenously.''

Further, Kate Michelman of NARAL, at a NARAL news conference, November 7, 1995, here is what she said. ''There has been expert testimony by physicians who do this procedure stating that the anesthesia that is given to the pregnant women prior to the procedure causes fetal demise, the death of the fetus, prior to the procedure.''

Now, Mr. President, in spite of these three comments, in spite of the three assertions that were made on this floor, the facts are directly contrary to this.

This was brought out very clearly—very clearly—in the Judiciary Committee hearing. Again, I invite my colleagues to examine the record.

The confusion raised by these statements was so great in fact, Mr. President, that the American society came forward to set the record straight, a society of people who do this every day, who administer anesthesia.

Mr. Norwig Ellison, president of ASA, came forward and testified at the Judiciary Committee hearing. This is his written statement that was presented that day, and then he gave an oral statement where he stated it again. This is what he had to say:

> The widespread publicity given to this view may cause pregnant women to delay necessary and perhaps lifesaving medical procedures.

He further said:

> Pregnant women are routinely heavily sedated during the second and third trimester for the performance of a variety of necessary medical procedures with absolutely no adverse effect on the fetus, let alone death or brain death.

Also at the hearing, when confronted with this fact, Dr. Campbell, who I quoted earlier, changed her position. At the hearing, Senator SPENCE ABRAHAM from Michigan asked her about the position, referring to the fact sheet that the fetus dies of an overdose of anesthesia. Senator ABRAHAM said, ''This is no longer your position?''

Dr. Campbell replied: ''I believe that is true.''

In other words, she no longer holds the position that the fetus dies from anesthesia.

Further, Dr. Haskell, who performed this procedure on numerous occasions, himself had no doubts on this issue. The American Medical News asked Dr. Haskell the following question: ''Let's talk first about whether or not the fetus is dead beforehand.''

Dr. Haskell responded: ''No, no it's not. No, it's really not. A percentage are for various number of reasons and probably the other two-thirds are not.''

Again, one of the allegations that was made on this floor that the hearings clearly showed was wrong.

Some of the opponents of the bill would have the Members of this Senate and the American people believe that this debate is about whether we ban all abortions. It is sad that this bill is really not about partial-birth abortions, that what it really is is a covert assault on the decision in Roe versus Wade. This is totally false. Look at some of the people lining up behind this legislation: Congressman DAVE BONIOR, SUSAN MOLINARI, PATRICK KENNEDY, DICK GEPHARDT. These individuals are pro-choice. No one has questioned their pro-choice credentials.

They voted for this bill because they believe this is, in fact, a legitimate public policy issue.

Mr. President, this is a legitimate public policy issue. This procedure is especially cruel, it is unusual, it is inhumane, and it should be abolished.

It is perfectly possible and intellectually consistent and coherent to endorse this legislation and simultaneously support the Supreme Court decision in Roe versus Wade. This bill is not a ban on abortions. It is not even a restriction on when an abortion may be performed. Restrictions of that kind were actually envisioned by Roe versus Wade, based as it was on the differences of three trimesters of a pregnancy, but this bill does not do that.

Even so, even though Roe v. Wade allowed for that kind of restriction, this bill does not restrict the timeframe for a woman contemplating an abortion. All this bill does is abolish one particular procedure.

By now, we have all heard this procedure described in considerable detail. I hope that we can agree that this procedure is especially cruel, unusual, and inhumane. This debate is about a very, very, very limited number of abortions. It is a narrow, and should be narrowly structured, debate. To my friends on the other side who argue that we simply have to continue to allow this particular procedure to exist I simply say, is there not any limit to what we as a society will tolerate, what we as a society will accept? How close to an actual birth do we have to get in seconds, in inches, before we say, no?

Mr. President, the two witnesses who testified in front of our committee—my colleague from Illinois and my colleague from California have referenced them—gave some very heart-wrenching testimony. No one could have sat through that hearing without being moved, touched—really those terms are not adequate for how anyone would feel, certainly as I felt as I listened to the testimony.

I think, though, that what we need to remember is that neither of these two tragic situations would have been affected by the bill we are debating. H.R. 1833 covers only living fetuses, not fetuses that have died in the womb. In both the cases, in both the tragedies that were related by the witnesses, their babies had died prior to birth. Their babies had died in the womb. So this bill simply would not cover them.

We will continue to hear, I am sure, on this floor the argument made that we should look at these two heart-wrenching situations. I simply remind my colleagues, whether in the Chamber or back in their office listening to this debate, that we all agree these are just heart-wrenching situations. But we also should understand, and I ask my colleagues to keep in mind, that these two situations are simply not covered by this bill, and so it is really a bogus argument.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President. The Senator from Ohio raises a very important question—and I am paraphrasing it and if I do not do it right, he will let me know—when he asked this rhetorical question: How close do you get to a birth before you just say no to abortion?

I think, clearly, that is a crucial question to be raised. That was the question raised in Roe versus Wade when, in 1973, the Supreme Court looked at the entire issue and tried to answer that question. What they basically said was that in the first 3 months of a woman's pregnancy, she is going to have the right to choose and she is going to make that decision with her God. Government is going to stay out of that decision. That is between her and her God. And as the pregnancy develops, the State has an interest. Clearly, States may regulate later in the pregnancy, and they do. But always under Roe versus Wade, the life and health of the mother is paramount.

When my friend from Ohio says the most compelling testimony was from a nurse, it shows his point of view here because I have heard back from members of that Judiciary Committee, even on the other side of the issue, who said they were riveted to Coreen Costello and to Viki Wilson. They were riveted to hear a story from a pro-life Republican about how she faced this and had to choose this procedure for her life and her health and because of her deep and abiding love, not only because she wanted to live on this planet but for her beautiful children.

So I guess, to me, what is more compelling than someone who served in the clinic for 3 days and comes away and talks about it—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time a letter from Nurse Shafer's supervisor, Christie Gallivan, an R.N.

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

THE WOMEN'S MED+CENTER,
Cincinnati, OH, July 17, 1995.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SCHROEDER: I am a registered nurse and have worked since July, 1993, in the Dayton office of Dr. Martin Haskell. In this capacity, I was the nurse that supervised the training of Brenda Pratt during her brief temporary employment at the Women's Medical Center of Dayton. As you know, we initially conducted a search of our employment records under the name ''Brenda Shafer,'' as this was the name she signed to the letter which was given to us. When provided with the correct last name, we did in fact find the record of her three-day employment at our Dayton facility.

The information provided by Ms. Pratt as to our practices at the Women's Medical Center of Dayton is largely inaccurate. First, she describes Dr. Haskell performing one 25-week and one 26-week abortion procedure. Dr. Haskell does not perform abortions past 24 weeks of pregnancy. This is a self-imposed limit to which he has scrupulously adhered throughout the time I have worked for him.

Second, Dr. Haskell does not use ultrasound in the performance of second-trimester procedures. We use ultrasound only to determine the pregnancy's gestation. Therefore, her entire description of her experience when viewing a second-trimester abortion, which includes Dr. Haskell's using the ultrasound while doing the procedure, is clearly questionable.

Finally, at no point during a dilatation and extraction or intact D&E is there any fetal movement or response that would indicate awareness, pain or struggle. Ms. Pratt absolutely could not have witnessed fetal movement as she describes. We do not train temporary nurses in second trimester dilatation and extraction, since it is a highly technical procedure and would not be performed by someone in a temporary capacity. If, indeed, Ms. Pratt entered the operating room at any point during a D&X procedure, she clearly either is misrepresenting what she saw or remembers it incorrectly.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

CHRISTIE GALLIVAN, RN.

Mrs. BOXER. In this letter, Nurse Gallivan says:

We do not train temporary nurses in second trimester dilatation and extraction, since it is a highly technical procedure and would not be performed by someone in a temporary capacity. If, indeed, Ms. Pratt entered the operating room at any point . . . she clearly either is misrepresenting what she saw or remembers it incorrectly.

Since we are talking about compelling testimony from a nurse, I think it is very compelling that the American Nurses Association has written as follows:

I am writing to express the opposition of the American Nurses Association to H.R. 1833 . . . which is scheduled to be considered by the Senate this week. The legislation would impose Federal criminal penalties and provide for civil actions against health care providers who perform certain late-term abortions.

In the view of the American Nurses Association this proposal would involve an inappropriate intrusion of the Federal Government into a therapeutic decision that should be left in the hands of a pregnant woman and her health care provider.

They go on to say:

This legislation would impose a significant barrier to these principles.

. . . The American Nurses Association is the only full-time professional organization representing the nation's 2.2 million Registered Nurses through its 53 constituent associations.

They respectfully urge us to vote against this bill. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, November 8, 1995.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I am writing to express the opposition of the American Nurses Association to H.R. 1833, the ''Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995'', which is scheduled to be considered by the Senate this week. This legislation would impose Federal criminal penalties and provide for civil actions against health care providers who perform certain late-term abortions.

It is the view of the American Nurses Association that this proposal would involve an

inappropriate intrusion of the federal government into a therapeutic decision that should be left in the hands of a pregnant woman and her health care provider. ANA has long supported freedom of choice and equitable access of all women to basic health services, including services related to reproductive health. This legislation would impose a significant barrier to those principles.

Furthermore, very few of those late-term abortions are performed each year and they are usually necessary either to protect the life of the mother or because of severe fetal abnormalities. It is inappropriate for Congress to mandate a course of action for a woman who is already faced with an intensely personal and difficult decision. This procedure can mean the difference between life and death for a woman.

The American Nurses Association is the only full-service professional organization representing the nation's 2.2 million Registered Nurses through its 53 constituent associations. ANA advances the nursing profession by fostering high standards of nursing practice, promoting the economic and general welfare of nurses in the workplace, projecting a positive and realistic view of nursing, and by lobbying the Congress and regulatory agencies on health care issues affecting nurses and the public.

The American Nurses Association respectfully urges you to vote against H.R. 1833 when it is brought before the Senate.

GERI MARULLO, MSN, RN,
Executive Director.

Mrs. BOXER. When we look at people who nurture, who bring their love into medicine, who bring their compassion into medicine, who have been known to place themselves at risk in the work that they do to save lives, I think it is very important to note that the American Nurses Association strongly opposes this bill.

We know that Viki Wilson, whose testimony was read so eloquently by Senator SIMON, is a pediatric nurse, and she found herself in this circumstance. So if we want to talk about compelling testimony, I guess there was a lot of compelling testimony.

The reason I am keeping this family portrait up here is because I want to keep this family's face right up here. Because with all the talk about medicine and all the charts of drawings of medical procedures, as if we were a medical school here, this has been forgotten. I will not allow these families to be forgotten in this debate. This mother, this wife, this husband and father, and these children, who could have lost this extraordinary woman, who happens to be a pro-life Republican, and who, by the way, wrote in her Op-Ed to the New York Times—that is why I was grateful that we had the hearing, because more attention was paid to this. She said, ''Those who want Congress to ban the controversial late-term abortion technique might think I would be an ally. I was raised in a conservative, religious family. My parents are Rush Limbaugh fans. I am a Republican that always believed that abortion was wrong. Then I had one.'' Then she goes into the pain of this late-term abortion, which was her only option. So, yes, I am leaving her face up here through this debate.

For those people who do not support a woman's right to choose, who say that this bill is consistent with Roe versus Wade, I remind you that Roe is very clear. Always the life and health of the woman is paramount—always, even when a State can in fact regulate abortion, which Roe says they can do under certain circumstances. There is a State interest. The woman's life and her health must always be protected, always be protected. Yes, we had physicians who said this procedure is not necessary to do, but we had others who said, clearly, that it is quite necessary.

As a matter of fact, Coreen Costello, age 31, pregnant now with her third child, her doctor said a cesarean section or induction of labor could well have cost her life.

Well, Mr. President, we are going to have a long time more to debate this. I am not going to go on too long this evening. My friend has been patient and has a lot more to say.

There is no such thing as a partial-birth abortion. There is no such terminology. There is no such thing. There is such a thing as a late-term abortion, and it is always tragic and always undertaken because it is an emergency procedure. The life of mothers like Coreen may well be at stake, or serious adverse health consequences may arise from severe fetal abnormalities, such as organs growing outside the body. These late-term abortions are not births or partial births. They are the most tragic emergency medical procedures.

So I ask again, why is the Senate taking this up—a ban on a particular procedure used in these tragic operations? Is it because nobody is regulating these abortions? No. I explained that in Roe versus Wade clearly the State has the right to, and States do, regulate late-term abortions. Is it because there is a surge in late-term abortions? No. That is not the case.

My colleagues will say that they are doing this because this is a terrible procedure. They throw away the arguments by physicians who say it is a necessary life-saving procedure and only quote those doctors who say it is not. I thought you people were conservative. You should take the conservative position. If even a handful of doctors think a woman is more likely to die—14 times more likely if she undergoes cesarean section—then take the conservative approach and give the physician every tool he or she can have, so that it can be a safe emergency procedure, so women like Coreen Costello and Viki Wilson, and the others we will talk about in debate later, will live.

Well, I think I know what the real agenda is. I do not think it is a surprise. It is not going to shatter anybody's mind when I say this. I think there is a group of Senators who want to make abortion illegal in this country. They ran on that platform. They are committed to doing it. They feel a woman should not have a right to choose.

If it was up to them, they would criminalize this procedure. They would put the woman in jail. They would put the doctor in jail. They do not have the votes, folks. They do not have the votes to outlaw abortion. They wish they did.

Now, with this Republican Congress they have more votes than they have ever had before, and I hope people in this country understand that. But they still do not have the votes to outlaw abortion straight out.

Just like those who came here to destroy environmental protection, they do not have the votes to outlaw the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act. So what do you do? Cut the Environmental Protection Agency by a third; cut enforcement by two-thirds. This way you do not have to go just right at it and repeal the laws.

The same thing here, but another issue. They do not have the votes to outlaw abortion. The Supreme Court, much to their dismay, upheld Roe. They have said abortion is a constitutional right. So these Senators are trying to outlaw abortion not directly but indirectly and they will take every chance to do it. That is what this is about.

Already, we have seen an erosion of a woman's right to choose. No abortion in military hospitals. Imagine, it is your daughter, she is stationed in Saudi Arabia, she cannot go to a military hospital. God knows where she will go.

As Senator SIMPSON said, and I read every word he said, when abortion was illegal in this country, women obtained abortion. A woman risked her freedom to try and get an abortion. Doctors did the same.

I lived through those days. Women died. They died in back alleys. They lost their fertility. We are not going back to those days. But there are those in the Senate who want to take us back. That is what this is about.

They may say it is nothing, you could be pro-choice and support this. That is fine. They can say it. But if you read behind the lines, you know that is the plan. That is the plan of the far right in this country. Take the victories where you get them. Force the President to sign the defense bill. Ipso facto outlaw abortion in military hospitals.

Now, if you are a Federal employee and happen to be a woman, you cannot use your own insurance for which you pay a good portion of the premium, you cannot use it to get an abortion. OK, that is gone.

How about this: one of the reasons the Health and Human Services bill has not been brought up here is there are those in this Senate who want to stop training ob-gyn's to perform abortion. Folks, listen: It does not say stop training them in this procedure. It says stop training medical students so that no one will know how to do a safe and legal abortion in this country.

I stood here on this floor and I objected to bringing that bill forward because I knew that would be offered.

How does that help a woman in this country, when she has to go back to the back alleys, and the men in this Chamber stand up and talk about the joy of giving birth?

I had the joy. Do not lecture me about that. And do not tell my children and my grandchildren that you know better for them than their God and their daughter and their husbands and their wives. Do not do that.

That is not what this Republican revolution was supposed to be about; if anything, it was supposed to be about getting Government out of our lives. Now they are putting it in the hospital room, in the medical school.

We said when this came up, we should have a hearing. We want to put a woman's face on it. We see these drawings. Time after time, day after day—where is the face of the mother? Where is the face of her husband? Where is the face of her children?

No, we did not see that face, but we got that face. We had the time to get that face into those hearings. I am so glad colleagues stuck with us on that one. It was going to be a close vote.

Yes, I hope our colleagues will read the testimony—all sides—and they will find that the medical community is split. The lawyers are split. We already know the Nurses Association is strongly against this bill. Yes, we had one nurse who is for it who worked 3 days as a temporary employee. That is if we believe the veracity of her testimony. Yes, we have some doctors who say the procedure is not necessary. But the obgyn organization says this bill is bad.

But no one can dispute Coreen Costello or Viki Wilson or John and Kim Leonetti, who I will talk about later in this debate, or the many others who had the courage to come forward and tell their story. They are religious women. They are God-loving mothers. No one on the other side of this would dare stand up and say what they said was not accurate. They lived it.

That is what this is about. This is what is going to happen if this bill passes and it is signed into law without exception. People like this do not have a chance.

We have a lot of work to do, as I said, in this Senate. We have a lot of appropriations bills we have to pass. We have to have a pass on Bosnia. We cannot even agree on a budget, can barely agree on the size of the table that we are going to sit around. We have work to do.

I say people sent us here to fight about those priorities. I want that debate. I want to know how Medicare survives after you cut $270 billion out of it. I want to know how Medicaid survives when you cut $182 billion out of it. I want to know how senior citizens are better off when you repeal nursing home standards and go back.

You want to talk about compelling? Why do you not read what it was like in the 1980's before we had nursing home standards from the Federal Government. It was pretty compelling. Grandmothers and grandfathers were sexually abused, mistreated, scalded in the bathtub.

We have a lot of work to do. We should not get into what medical procedure is appropriate and what medical procedure is not.

I will say this to my colleagues. If this bill becomes law as it is now written—I believe the chances of that are nil; there is not even an exception for life or health of the mother, but say it did—and someone's wife dies, someone in this Nation loses a wife and a loving partner because of the action of this body, I tell that person, even though their case could get kicked out of court, I would tell them to sue the pants off every U.S. Senator in this place who voted to outlaw a life-saving procedure. I would make that case that we have no business getting in the middle of a tragic family decision, playing God, playing doctor without the foggiest notion about what it means to make that tragic choice.

We talk about the joy of birth. God has blessed those people who have never known such a tragedy as these families have known. You are blessed that you never knew such a tragedy. But do not stand up here and say in every single case it is all beautiful. How you can even say that, in light of this testimony, is beyond belief.

One of the reasons we were so strong on having this testimony is because of what we heard here on this floor about how every birth is joyful, and there are no problems, and you do not need this procedure. I would have hoped we put that to rest, but it is back here again on the floor, calling doctors names, vicious names, because they helped a family like this. I say to you, if that doctor did not help this woman, that doctor would be violating the Hippocratic Oath.

So, I just hope we amend this bill. Abortion is a legal right in this country. If you want to take it on, if you want to have a bill introduced to make it illegal, to put women in jail, go ahead. Let us have that debate. But I really feel to set ourselves up as a special committee, like one of a hospital that delivers babies, to stand around here and talk about what procedure should be done and what should not be done, I just think we are off the mark as to what our responsibility is here.

This is going to be a very difficult debate. This is just a preview of it. I know my colleagues and I disagree. We try very hard not to be disagreeable with one another. I certainly do not feel disagreeable to my colleagues who take the other view.

I do feel, however, that they are looking at this in a way that ignores women like this, men like this, kids like this, families like this. So I will be bringing us back to these families, these circumstances.

When you legislate, you do not legislate for the majority of people. That is easy. Most times you do not even need to think about this subject.

Of course, we cannot close our eyes and say it is a beautiful, beautiful process, this process of birth. Nothing ever goes wrong, so therefore we are going to say any and all procedures that may have to be used in emergency, let us outlaw them, because maybe if we did, we would not need them.

That is not the way to legislate. You legislate in a conservative fashion. You give the most leeway to people who may need every option at their disposal to save a woman like this and spare her family.

So, yes, we will come back to this. We will debate it. We are going to try to amend this bill. It is a tough one, and I look forward to the remainder of the debate.

I again thank my friend from New Hampshire for his courtesy, for allowing me to continue and complete my remarks, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I heard during the course of the debate from the Senator from California that we should look in the eyes of a mother. She used her example of a woman who went through this very difficult decision, which I understand.

Here we can look into the eyes of a mother, Brenda Shafer. She has two children. She was horrified by what she saw, so horrified that she quit her job at that clinic.

We also heard the Senator from California make great mention of the life-of-the-mother exception. Of course, there is a life-of-the-mother exception in the bill, but it is easier to say it is not in there, so we can continue this debate, I guess; so we have something to say. But I guess my question would be something along these lines. If this is a life-of-the-mother threat that Brenda Shafer witnessed, why was it done in an abortion clinic? Why was it not done in a hospital? If the mother's life is under threat, then I would certainly think it would be done in a hospital where we could get the maximum medical attention, not in a clinic, whose specific and only purpose is to perform abortions. So, you see that is another falsehood that is being perpetrated in the debate here.

Also, another falsehood is we are somehow part of the radical right because we oppose this procedure. The radical right, we were called. In the House, PATRICK KENNEDY, son of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, voted for this. So he is in the radical right. I guess I must have missed something in the newspapers somewhere. I missed it, I guess. The minority leader, former majority leader of the House of Representatives, DICK GEPHARDT, is a member of the radical right. And so many others who were pro-choice who voted for this bill.

You see, the reason they voted for it is because those on the other side are the radical ones. Nurse Shafer was so horrified by this, to her everlasting

credit, she stood up and exposed this for what it is. It is not done to save the life of the mother. We have a life-of-the-mother exception, but this is not done to save the life of the mother. As I said, if it is to save the life of the mother, then get the mother to the hospital, not to an abortion clinic.

Nurse Shafer told the Judiciary Committee at its November 17 hearing on this bill that this partial-birth abortion that she witnessed was carried out—this is very important, I say to my colleagues—was carried out because the little boy involved, the one with the angelic face that she describes right here: ''I never went back to that clinic, but I am still haunted by the face of that little boy—it was the most perfect, angelic face I have ever seen.'' Do you know what that little boy was diagnosed with? Do you know why he was aborted? He was diagnosed with Down's syndrome.

I have heard a lot today on the floor, from the Senator from California and from the Senator from Illinois and others, that somehow I am in the business of playing God here. When a woman electively, selectively makes a decision to abort a child because it has Down's syndrome, that is the only reason, that is the little angelic face—because of that, only, that is what we are talking about here in this particular case—is that not playing God? Somehow there is a twisted sense of logic here.

I guess I have to wonder where we draw the line. Is it a missing foot, a deformed foot? Does that qualify for that decision? A cleft palate, does that qualify? I am having trouble understanding just where it comes down. Where does it come down? God? Playing God? Who is playing God here?

Think about it: Down's syndrome. Do you know, we see Down's syndrome people acting on television everyday. There is a television series involving a young man with Down's syndrome. This little baby boy was killed with a catheter to the back of his head because he had Down's syndrome, in the United States of America. He did nothing else. He did not do anything wrong. He did not commit any crimes.

Even killers on death row who are executed are done so more humanely than this little boy died because he had Down's syndrome. Where are we, in China? What is the next election, female child? Is that all right? Male child, twins, cannot handle that?

This little baby boy, described by Nurse Shafer, with scissors jammed into the back of his head and the catheter sucking his brains out, his crime was that he had Down's syndrome.

This little boy, as nurse Shafer said, was executed by Dr. Haskell because he had Down's syndrome. You know, it is no small irony, Mr. President, if I do say so myself, that we now see the sad spectacle—and it is a sad spectacle—of some of the Senate's most respected and vigorous liberal advocates of the rights of disabled persons in our society coming to the Senate floor to defend an abortion procedure that often targets disabled children, targets them for destruction for one reason—they have a disability.

That is what the Senator from California is talking about. No, I am not playing God, Mr. President. I am not. I am trying to prevent other people from playing God. I am not playing God when I am trying to protect those under the Constitution of the United States any more than I am playing God when I say that a person in this country has the right to the protection of life under the Constitution.

Later on in this debate we may see an amendment. Who knows, somebody may offer an amendment, offered by one or more of those so-called disabled rights advocates, seeking to exempt the disabled from this bill who are disabled through no fault of their own, through some genetic abnormality. How can they claim to be defenders of the rights of the disabled and turn around and single out to target, to execute, out of the womb—not in the womb; out of the womb—disabled babies? Disabled babies.

I would like to see an opportunity where one of these disabled young Americans today, perhaps a young man or woman with Down's syndrome, or perhaps someone with a cleft palate or perhaps someone with a foot or an arm missing due to some horrible birth defect, I would like to see that person come face to face with some of these U.S. Senators and look them in the eye and say, ''You know what? No, I don't have the same privileges you had in terms of health, but I am trying to make something of myself, I'm trying to contribute to society. And I'm doing it. And thank you, I don't appreciate it when you say you want to take my life because of what I was dealt.''

That is what this debate is about. That is what it is about, Mr. President—make no mistake about it—killing disabled children. One of the primary debating tactics that the defenders of the partial-birth abortions employ is to argue—they argue that this brutal, grizzly procedure is utilized only in the hard cases, only in medical emergencies, only in medical emergencies threatening the life of the mother or in the case of severe congenital abnormalities.

But the words, Mr. President, of the only living doctor in America who has publicly—I will strike the word ''confess''—admitted, publicly admitted that he does partial-birth abortions, Dr. Martin Haskell of Dayton, OH, has given the lie to this deceptive debating tactic. Haskell told the AMA News that the overwhelming majority—this is Haskell himself. This is not Smith, this is not the distinguished Senator from Ohio sitting in the Chair, this is not somebody from the pro-life movement; this is Dr. Haskell himself. And in the AMA News he said the overwhelming majority of the partial-birth abortions that he does are for elective reasons—elective reasons.

Haskell performed 1,000 of them. So 800 babies, 800 babies —who knows what those 800 babies may have been—doctors, lawyers, maybe somebody who came up with a cure for cancer, the first woman President, the first black President? Who knows. We will never know. They never had a chance.

In the United States of America this is going on. And people come down here on the floor, time and time again, every time we debate this issue, and accuse me and others of playing God. Haskell said, ''Most of my abortions are elective in that 20- to 24-week range, and probably 20 percent, 20 percent, 200 out of the 1,000 are for genetic reasons.''

So let us call it like it is and stop distorting the record and saying things that are not accurate down here. Let us call it like it is—1,000 abortions, partial-birth abortions in the birth canal, everything but the head; 800 elective, 200 for genetic reasons.

Haskell later tried to claim he had been misquoted. It turns out, however, that the AMA News tape recorded the interview. They tape recorded it. They prepared a transcript. There was not any misquoting in there. Dr. Haskell was quoted accurately.

Like I said earlier, Mr. President, no wonder he did not have the guts to appear before the Judiciary Committee and try to defend his employment of this, because you cannot defend it. They have a bit of a problem with Dr. Haskell's confession that he performs partial-birth abortions on perfectly healthy women with perfectly healthy babies.

We did not hear about that from the Senator from California. We did not hear anything about the perfectly healthy babies. We did not hear the Senator from California stand up on the floor and say, ''I support that healthy baby having the right to live and not die at the hands of an abortionist with a catheter and a pair of scissors to the back of the head.'' No, we did not hear about that.

They tried to claim that somehow the word ''elective'' includes ''hard cases,'' quote unquote. Well, Mr. President, that is another blatant and deliberate deception. And as we debate this bill, there is litigation going on in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, which I am sure the Senator in the chair is aware of, in which Dr. Haskell is challenging the constitutionality of Ohio's new State law banning partial-birth abortions. He is an advocate. I give him credit. He does not see anything wrong with it.

During the course of the proceedings in that case, Dr. Harlan Giles has testified about what ''elective'' means. Dr. Giles is an obstetrician-gynecologist at the Medical College of Pennsylvania and Allegheny General Hospital who has a subspecialty in the field of perinatology, which includes maternal fetal medicine, high-risk pregnancy, ultrasound and genetics.

During his testimony before the U.S. district court in Ohio, Dr. Giles was

asked to tell the court what an elective abortion is. What is it? Here is what Dr. Giles said:

> An elective abortion is a procedure carried out for a patient for whom there is no identifiable maternal or fetal indication. That is to say, the patient feels it would be in her best interest to terminate the pregnancy either on social grounds, emotional grounds, financial grounds, etc. If there are no medical indications from either a fetal or maternal standpoint, we refer to the termination as elective.

There we have it, Mr. President, 8½ months, bring the child 80 percent into the world, making sure you bring it out feet first so that it cannot breathe first, and kill it. That is exactly what we are doing. That is what an elective abortion is, not for medical reasons. Once in a while that is done. But that is not what we are talking about here in 80 percent of the cases.

To sum up what he said is an elective abortion, it is one that is done on a perfectly healthy mother with a perfectly healthy baby—not always. Therefore, what Dr. Haskell told the AMA News is that 80 percent of partial-birth abortions he does are done on perfectly healthy mothers with perfectly healthy babies. But we did not hear about that today—nothing. We did not hear about that at all. That is the truth.

I said during the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, that I would offer my colleagues a detailed assessment of the November 17 hearing that the Judiciary Committee held on this bill. I would like to focus a few remarks on that at the outset of this November 17 hearing. My colleague, Senator KENNEDY, described H.R. 1833 as ''extremist legislation at its worst.'' I found that somewhat puzzling that Senator KENNEDY would say this because his own son, Congressman PATRICK KENNEDY of Rhode Island, voted for the bill in the House, in the exact form that it is here before us in the Senate.

So I assume from that that he means his son is an extremist, and he may very well feel that way. I do not know. We already mentioned Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. BONIOR. I guess they are extremists.

Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY got it wrong, with all due respect to my colleague. The real extremists are those who believe that partial-birth abortions should be legal through all 9 months of pregnancy. We are talking about in the latter months of pregnancy, the latter days in some cases. Those are the extremists; they think it is legal for Haskell to use this method to kill a little Down's syndrome baby. They are the extremists. That is who the extremists are.

Frankly, I initially opposed sending the bill to the committee for a hearing because I did not think it was necessary. But I am glad we had a hearing. As you know, I agreed to have it and allowed the vote to go that way, did not object, because I think that hearing transcript, which the distinguished Senator from Ohio had the opportunity to be a part of, is now available, and I invite my colleagues to review it in detail. Before you vote, read it. It demonstrates just how bankrupt the arguments are on this issue.

When this bill first came to the Senate floor on November 7 and 8, we heard the opposition floor manager, Senator BOXER, repeatedly assert that partial-birth abortions are emergency operations. Senator BOXER said it again today, undertaken to save women's lives. During the November 7 floor debate on this bill, for example, Senator BOXER referred to partial-birth abortion as ''an emergency medical procedure that must be performed on certain pregnant women lest families lose that mother forever.''

You heard it again today. During her appearance on ''Nightline'' with me on November 7, she claimed that partial-birth abortions are emergency medical procedures and asserted that H.R. 1833 would ''outlaw an emergency medical procedure.''

The next day, on November 8, Senator BOXER helped lead the charge on the Senate floor for a hearing on H.R. 1833. And when the Senate agreed to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee for the hearing, it was incumbent upon Senator BOXER and allies on the committee to produce testimony to support her repeated assertions that a partial-birth abortion is an emergency medical procedure.

Well, they had plenty of time to prove it, but they failed to do so. You were there, Mr. President. The lead witness that the opponents of this bill presented was Dr. Nancy Campbell, who is the Medical Director for Planned Parenthood here in Washington. Far from claiming that any partial-birth abortions are undertaken as emergency procedures to save the lives of women, Dr. Campbell asserted that the vast majority of these procedures are done because of severe fetal malformations. So Dr. Campbell's testimony failed to support Senator BOXER's claims. A partial-birth abortion that is undertaken to destroy a baby because the baby has a disability is not necessarily an emergency abortion done to save the life of a mother. So it is not true what is being said here.

At some point in the debate, perhaps tomorrow when we go back to this debate—as the Chair knows, we are going to break at 7:30 and recess the Senate until tomorrow, but at the appropriate time I am going to read into the RECORD comments in a large number of letters from ob-gyn's who take a very interesting view of this bill. They support the bill, and they say the process of partial-birth abortions is simply not necessary to save the life of a mother.

In fact, regarding Dr. Campbell's assertion that the vast majority of partial-birth abortions are done because of severe fetal malformations, that is also unsupportable. Campbell cited no academic studies, no medical journal articles, no government or private statistics, nothing—nothing. Just stated it, no support. In fact, her statement to that effect appears only in the transcript of her oral argument, not in her written statement.

So as I pointed out earlier, the only reliable testimony that we have on this point comes from the only living doctor who is willing to admit publicly that he does these, Dr. Martin Haskell. Haskell told the American Medical Association News that 80 percent of the partial-birth abortions he does are purely for elective reasons. It is entirely reliable because he does them. The man knows what he is talking about. Give him credit for admitting it. He is telling the truth. He is not trying to hide it.

Campbell's assertion, on the other hand, is completely unreliable because she does not do partial-birth abortions and cited no other evidence to support her completely unsupported claim. It is interesting that they had Dr. Campbell testify and she does not do partial-birth abortions and the guy who does do it, Haskell, he does not testify. He cannot be here.

The only other medical witness on the other side was Dr. Courtland Robinson, who is a medical professor at Johns Hopkins, and during his testimony Robinson managed to contradict both Senator BOXER's claim that partial-birth abortions are done for emergency reasons to save women's lives and Dr. Campbell's assertion that the vast majority of them are done because of severe fetal abnormalities. On the other hand, though, Robinson's testimony supports Dr. Haskell's statement to the AMA News that the overwhelming majority, 80 percent of these abortions are done for purely elective reasons.

We have all heard the debate on abortion, about whether or not a woman has the right to choose in the first month, second month, third month. That is a debate that we have had on the Senate floor, and everyone knows where I come from on it. That is not the debate we are having on the Senate floor right now. We are having a debate on the Senate floor now as to whether or not we approve of this procedure that I have earlier described of allowing a child to be brought out through the birth canal with the exception of the head and killed with scissors and a catheter with no anesthetic. And as I said then, would you kill a pet, would you euthanize your pet in that way? Yet we do it to children.

During his oral testimony before the committee, Robinson said that ''women present to us for later abortions for a number of reasons. I am a doctor,'' Robinson continued, ''and it is not my place to judge my patient's reasons for ending a pregnancy or to punish her because circumstances prevented her from obtaining an abortion earlier. It is my place to treat my patient, a woman with a pregnancy she feels she cannot continue.

But bear in mind the timeframe we are talking about—5th through 9th month. I again give the doctor credit for his candor. In seeking to justify the use of the brutal and shockingly inhumane partial-birth procedure, Robinson did claim, as Senator BOXER does, that these are emergency medical procedures.

Neither did Robinson assert, as did Campbell, that the vast majority of such abortions are undertaken because of severe fetal malformations. No. Dr. Robinson told the truth. He corroborated what Dr. Haskell said—80 percent of the partial-birth abortions are purely elective.

So, in conclusion on that point, there are only two witnesses, medical witnesses, that the supporters of partial-birth abortions offered at the 17th of November Judiciary hearing—Campbell and Robinson. Neither one had ever performed a partial-birth abortion, and they flatly contradicted each other about why partial-birth abortions are performed, Campbell claiming the vast majority are because of severe fetal abnormalities, and Robinson said they are done for elective reasons—in other words, on demand. No consistency whatsoever.

Now, the next two witnesses that the supporters of partial-birth abortion presented—and this is the interesting part—were two women who had late-term abortions. Interestingly enough, however—and this was not brought out by the Senator from California—neither one of them had a partial-birth abortion. The Senator from Ohio pointed it out when he was speaking, that neither one of the women had a partial-birth abortion.

The stories they told before the committee were very compelling and very emotional, and I respect that. I understand it. But they were not partial-birth abortions. The first woman was Miss Coreen Costello of Agoura, CA. She explained to the committee that she sought a late-term abortion because her baby had severe deformities and was not expected to survive. She then described her abortion, and what she described was not a partial-birth abortion. It was not a partial-birth abortion.

She said her baby died in the womb before any part of her was removed. She said the baby was not stabbed in the head with scissors. Third, Miss Costello said no part of her brain was missing. Of course not. It was not a partial-birth abortion. The baby died in the womb. That is different.

Clearly, what Ms. Costello described is something else. I do not intend, Mr. President, to make light of the agony that Ms. Costello's anguish caused her over her baby's condition and her abortion. The only thing I want to point out is that this debate is about partial-birth abortions. They could not find anybody to testify who had a partial-birth abortion because the life of the mother was threatened. They could not find anybody to do it. That is my point. That is why we are here, to stop a brutal practice.

To be honest, Ms. Costello's testimony, although very emotional and very personal, is not relevant to the debate we are having today.

The second and last witness who had received a late-term abortion to support partial-birth abortions presented at the November 17 hearing was Viki Wilson. The Senator from Ohio mentioned her.

Ms. Wilson, like Ms. Costello, told the committee about her child's condition and why she had decided to have a late-term abortion. Like Ms. Costello, Ms. Wilson proceeded to describe an abortion that very clearly was not a partial-birth abortion.

She said her little girl died inside the womb. ''My daughter died with dignity inside my womb,'' Ms. Wilson testified. ''She was not stabbed in the back of the head with scissors, no one dragged her out half alive and killed her. We never would have allowed that.''

That is interesting, she never would have allowed that, but we are allowing it here. It is going on. Maybe she would not, and I give Ms. Wilson credit for saying she would not allow it, but others do and it is happening. One thousand Dr. Haskell performed. The estimates are one or two a day.

So not only did Ms. Wilson, like Ms. Costello, not have a partial-birth abortion, she also told the committee she never would have consented to it. Very interesting. Their witness.

In summary, Mr. President, the supporters of partial-birth abortions were not able to produce at the November 17 hearing a single doctor who had ever performed a partial-birth abortion. The only doctor who has publicly confessed to performing them refused to appear, and all they did produce was two doctors who had never done partial-birth abortions, but nonetheless speculated, and in the process contradicted one another about why partial-birth abortions are done.

In short, the supporters of partial-birth abortion produced not a single doctor who cast any doubt whatsoever on the one who has done them, Dr. Haskell. In his own unrefuted statement to the AMA News, 80 percent of partial-birth abortions he does are purely elective. Nobody refuted it.

The supporters of partial-birth abortion were not able to produce as a witness a single woman who had ever undergone a partial-birth abortion. Of course, they are out there, but they did not produce any.

Senator BOXER says that partial-birth abortions are an emergency, and yet she could not find anybody to say that. Other supporters of partial-birth abortions talk about how the procedure is done to eliminate children with severe abnormalities, yet they could not produce a witness who had a partial-birth abortion for that reason.

There you have it, the supporters of partial-birth abortion demanded a hearing to tell their side of the story, and what did they produce? Two doctors who had not done any and two women who had not had any. There is their hearing. They fought hard for it. They wanted it. They got it.

The last witness produced by the supporters of partial-birth abortion at the hearing was a constitutional law professor by the name of Louis Michael Seidman of Georgetown University Law Center. Frankly, as a Catholic myself, I am a little surprised that a Catholic university has on its payroll such a highly partisan, indeed enthusiastic, supporter of abortion on demand through all 9 months of pregnancy for any reason. But to each his own.

Predictably, given Professor Seidman's undisguised enthusiasm for a right to an abortion, that is, Roe versus Wade, it is not surprising he confidently predicted that the Court would strike H.R. 1833 if it were to be enacted.

The other constitutional law expert on the panel was Dr. Kmiec, who served as Assistant Attorney General of the United States at the Justice Department under President Reagan and who now is a professor of law at Notre Dame. He strongly disagreed with Professor Seidman, and I believe Professor Kmiec made, by far, the better case.

Much to my disappointment, though, the Supreme Court in 1992, by a vote of 5 to 4 in the case of Planned Parenthood versus Casey, reaffirmed the basic holding of Roe versus Wade. But the Court did not address in that case, which involved a Pennsylvania State law, a congressional statute like H.R. 1833 that aims to protect babies who have emerged into the birth canal from being brutally killed. Kmiec has no doubt this will be held constitutional if this law passes.

A born child is a constitutional person. Why is a little baby whose whole body beneath her head has already entered the birth canal and entered outside the birth canal be less of a person than one whose head remains inside the birth canal? Can someone please answer that question for me? Why is it any less a person? Three inches, three seconds; three inches, three seconds. If you do not stop the baby from being born, in 3 seconds it is out; it is a living child, 3 inches or 4. What is the difference? If somebody can tell me what the difference is, I sure would like to hear it.

Where in the Constitution does it say that the Congress is powerless to protect such a child from Dr. Haskell's scissors and catheter? Where in the Constitution, where in the Constitution does it say that?

The God-given right to life, of which Thomas Jefferson wrote in the magnificent Declaration of Independence, protects the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness of each and every child who falls victim to Haskell's scissors and his suction catheter, and our great Constitution which guarantees the right of each and every person to

equal protection under the law protects these defenseless, partially born babies from being attacked by Dr. Haskell and other abortionists like him. The American people know it, and the people sitting in this Chamber now, members of the staff, they know it, my colleagues know it—we all know it. You ought to witness one of these things if you have any doubts. See if you can come away like Nurse Shafer and not be affected.

I am going to have a lot more to say on this tomorrow, but I know we have a gentleman's agreement to get this place closed down, because we do not have anybody else to relieve the Chair.

At this point, 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. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to, very briefly, respond to the comments my colleague from California made a few moments ago. I will try to be brief because I realize that we will be debating this bill on other days.

My colleague from California placed in the RECORD a letter, which I might point out had already been placed in the RECORD in the previous days of debate. That was a letter from Nurse Shafer's supervisor. That letter calls into question some of the things that Nurse Shafer said, or in the words of my colleague from California, the supervisor doubts the veracity of the nurse.

Mr. President, let me again talk about the testimony that we heard in the Judiciary Committee that refutes the attacks on Nurse Shafer and that refutes this specific letter by the purported supervisor of Nurse Shafer. First, the issue of how far along, how many weeks along Dr. Haskell would continue to do abortions. Let me quote from the letter. ''Dr. Haskell does not perform abortions past 24 weeks of pregnancy.''

Wrong. Dr. Haskell does. Dr. Haskell says so himself. We have already put that into the RECORD in Dr. Haskell's own words.

Second, ''Dr. Haskell does not use ultrasound.'' Wrong. The record clearly shows he does. How do we know that? Because he says he does.

Third. ''At no point is there any fetal movement or response that would indicate awareness, pain, or struggle.'' Wrong. The testimony that we heard would indicate contrary to that.

So I do not think we should spend this entire debate talking about the veracity of Nurse Shafer. But, again, I would go back to what I said an hour ago and, that is, if anyone doubts her veracity, take the facts, compare them with what Dr. Haskell says, the man who performs the abortions. What you will find is that Nurse Shafer's description fits identically with what Dr. Haskell says he does himself.

So this is a red herring. This is a side issue. This is the old tactic that is always used in court or in a debate: When you do not have the facts, talk about something else. Attack somebody whose testimony you do not like. Let us continue, if we can, to try to focus on what this debate is all about. I will come back to that in a moment. Senator BOXER has quoted Ms. Costello and Ms. Wilson, who gave very compelling testimony. Yes, it was. I thought that in my previous statement I stated that.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I do not see how anyone could have listened to their testimony and not have teared up. I did. Nobody who is a parent and nobody who has lost a child could listen to that and not become emotional. The hearts of everybody in that room went out to those two women. But let me again say, Mr. President, that their testimony was not relevant. Let us confine ourselves to the terms of this debate and to the terms of this bill. No matter how compelling or how emotional their testimony was, or how much our hearts go out to them, it does not alter the simple fact that this bill does not apply to their situations. And so, again, the opponents of this bill want to talk about everything in the world but the bill.

With all due respect, I believe that the attack on this bill that we have heard this afternoon, 90 percent—and that is a conservative estimate—of what was said in opposition to this bill is totally irrelevant. You may believe it, disbelieve it, agree with it, disagree with it, but it is irrelevant. This bill, I submit, Mr. President, has nothing to do with nursing home standards. It has nothing to do with the EPA. It has nothing to do with the environment. We can and will argue these issues on this floor. But let us, please, try to keep this debate to what the issues are in front of us.

Maybe on a note of personal privilege, if I could, Mr. President, my friend from California talks about the ''joy of giving birth.'' She used that phrase four or five times. I guess she was inferring that those of us who favor this bill use this term to in some way denigrate women and say that it is just an easy thing. Well, let me tell you, Mr. President, and let me assure my colleague from California, as the father of eight—but much more importantly, as the husband of the mother of eight, you are never going to catch this U.S. Senator in any way denigrating or in any way making light of birth. You are not going to find me minimizing the pain or the great accomplishment of the mother or the seriousness of the delivery.

Again, Mr. President, let us try to stay on the debate and try to stay on what is relevant. The opponents of this bill talk about protecting the life of the mother. I would, again, call to my colleagues' attention the affirmative defense that was in this bill when it was passed in the House. When many pro-choice Members of the House voted for this bill, that affirmative defense was in there. I also, though, refer my colleagues in the Senate to the evidence that came at the hearing. Again, this is the hearing that the opponents of this bill wanted. It was a good hearing, and we learned things. The evidence at the hearing clearly showed that this is a procedure that you would not use—that a doctor would not use to save the life of a mother. I point out that the testimony clearly showed that this procedure takes 3 days, from the time the woman comes in and you begin to treat the woman until the actual final act takes place. The testimony at the hearing was very clear. If the life of the mother was at stake, a doctor would not do this method, would not do this 3-day procedure. This procedure is not the ''standard of care'' in these cases.

So, again, we can talk about saving the life of the mother. But I maintain that it is outside the scope of this debate. We have the affirmative defense built into the law, built into this proposed law, and you also have testimony—medical testimony—that this is not the procedure you would use anyway.

Dr. Pamela Smith of Chicago's Mt. Sinai Medical Center testified that medical texts prescribe at least three other techniques, but not this one. I will not take the time of the Senate to go into all the medical details, but the testimony is clearly there.

I also point out that no one at the hearing—no one at the hearing—disputed Dr. Smith's testimony. That is the state of the record. We simply do not do this procedure. Again, confine ourselves to this debate.

Mr. President, the debate will go on. We will hear again from both sides, but we should try to narrow it and talk about what is at stake. It is not a question of, do we do away with Roe versus Wade? It is not a question about Republicans or Democrats or conservatives or liberals, or trends, or Republican Congresses or Democrat Congresses. It is about a very, very, very limited number of abortions that are performed each year. But they are performed. They are, I maintain, wrong.

I think the evidence is abundantly clear. My colleague who is in the chair and who has shown the pictures and who has talked about it in graphic detail has described exactly what this procedure consists of. So it is a public policy debate, of very limited scope, but of an important area. We define in this debate, as we do in many debates, what kind of a people we are.

To my friends who are pro-choice—and, again, I say being pro-choice, being for Roe versus Wade, is not inconsistent for being with this bill; in fact, you can be consistent and do that—I say to them and I say to my

friend from California and others who oppose this bill, is there not some limit, some limit, to what a civilized society will tolerate, to what a good and decent people will allow?

I think, Mr. President, in this bill we are saying, yes, there is a limit, however narrow that may be drawn, but there is a limit. So in this bill, in this public debate, as in many debates, we define and redefine and redefine what kind of a people we are and what we hold dear.

MORNING BUSINESS

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

The text of the bill (S. 1316) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the ''Safe Drinking Water Act''), and for other purposes, as passed by the Senate on November 29, 1995, is as follows:

S. 1316

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents; references.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. State revolving loan funds.
Sec. 4. Selection of contaminants; schedule.
Sec. 5. Risk assessment, management, and communication.
Sec. 6. Standard-setting; review of standards.
Sec. 7. Arsenic.
Sec. 8. Radon.
Sec. 9. Sulfate.
Sec. 10. Filtration and disinfection.
Sec. 11. Effective date for regulations.
Sec. 12. Technology and treatment techniques; technology centers.
Sec. 13. Variances and exemptions.
Sec. 14. Small systems; technical assistance.
Sec. 15. Capacity development; finance centers.
Sec. 16. Operator and laboratory certification.
Sec. 17. Source water quality protection partnerships.
Sec. 18. State primacy; State funding.
Sec. 19. Monitoring and information gathering.
Sec. 20. Public notification.
Sec. 21. Enforcement; judicial review.
Sec. 22. Federal agencies.
Sec. 23. Research.
Sec. 24. Definitions.
Sec. 25. Watershed and ground water protection.
Sec. 26. Lead plumbing and pipes; return flows.
Sec. 27. Bottled water.
Sec. 28. Other amendments.

(c) REFERENCES TO TITLE XIV OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, 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 title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the ''Safe Drinking Water Act'') (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) safe drinking water is essential to the protection of public health;

(2) because the requirements of title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the ''Safe Drinking Water Act'') (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) now exceed the financial and technical capacity of some public water systems, especially many small public water systems, the Federal Government needs to provide assistance to communities to help the communities meet Federal drinking water requirements;

(3) the Federal Government commits to take steps to foster and maintain a genuine partnership with the States in the administration and implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act;

(4) States play a central role in the implementation of safe drinking water programs, and States need increased financial resources and appropriate flexibility to ensure the prompt and effective development and implementation of drinking water programs;

(5) the existing process for the assessment and regulation of additional drinking water contaminants needs to be revised and improved to ensure that there is a sound scientific basis for drinking water regulations and that the standards established address the health risks posed by contaminants;

(6) procedures for assessing the health effects of contaminants and establishing drinking water standards should be revised to provide greater opportunity for public education and participation;

(7) in setting priorities with respect to the health risks from drinking water to be addressed and in selecting the appropriate level of regulation for contaminants in drinking water, risk assessment and benefit-cost analysis are important and useful tools for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of drinking water regulations to protect human health;

(8) more effective protection of public health requires—

(A) a Federal commitment to set priorities that will allow scarce Federal, State, and local resources to be targeted toward the drinking water problems of greatest public health concern; and

(B) maximizing the value of the different and complementary strengths and responsibilities of the Federal and State governments in those States that have primary enforcement responsibility for the Safe Drinking Water Act; and

(9) compliance with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act continues to be a concern at public water systems experiencing technical and financial limitations, and Federal, State, and local governments need more resources and more effective authority to attain the objectives of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

SEC. 3. STATE REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

The title (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART G—STATE REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS

''GENERAL AUTHORITY

''SEC. 1471. (a) CAPITALIZATION GRANT AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator shall offer to enter into an agreement with each State to make capitalization grants to the State pursuant to section 1472 (referred to in this part as 'capitalization grants') to establish a drinking water treatment State revolving loan fund (referred to in this part as a 'State loan fund').

''(b) REQUIREMENTS OF AGREEMENTS.—An agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall establish, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that—

''(1) the State has established a State loan fund that complies with the requirements of this part;

''(2) the State loan fund will be administered by an instrumentality of the State that has the powers and authorities that are required to operate the State loan fund in accordance with this part;

''(3) the State will deposit the capitalization grants into the State loan fund;

''(4) the State will deposit all loan repayments received, and interest earned on the amounts deposited into the State loan fund under this part, into the State loan fund;

''(5) the State will deposit into the State loan fund an amount equal to at least 20 percent of the total amount of each payment to be made to the State on or before the date on which the payment is made to the State, except as provided in subsection (c)(4);

''(6) the State will use funds in the State loan fund in accordance with an intended use plan prepared pursuant to section 1474(b);

''(7) the State and loan recipients that receive funds that the State makes available from the State loan fund will use accounting procedures that conform to generally accepted accounting principles, auditing procedures that conform to chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Single Audit Act of 1984'), and such fiscal procedures as the Administrator may prescribe; and

''(8) the State has adopted policies and procedures to ensure that loan recipients are reasonably likely to be able to repay a loan.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION OF STATE LOAN FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to establish assistance priorities for financial assistance provided with amounts deposited into the State loan fund shall reside in the State agency that has primary responsibility for the administration of the State program under section 1413, after consultation with other appropriate State agencies (as determined by the State): *Provided further*, That in nonprimacy States, the Governor shall determine which State agency will have the authority to establish assistance priorities for financial assistance provided with amounts deposited into the State loan fund.

''(2) FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION.—A State may combine the financial administration of the State loan fund pursuant to this part with the financial administration of a State water pollution control revolving fund established by the State pursuant to title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), or other State revolving funds providing financing for similar purposes, if the Administrator determines that the grants to be provided to the State under this part, and the loan repayments and interest deposited into the State loan fund pursuant to this part, will be separately accounted for and used solely for the purposes of and in compliance with the requirements of this part.

''(3) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Governor of a State may—

''(i) reserve up to 50 percent of a capitalization grant made pursuant to section 1472 and add the funds reserved to any funds provided to the State pursuant to section 601 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381); and

''(ii) reserve in any year a dollar amount up to the dollar amount that may be reserved under clause (i) for that year from capitalization grants made pursuant to section 601 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1381) and add

the reserved funds to any funds provided to the State pursuant to section 1472.

''(B) STATE MATCH.—Funds reserved pursuant to this paragraph shall not be considered to be a State match of a capitalization grant required pursuant to this title or the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

''(4) EXTENDED PERIOD.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(5), a State shall not be required to deposit a State matching amount into the fund prior to the date on which each payment is made for payments from funds appropriated for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, if the matching amounts for the payments are deposited into the State fund prior to September 30, 1998.

''CAPITALIZATION GRANTS

''SEC. 1472. (a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may make grants to capitalize State loan funds to a State that has entered into an agreement pursuant to section 1471.

''(b) FORMULA FOR ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c) and paragraph (2), funds made available to carry out this part shall be allotted to States that have entered into an agreement pursuant to section 1471 in accordance with—

''(A) for each of fiscal years 1995 through 1997, a formula that is the same as the formula used to distribute public water system supervision grant funds under section 1443 in fiscal year 1995, except that the minimum proportionate share established in the formula shall be 1 percent of available funds and the formula shall be adjusted to include a minimum proportionate share for the State of Wyoming; and

''(B) for fiscal year 1998 and each subsequent fiscal year, a formula that allocates to each State the proportional share of the State needs identified in the most recent survey conducted pursuant to section 1475(c), except that the minimum proportionate share provided to each State shall be the same as the minimum proportionate share provided under subparagraph (A).

''(2) OTHER JURISDICTIONS.—The formula established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall reserve 0.5 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this part for a fiscal year for providing direct grants to the jurisdictions, other than Indian Tribes, referred to in subsection (f).

''(c) RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, prior to the allotment of funds made available to carry out this part, the Administrator shall reserve 1.5 percent of the funds for providing financial assistance to Indian Tribes pursuant to subsection (f).

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be used to address the most significant threats to public health associated with public water systems that serve Indian Tribes, as determined by the Administrator in consultation with the Director of the Indian Health Service and Indian Tribes.

''(3) NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Indian Health Service and Indian Tribes, shall, in accordance with a schedule that is consistent with the needs surveys conducted pursuant to section 1475(c), prepare surveys and assess the needs of drinking water treatment facilities to serve Indian Tribes, including an evaluation of the public water systems that pose the most significant threats to public health.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) SMALL SYSTEM.—The term 'small system' means a public water system that serves a population of 10,000 or fewer.

''(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The term 'technical assistance' means assistance provided by a State to a small system, including assistance to potential loan recipients and assistance for planning and design, development and implementation of a source water quality protection partnership program, alternative supplies of drinking water, restructuring or consolidation of a small system, and treatment to comply with a national primary drinking water regulation.

''(2) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—To provide technical assistance pursuant to this subsection, each State may reserve from capitalization grants received in any year an amount that does not exceed the greater of—

''(A) an amount equal to 2 percent of the amount of the capitalization grants received by the State pursuant to this section; or

''(B) $300,000.

''(e) ALLOTMENT PERIOD.—

''(1) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the sums allotted to a State pursuant to subsection (b) for a fiscal year shall be available to the State for obligation during the fiscal year for which the sums are authorized and during the following fiscal year.

''(B) FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1995 AND 1996.—The sums allotted to a State pursuant to subsection (b) from funds that are made available by appropriations for each of fiscal years 1995 and 1996 shall be available to the State for obligation during each of fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

''(2) REALLOTMENT OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Prior to obligating new allotments made available to the State pursuant to subsection (b), each State shall obligate funds accumulated before a date that is 1 year prior to the date of the obligation of a new allotment from loan repayments and interest earned on amounts deposited into a State loan fund. The amount of any allotment that is not obligated by a State by the last day of the period of availability established by paragraph (1) shall be immediately reallotted by the Administrator on the basis of the same ratio as is applicable to sums allotted under subsection (b), except that the Administrator may reserve and allocate 10 percent of the remaining amount for financial assistance to Indian Tribes in addition to the amount allotted under subsection (c). None of the funds reallotted by the Administrator shall be reallotted to any State that has not obligated all sums allotted to the State pursuant to this section during the period in which the sums were available for obligation.

''(3) ALLOTMENT OF WITHHELD FUNDS.—All funds withheld by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (g) and section 1442(e)(3) shall be allotted by the Administrator on the basis of the same ratio as is applicable to funds allotted under subsection (b). None of the funds allotted by the Administrator pursuant to this paragraph shall be allotted to a State unless the State has met the requirements of section 1418(a).

''(f) DIRECT GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator is authorized to make grants for the improvement of public water systems of Indian Tribes, the District of Columbia, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam and, if funds are appropriated to carry out this part for fiscal year 1995, the Republic of Palau.

''(2) ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGES.—In the case of a grant for a project under this subsection in an Alaska Native village, the Administrator is also authorized to make grants to the State of Alaska for the benefit of Native villages. An amount not to exceed 4 percent of the grant amount may be used by the State of Alaska for project management.

''(g) NEW SYSTEM CAPACITY.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Administrator shall withhold the percentage prescribed in the following sentence of each capitalization grant made pursuant to this section to a State unless the State has met the requirements of section 1418(a). The percentage withheld shall be 5 percent for fiscal year 1999, 10 percent for fiscal year 2000, and 15 percent for each subsequent fiscal year.

''ELIGIBLE ASSISTANCE

''SEC. 1473. (a) IN GENERAL.—The amounts deposited into a State loan fund, including any amounts equal to the amounts of loan repayments and interest earned on the amounts deposited, may be used by the State to carry out projects that are consistent with this section.

''(b) PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts deposited into a State loan fund shall be used only for providing financial assistance for capital expenditures and associated costs (but excluding the cost of land acquisition unless the cost is incurred to acquire land for the construction of a treatment facility or for a consolidation project) for—

''(A) a project that will facilitate compliance with national primary drinking water regulations promulgated pursuant to section 1412;

''(B) a project that will facilitate the consolidation of public water systems or the use of an alternative source of water supply;

''(C) a project that will upgrade a drinking water treatment system; and

''(D) the development of a public water system to replace private drinking water supplies if the private water supplies pose a significant threat to human health.

''(2) OPERATOR TRAINING.—Associated costs eligible for assistance under this part include the costs of training and certifying the persons who will operate facilities that receive assistance pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(3) LIMITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no assistance under this part shall be provided to a public water system that—

''(i) does not have the technical, managerial, and financial capability to ensure compliance with the requirements of this title; and

''(ii) has a history of—

''(I) past violations of any maximum contaminant level or treatment technique established by a regulation or a variance; or

''(II) significant noncompliance with monitoring requirements or any other requirement of a national primary drinking water regulation or variance.

''(B) RESTRUCTURING.—A public water system described in subparagraph (A) may receive assistance under this part if—

''(i) the owner or operator of the system agrees to undertake feasible and appropriate changes in operations (including ownership, management, accounting, rates, maintenance, consolidation, alternative water supply, or other procedures) if the State determines that such measures are necessary to ensure that the system has the technical, managerial, and financial capability to comply with the requirements of this title over the long term; and

''(ii) the use of the assistance will ensure compliance.

''(c) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS.—A State loan fund, or the Administrator in the case of direct grants under section 1472(f), may provide financial assistance only to community water systems, publicly owned water systems (other than systems owned by Federal agencies), and nonprofit noncommunity water systems.

''(d) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Except as otherwise limited by State law, the amounts deposited into a State loan fund under this section may be used only—

''(1) to make loans, on the condition that—

''(A) the interest rate for each loan is less than or equal to the market interest rate, including an interest free loan;

''(B) principal and interest payments on each loan will commence not later than 1 year after completion of the project for which the loan was made, and each loan will be fully amortized not later than 20 years after the completion of the project, except that in the case of a disadvantaged community (as defined in subsection (e)(1)), a State may provide an extended term for a loan, if the extended term—

''(i) terminates not later than the date that is 30 years after the date of project completion; and

''(ii) does not exceed the expected design life of the project;

''(C) the recipient of each loan will establish a dedicated source of revenue (or, in the case of a privately-owned system, demonstrate that there is adequate security) for the repayment of the loan; and

''(D) the State loan fund will be credited with all payments of principal and interest on each loan;

''(2) to buy or refinance the debt obligation of a municipality or an intermunicipal or interstate agency within the State at an interest rate that is less than or equal to the market interest rate in any case in which a debt obligation is incurred after October 14, 1993, or to refinance a debt obligation for a project constructed to comply with a regulation established pursuant to an amendment to this title made by the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1986 (Public Law 99–339; 100 Stat. 642);

''(3) to guarantee, or purchase insurance for, a local obligation (all of the proceeds of which finance a project eligible for assistance under subsection (b)) if the guarantee or purchase would improve credit market access or reduce the interest rate applicable to the obligation;

''(4) as a source of revenue or security for the payment of principal and interest on revenue or general obligation bonds issued by the State if the proceeds of the sale of the bonds will be deposited into the State loan fund; and

''(5) to earn interest on the amounts deposited into the State loan fund.

''(e) ASSISTANCE FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.—In this subsection, the term 'disadvantaged community' means the service area of a public water system that meets affordability criteria established after public review and comment by the State in which the public water system is located. The Administrator may publish information to assist States in establishing affordability criteria.

''(2) LOAN SUBSIDY.—Notwithstanding subsection (d), in any case in which the State makes a loan pursuant to subsection (d) to a disadvantaged community or to a community that the State expects to become a disadvantaged community as the result of a proposed project, the State may provide additional subsidization (including forgiveness of principal).

''(3) TOTAL AMOUNT OF SUBSIDIES.—For each fiscal year, the total amount of loan subsidies made by a State pursuant to paragraph (2) may not exceed 30 percent of the amount of the capitalization grant received by the State for the year.

''(f) SOURCE WATER QUALITY PROTECTION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), a State may—

''(A) provide assistance, only in the form of a loan, to—

''(i) any public water system described in subsection (c) to acquire land or a conservation easement from a willing seller or grantor, if the purpose of the acquisition is to protect the source water of the system from contamination; or

''(ii) any community water system described in subsection (c) to provide funding in accordance with section 1419(d)(1)(C)(i);

''(B) provide assistance, including technical and financial assistance, to any public water system as part of a capacity development strategy developed and implemented in accordance with section 1418(c); and

''(C) make expenditures from the capitalization grant of the State for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to delineate and assess source water protection areas in accordance with section 1419, except that funds set aside for such expenditure shall be obligated within 4 fiscal years.

''(2) LIMITATION.—For each fiscal year, the total amount of assistance provided and expenditures made by a State under this subsection may not exceed 15 percent of the amount of the capitalization grant received by the State for that year and may not exceed 10 percent of that amount for any one of the following activities:

''(A) To acquire land or conservation easements pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(i).

''(B) To provide funding to implement recommendations of source water quality protection partnerships pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

''(C) To provide assistance through a capacity development strategy pursuant to paragraph (1)(B).

''(D) To make expenditures to delineate or assess source water protection areas pursuant to paragraph (1)(C).

''STATE LOAN FUND ADMINISTRATION

''SEC. 1474. (a) ADMINISTRATION, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND MANAGEMENT.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—Each State that has a State loan fund is authorized to expend from the annual capitalization grant of the State a reasonable amount, not to exceed 4 percent of the capitalization grant made to the State, for the costs of the administration of the State loan fund.

''(2) STATE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State that has a loan fund is authorized to expend from the annual capitalization grant of the State an amount, determined pursuant to this paragraph, to carry out the public water system supervision program under section 1443(a) and to—

''(i) administer, or provide technical assistance through, source water quality protection programs, including a partnership program under section 1419; and

''(ii) develop and implement a capacity development strategy under section 1418(c) in the State.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Amounts expended by a State pursuant to this paragraph for any fiscal year may not exceed an amount that is equal to the amount of the grant funds available to the State for that fiscal year under section 1443(a).

''(C) STATE FUNDS.—For any fiscal year, funds may not be expended pursuant to this paragraph unless the Administrator determines that the amount of State funds made available to carry out the public water system supervision program under section 1443(a) for the fiscal year is not less than the amount of State funds made available to carry out the program for fiscal year 1993.

''(b) INTENDED USE PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing for public review and comment, each State that has entered into a capitalization agreement pursuant to this part shall annually prepare a plan that identifies the intended uses of the amounts available to the State loan fund of the State.

''(2) CONTENTS.—An intended use plan shall include—

''(A) a list of the projects to be assisted in the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the plan, including a description of the project, the expected terms of financial assistance, and the size of the community served;

''(B) the criteria and methods established for the distribution of funds; and

''(C) a description of the financial status of the State loan fund and the short-term and long-term goals of the State loan fund.

''(3) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An intended use plan shall provide, to the maximum extent practicable, that priority for the use of funds be given to projects that—

''(i) address the most serious risk to human health;

''(ii) are necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this title (including requirements for filtration); and

''(iii) assist systems most in need on a per household basis according to State affordability criteria.

''(B) LIST OF PROJECTS.—Each State shall, after notice and opportunity for public comment, publish and periodically update a list of projects in the State that are eligible for assistance under this part, including the priority assigned to each project and, to the extent known, the expected funding schedule for each project.

''STATE LOAN FUND MANAGEMENT

''SEC. 1475. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall conduct such reviews and audits as the Administrator considers appropriate, or require each State to have the reviews and audits independently conducted, in accordance with the single audit requirements of chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.

''(b) STATE REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this part, and every 2 years thereafter, each State that administers a State loan fund shall publish and submit to the Administrator a report on the activities of the State under this part, including the findings of the most recent audit of the State loan fund.

''(c) DRINKING WATER NEEDS SURVEY AND ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, and every 4 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a survey and assessment of the needs for facilities in each State eligible for assistance under this part (including, in the case of the State of Alaska, the needs of Native villages (as defined in section 3(c) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602 (c))). The survey and assessment conducted pursuant to this subsection shall—

''(1) identify, by State, the needs for projects or facilities owned or controlled by community water systems eligible for assistance under this part on the date of the assessment (other than refinancing for a project pursuant to section 1473(d)(2));

''(2) estimate the needs for eligible facilities over the 20-year period following the date of the assessment;

''(3) identify, by size category, the population served by public water systems with needs identified pursuant to paragraph (1); and

''(4) include such other information as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Administrator shall conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the State loan funds through fiscal year 1999. The evaluation shall be submitted to Congress at the same time as the President submits to Congress, pursuant to section 1108 of title 31, United States Code, an appropriations request for fiscal year 2001 relating to the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency.

''ENFORCEMENT

''SEC. 1476. The failure or inability of any public water system to receive funds under this part or any other loan or grant program, or any delay in obtaining the funds, shall not alter the obligation of the system to comply in a timely manner with all applicable drinking water standards and requirements of this title.

''REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

''SEC. 1477. The Administrator shall publish such guidance and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this part, including guidance and regulations to ensure that—

''(1) each State commits and expends funds from the State loan fund in accordance with the requirements of this part and applicable Federal and State laws; and

''(2) the States and eligible public water systems that receive funds under this part use accounting procedures that conform to generally accepted accounting principles, auditing procedures that conform to chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Single Audit Act of 1984'), and such fiscal procedures as the Administrator may prescribe.

''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

''SEC. 1478. (a) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out this part $600,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $1,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.

''(b) HEALTH EFFECTS RESEARCH.—From funds appropriated pursuant to this section for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall reserve $10,000,000 for health effects research on drinking water contaminants authorized by section 1442. In allocating funds made available under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority to research concerning the health effects of cryptosporidium, disinfection byproducts, and arsenic, and the implementation of a research plan for subpopulations at greater risk of adverse effects pursuant to section 1442(l).

''(c) MONITORING FOR UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—From funds appropriated pursuant to this section for each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1997, the Administrator shall reserve $2,000,000 to pay the costs of monitoring for unregulated contaminants under section 1445(a)(2)(D).

''(d) SMALL SYSTEM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), from funds appropriated pursuant to this section for each fiscal year for which the appropriation made pursuant to subsection (a) exceeds $800,000,000, the Administrator shall reserve to carry out section 1442(g) an amount that is equal to any amount by which the amount made available to carry out section 1442(g) is less than the amount referred to in the third sentence of section 1442(g).

''(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—For each fiscal year, the amount reserved under paragraph (1) shall be not greater than an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(A) 2 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal year; or

''(B) $10,000,000.''.

SEC. 4. SELECTION OF CONTAMINANTS; SCHEDULE.

(a) STANDARDS.—Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) is amended by striking ''(b)(1)'' and all that follows through the end of paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(b) STANDARDS.—

''(1) IDENTIFICATION OF CONTAMINANTS FOR LISTING.—

''(A) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for each contaminant (other than a contaminant referred to in paragraph (2) for which a national primary drinking water regulation has been promulgated as of the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995) if the Administrator determines, based on adequate data and appropriate peer-reviewed scientific information and an assessment of health risks, conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices, that—

''(i) the contaminant may have an adverse effect on the health of persons; and

''(ii) the contaminant is known to occur or there is a substantial likelihood that the contaminant will occur in public water systems with a frequency and at levels of public health concern.

''(B) SELECTION AND LISTING OF CONTAMINANTS FOR CONSIDERATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, 1997, the Administrator (after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services) shall publish and periodically, but not less often than every 5 years, update a list of contaminants that are known or anticipated to occur in drinking water provided by public water systems and that may warrant regulation under this title.

''(ii) RESEARCH AND STUDY PLAN.—At such time as a list is published under clause (i), the Administrator shall describe available and needed information and research with respect to—

''(I) the health effects of the contaminants;

''(II) the occurrence of the contaminants in drinking water; and

''(III) treatment techniques and other means that may be feasible to control the contaminants.

''(iii) COMMENT.—The Administrator shall seek comment on each list and any research plan that is published from officials of State and local governments, operators of public water systems, the scientific community, and the general public.

''(C) DETERMINATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), not later than July 1, 2001, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall take one of the following actions for not fewer than 5 contaminants:

''(I) Publish a determination that information available to the Administrator does not warrant the issuance of a national primary drinking water regulation.

''(II) Publish a determination that a national primary drinking water regulation is warranted based on information available to the Administrator, and proceed to propose a maximum contaminant level goal and national primary drinking water regulation not later than 2 years after the date of publication of the determination.

''(III) Propose a maximum contaminant level goal and national primary drinking water regulation.

''(ii) INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the Administrator determines that available information is insufficient to make a determination for a contaminant under clause (i), the Administrator may publish a determination to continue to study the contaminant. Not later than 5 years after the Administrator determines that further study is necessary for a contaminant pursuant to this clause, the Administrator shall make a determination under clause (i).

''(iii) ASSESSMENT.—The determinations under clause (i) shall be based on an assessment of—

''(I) the available scientific knowledge that is consistent with the requirements of paragraph (3)(A) and useful in determining the nature and extent of adverse effects on the health of persons that may occur due to the presence of the contaminant in drinking water;

''(II) information on the occurrence of the contaminant in drinking water; and

''(III) the treatment technologies, treatment techniques, or other means that may be feasible in reducing the contaminant in drinking water provided by public water systems.

''(iv) PRIORITIES.—In making determinations under this subparagraph, the Administrator shall give priority to those contaminants not currently regulated that are associated with the most serious adverse health effects and that present the greatest potential risk to the health of persons due to the presence of the contaminant in drinking water provided by public water systems.

''(v) REVIEW.—Each document setting forth the determination for a contaminant under clause (i) shall be available for public comment at such time as the determination is published.

''(vi) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Determinations made by the Administrator pursuant to clause (i)(I) shall be considered final agency actions for the purposes of section 1448. No determination under clause (i)(I) shall be set aside by a court pursuant to a review authorized under that section, unless the court finds that the determination is arbitrary and capricious.

''(D) URGENT THREATS TO PUBLIC HEALTH.—The Administrator may promulgate an interim national primary drinking water regulation for a contaminant without listing the contaminant under subparagraph (B) or publishing a determination for the contaminant under subparagraph (C) to address an urgent threat to public health as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and written response to any comments provided by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the director of the National Institutes of Health. A determination for any contaminant in accordance with subparagraph (C) subject to an interim regulation under this subparagraph shall be issued not later than 3 years after the date on which the regulation is promulgated and the regulation shall be repromulgated, or revised if appropriate, not later than 5 years after that date.

''(E) MONITORING DATA AND OTHER INFORMATION.—The Administrator may require, in accordance with section 1445(a)(2), the submission of monitoring data and other information necessary for the development of studies, research plans, or national primary drinking water regulations.

''(2) SCHEDULES AND DEADLINES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the contaminants listed in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published in volume 47, Federal Register, page 9352, and in volume 48, Federal Register, page 45502, the Administrator shall publish maximum contaminant level goals and promulgate national primary drinking water regulations—

''(i) not later than 1 year after June 19, 1986, for not fewer than 9 of the listed contaminants;

''(ii) not later than 2 years after June 19, 1986, for not fewer than 40 of the listed contaminants; and

''(iii) not later than 3 years after June 19, 1986, for the remainder of the listed contaminants.

''(B) SUBSTITUTION OF CONTAMINANTS.—If the Administrator identifies a drinking water contaminant the regulation of which, in the judgment of the Administrator, is more likely to be protective of public health (taking into account the schedule for regulation under subparagraph (A)) than a contaminant referred to in subparagraph (A), the Administrator may publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for the identified contaminant in lieu of regulating the contaminant referred to in subparagraph (A). Substitutions may be made for not more than 7 contaminants referred to in subparagraph (A). Regulation of a contaminant identified under this subparagraph shall be in accordance with the schedule applicable to the contaminant for which the substitution is made.

''(C) DISINFECTANTS AND DISINFECTION BYPRODUCTS.—

''(i) INFORMATION COLLECTION RULE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 1995, the Administrator shall, after notice and opportunity for public comment, promulgate an information collection rule to obtain information that will facilitate further revisions to the national primary drinking water regulation for disinfectants and disinfection byproducts, including information on microbial contaminants such as cryptosporidium.

''(II) EXTENSION.—The Administrator may extend the deadline under subclause (I) for up to 180 days if the Administrator determines that progress toward approval of an appropriate analytical method to screen for cryptosporidium is sufficiently advanced and approval is likely to be completed within the additional time period.

''(ii) ADDITIONAL DEADLINES.—The time intervals between promulgation of a final information collection rule, an Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, a Final Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, a Stage I Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule, and a Stage II Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule shall be in accordance with the schedule published in volume 59, Federal Register, page 6361 (February 10, 1994), in table III.13 of the proposed Information Collection Rule. If a delay occurs with respect to the promulgation of any rule in the timetable established by this subparagraph, all subsequent rules shall be completed as expeditiously as practicable subject to agreement by all the parties to the negotiated rulemaking, but no later than a revised date that reflects the interval or intervals for the rules in the timetable.

''(D) PRIOR REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of subparagraphs (C) and (D) of section 1412(b)(3) (as in effect before the amendment made by section 4(a) of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995), and any obligation to promulgate regulations pursuant to such subparagraphs not promulgated as of the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, are superseded by this paragraph and paragraph (1).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1412(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b)''.

(2) Section 1415(d) (42 U.S.C. 300g–4(d)) is amended by striking ''section 1412(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 1412(b)(7)(A)''.

SEC. 5. RISK ASSESSMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND COMMUNICATION.

Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) (as amended by section 4) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) RISK ASSESSMENT, MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION.—

''(A) USE OF SCIENCE IN DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this section, and, to the degree that an Agency action is based on science in carrying out this title, the Administrator shall use—

''(i) the best available, peer-reviewed science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices; and

''(ii) data collected by accepted methods or best available methods (if the reliability of the method and the nature of the decision justifies use of the data).

''(B) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall ensure that the presentation of information on public health effects is comprehensive, informative and understandable. The Administrator shall, in a document made available to the public in support of a regulation promulgated under this section, specify, to the extent practicable—

''(i) each population addressed by any estimate of public health effects;

''(ii) the expected risk or central estimate of risk for the specific populations;

''(iii) each appropriate upper-bound or lower-bound estimate of risk;

''(iv) each uncertainty identified in the process of the assessment of public health effects and research that would assist in resolving the uncertainty; and

''(v) peer-reviewed studies known to the Administrator that support, are directly relevant to, or fail to support any estimate of public health effects and the methodology used to reconcile inconsistencies in the scientific data.

''(C) HEALTH RISK REDUCTION AND COST ANALYSIS.—

''(i) MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVELS.—Not later than 90 days prior to proposing any national primary drinking water regulation that includes a maximum contaminant level, the Administrator shall, with respect to a maximum contaminant level that would be considered in accordance with paragraph (4) in a proposed regulation and each alternative maximum contaminant level that would be considered in a proposed regulation pursuant to paragraph (5) or (6)(A), publish, seek public comment on, and use for the purposes of paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) an analysis of—

''(I) the health risk reduction benefits (including non-quantifiable health benefits identified and described by the Administrator, except that such benefits shall not be used by the Administrator for purposes of determining whether a maximum contaminant level is or is not justified unless there is a factual basis in the rulemaking record to conclude that such benefits are likely to occur) expected as the result of treatment to comply with each level;

''(II) the health risk reduction benefits (including non-quantifiable health benefits identified and described by the Administrator, except that such benefits shall not be used by the Administrator for purposes of determining whether a maximum contaminant level is or is not justified unless there is a factual basis in the rulemaking record to conclude that such benefits are likely to occur) expected from reductions in co-occurring contaminants that may be attributed solely to compliance with the maximum contaminant level, excluding benefits resulting from compliance with other proposed or promulgated regulations;

''(III) the costs (including non-quantifiable costs identified and described by the Administrator, except that such costs shall not be used by the Administrator for purposes of determining whether a maximum contaminant level is or is not justified unless there is a factual basis in the rulemaking record to conclude that such costs are likely to occur) expected solely as a result of compliance with the maximum contaminant level, including monitoring, treatment, and other costs and excluding costs resulting from compliance with other proposed or promulgated regulations;

''(IV) the incremental costs and benefits associated with each alternative maximum contaminant level considered;

''(V) the effects of the contaminant on the general population and on groups within the general population such as infants, children, pregnant women, the elderly, individuals with a history of serious illness, or other subpopulations that are identified as likely to be at greater risk of adverse health effects due to exposure to contaminants in drinking water than the general population;

''(VI) any increased health risk that may occur as the result of compliance, including risks associated with co-occurring contaminants; and

''(VII) other relevant factors, including the quality and extent of the information, the uncertainties in the analysis supporting subclauses (I) through (VI), and factors with respect to the degree and nature of the risk.

''(ii) TREATMENT TECHNIQUES.—Not later than 90 days prior to proposing a national primary drinking water regulation that includes a treatment technique in accordance with paragraph (7)(A), the Administrator shall publish and seek public comment on an analysis of the health risk reduction benefits and costs likely to be experienced as the result of compliance with the treatment technique and alternative treatment techniques that would be considered in a proposed regulation, taking into account, as appropriate, the factors described in clause (i).

''(iii) APPROACHES TO MEASURE AND VALUE BENEFITS.—The Administrator may identify valid approaches for the measurement and valuation of benefits under this subparagraph, including approaches to identify consumer willingness to pay for reductions in health risks from drinking water contaminants.

''(iv) FORM OF NOTICE.—Whenever a national primary drinking water regulation is expected to result in compliance costs greater than $75,000,000 per year, the Administrator shall provide the notice required by clause (i) or (ii) through an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.

''(v) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, acting through the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, to conduct studies, assessments, and analyses in support of regulations or the development of methods, $35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2003.''.

SEC. 6. STANDARD-SETTING; REVIEW OF STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''(4) Each'' and inserting the following:

''(4) GOALS AND STANDARDS.—

''(A) MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL GOALS.—Each'';

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''The maximum contaminant level goal for contaminants that are known or likely to cause cancer in humans may be set

at a level other than zero, if the Administrator determines, based on the best available, peer-reviewed science, that there is a threshold level below which there is unlikely to be any increase in cancer risk and the Administrator sets the maximum contaminant level goal at that level with an adequate margin of safety.'';

(C) in the last sentence—

(i) by striking ''Each national'' and inserting the following:

''(B) MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVELS.— Except as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6), each national''; and

(ii) by striking ''maximum level'' and inserting ''maximum contaminant level''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) DETERMINATION.—At the time the Administrator proposes a national primary drinking water regulation under this paragraph, the Administrator shall publish a determination as to whether the benefits of the maximum contaminant level justify, or do not justify, the costs based on the analysis conducted under paragraph (3)(C).'';

(2) by striking ''(5) For the'' and inserting the following:

''(D) DEFINITION OF FEASIBLE.—For the'';

(3) in the second sentence of paragraph (4)(D) (as so designated), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''this paragraph'';

(4) by striking ''(6) Each national'' and inserting the following:

''(E) FEASIBLE TECHNOLOGIES.—Each national'';

(5) in paragraph (4)(E) (as so designated), by striking ''this paragraph'' and inserting ''this subsection''; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as so amended) the following:

''(5) ADDITIONAL HEALTH RISK CONSIDERATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (4), the Administrator may establish a maximum contaminant level for a contaminant at a level other than the feasible level, if the technology, treatment techniques, and other means used to determine the feasible level would result in an increase in the health risk from drinking water by—

''(i) increasing the concentration of other contaminants in drinking water; or

''(ii) interfering with the efficacy of drinking water treatment techniques or processes that are used to comply with other national primary drinking water regulations.

''(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEVEL.—If the Administrator establishes a maximum contaminant level or levels or requires the use of treatment techniques for any contaminant or contaminants pursuant to the authority of this paragraph—

''(i) the level or levels or treatment techniques shall minimize the overall risk of adverse health effects by balancing the risk from the contaminant and the risk from other contaminants the concentrations of which may be affected by the use of a treatment technique or process that would be employed to attain the maximum contaminant level or levels; and

''(ii) the combination of technology, treatment techniques, or other means required to meet the level or levels shall not be more stringent than is feasible (as defined in paragraph (4)(D)).

''(6) ADDITIONAL HEALTH RISK REDUCTION AND COST CONSIDERATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (4), if the Administrator determines based on an analysis conducted under paragraph (3)(C) that the benefits of a maximum contaminant level promulgated in accordance with paragraph (4) would not justify the costs of complying with the level, the Administrator may, after notice and opportunity for public comment, promulgate a maximum contaminant level for the contaminant that maximizes health risk reduction benefits at a cost that is justified by the benefits.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator shall not use the authority of this paragraph to promulgate a maximum contaminant level for a contaminant, if the benefits of compliance with a national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant that would be promulgated in accordance with paragraph (4) experienced by—

''(i) persons served by large public water systems; and

''(ii) persons served by such other systems as are unlikely, based on information provided by the States, to receive a variance under section 1415(e);

would justify the costs to the systems of complying with the regulation. This subparagraph shall not apply if the contaminant is found almost exclusively in small systems (as defined in section 1415(e)).

''(C) DISINFECTANTS AND DISINFECTION BYPRODUCTS.—The Administrator may not use the authority of this paragraph to establish a maximum contaminant level in a Stage I or Stage II national primary drinking water regulation for contaminants that are disinfectants or disinfection byproducts (as described in paragraph (2)), or to establish a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique requirement for the control of cryptosporidium. The authority of this paragraph may be used to establish regulations for the use of disinfection by systems relying on ground water sources as required by paragraph (8).

''(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination by the Administrator that the benefits of a maximum contaminant level or treatment requirement justify or do not justify the costs of complying with the level shall be reviewed by the court pursuant to section 1448 only as part of a review of a final national primary drinking water regulation that has been promulgated based on the determination and shall not be set aside by the court under that section, unless the court finds that the determination is arbitrary and capricious.''.

(b) DISINFECTANTS AND DISINFECTION BYPRODUCTS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may use the authority of section 1412(b)(5) of the Public Health Service Act (as amended by subsection (a)) to promulgate the Stage I rulemaking for disinfectants and disinfection byproducts as proposed in volume 59, Federal Register, page 38668 (July 29, 1994). Unless new information warrants a modification of the proposal as provided for in the ''Disinfection and Disinfection Byproducts Negotiated Rulemaking Committee Agreement'', nothing in such section shall be construed to require the Administrator to modify the provisions of the rulemaking as proposed.

(c) REVIEW OF STANDARDS.—Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

''(9) REVIEW AND REVISION.—The Administrator shall, not less often than every 6 years, review and revise, as appropriate, each national primary drinking water regulation promulgated under this title. Any revision of a national primary drinking water regulation shall be promulgated in accordance with this section, except that each revision shall maintain or provide for greater protection of the health of persons.''.

SEC. 7. ARSENIC.

Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) ARSENIC.—

''(A) SCHEDULE AND STANDARD.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Administrator shall promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for arsenic in accordance with the schedule established by this paragraph and pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall develop a comprehensive plan for research in support of drinking water rulemaking to reduce the uncertainty in assessing health risks associated with exposure to low levels of arsenic. The Administrator shall consult with the Science Advisory Board established by section 8 of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365), other Federal agencies, and interested public and private entities.

''(C) RESEARCH PROJECTS.—The Administrator shall carry out the research plan, taking care to avoid duplication of other research in progress. The Administrator may enter into cooperative research agreements with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and other interested public and private entities to carry out the research plan.

''(D) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 3½ years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall review the progress of the research to determine whether the health risks associated with exposure to low levels of arsenic are sufficiently well understood to proceed with a national primary drinking water regulation. The Administrator shall consult with the Science Advisory Board, other Federal agencies, and other interested public and private entities as part of the review.

''(E) PROPOSED REGULATION.—The Administrator shall propose a national primary drinking water regulation for arsenic not later than January 1, 2000.

''(F) FINAL REGULATION.—Not later than January 1, 2001, after notice and opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for arsenic.''.

SEC. 8. RADON.

Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) (as amended by section 7) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) RADON IN DRINKING WATER.—

''(A) REGULATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for radon.

''(B) MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the regulation shall provide for a maximum contaminant level for radon of 3,000 picocuries per liter.

''(C) REVISION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a revision to the regulation promulgated under subparagraph (A) may be made pursuant to this subsection. The revision may include a maximum contaminant level less stringent than 3,000 picocuries per liter as provided in paragraphs (4) and (9) or a maximum contaminant level more stringent than 3,000 picocuries per liter as provided in clause (ii).

''(ii) MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—

''(I) CRITERIA FOR REVISION.—The Administrator shall not revise the maximum contaminant level for radon to a more stringent level than the level established under subparagraph (B) unless—

''(aa) the revision is made to reflect consideration of risks from the ingestion of radon in drinking water and episodic uses of drinking water;

''(bb) the revision is supported by peer-reviewed scientific studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices; and

''(cc) based on the studies, the National Academy of Sciences and the Science Advisory Board, established by section 8 of the

Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365), consider a revision of the maximum contaminant level to be appropriate.

''(II) AMOUNT OF REVISION.—If the Administrator determines to revise the maximum contaminant level for radon in accordance with subclause (I), the maximum contaminant level shall be revised to a level that is no more stringent than is necessary to reduce risks to human health from radon in drinking water to a level that is equivalent to risks to human health from radon in outdoor air based on the national average concentration of radon in outdoor air.''.

SEC. 9. SULFATE.

Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) (as amended by section 8) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(14) SULFATE.—

''(A) ADDITIONAL RESEARCH.—Prior to promulgating a national primary drinking water regulation for sulfate the Administrator and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control shall jointly conduct additional research to establish a reliable dose-response relationship for the adverse health effects that may result from exposure to sulfate in drinking water, including the health effects that may be experienced by groups within the general population (including infants and travelers) that are potentially at greater risk of adverse health effects as the result of such exposure. The research shall be conducted in consultation with interested States, shall be based on the best available, peer-reviewed science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices and shall be completed not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

''(B) PROPOSED AND FINAL RULE.—Prior to promulgating a national primary drinking water regulation for sulfate and after consultation with interested States, the Administrator shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking that shall supersede the proposal published in December, 1994. For purposes of the proposed and final rule, the Administrator may specify in the regulation requirements for public notification and options for the provision of alternative water supplies to populations at risk as a means of complying with the regulation in lieu of a best available treatment technology or other means. The Administrator shall, pursuant to the authorities of this subsection and after notice and opportunity for public comment, promulgate a final national primary drinking water regulation for sulfate not later than 48 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

''(C) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

''(i) FEDERAL LAWS.—Notwithstanding part C, section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321), subtitle C or D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.), or section 107 or 121(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607 and 9621(d)), no national primary drinking water regulation for sulfate shall be—

''(I) used as a standard for determining compliance with any provision of any law other than this subsection;

''(II) used as a standard for determining appropriate cleanup levels or whether cleanup should be undertaken with respect to any facility or site;

''(III) considered to be an applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement for any such cleanup; or

''(IV) used for the purpose of defining injury to a natural resource;

unless the Administrator, by rule and after notice and opportunity for public comment, determines that the regulation is appropriate for a use described in subclause (I), (II), (III), or (IV).

''(ii) STATE LAWS.—This subparagraph shall not affect any requirement of State law, including the applicability of any State standard similar to the regulation published under this paragraph as a standard for any cleanup action, compliance action, or natural resource damage action taken pursuant to such a law.''.

SEC. 10. FILTRATION AND DISINFECTION.

(a) FILTRATION CRITERIA.—Section 1412(b)(7)(C)(i) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ''Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, the Administrator shall amend the criteria issued under this clause to provide that a State exercising primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems may, on a case-by-case basis, establish treatment requirements as an alternative to filtration in the case of systems having uninhabited, undeveloped watersheds in consolidated ownership, and having control over access to, and activities in, those watersheds, if the State determines (and the Administrator concurs) that the quality of the source water and the alternative treatment requirements established by the State ensure significantly greater removal efficiencies of pathogenic organisms for which national primary drinking water regulations have been promulgated or that are of public health concern than would be achieved by the combination of filtration and chlorine disinfection (in compliance with this paragraph and paragraph (8)).''.

(b) FILTRATION TECHNOLOGY FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—Section 1412(b)(7)(C) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)(7)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) FILTRATION TECHNOLOGY FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—At the same time as the Administrator proposes an Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule pursuant to paragraph (2)(C)(ii), the Administrator shall propose a regulation that describes treatment techniques that meet the requirements for filtration pursuant to this subparagraph and are feasible for community water systems serving a population of 3,300 or fewer and noncommunity water systems.''.

(c) GROUND WATER DISINFECTION.—The first sentence of section 1412(b)(8) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Not later than 36 months after the enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1986, the Administrator shall propose and promulgate'' and inserting ''At any time after the end of the 3-year period that begins on the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995 but not later than the date on which the Administrator promulgates a Stage II rulemaking for disinfectants and disinfection byproducts (as described in paragraph (2)), the Administrator shall also promulgate''; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', including surface water systems and, as necessary, ground water systems. After consultation with the States, the Administrator shall (as part of the regulations) promulgate criteria that the Administrator, or a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413, shall apply to determine whether disinfection shall be required as a treatment technique for any public water system served by ground water.''.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR REGULATIONS.

Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

''(10) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A national primary drinking water regulation promulgated under this section shall take effect on the date that is 3 years after the date on which the regulation is promulgated unless the Administrator determines that an earlier date is practicable, except that the Administrator, or a State in the case of an individual system, may allow up to 2 additional years to comply with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique if the Administrator or State determines that additional time is necessary for capital improvements.''.

SEC. 12. TECHNOLOGY AND TREATMENT TECHNIQUES; TECHNOLOGY CENTERS.

(a) SYSTEM TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 1412(b) (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)) (as amended by section 9) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) SYSTEM TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(A) GUIDANCE OR REGULATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the Administrator promulgates a national primary drinking water regulation pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall issue guidance or regulations describing all treatment technologies for the contaminant that is the subject of the regulation that are feasible with the use of best technology, treatment techniques, or other means that the Administrator finds, after examination for efficacy under field conditions and not solely under laboratory conditions, are available taking cost into consideration for public water systems serving—

''(I) a population of 10,000 or fewer but more than 3,300;

''(II) a population of 3,300 or fewer but more than 500; and

''(III) a population of 500 or fewer but more than 25.

''(ii) CONTENTS.—The guidance or regulations shall identify the effectiveness of the technology, the cost of the technology, and other factors related to the use of the technology, including requirements for the quality of source water to ensure adequate protection of human health, considering removal efficiencies of the technology, and installation and operation and maintenance requirements for the technology.

''(iii) LIMITATION.—The Administrator shall not issue guidance or regulations for a technology under this paragraph unless the technology adequately protects human health, considering the expected useful life of the technology and the source waters available to systems for which the technology is considered to be feasible.

''(B) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph and after consultation with the States, the Administrator shall issue guidance or regulations under subparagraph (A) for each national primary drinking water regulation promulgated prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph for which a variance may be granted under section 1415(e). The Administrator may, at any time after a national primary drinking water regulation has been promulgated, issue guidance or regulations describing additional or new or innovative treatment technologies that meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) for public water systems described in subparagraph (A)(i) that are subject to the regulation.

''(C) NO SPECIFIED TECHNOLOGY.—A description under subparagraph (A) of the best technology or other means available shall not be considered to require or authorize that the specified technology or other means be used for the purpose of meeting the requirements of any national primary drinking water regulation.''.

(b) TECHNOLOGIES AND TREATMENT TECHNIQUES FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—Section 1412(b)(4)(E) (as amended by section 6(a)) is further amended by adding at the end the

following: ''The Administrator shall include in the list any technology, treatment technique, or other means that is feasible for small public water systems serving—

''(i) a population of 10,000 or fewer but more than 3,300;

''(ii) a population of 3,300 or fewer but more than 500; and

''(iii) a population of 500 or fewer but more than 25;

and that achieves compliance with the maximum contaminant level or treatment technique, including packaged or modular systems and point-of-entry or point-of-use treatment units that are owned, controlled and maintained by the public water system or by a person under contract with the public water system to ensure proper operation and maintenance and compliance with the maximum contaminant level and equipped with mechanical warnings to ensure that customers are automatically notified of operational problems. The Administrator shall not include in the list any point-of-use treatment technology, treatment technique, or other means to achieve compliance with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique requirement for a microbial contaminant (or an indicator of a microbial contaminant). If the American National Standards Institute has issued product standards applicable to a specific type of point-of-entry or point-of-use treatment device, individual units of that type shall not be accepted for compliance with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique requirement unless they are independently certified in accordance with such standards.''.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON SMALL SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 1445 (42 U.S.C. 300j–4) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON SMALL SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES.—For purposes of paragraphs (4)(E) and (15) of section 1412(b), the Administrator may request information on the characteristics of commercially available treatment systems and technologies, including the effectiveness and performance of the systems and technologies under various operating conditions. The Administrator may specify the form, content, and date by which information shall be submitted by manufacturers, States, and other interested persons for the purpose of considering the systems and technologies in the development of regulations or guidance under paragraph (4)(E) or (15) of section 1412(b).''.

(d) SMALL WATER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY CENTERS.—Section 1442 (42 U.S.C. 300j–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—

''(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—The Administrator is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher learning to establish and operate not fewer than 5 small public water system technology assistance centers in the United States.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CENTERS.—The responsibilities of the small public water system technology assistance centers established under this subsection shall include the conduct of research, training, and technical assistance relating to the information, performance, and technical needs of small public water systems or public water systems that serve Indian Tribes.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—Any institution of higher learning interested in receiving a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form and containing such information as the Administrator may require by regulation.

''(4) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Administrator shall select recipients of grants under this subsection on the basis of the following criteria:

''(A) The small public water system technology assistance center shall be located in a State that is representative of the needs of the region in which the State is located for addressing the drinking water needs of rural small communities or Indian Tribes.

''(B) The grant recipient shall be located in a region that has experienced problems with rural water supplies.

''(C) There is available to the grant recipient for carrying out this subsection demonstrated expertise in water resources research, technical assistance, and training.

''(D) The grant recipient shall have the capability to provide leadership in making national and regional contributions to the solution of both long-range and intermediate-range rural water system technology management problems.

''(E) The grant recipient shall have a demonstrated interdisciplinary capability with expertise in small public water system technology management and research.

''(F) The grant recipient shall have a demonstrated capability to disseminate the results of small public water system technology research and training programs through an interdisciplinary continuing education program.

''(G) The projects that the grant recipient proposes to carry out under the grant are necessary and appropriate.

''(H) The grant recipient has regional support beyond the host institution.

''(I) The grant recipient shall include the participation of water resources research institutes established under section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303).

''(5) ALASKA.—For purposes of this subsection, the State of Alaska shall be considered to be a region.

''(6) CONSORTIA OF STATES.—At least 2 of the grants under this subsection shall be made to consortia of States with low population densities. In this paragraph, the term 'consortium of States with low population densities' means a consortium of States, each State of which has an average population density of less than 12.3 persons per square mile, based on data for 1993 from the Bureau of the Census.

''(7) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—At least one center established under this subsection shall focus primarily on the development and evaluation of new technologies and new combinations of existing technologies that are likely to provide more reliable or lower cost options for providing safe drinking water. This center shall be located in a geographic region of the country with a high density of small systems, at a university with an established record of developing and piloting small treatment technologies in cooperation with industry, States, communities, and water system associations.

''(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to make grants under this subsection $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.''.

SEC. 13. VARIANCES AND EXEMPTIONS.

(a) TECHNOLOGY AND TREATMENT TECHNIQUES FOR SYSTEMS ISSUED VARIANCES.—The second sentence of section 1415(a)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 300g–4(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''only be issued to a system after the system's application of'' and inserting ''be issued to a system on condition that the system install''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and based upon an evaluation satisfactory to the State that indicates that alternative sources of water are not reasonably available to the system''.

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—Section 1416 (42 U.S.C. 300g–5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by inserting after ''(which may include economic factors'' the following: '', including qualification of the public water system as a system serving a disadvantaged community pursuant to section 1473(e)(1)''; and

(B) by inserting after ''treatment technique requirement,'' the following: ''or to implement measures to develop an alternative source of water supply,'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''(including increments of progress)'' and inserting ''(including increments of progress or measures to develop an alternative source of water supply)''; and

(B) by striking ''requirement and treatment'' and inserting ''requirement or treatment''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking ''(except as provided in subparagraph (B))'' in subparagraph (A) and all that follows through ''3 years after the date of the issuance of the exemption if'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting the following: ''not later than 3 years after the otherwise applicable compliance date established in section 1412(b)(10).

''(B) No exemption shall be granted unless'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''within the period of such exemption'' and inserting ''prior to the date established pursuant to section 1412(b)(10)'';

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting after ''such financial assistance'' the following: ''or assistance pursuant to part G, or any other Federal or State program is reasonably likely to be available within the period of the exemption'';

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''500 service connections'' and inserting ''a population of 3,300''; and

(ii) by inserting '', but not to exceed a total of 6 years,'' after ''for one or more additional 2-year periods''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LIMITATION.—A public water system may not receive an exemption under this section if the system was granted a variance under section 1415(e).''.

SEC. 14. SMALL SYSTEMS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) SMALL SYSTEM VARIANCES.—Section 1415 (42 U.S.C. 300g–4) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) SMALL SYSTEM VARIANCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator (or a State with primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems under section 1413) may grant to a public water system serving a population of 10,000 or fewer (referred to in this subsection as a 'small system') a variance under this subsection for compliance with a requirement specifying a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique contained in a national primary drinking water regulation, if the variance meets each requirement of this subsection.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF VARIANCES.—A small system may receive a variance under this subsection if the system installs, operates, and maintains, in accordance with guidance or regulations issued by the Administrator, treatment technology that is feasible for small systems as determined by the Administrator pursuant to section 1412(b)(15).

''(3) CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING VARIANCES.—A variance under this subsection shall be available only to a system—

''(A) that cannot afford to comply, in accordance with affordability criteria established by the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413), with a national primary drinking water regulation, including compliance through—

''(i) treatment;

''(ii) alternative source of water supply; or

''(iii) restructuring or consolidation (unless the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) makes a written determination that restructuring or consolidation is not feasible or appropriate based on other specified public policy considerations); and

''(B) for which the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) determines that the terms of the variance ensure adequate protection of human health, considering the quality of the source water for the system and the removal efficiencies and expected useful life of the treatment technology required by the variance.

''(4) APPLICATIONS.—An application for a variance for a national primary drinking water regulation under this subsection shall be submitted to the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) not later than the date that is the later of—

''(A) 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection; or

''(B) 1 year after the compliance date of the national primary drinking water regulation as established under section 1412(b)(10) for which a variance is requested.

''(5) VARIANCE REVIEW AND DECISION.—

''(A) TIMETABLE.—The Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) shall grant or deny a variance not later than 1 year after the date of receipt of the application.

''(B) PENALTY MORATORIUM.—Each public water system that submits a timely application for a variance under this subsection shall not be subject to a penalty in an enforcement action under section 1414 for a violation of a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique in the national primary drinking water regulation with respect to which the variance application was submitted prior to the date of a decision to grant or deny the variance.

''(6) COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES.—

''(A) VARIANCES.—A variance granted under this subsection shall require compliance with the conditions of the variance not later than 3 years after the date on which the variance is granted, except that the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) may allow up to 2 additional years to comply with a treatment technique, secure an alternative source of water, or restructure if the Administrator (or the State) determines that additional time is necessary for capital improvements, or to allow for financial assistance provided pursuant to part G or any other Federal or State program.

''(B) DENIED APPLICATIONS.—If the Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) denies a variance application under this subsection, the public water system shall come into compliance with the requirements of the national primary drinking water regulation for which the variance was requested not later than 4 years after the date on which the national primary drinking water regulation was promulgated.

''(7) DURATION OF VARIANCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) shall review each variance granted under this subsection not less often than every 5 years after the compliance date established in the variance to determine whether the system remains eligible for the variance and is conforming to each condition of the variance.

''(B) REVOCATION OF VARIANCES.—The Administrator (or the State in the case of a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) shall revoke a variance in effect under this subsection if the Administrator (or the State) determines that—

''(i) the system is no longer eligible for a variance;

''(ii) the system has failed to comply with any term or condition of the variance, other than a reporting or monitoring requirement, unless the failure is caused by circumstances outside the control of the system; or

''(iii) the terms of the variance do not ensure adequate protection of human health, considering the quality of source water available to the system and the removal efficiencies and expected useful life of the treatment technology required by the variance.

''(8) INELIGIBILITY FOR VARIANCES.—A variance shall not be available under this subsection for—

''(A) any maximum contaminant level or treatment technique for a contaminant with respect to which a national primary drinking water regulation was promulgated prior to January 1, 1986; or

''(B) a national primary drinking water regulation for a microbial contaminant (including a bacterium, virus, or other organism) or an indicator or treatment technique for a microbial contaminant.

''(9) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection and in consultation with the States, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations for variances to be granted under this subsection. The regulations shall, at a minimum, specify—

''(i) procedures to be used by the Administrator or a State to grant or deny variances, including requirements for notifying the Administrator and consumers of the public water system applying for a variance and requirements for a public hearing on the variance before the variance is granted;

''(ii) requirements for the installation and proper operation of treatment technology that is feasible (pursuant to section 1412(b)(15)) for small systems and the financial and technical capability to operate the treatment system, including operator training and certification;

''(iii) eligibility criteria for a variance for each national primary drinking water regulation, including requirements for the quality of the source water (pursuant to section 1412(b)(15)(A)); and

''(iv) information requirements for variance applications.

''(B) AFFORDABILITY CRITERIA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, the Administrator, in consultation with the States and the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, shall publish information to assist the States in developing affordability criteria. The affordability criteria shall be reviewed by the States not less often than every 5 years to determine if changes are needed to the criteria.

''(10) REVIEW BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall periodically review the program of each State that has primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems under section 1413 with respect to variances to determine whether the variances granted by the State comply with the requirements of this subsection. With respect to affordability, the determination of the Administrator shall be limited to whether the variances granted by the State comply with the affordability criteria developed by the State.

''(B) NOTICE AND PUBLICATION.—If the Administrator determines that variances granted by a State are not in compliance with affordability criteria developed by the State and the requirements of this subsection, the Administrator shall notify the State in writing of the deficiencies and make public the determination.

''(C) OBJECTIONS TO VARIANCES.—

''(i) BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator may review and object to any variance proposed to be granted by a State, if the objection is communicated to the State not later than 90 days after the State proposes to grant the variance. If the Administrator objects to the granting of a variance, the Administrator shall notify the State in writing of each basis for the objection and propose a modification to the variance to resolve the concerns of the Administrator. The State shall make the recommended modification or respond in writing to each objection. If the State issues the variance without resolving the concerns of the Administrator, the Administrator may overturn the State decision to grant the variance if the Administrator determines that the State decision does not comply with this subsection.

''(ii) PETITION BY CONSUMERS.—Not later than 30 days after a State with primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems under section 1413 proposes to grant a variance for a public water system, any person served by the system may petition the Administrator to object to the granting of a variance. The Administrator shall respond to the petition not later than 60 days after the receipt of the petition. The State shall not grant the variance during the 60-day period. The petition shall be based on comments made by the petitioner during public review of the variance by the State.''.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1442(g) (42 U.S.C. 300j–1(g)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting ''and multi-State regional technical assistance'' after '' 'circuit-rider' ''; and

(2) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: ''The Administrator shall ensure that funds made available for technical assistance pursuant to this subsection are allocated among the States equally. Each nonprofit organization receiving assistance under this subsection shall consult with the State in which the assistance is to be expended or otherwise made available before using the assistance to undertake activities to carry out this subsection. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1992 through 2003.''.

SEC. 15. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT; FINANCE CENTERS.

Part B (42 U.S.C. 300g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

''SEC. 1418. (a) STATE AUTHORITY FOR NEW SYSTEMS.—Each State shall obtain the legal authority or other means to ensure that all new community water systems and new nontransient, noncommunity water systems commencing operation after October 1, 1998, demonstrate technical, managerial, and financial capacity with respect to each national primary drinking water regulation in effect, or likely to be in effect, on the date of commencement of operations.

''(b) SYSTEMS IN SIGNIFICANT NONCOMPLIANCE.—

''(1) LIST.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each State shall prepare, periodically update, and submit to the Administrator a list of community water systems and nontransient, noncommunity water systems that have a history of significant noncompliance with this title (as defined in guidelines

issued prior to the date of enactment of this section or any revisions of the guidelines that have been made in consultation with the States) and, to the extent practicable, the reasons for noncompliance.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this section and as part of the capacity development strategy of the State, each State shall report to the Administrator on the success of enforcement mechanisms and initial capacity development efforts in assisting the public water systems listed under paragraph (1) to improve technical, managerial, and financial capacity.

''(c) CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this section, each State shall develop and implement a strategy to assist public water systems in acquiring and maintaining technical, managerial, and financial capacity.

''(2) CONTENT.—In preparing the capacity development strategy, the State shall consider, solicit public comment on, and include as appropriate—

''(A) the methods or criteria that the State will use to identify and prioritize the public water systems most in need of improving technical, managerial, and financial capacity;

''(B) a description of the institutional, regulatory, financial, tax, or legal factors at the Federal, State, or local level that encourage or impair capacity development;

''(C) a description of how the State will use the authorities and resources of this title or other means to—

''(i) assist public water systems in complying with national primary drinking water regulations;

''(ii) encourage the development of partnerships between public water systems to enhance the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of the systems; and

''(iii) assist public water systems in the training and certification of operators;

''(D) a description of how the State will establish a baseline and measure improvements in capacity with respect to national primary drinking water regulations and State drinking water law; and

''(E) an identification of the persons that have an interest in and are involved in the development and implementation of the capacity development strategy (including all appropriate agencies of Federal, State, and local governments, private and nonprofit public water systems, and public water system customers).

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which a State first adopts a capacity development strategy under this subsection, and every 3 years thereafter, the head of the State agency that has primary responsibility to carry out this title in the State shall submit to the Governor a report that shall also be available to the public on the efficacy of the strategy and progress made toward improving the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of public water systems in the State.

''(d) FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support the States in developing capacity development strategies.

''(2) INFORMATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall—

''(i) conduct a review of State capacity development efforts in existence on the date of enactment of this section and publish information to assist States and public water systems in capacity development efforts; and

''(ii) initiate a partnership with States, public water systems, and the public to develop information for States on recommended operator certification requirements.

''(B) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall publish the information developed through the partnership under subparagraph (A)(ii) not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section.

''(3) VARIANCES AND EXEMPTIONS.—Based on information obtained under subsection (c)(2)(B), the Administrator shall, as appropriate, modify regulations concerning variances and exemptions for small public water systems to ensure flexibility in the use of the variances and exemptions. Nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted, construed, or applied to affect or alter the requirements of section 1415 or 1416.

''(4) PROMULGATION OF DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS.—In promulgating a national primary drinking water regulation, the Administrator shall include an analysis of the likely effect of compliance with the regulation on the technical, financial, and managerial capacity of public water systems.

''(5) GUIDANCE FOR NEW SYSTEMS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall publish guidance developed in consultation with the States describing legal authorities and other means to ensure that all new community water systems and new nontransient, noncommunity water systems demonstrate technical, managerial, and financial capacity with respect to national primary drinking water regulations.

''(e) ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support the network of university-based Environmental Finance Centers in providing training and technical assistance to State and local officials in developing capacity of public water systems.

''(2) NATIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT CLEARINGHOUSE.—Within the Environmental Finance Center network in existence on the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a national public water systems capacity development clearinghouse to receive, coordinate, and disseminate research and reports on projects funded under this title and from other sources with respect to developing, improving, and maintaining technical, financial, and managerial capacity at public water systems to Federal and State agencies, universities, water suppliers, and other interested persons.

''(3) CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT TECHNIQUES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Environmental Finance Centers shall develop and test managerial, financial, and institutional techniques—

''(i) to ensure that new public water systems have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity before commencing operation;

''(ii) to identify public water systems in need of capacity development; and

''(iii) to bring public water systems with a history of significant noncompliance with national primary drinking water regulations into compliance.

''(B) TECHNIQUES.—The techniques may include capacity assessment methodologies, manual and computer-based public water system rate models and capital planning models, public water system consolidation procedures, and regionalization models.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (e) $2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.''.

SEC. 16. OPERATOR AND LABORATORY CERTIFICATION.

Section 1442 (42 U.S.C. 300j–1) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) CERTIFICATION OF OPERATORS AND LABORATORIES.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—Beginning 3 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995—

''(A) no assistance may be provided to a public water system under part G unless the system has entered into an enforceable commitment with the State providing that any person who operates the system will be trained and certified according to requirements established by the Administrator or the State (in the case of a State with primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) not later than the date of completion of the capital project for which the assistance is provided; and

''(B) a public water system that has received assistance under part G may be operated only by a person who has been trained and certified according to requirements established by the Administrator or the State (in the case of a State with primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413).

''(2) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995 and after consultation with the States, the Administrator shall publish information to assist States in carrying out paragraph (1). In the case of a State with primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 or any other State that has established a training program that is consistent with the guidance issued under this paragraph, the authority to prescribe the appropriate level of training for certification for all systems shall be solely the responsibility of the State. The guidance issued under this paragraph shall also include information to assist States in certifying laboratories engaged in testing for the purpose of compliance with sections 1445 and 1401(1).

''(3) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If a public water system in a State is not operated in accordance with paragraph (1), the Administrator is authorized to withhold from funds that would otherwise be allocated to the State under section 1472 or require the repayment of an amount equal to the amount of any assistance under part G provided to the public water system.''.

SEC. 17. SOURCE WATER QUALITY PROTECTION PARTNERSHIPS.

Part B (42 U.S.C. 300g et seq.) (as amended by section 15) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SOURCE WATER QUALITY PROTECTION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

''SEC. 1419. (a) SOURCE WATER AREA DELINEATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, and after an opportunity for public comment, each State shall—

''(1) delineate (directly or through delegation) the source water protection areas for community water systems in the State using hydrogeologic information considered to be reasonably available and appropriate by the State; and

''(2) conduct, to the extent practicable, vulnerability assessments in source water areas determined to be a priority by the State, including, to the extent practicable, identification of risks in source water protection areas to drinking water.

''(b) ALTERNATIVE DELINEATIONS AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—For the purposes of satisfying the requirements of subsection (a), a State may use delineations and vulnerability assessments conducted for—

''(1) ground water sources under a State wellhead protection program developed pursuant to section 1428;

''(2) surface or ground water sources under a State pesticide management plan developed pursuant to the Pesticide and Ground

Water State Management Plan Regulation (subparts I and J of part 152 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations), promulgated under section 3(d) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(d)); or

''(3) surface water sources under a State watershed initiative or to satisfy the watershed criterion for determining if filtration is required under the Surface Water Treatment Rule (section 141.70 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations).

''(c) FUNDING.—To carry out the delineations and assessments described in subsection (a), a State may use funds made available for that purpose pursuant to section 1473(f). If funds available under that section are insufficient to meet the minimum requirements of subsection (a), the State shall establish a priority-based schedule for the delineations and assessments within available resources.

''(d) PETITION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—A State may establish a program under which an owner or operator of a community water system in the State, or a municipal or local government or political subdivision of a government in the State, may submit a source water quality protection partnership petition to the State requesting that the State assist in the local development of a voluntary, incentive-based partnership, among the owner, operator, or government and other persons likely to be affected by the recommendations of the partnership, to—

''(i) reduce the presence in drinking water of contaminants that may be addressed by a petition by considering the origins of the contaminants, including to the maximum extent practicable the specific activities that affect the drinking water supply of a community;

''(ii) obtain financial or technical assistance necessary to facilitate establishment of a partnership, or to develop and implement recommendations of a partnership for the protection of source water to assist in the provision of drinking water that complies with national primary drinking water regulations with respect to contaminants addressed by a petition; and

''(iii) develop recommendations regarding voluntary and incentive-based strategies for the long-term protection of the source water of community water systems.

''(B) STATE DETERMINATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each State shall provide public notice and solicit public comment on the question of whether to develop a source water quality protection partnership petition program in the State, and publicly announce the determination of the State thereafter. If so requested by any public water system or local governmental entity, prior to making the determination, the State shall hold at least one public hearing to assess the level of interest in the State for development and implementation of a State source water quality partnership petition program.

''(C) FUNDING.—Each State may—

''(i) use funds set aside pursuant to section 1473(f) by the State to carry out a program described in subparagraph (A), including assistance to voluntary local partnerships for the development and implementation of partnership recommendations for the protection of source water such as source water quality assessment, contingency plans, and demonstration projects for partners within a source water area delineated under subsection (a); and

''(ii) provide assistance in response to a petition submitted under this subsection using funds referred to in subsections (e)(2)(B) and (g).

''(2) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of a petition submitted under this subsection shall be to—

''(A) facilitate the local development of voluntary, incentive-based partnerships among owners and operators of community water systems, governments, and other persons in source water areas; and

''(B) obtain assistance from the State in directing or redirecting resources under Federal or State water quality programs to implement the recommendations of the partnerships to address the origins of drinking water contaminants that may be addressed by a petition (including to the maximum extent practicable the specific activities) that affect the drinking water supply of a community.

''(3) CONTAMINANTS ADDRESSED BY A PETITION.—A petition submitted to a State under this section may address only those contaminants—

''(A) that are pathogenic organisms for which a national primary drinking water regulation has been established or is required under section 1412(b)(2)(C); or

''(B) for which a national primary drinking water regulation has been promulgated or proposed and—

''(i) that are detected in the community water system for which the petition is submitted at levels above the maximum contaminant level; or

''(ii) that are detected by adequate monitoring methods at levels that are not reliably and consistently below the maximum contaminant level.

''(4) CONTENTS.—A petition submitted under this subsection shall, at a minimum—

''(A) include a delineation of the source water area in the State that is the subject of the petition;

''(B) identify, to the maximum extent practicable, the origins of the drinking water contaminants that may be addressed by a petition (including to the maximum extent practicable the specific activities contributing to the presence of the contaminants) in the source water area delineated under subparagraph (A);

''(C) identify any deficiencies in information that will impair the development of recommendations by the voluntary local partnership to address drinking water contaminants that may be addressed by a petition;

''(D) specify the efforts made to establish the voluntary local partnership and obtain the participation of—

''(i) the municipal or local government or other political subdivision of the State with jurisdiction over the source water area delineated under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) each person in the source water area delineated under subparagraph (A)—

''(I) who is likely to be affected by recommendations of the voluntary local partnership; and

''(II) whose participation is essential to the success of the partnership;

''(E) outline how the voluntary local partnership has or will, during development and implementation of recommendations of the voluntary local partnership, identify, recognize and take into account any voluntary or other activities already being undertaken by persons in the source water area delineated under subparagraph (A) under Federal or State law to reduce the likelihood that contaminants will occur in drinking water at levels of public health concern; and

''(F) specify the technical, financial, or other assistance that the voluntary local partnership requests of the State to develop the partnership or to implement recommendations of the partnership.

''(e) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF PETITIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing notice and an opportunity for public comment on a petition submitted under subsection (d), the State shall approve or disapprove the petition, in whole or in part, not later than 120 days after the date of submission of the petition.

''(2) APPROVAL.—The State may approve a petition if the petition meets the requirements established under subsection (d). The notice of approval shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) an identification of technical, financial, or other assistance that the State will provide to assist in addressing the drinking water contaminants that may be addressed by a petition based on—

''(i) the relative priority of the public health concern identified in the petition with respect to the other water quality needs identified by the State;

''(ii) any necessary coordination that the State will perform of the program established under this section with programs implemented or planned by other States under this section; and

''(iii) funds available (including funds available from a State revolving loan fund established under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) or part G and the appropriate distribution of the funds to assist in implementing the recommendations of the partnership;

''(B) a description of technical or financial assistance pursuant to Federal and State programs that is available to assist in implementing recommendations of the partnership in the petition, including—

''(i) any program established under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

''(ii) the program established under section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1455b);

''(iii) the agricultural water quality protection program established under chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.);

''(iv) the sole source aquifer protection program established under section 1427;

''(v) the community wellhead protection program established under section 1428;

''(vi) any pesticide or ground water management plan;

''(vii) any voluntary agricultural resource management plan or voluntary whole farm or whole ranch management plan developed and implemented under a process established by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

''(viii) any abandoned well closure program; and

''(C) a description of activities that will be undertaken to coordinate Federal and State programs to respond to the petition.

''(3) DISAPPROVAL.—If the State disapproves a petition submitted under subsection (d), the State shall notify the entity submitting the petition in writing of the reasons for disapproval. A petition may be resubmitted at any time if—

''(A) new information becomes available;

''(B) conditions affecting the source water that is the subject of the petition change; or

''(C) modifications are made in the type of assistance being requested.

''(f) ELIGIBILITY FOR WATER QUALITY PROTECTION ASSISTANCE.—A sole source aquifer plan developed under section 1427, a wellhead protection plan developed under section 1428, and a source water quality protection measure assisted in response to a petition submitted under subsection (d) shall be eligible for assistance under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), including assistance provided under section 319 and title VI of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1329 and

1381 et seq.), if the project, measure, or practice would be eligible for assistance under such Act. In the case of funds made available under such section 319 to assist a source water quality protection measure in response to a petition submitted under subsection (d), the funds may be used only for a measure that addresses nonpoint source pollution.

''(g) GRANTS TO SUPPORT STATE PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make a grant to each State that establishes a program under this section that is approved under paragraph (2). The amount of each grant shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of administering the program for the year in which the grant is available.

''(2) APPROVAL.—In order to receive grant assistance under this subsection, a State shall submit to the Administrator for approval a plan for a source water quality protection partnership program that is consistent with the guidance published under paragraph (3). The Administrator shall approve the plan if the plan is consistent with the guidance published under paragraph (3).

''(3) GUIDANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the States, shall publish guidance to assist—

''(i) States in the development of a source water quality protection partnership program; and

''(ii) municipal or local governments or political subdivisions of the governments and community water systems in the development of source water quality protection partnerships and in the assessment of source water quality.

''(B) CONTENTS OF THE GUIDANCE.—The guidance shall, at a minimum—

''(i) recommend procedures for the approval or disapproval by a State of a petition submitted under subsection (d);

''(ii) recommend procedures for the submission of petitions developed under subsection (d);

''(iii) recommend criteria for the assessment of source water areas within a State;

''(iv) describe technical or financial assistance pursuant to Federal and State programs that is available to address the contamination of sources of drinking water and to develop and respond to petitions submitted under subsection (d); and

''(v) specify actions taken by the Administrator to ensure the coordination of the programs referred to in clause (iv) with the goals and objectives of this title to the maximum extent practicable.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 1995 through 2003. Each State with a plan for a program approved under paragraph (2) shall receive an equitable portion of the funds available for any fiscal year.

''(h) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section—

''(1)(A) creates or conveys new authority to a State, political subdivision of a State, or community water system for any new regulatory measure; or

''(B) limits any authority of a State, political subdivision, or community water system; or

''(2) precludes a community water system, municipal or local government, or political subdivision of a government from locally developing and carrying out a voluntary, incentive-based, source water quality protection partnership to address the origins of drinking water contaminants of public health concern.''.

SEC. 18. STATE PRIMACY; STATE FUNDING.

(a) STATE PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITY.—Section 1413 (42 U.S.C. 300g–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) has adopted drinking water regulations that are no less stringent than the national primary drinking water regulations promulgated by the Administrator under section 1412 not later than 2 years after the date on which the regulations are promulgated by the Administrator except that the Administrator may provide for an extension of not more than 2 years if, after submission and review of appropriate, adequate documentation from the State, the Administrator determines that the extension is necessary and justified;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) INTERIM PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—A State that has primary enforcement authority under this section with respect to each existing national primary drinking water regulation shall be considered to have primary enforcement authority with respect to each new or revised national primary drinking water regulation during the period beginning on the effective date of a regulation adopted and submitted by the State with respect to the new or revised national primary drinking water regulation in accordance with subsection (b)(1) and ending at such time as the Administrator makes a determination under subsection (b)(2) with respect to the regulation.''.

(b) PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM SUPERVISION PROGRAM.—Section 1443(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–2(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''(3) A grant'' and inserting the following:

''(3) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) DETERMINATION OF COSTS.—To determine the costs of a grant recipient pursuant to this paragraph, the Administrator shall, in cooperation with the States and not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, establish a resource model for the public water system supervision program and review and revise the model as necessary.

''(C) STATE COST ADJUSTMENTS.—The Administrator shall revise cost estimates used in the resource model for any particular State to reflect costs more likely to be experienced in that State, if—

''(i) the State requests the modification; and

''(ii) the revised estimates ensure full and effective administration of the public water system supervision program in the State and the revised estimates do not overstate the resources needed to administer the program.'';

(2) in paragraph (7), by adding at the end a period and the following:

''For the purpose of making grants under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1992 and 1993 and $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 2003.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) RESERVATION OF FUNDS BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—If the Administrator assumes the primary enforcement responsibility of a State public water system supervision program, the Administrator may reserve from funds made available pursuant to this subsection, an amount equal to the amount that would otherwise have been provided to the State pursuant to this subsection. The Administrator shall use the funds reserved pursuant to this paragraph to ensure the full and effective administration of a public water system supervision program in the State.

''(9) STATE LOAN FUNDS.—

''(A) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—For any fiscal year for which the amount made available to the Administrator by appropriations to carry out this subsection is less than the amount that the Administrator determines is necessary to supplement funds made available pursuant to paragraph (8) to ensure the full and effective administration of a public water system supervision program in a State (based on the resource model developed under paragraph (3)(B)), the Administrator may reserve from the funds made available to the State under section 1472 an amount that is equal to the amount of the shortfall.

''(B) DUTY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—If the Administrator reserves funds from the allocation of a State under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall carry out in the State—

''(i) each of the activities that would be required of the State if the State had primary enforcement authority under section 1413; and

''(ii) each of the activities required of the State by this title, other than part C, but not made a condition of the authority.''.

SEC. 19. MONITORING AND INFORMATION GATHERING.

(a) REGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—

(1) REVIEW OF EXISTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1445(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by designating the first and second sentences as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) REVIEW.—The Administrator shall not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, after consultation with public health experts, representatives of the general public, and officials of State and local governments, review the monitoring requirements for not fewer than 12 contaminants identified by the Administrator, and promulgate any necessary modifications.''.

(2) ALTERNATIVE MONITORING PROGRAMS.—Section 1445(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)(1)) (as amended by paragraph (1)(B)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) STATE-ESTABLISHED REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each State with primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 may, by rule, establish alternative monitoring requirements for any national primary drinking water regulation, other than a regulation applicable to a microbial contaminant (or an indicator of a microbial contaminant). The alternative monitoring requirements established by a State under this clause may not take effect for any national primary drinking water regulation until after completion of at least 1 full cycle of monitoring in the State satisfying the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1413(a). The alternative monitoring requirements may be applicable to public water systems or classes of public water systems identified by the State, in lieu of the monitoring requirements that would otherwise be applicable under the regulation, if the alternative monitoring requirements—

''(I) are based on use of the best available science conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices and data collected by accepted methods;

''(II) are based on the potential for the contaminant to occur in the source water based on use patterns and other relevant characteristics of the contaminant or the systems subject to the requirements;

''(III) in the case of a public water system or class of public water systems in which a

contaminant has been detected at quantifiable levels that are not reliably and consistently below the maximum contaminant level, include monitoring frequencies that are not less frequent than the frequencies required in the national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant for a period of 5 years after the detection; and

''(IV) in the case of each contaminant formed in the distribution system, are not applicable to public water systems for which treatment is necessary to comply with the national primary drinking water regulation.

''(ii) COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.—The alternative monitoring requirements established by the State shall be adequate to ensure compliance with, and enforcement of, each national primary drinking water regulation. The State may review and update the alternative monitoring requirements as necessary.

''(iii) APPLICATION OF SECTION 1413.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Each State establishing alternative monitoring requirements under this subparagraph shall submit the rule to the Administrator as provided in section 1413(b)(1). Any requirements for a State to provide information supporting a submission shall be defined only in consultation with the States, and shall address only such information as is necessary to make a decision to approve or disapprove an alternative monitoring rule in accordance with the following sentence. The Administrator shall approve an alternative monitoring rule submitted under this clause for the purposes of section 1413, unless the Administrator determines in writing that the State rule for alternative monitoring does not ensure compliance with, and enforcement of, the national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant or contaminants to which the rule applies.

''(II) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirements of section 1413(a)(1) that a rule be no less stringent than the national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant or contaminants to which the rule applies shall not apply to the decision of the Administrator to approve or disapprove a rule submitted under this clause. Notwithstanding the requirements of section 1413(b)(2), the Administrator shall approve or disapprove a rule submitted under this clause within 180 days of submission. In the absence of a determination to disapprove a rule made by the Administrator within 180 days, the rule shall be deemed to be approved under section 1413(b)(2).

''(III) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—A State shall be considered to have primary enforcement authority with regard to an alternative monitoring rule, and the rule shall be effective, on a date (determined by the State) any time on or after submission of the rule, consistent with section 1413(c). A decision by the Administrator to disapprove an alternative monitoring rule under section 1413 or to withdraw the authority of the State to carry out the rule under clause (iv) may not be the basis for withdrawing primary enforcement responsibility for a national primary drinking water regulation or regulations from the State under section 1413.

''(iv) OVERSIGHT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator shall review, not less often than every 5 years, any alternative monitoring requirements established by a State under clause (i) to determine whether the requirements are adequate to ensure compliance with, and enforcement of, national primary drinking water regulations. If the Administrator determines that the alternative monitoring requirements of a State are inadequate with respect to a contaminant, and after providing the State with an opportunity to respond to the determination of the Administrator and to correct any inadequacies, the Administrator may withdraw the authority of the State to carry out the alternative monitoring requirements with respect to the contaminant. If the Administrator withdraws the authority, the monitoring requirements contained in the national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant shall apply to public water systems in the State.

''(v) NONPRIMACY STATES.—The Governor of any State that does not have primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 on the date of enactment of this clause may submit to the Administrator a request that the Administrator modify the monitoring requirements established by the Administrator and applicable to public water systems in that State. After consultation with the Governor, the Administrator shall modify the requirements for public water systems in that State if the request of the Governor is in accordance with each of the requirements of this subparagraph that apply to alternative monitoring requirements established by States that have primary enforcement responsibility. A decision by the Administrator to approve a request under this clause shall be for a period of 3 years and may subsequently be extended for periods of 5 years.

''(vi) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall issue guidance in consultation with the States that States may use to develop State-established requirements pursuant to this subparagraph and subparagraph (E). The guidance shall identify options for alternative monitoring designs that meet the criteria identified in clause (i) and the requirements of clause (ii).''.

(3) SMALL SYSTEM MONITORING.—Section 1445(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)(1)) (as amended by paragraph (2)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) SMALL SYSTEM MONITORING.—The Administrator or a State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 may modify the monitoring requirements for any contaminant, other than a microbial contaminant or an indicator of a microbial contaminant, a contaminant regulated on the basis of an acute health effect, or a contaminant formed in the treatment process or in the distribution system, to provide that any public water system that serves a population of 10,000 or fewer shall not be required to conduct additional quarterly monitoring during any 3-year period for a specific contaminant if monitoring conducted at the beginning of the period for the contaminant fails to detect the presence of the contaminant in the water supplied by the public water system, and the Administrator or the State determines that the contaminant is unlikely to be detected by further monitoring in the period.''.

(b) UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—Section 1445(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (8) and inserting the following:

''(2) MONITORING PROGRAM FOR UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall promulgate regulations establishing the criteria for a monitoring program for unregulated contaminants. The regulations shall require monitoring of drinking water supplied by public water systems and shall vary the frequency and schedule for monitoring requirements for systems based on the number of persons served by the system, the source of supply, and the contaminants likely to be found.

''(B) MONITORING PROGRAM FOR CERTAIN UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—

''(i) INITIAL LIST.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Amendments of 1995 and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall issue a list pursuant to subparagraph (A) of not more than 20 unregulated contaminants to be monitored by public water systems and to be included in the national drinking water occurrence data base maintained pursuant to paragraph (3).

''(ii) GOVERNORS' PETITION.—The Administrator shall include among the list of contaminants for which monitoring is required under this paragraph each contaminant recommended in a petition signed by the Governor of each of 7 or more States, unless the Administrator determines that the action would prevent the listing of other contaminants of a higher public health concern.

''(C) MONITORING BY LARGE SYSTEMS.—A public water system that serves a population of more than 10,000 shall conduct monitoring for all contaminants listed under subparagraph (B).

''(D) MONITORING PLAN FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM SYSTEMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Based on the regulations promulgated by the Administrator, each State shall develop a representative monitoring plan to assess the occurrence of unregulated contaminants in public water systems that serve a population of 10,000 or fewer. The plan shall require monitoring for systems representative of different sizes, types, and geographic locations in the State.

''(ii) GRANTS FOR SMALL SYSTEM COSTS.—From funds reserved under section 1478(c), the Administrator shall pay the reasonable cost of such testing and laboratory analysis as are necessary to carry out monitoring under the plan.

''(E) MONITORING RESULTS.—Each public water system that conducts monitoring of unregulated contaminants pursuant to this paragraph shall provide the results of the monitoring to the primary enforcement authority for the system.

''(F) WAIVER OF MONITORING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator shall waive the requirement for monitoring for a contaminant under this paragraph in a State, if the State demonstrates that the criteria for listing the contaminant do not apply in that State.

''(G) ANALYTICAL METHODS.—The State may use screening methods approved by the Administrator under subsection (h) in lieu of monitoring for particular contaminants under this paragraph.

''(H) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.''.

(c) NATIONAL DRINKING WATER OCCURRENCE DATABASE.—Section 1445(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)) (as amended by subsection (b)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NATIONAL DRINKING WATER OCCURRENCE DATABASE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, the Administrator shall assemble and maintain a national drinking water occurrence data base, using information on the occurrence of both regulated and unregulated contaminants in public water systems obtained under paragraph (2) and reliable information from other public and private sources.

''(B) USE.—The data shall be used by the Administrator in making determinations under section 1412(b)(1) with respect to the occurrence of a contaminant in drinking water at a level of public health concern.

''(C) PUBLIC RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Administrator shall periodically solicit recommendations from the appropriate officials of the National Academy of Sciences and the States, and any person may submit recommendations to the Administrator, with

respect to contaminants that should be included in the national drinking water occurrence data base, including recommendations with respect to additional unregulated contaminants that should be listed under paragraph (2). Any recommendation submitted under this clause shall be accompanied by reasonable documentation that—

''(i) the contaminant occurs or is likely to occur in drinking water; and

''(ii) the contaminant poses a risk to public health.

''(D) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The information from the data base shall be available to the public in readily accessible form.

''(E) REGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—With respect to each contaminant for which a national primary drinking water regulation has been established, the data base shall include information on the detection of the contaminant at a quantifiable level in public water systems (including detection of the contaminant at levels not constituting a violation of the maximum contaminant level for the contaminant).

''(F) UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—With respect to contaminants for which a national primary drinking water regulation has not been established, the data base shall include—

''(i) monitoring information collected by public water systems that serve a population of more than 10,000, as required by the Administrator under paragraph (2);

''(ii) monitoring information collected by the States from a representative sampling of public water systems that serve a population of 10,000 or fewer; and

''(iii) other reliable and appropriate monitoring information on the occurrence of the contaminants in public water systems that is available to the Administrator.''.

(d) INFORMATION.—

(1) MONITORING AND TESTING AUTHORITY.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1445(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)(1)) (as designated by subsection (a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''by accepted methods'' after ''conduct such monitoring''; and

(B) by striking ''such information as the Administrator may reasonably require'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''such information as the Administrator may reasonably require—

''(i) to assist the Administrator in establishing regulations under this title or to assist the Administrator in determining, on a case-by-case basis, whether the person has acted or is acting in compliance with this title; and

''(ii) by regulation to assist the Administrator in determining compliance with national primary drinking water regulations promulgated under section 1412 or in administering any program of financial assistance under this title.

If the Administrator is requiring monitoring for purposes of testing new or alternative methods, the Administrator may require the use of other than accepted methods. Information requirements imposed by the Administrator pursuant to the authority of this subparagraph that require monitoring, the establishment or maintenance of records or reporting, by a substantial number of public water systems (determined in the sole discretion of the Administrator), shall be established by regulation as provided in clause (ii).''.

(2) SCREENING METHODS.—Section 1445 (42 U.S.C. 300j–4) (as amended by section 12(c)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SCREENING METHODS.—The Administrator shall review new analytical methods to screen for regulated contaminants and may approve such methods as are more accurate or cost-effective than established reference methods for use in compliance monitoring.''.

SEC. 20. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.

Section 1414 (42 U.S.C. 300g–3) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) NOTICE TO PERSONS SERVED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each owner or operator of a public water system shall give notice to the persons served by the system—

''(A) of any failure on the part of the public water system to—

''(i) comply with an applicable maximum contaminant level or treatment technique requirement of, or a testing procedure prescribed by, a national primary drinking water regulation; or

''(ii) perform monitoring required by section 1445(a);

''(B) if the public water system is subject to a variance granted under section 1415(a)(1)(A), 1415(a)(2), or 1415(e) for an inability to meet a maximum contaminant level requirement or is subject to an exemption granted under section 1416, of—

''(i) the existence of the variance or exemption; and

''(ii) any failure to comply with the requirements of any schedule prescribed pursuant to the variance or exemption; and

''(C) of the concentration level of any unregulated contaminant for which the Administrator has required public notice pursuant to paragraph (2)(E).

''(2) FORM, MANNER, AND FREQUENCY OF NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, by regulation, and after consultation with the States, prescribe the manner, frequency, form, and content for giving notice under this subsection. The regulations shall—

''(i) provide for different frequencies of notice based on the differences between violations that are intermittent or infrequent and violations that are continuous or frequent; and

''(ii) take into account the seriousness of any potential adverse health effects that may be involved.

''(B) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A State may, by rule, establish alternative notification requirements—

''(I) with respect to the form and content of notice given under and in a manner in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

''(II) with respect to the form and content of notice given under subparagraph (D).

''(ii) CONTENTS.—The alternative requirements shall provide the same type and amount of information as required pursuant to this subsection and regulations issued under subparagraph (A).

''(iii) RELATIONSHIP TO SECTION 1413.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed or applied to modify the requirements of section 1413.

''(C) VIOLATIONS WITH POTENTIAL TO HAVE SERIOUS ADVERSE EFFECTS ON HUMAN HEALTH.—Regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall specify notification procedures for each violation by a public water system that has the potential to have serious adverse effects on human health as a result of short-term exposure. Each notice of violation provided under this subparagraph shall—

''(i) be distributed as soon as practicable after the occurrence of the violation, but not later than 24 hours after the occurrence of the violation;

''(ii) provide a clear and readily understandable explanation of—

''(I) the violation;

''(II) the potential adverse effects on human health;

''(III) the steps that the public water system is taking to correct the violation; and

''(IV) the necessity of seeking alternative water supplies until the violation is corrected;

''(iii) be provided to the Administrator or the head of the State agency that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 as soon as practicable, but not later than 24 hours after the occurrence of the violation; and

''(iv) as required by the State agency in general regulations of the State agency, or on a case-by-case basis after the consultation referred to in clause (iii), considering the health risks involved—

''(I) be provided to appropriate broadcast media;

''(II) be prominently published in a newspaper of general circulation serving the area not later than 1 day after distribution of a notice pursuant to clause (i) or the date of publication of the next issue of the newspaper; or

''(III) be provided by posting or door-to-door notification in lieu of notification by means of broadcast media or newspaper.

''(D) WRITTEN NOTICE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall specify notification procedures for violations other than the violations covered by subparagraph (C). The procedures shall specify that a public water system shall provide written notice to each person served by the system by notice—

''(I) in the first bill (if any) prepared after the date of occurrence of the violation;

''(II) in an annual report issued not later than 1 year after the date of occurrence of the violation; or

''(III) by mail or direct delivery as soon as practicable, but not later than 1 year after the date of occurrence of the violation.

''(ii) FORM AND MANNER OF NOTICE.—The Administrator shall prescribe the form and manner of the notice to provide a clear and readily understandable explanation of—

''(I) the violation;

''(II) any potential adverse health effects; and

''(III) the steps that the system is taking to seek alternative water supplies, if any, until the violation is corrected.

''(E) UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—The Administrator may require the owner or operator of a public water system to give notice to the persons served by the system of the concentration levels of an unregulated contaminant required to be monitored under section 1445(a).

''(3) REPORTS.—

''(A) ANNUAL REPORT BY STATE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 1997, and annually thereafter, each State that has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413 shall prepare, make readily available to the public, and submit to the Administrator an annual report on violations of national primary drinking water regulations by public water systems in the State, including violations with respect to—

''(I) maximum contaminant levels;

''(II) treatment requirements;

''(III) variances and exemptions; and

''(IV) monitoring requirements determined to be significant by the Administrator after consultation with the States.

''(ii) DISTRIBUTION.—The State shall publish and distribute summaries of the report and indicate where the full report is available for review.

''(B) ANNUAL REPORT BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Not later than July 1, 1997, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall prepare and make available to the public an annual report summarizing and evaluating reports

submitted by States pursuant to subparagraph (A) and notices submitted by public water systems serving Indian Tribes provided to the Administrator pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2) and making recommendations concerning the resources needed to improve compliance with this title. The report shall include information about public water system compliance on Indian reservations and about enforcement activities undertaken and financial assistance provided by the Administrator on Indian reservations, and shall make specific recommendations concerning the resources needed to improve compliance with this title on Indian reservations.''.

SEC. 21. ENFORCEMENT; JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1414 (42 U.S.C. 300g–3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking ''any national primary drinking water regulation in effect under section 1412'' and inserting ''any applicable requirement''; and

(II) by striking ''with such regulation or requirement'' and inserting ''with the requirement''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''regulation or'' and inserting ''applicable''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) ENFORCEMENT IN NONPRIMACY STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, on the basis of information available to the Administrator, the Administrator finds, with respect to a period in which a State does not have primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems, that a public water system in the State—

''(i) for which a variance under section 1415 or an exemption under section 1416 is not in effect, does not comply with any applicable requirement; or

''(ii) for which a variance under section 1415 or an exemption under section 1416 is in effect, does not comply with any schedule or other requirement imposed pursuant to the variance or exemption;

the Administrator shall issue an order under subsection (g) requiring the public water system to comply with the requirement, or commence a civil action under subsection (b).

''(B) NOTICE.—If the Administrator takes any action pursuant to this paragraph, the Administrator shall notify an appropriate local elected official, if any, with jurisdiction over the public water system of the action prior to the time that the action is taken.'';

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by striking ''a national primary drinking water regulation'' and inserting ''any applicable requirement'';

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''regulation, schedule, or other'' each place it appears and inserting ''applicable'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking ''effect until after notice and opportunity for public hearing and,'' and inserting ''effect,''; and

(II) by striking ''proposed order'' and inserting ''order''; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''proposed to be''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) EFFECT OF PENALTY AMOUNTS.—In a case in which a civil penalty sought by the Administrator under this paragraph does not exceed $5,000, the penalty shall be assessed by the Administrator after notice and opportunity for a public hearing (unless the person against whom the penalty is assessed requests a hearing on the record in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code). In a case in which a civil penalty sought by the Administrator under this paragraph exceeds $5,000, but does not exceed $25,000, the penalty shall be assessed by the Administrator after notice and opportunity for a hearing on the record in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''paragraph exceeds $5,000'' and inserting ''subsection for a violation of an applicable requirement exceeds $25,000''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CONSOLIDATION INCENTIVE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner or operator of a public water system may submit to the State in which the system is located (if the State has primary enforcement responsibility under section 1413) or to the Administrator (if the State does not have primary enforcement responsibility) a plan (including specific measures and schedules) for—

''(A) the physical consolidation of the system with 1 or more other systems;

''(B) the consolidation of significant management and administrative functions of the system with 1 or more other systems; or

''(C) the transfer of ownership of the system that may reasonably be expected to improve drinking water quality.

''(2) CONSEQUENCES OF APPROVAL.—If the State or the Administrator approves a plan pursuant to paragraph (1), no enforcement action shall be taken pursuant to this part with respect to a specific violation identified in the approved plan prior to the date that is the earlier of the date on which consolidation is completed according to the plan or the date that is 2 years after the plan is approved.

''(i) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT.—In this section, the term 'applicable requirement' means—

''(1) a requirement of section 1412, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417, 1441, or 1445;

''(2) a regulation promulgated pursuant to a section referred to in paragraph (1);

''(3) a schedule or requirement imposed pursuant to a section referred to in paragraph (1); and

''(4) a requirement of, or permit issued under, an applicable State program for which the Administrator has made a determination that the requirements of section 1413 have been satisfied, or an applicable State program approved pursuant to this part.''.

(b) STATE AUTHORITY FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES.—Section 1413(a) (42 U.S.C. 300g–2(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) has adopted authority for administrative penalties (unless the constitution of the State prohibits the adoption of the authority) in a maximum amount—

''(A) in the case of a system serving a population of more than 10,000, that is not less than $1,000 per day per violation; and

''(B) in the case of any other system, that is adequate to ensure compliance (as determined by the State);

except that a State may establish a maximum limitation on the total amount of administrative penalties that may be imposed on a public water system per violation.''.

(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 1448(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–7(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) of the first sentence, by inserting ''final'' after ''any other'';

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''or issuance of the order'' and inserting ''or any other final Agency action''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following ''In any petition concerning the assessment of a civil penalty pursuant to section 1414(g)(3)(B), the petitioner shall simultaneously send a copy of the complaint by certified mail to the Administrator and the Attorney General. The court shall set aside and remand the penalty order if the court finds that there is not substantial evidence in the record to support the finding of a violation or that the assessment of the penalty by the Administrator constitutes an abuse of discretion.''.

SEC. 22. FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 1447 (42 U.S.C. 300j–6) are amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency shall be subject to, and comply with, all Federal, State, interstate, and local substantive and procedural requirements, administrative authorities, and process and sanctions concerning the provision of safe drinking water or underground injection in the same manner, and to the same extent, as any nongovernmental entity is subject to, and shall comply with, the requirements, authorities, and process and sanctions.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS AND PENALTIES.—The Federal, State, interstate, and local substantive and procedural requirements, administrative authorities, and process and sanctions referred to in paragraph (1) include all administrative orders and all civil and administrative penalties or fines, regardless of whether the penalties or fines are punitive or coercive in nature or are imposed for isolated, intermittent, or continuing violations.

''(3) LIMITED WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—The United States expressly waives any immunity otherwise applicable to the United States with respect to any requirement, administrative authority, or process or sanction referred to in paragraph (2) (including any injunctive relief, administrative order, or civil or administrative penalty or fine referred to in paragraph (2), or reasonable service charge). The reasonable service charge referred to in the preceding sentence includes—

''(A) a fee or charge assessed in connection with the processing, issuance, renewal, or amendment of a permit, variance, or exemption, review of a plan, study, or other document, or inspection or monitoring of a facility; and

''(B) any other nondiscriminatory charge that is assessed in connection with a Federal, State, interstate, or local safe drinking water regulatory program.

''(4) CIVIL PENALTIES.—No agent, employee, or officer of the United States shall be personally liable for any civil penalty under this subsection with respect to any act or omission within the scope of the official duties of the agent, employee, or officer.

''(5) CRIMINAL SANCTIONS.—An agent, employee, or officer of the United States may be subject to a criminal sanction under a State, interstate, or local law concerning the provision of drinking water or underground injection. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government shall be subject to a sanction referred to in the preceding sentence.

''(b) WAIVER OF COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive compliance with subsection (a) by any department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch if the President determines waiving compliance with such subsection to

be in the paramount interest of the United States.

''(2) WAIVERS DUE TO LACK OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No waiver described in paragraph (1) shall be granted due to the lack of an appropriation unless the President has specifically requested the appropriation as part of the budgetary process and Congress has failed to make available the requested appropriation.

''(3) PERIOD OF WAIVER.—A waiver under this subsection shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but an additional waiver may be granted for a period of not to exceed 1 year on the termination of a waiver if the President reviews the waiver and makes a determination that it is in the paramount interest of the United States to grant an additional waiver.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than January 31 of each year, the President shall report to Congress on each waiver granted pursuant to this subsection during the preceding calendar year, together with the reason for granting the waiver.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY ORDERS.—Section 1447 (42 U.S.C. 300j–6) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY ORDERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator finds that a Federal agency has violated an applicable requirement under this title, the Administrator may issue a penalty order assessing a penalty against the Federal agency.

''(2) PENALTIES.—The Administrator may, after notice to the agency, assess a civil penalty against the agency in an amount not to exceed $25,000 per day per violation.

''(3) PROCEDURE.—Before an administrative penalty order issued under this subsection becomes final, the Administrator shall provide the agency an opportunity to confer with the Administrator and shall provide the agency notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record in accordance with chapters 5 and 7 of title 5, United States Code.

''(4) PUBLIC REVIEW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any interested person may obtain review of an administrative penalty order issued under this subsection. The review may be obtained in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States District Court for the district in which the violation is alleged to have occurred by the filing of a complaint with the court within the 30-day period beginning on the date the penalty order becomes final. The person filing the complaint shall simultaneously send a copy of the complaint by certified mail to the Administrator and the Attorney General.

''(B) RECORD.—The Administrator shall promptly file in the court a certified copy of the record on which the order was issued.

''(C) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The court shall not set aside or remand the order unless the court finds that there is not substantial evidence in the record, taken as a whole, to support the finding of a violation or that the assessment of the penalty by the Administrator constitutes an abuse of discretion.

''(D) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL PENALTIES.—The court may not impose an additional civil penalty for a violation that is subject to the order unless the court finds that the assessment constitutes an abuse of discretion by the Administrator.''.

(c) CITIZEN ENFORCEMENT.—The first sentence of section 1449(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–8(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking '', or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) for the collection of a penalty (and associated costs and interest) against any Federal agency that fails, by the date that is 1 year after the effective date of a final order to pay a penalty assessed by the Administrator under section 1447(d), to pay the penalty.''.

(d) WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—Section 1447 (42 U.S.C. 300j–6) (as amended by subsection (b)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—The Washington Aqueduct Authority, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army shall not pass the cost of any penalty assessed under this title on to any customer, user, or other purchaser of drinking water from the Washington Aqueduct system, including finished water from the Dalecarlia or McMillan treatment plant.''.

SEC. 23. RESEARCH.

Section 1442 (42 U.S.C. 300j–1) (as amended by section 12(d)) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) of subsection (b) as paragraph (3) of subsection (d) and moving such paragraph to appear after paragraph (2) of subsection (d);

(2) by striking subsection (b) (as so amended);

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(2) as subsection (b) and moving such subsection to appear after subsection (a);

(4) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) (as so amended) and inserting the following:

''(2) INFORMATION AND RESEARCH FACILITIES.—In carrying out this title, the Administrator is authorized to—

''(A) collect and make available information pertaining to research, investigations, and demonstrations with respect to providing a dependably safe supply of drinking water, together with appropriate recommendations in connection with the information; and

''(B) make available research facilities of the Agency to appropriate public authorities, institutions, and individuals engaged in studies and research relating to this title.'';

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (3) and moving such paragraph to appear before paragraph (4); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out research authorized by this section $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 2003, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for each fiscal year for research on the health effects of arsenic in drinking water.'';

(5) in subsection (b) (as so amended)—

(A) by striking ''subparagraph'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.'';

(6) in the first sentence of subsection (c), by striking ''eighteen months after the date of enactment of this subsection'' and inserting ''2 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, and every 5 years thereafter'';

(7) in subsection (d) (as amended by paragraph (1))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', and'' at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) develop and maintain a system for forecasting the supply of, and demand for, various professional occupational categories and other occupational categories needed for the protection and treatment of drinking water in each region of the United States.''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 2003.''; and

(8) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) BIOLOGICAL MECHANISMS.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall conduct studies to—

''(1) understand the mechanisms by which chemical contaminants are absorbed, distributed, metabolized, and eliminated from the human body, so as to develop more accurate physiologically based models of the phenomena;

''(2) understand the effects of contaminants and the mechanisms by which the contaminants cause adverse effects (especially noncancer and infectious effects) and the variations in the effects among humans, especially subpopulations at greater risk of adverse effects, and between test animals and humans; and

''(3) develop new approaches to the study of complex mixtures, such as mixtures found in drinking water, especially to determine the prospects for synergistic or antagonistic interactions that may affect the shape of the dose-response relationship of the individual chemicals and microbes, and to examine noncancer endpoints and infectious diseases, and susceptible individuals and subpopulations.

''(j) RESEARCH PRIORITIES.—To establish long-term priorities for research under this section, the Administrator shall develop, and periodically update, an integrated risk characterization strategy for drinking water quality. The strategy shall identify unmet needs, priorities for study, and needed improvements in the scientific basis for activities carried out under this title. The initial strategy shall be made available to the public not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(k) RESEARCH PLAN FOR HARMFUL SUBSTANCES IN DRINKING WATER.—

''(1) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, and, as appropriate, the heads of other Federal agencies, develop a research plan to support the development and implementation of the most current version of the—

''(i) enhanced surface water treatment rule (59 Fed. Reg. 38832 (July 29, 1994));

''(ii) disinfectant and disinfection byproducts rule (Stage 2) (59 Fed. Reg. 38668 (July 29, 1994)); and

''(iii) ground water disinfection rule (availability of draft summary announced at 57 Fed. Reg. 33960 (July 31, 1992)); and

''(B) carry out the research plan, after consultation and appropriate coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture and the heads of other Federal agencies.

''(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The research plan shall include, at a minimum—

''(i) an identification and characterization of new disinfection byproducts associated with the use of different disinfectants;

''(ii) toxicological studies and, if warranted, epidemiological studies to determine what levels of exposure from disinfectants and disinfection byproducts, if any, may be associated with developmental and birth defects and other potential toxic end points;

''(iii) toxicological studies and, if warranted, epidemiological studies to quantify the carcinogenic potential from exposure to

disinfection byproducts resulting from different disinfectants;

''(iv) the development of practical analytical methods for detecting and enumerating microbial contaminants, including giardia, cryptosporidium, and viruses;

''(v) the development of reliable, efficient, and economical methods to determine the viability of individual cryptosporidium oocysts;

''(vi) the development of dose-response curves for pathogens, including cryptosporidium and the Norwalk virus;

''(vii) the development of indicators that define treatment effectiveness for pathogens and disinfection byproducts; and

''(viii) bench, pilot, and full-scale studies and demonstration projects to evaluate optimized conventional treatment, ozone, granular activated carbon, and membrane technology for controlling pathogens (including cryptosporidium) and disinfection byproducts.

''(B) RISK DEFINITION STRATEGY.—The research plan shall include a strategy for determining the risks and estimated extent of disease resulting from pathogens, disinfectants, and disinfection byproducts in drinking water, and the costs and removal efficiencies associated with various control methods for pathogens, disinfectants, and disinfection byproducts.

''(3) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.—In carrying out the research plan, the Administrator shall use the most cost-effective mechanisms available, including coordination of research with, and use of matching funds from, institutions and utilities.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $12,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2003.

''(l) SUBPOPULATIONS AT GREATER RISK.—

''(1) RESEARCH PLAN.—The Administrator shall conduct a continuing program of peer-reviewed research to identify groups within the general population that may be at greater risk than the general population of adverse health effects from exposure to contaminants in drinking water. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall develop and implement a research plan to establish whether and to what degree infants, children, pregnant women, the elderly, individuals with a history of serious illness, or other subpopulations that can be identified and characterized are likely to experience elevated health risks, including risks of cancer, from contaminants in drinking water.

''(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—To the extent appropriate, the research shall be—

''(A) integrated into the health effects research plan carried out by the Administrator to support the regulation of specific contaminants under this Act; and

''(B) designed to identify—

''(i) the nature and extent of the elevated health risks, if any;

''(ii) the groups likely to experience the elevated health risks;

''(iii) biological mechanisms and other factors that may contribute to elevated health risks for groups within the general population;

''(iv) the degree of variability of the health risks to the groups from the health risks to the general population;

''(v) the threshold, if any, at which the elevated health risks for a specific contaminant occur; and

''(vi) the probability of the exposure to the contaminants by the identified group.

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this subsection and periodically thereafter as new and significant information becomes available, the Administrator shall report to Congress on the results of the research.

''(4) USE OF RESEARCH.—In characterizing the health effects of drinking water contaminants under this Act, the Administrator shall consider all relevant factors, including the results of research under this subsection, the margin of safety for variability in the general population, and sound scientific practices (including the 1993 and 1994 reports of the National Academy of Sciences) regarding subpopulations at greater risk for adverse health effects.''.

SEC. 24. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1401 (42 U.S.C. 300f) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''accepted methods for'' before ''quality control''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''At any time after promulgation of a regulation referred to in this paragraph, the Administrator may add equally effective quality control and testing procedures by guidance published in the Federal Register. The procedures shall be treated as an alternative for public water systems to the quality control and testing procedures listed in the regulation.'';

(2) in paragraph (13)—

(A) by striking ''The'' and inserting ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) For purposes of part G, the term 'State' means each of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.'';

(3) in paragraph (14), by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of part G, the term includes any Native village (as defined in section 3(c) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(c))).''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM.—The term 'community water system' means a public water system that—

''(A) serves at least 15 service connections used by year-round residents of the area served by the system; or

''(B) regularly serves at least 25 year-round residents.

''(16) NONCOMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM.—The term 'noncommunity water system' means a public water system that is not a community water system.''.

(b) PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1401(4) (42 U.S.C. 300f(4)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''piped water for human consumption'' and inserting ''water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(C) by striking ''(4) The'' and inserting the following:

''(4) PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) CONNECTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a connection to a system that delivers water by a constructed conveyance other than a pipe shall not be considered a connection, if—

''(I) the water is used exclusively for purposes other than residential uses (consisting of drinking, bathing, and cooking, or other similar uses);

''(II) the Administrator or the State (in the case of a State exercising primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems) determines that alternative water to achieve the equivalent level of public health protection provided by the applicable national primary drinking water regulation is provided for residential or similar uses for drinking and cooking; or

''(III) the Administrator or the State (in the case of a State exercising primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems) determines that the water provided for residential or similar uses for drinking and cooking is centrally treated or treated at the point of entry by the provider, a pass-through entity, or the user to achieve the equivalent level of protection provided by the applicable national primary drinking water regulations.

''(ii) IRRIGATION DISTRICTS.—An irrigation district in existence prior to May 18, 1994, that provides primarily agricultural service through a piped water system with only incidental residential use shall not be considered to be a public water system if the system or the residential users of the system comply with subclause (II) or (III) of clause (i).

''(C) TRANSITION PERIOD.—A water supplier that would be a public water system only as a result of modifications made to this paragraph by the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995 shall not be considered a public water system for purposes of the Act until the date that is two years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, if during such two-year period the water supplier complies with the monitoring requirements of the Surface Water Treatment Rule and no indicator of microbial contamination is exceeded during that period. If a water supplier does not serve 15 service connections (as defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B)) or 25 people at any time after the conclusion of the two-year period, the water supplier shall not be considered a public water system.''.

SEC. 25. WATERSHED AND GROUND WATER PROTECTION.

(a) STATE GROUND WATER PROTECTION GRANTS.—Section 1443 (42 U.S.C. 300j–2) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) STATE GROUND WATER PROTECTION GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make a grant to a State for the development and implementation of a State program to ensure the coordinated and comprehensive protection of ground water resources within the State.

''(2) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall publish guidance that establishes procedures for application for State ground water protection program assistance and that identifies key elements of State ground water protection programs.

''(3) CONDITIONS OF GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall award grants to States that submit an application that is approved by the Administrator. The Administrator shall determine the amount of a grant awarded pursuant to this paragraph on the basis of an assessment of the extent of ground water resources in the State and the likelihood that awarding the grant will result in sustained and reliable protection of ground water quality.

''(B) INNOVATIVE PROGRAM GRANTS.—The Administrator may also award a grant pursuant to this paragraph for innovative programs proposed by a State for the prevention of ground water contamination.

''(C) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The Administrator shall, at a minimum, ensure that, for each fiscal year, not less than 1 percent of funds made available to the Administrator

by appropriations to carry out this subsection are allocated to each State that submits an application that is approved by the Administrator pursuant to this subsection.

''(D) LIMITATION ON GRANTS.—No grant awarded by the Administrator may be used for a project to remediate ground water contamination.

''(4) COORDINATION WITH OTHER GRANT PROGRAMS.—The awarding of grants by the Administrator pursuant to this subsection shall be coordinated with the awarding of grants pursuant to section 319(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1329(i)) and the awarding of other Federal grant assistance that provides funding for programs related to ground water protection.

''(5) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—The amount of a grant awarded pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not exceed 50 percent of the eligible costs of carrying out the ground water protection program that is the subject of the grant (as determined by the Administrator) for the 1-year period beginning on the date that the grant is awarded. The State shall pay a State share to cover the costs of the ground water protection program from State funds in an amount that is not less than 50 percent of the cost of conducting the program.

''(6) EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator shall evaluate the State ground water protection programs that are the subject of grants awarded pursuant to this subsection and report to Congress on the status of ground water quality in the United States and the effectiveness of State programs for ground water protection.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2003.''.

(b) CRITICAL AQUIFER PROTECTION.—Section 1427 (42 U.S.C. 300h–6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''not later than 24 months after the enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1986''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (n), by adding at the end the following:

''1992–2003 ..... 15,000,000.''.

(c) WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREAS.—Section 1428(k) (42 U.S.C. 300h–7(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1992–2003 ..... 30,000,000.''.

(d) UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL GRANT.—Section 1443(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 300j–2(b)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1992–2003 ..... 15,000,000.''.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PRIVATE DRINKING WATER.—Section 1450 (42 U.S.C. 300j–9) is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

''(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PRIVATE DRINKING WATER.—The Administrator shall conduct a study to determine the extent and seriousness of contamination of private sources of drinking water that are not regulated under this title. Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report that includes the findings of the study and recommendations by the Administrator concerning responses to any problems identified under the study. In designing and conducting the study, including consideration of research design, methodology, and conclusions and recommendations, the Administrator shall consult with experts outside the Agency, including scientists, hydrogeologists, well contractors and suppliers, and other individuals knowledgeable in ground water protection and remediation.''.

(f) NATIONAL CENTER FOR GROUND WATER RESEARCH.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, acting through the Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, is authorized to reestablish a partnership between the Laboratory and the National Center for Ground Water Research, a university consortium, to conduct research, training, and technology transfer for ground water quality protection and restoration.

(g) WATERSHED PROTECTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

(1) The heading of section 1443 (42 U.S.C.) is amended to read as follows:

''Grants for State and local programs''

(2) Section 1443 (42 U.S.C.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(e) WATERSHED PROTECTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) ASSISTANCE FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—The Administrator is authorized to provide technical and financial assistance to units of State or local government for projects that demonstrate and assess innovative and enhanced methods and practices to develop and implement watershed protection programs including methods and practices that protect both surface and ground water. In selecting projects for assistance under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority to projects that are carried out to satisfy criteria published under section 1412(b)(7)(C) or that are identified through programs developed and implemented pursuant to section 1428.

''(B) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—Federal assistance provided under this subsection shall not exceed 35 percent of the total cost of the protection program being carried out for any particular watershed or ground water recharge area.

''(2) NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the authority of paragraph (1), the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to the State of New York for demonstration projects implemented as part of the watershed program for the protection and enhancement of the quality of source waters of the New York City water supply system. Demonstration projects which shall be eligible for financial assistance shall be certified to the Administrator by the State of New York as satisfying the purposes of this subsection and shall include those projects that demonstrate, assess, or provide for comprehensive monitoring, surveillance, and research with respect to the efficacy of phosphorus offsets or trading, wastewater diversion, septic system siting and maintenance, innovative or enhanced wastewater treatment technologies, innovative methodologies for the control of storm water runoff, urban, agricultural, and forestry best management practices for controlling nonpoint source pollution, operator training, compliance surveillance and that establish watershed or basin-wide coordinating, planning or governing organizations. In certifying projects to the Administrator, the State of New York shall give priority to these monitoring and research projects that have undergone peer review.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date on which the Administrator first provides assistance pursuant to this paragraph, the Governor of the State of New York shall submit a report to the Administrator on the results of projects assisted.

''(3) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2003 including $15,000,000 for each of such fiscal years for the purpose of providing assistance to the State of New York to carry out paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 26. LEAD PLUMBING AND PIPES; RETURN FLOWS.

(a) FITTINGS AND FIXTURES.—Section 1417 (42 U.S.C. 300g–6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No person may use any pipe, any pipe or plumbing fitting or fixture, any solder, or any flux, after June 19, 1986, in the installation or repair of—

''(i) any public water system; or

''(ii) any plumbing in a residential or nonresidential facility providing water for human consumption,

that is not lead free (within the meaning of subsection (d)).

''(B) LEADED JOINTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to leaded joints necessary for the repair of cast iron pipes.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting after ''Each'' the following: ''owner or operator of a''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Effective 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful—

''(A) for any person to introduce into commerce any pipe, or any pipe or plumbing fitting or fixture, that is not lead free, except for a pipe that is used in manufacturing or industrial processing;

''(B) for any person engaged in the business of selling plumbing supplies, except manufacturers, to sell solder or flux that is not lead free; or

''(C) for any person to introduce into commerce any solder or flux that is not lead free unless the solder or flux bears a prominent label stating that it is illegal to use the solder or flux in the installation or repair of any plumbing providing water for human consumption.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''lead, and'' and inserting ''lead;'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''lead.'' and inserting ''lead; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) when used with respect to plumbing fittings and fixtures, refers to plumbing fittings and fixtures in compliance with standards established in accordance with subsection (e).''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PLUMBING FITTINGS AND FIXTURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide accurate and timely technical information and assistance to qualified third-party certifiers in the development of voluntary standards and testing protocols for the leaching of lead from new plumbing fittings and fixtures that are intended by the manufacturer to dispense water for human ingestion.

''(2) STANDARDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a voluntary standard for the leaching of lead is not established by the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, promulgate regulations setting a health-effects-based performance standard establishing maximum leaching levels from new plumbing fittings and fixtures that are intended by the manufacturer to dispense water for human ingestion. The standard shall become effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of promulgation of the standard.

''(B) ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENT.—If regulations are required to be promulgated under subparagraph (A) and have not been promulgated by the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, no person may import, manufacture, process, or distribute in commerce a new plumbing fitting or fixture, intended by the manufacturer to dispense water for human ingestion, that contains more than 4 percent lead by dry weight.''.

(b) WATER RETURN FLOWS.—Section 3013 of Public Law 102–486 (42 U.S.C. 13551) is repealed.

(c) RECORDS AND INSPECTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1445(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 300j–4(a)(1)) (as designated by section 19(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''Every person'' and all that follows through ''is a grantee,'' and inserting ''Every person who is subject to any requirement of this title or who is a grantee''.

SEC. 27. BOTTLED WATER.

Section 410 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 349) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Whenever'' and inserting ''(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), whenever''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b)(1) After the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency publishes a proposed maximum contaminant level, but not later than 180 days after the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency publishes a final maximum contaminant level, for a contaminant under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g–1), the Secretary, after public notice and comment, shall issue a regulation that establishes a quality level for the contaminant in bottled water or make a finding that a regulation is not necessary to protect the public health because the contaminant is contained in water in the public water systems (as defined under section 1401(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300f(4)) and not in water used for bottled drinking water. In the case of any contaminant for which a national primary drinking water regulation was promulgated before the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995, the Secretary shall issue the regulation or make the finding required by this paragraph not later than 1 year after that date.

''(2) The regulation shall include any monitoring requirements that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for bottled water.

''(3) The regulation—

''(A) shall require that the quality level for the contaminant in bottled water be as stringent as the maximum contaminant level for the contaminant published by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

''(B) may require that the quality level be more stringent than the maximum contaminant level if necessary to provide ample public health protection under this Act.

''(4)(A) If the Secretary fails to establish a regulation within the period described in paragraph (1), the regulation with respect to the final maximum contaminant level published by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (as described in such paragraph) shall be considered, as of the date on which the Secretary is required to establish a regulation under paragraph (1), as the final regulation for the establishment of the quality level for a contaminant required under paragraph (1) for the purpose of establishing or amending a bottled water quality level standard with respect to the contaminant.

''(B) Not later than 30 days after the end of the period described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, with respect to a maximum contaminant level that is considered as a quality level under subparagraph (A), publish a notice in the Federal Register that sets forth the quality level and appropriate monitoring requirements required under paragraphs (1) and (2) and that provides that the quality level standard and requirements shall take effect on the date on which the final regulation of the maximum contaminant level takes effect or 18 months after the notice is issued pursuant to this subparagraph, whichever is later.''.

SEC. 28. OTHER AMENDMENTS.

(a) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—

(1) AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF MODERNIZATION.—Subject to approval in, and in such amounts as may be provided in appropriations Acts, the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers is authorized to modernize the Washington Aqueduct.

(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Army Corps of Engineers borrowing authority in amounts sufficient to cover the full costs of modernizing the Washington Aqueduct. The borrowing authority shall be provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, under such terms and conditions as are established by the Secretary of the Treasury, after a series of contracts with each public water supply customer has been entered into under paragraph (2).

(2) CONTRACTS WITH PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY CUSTOMERS.—

(A) CONTRACTS TO REPAY CORPS DEBT.—To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, and in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers is authorized to enter into a series of contracts with each public water supply customer under which the customer commits to repay a pro-rata share of the principal and interest owed by the Army Corps of Engineers to the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1). Under each of the contracts, the customer that enters into the contract shall commit to pay any additional amount necessary to fully offset the risk of default on the contract.

(B) OFFSETTING OF RISK OF DEFAULT.—Each contract under subparagraph (A) shall include such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may require so that the value to the Government of the contracts is estimated to be equal to the obligational authority used by the Army Corps of Engineers for modernizing the Washington Aqueduct at the time that each series of contracts is entered into.

(C) OTHER CONDITIONS.—Each contract entered into under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) provide that the public water supply customer pledges future income from fees assessed to operate and maintain the Washington Aqueduct;

(ii) provide the United States priority over all other creditors; and

(iii) include other conditions that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be appropriate.

(3) BORROWING AUTHORITY.—Subject to an appropriation under paragraph (1)(B) and after entering into a series of contracts under paragraph (2), the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers, shall seek borrowing authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1)(B).

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY CUSTOMER.—The term ''public water supply customer'' means the District of Columbia, the county of Arlington, Virginia, and the city of Falls Church, Virginia.

(B) VALUE TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The term ''value to the Government'' means the net present value of a contract under paragraph (2) calculated under the rules set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)), excluding section 502(5)(B)(i) of such Act, as though the contracts provided for the repayment of direct loans to the public water supply customers.

(C) WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—The term ''Washington Aqueduct'' means the water supply system of treatment plants, raw water intakes, conduits, reservoirs, transmission mains, and pumping stations owned by the Federal Government located in the metropolitan Washington, District of Columbia, area.

(b) DRINKING WATER ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The second sentence of section 1446(a) (42 U.S.C. 300j–6(a)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', of which two such members shall be associated with small, rural public water systems''.

(c) SHORT TITLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The title (42 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the title heading the following:

''SHORT TITLE

''SEC. 1400. This title may be cited as the 'Safe Drinking Water Act'.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1 of Public Law 93–523 (88 Stat. 1660) is amended by inserting ''of 1974'' after ''Water Act''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO SECTION HEADINGS.—

(1) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1417 (42 U.S.C. 300g–6) are amended to read as follows:

''PROHIBITION ON USE OF LEAD PIPES, FITTINGS, SOLDER, AND FLUX

''SEC. 1417. (a)''.

(2) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1426 (42 U.S.C. 300h–5) are amended to read as follows:

''REGULATION OF STATE PROGRAMS

''SEC. 1426. (a)''.

(3) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1427 (42 U.S.C. 300h–6) are amended to read as follows:

''SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

''SEC. 1427. (a)''.

(4) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1428 (42 U.S.C. 300h–7) are amended to read as follows:

''STATE PROGRAMS TO ESTABLISH WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREAS

''SEC. 1428. (a)''.

(5) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1432 (42 U.S.C. 300i–1) are amended to read as follows:

''TAMPERING WITH PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

''SEC. 1432. (a)''.

(6) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1451 (42 U.S.C. 300j–11) are amended to read as follows:

''INDIAN TRIBES

''SEC. 1451. (a)''.

(7) The section heading and first word of section 1461 (42 U.S.C. 300j–21) are amended to read as follows:

''DEFINITIONS

''SEC. 1461. As''.

(8) The section heading and first word of section 1462 (42 U.S.C. 300j–22) are amended to read as follows:

''RECALL OF DRINKING WATER COOLERS WITH LEAD-LINED TANKS

''SEC. 1462. For''.

(9) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1463 (42 U.S.C. 300j–23) are amended to read as follows:

''DRINKING WATER COOLERS CONTAINING LEAD

''SEC. 1463. (a)''.

(10) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1464 (42 U.S.C. 300j–24) are amended to read as follows:

''LEAD CONTAMINATION IN SCHOOL DRINKING WATER

''SEC. 1464. (a)''.

(11) The section heading and subsection designation of subsection (a) of section 1465 (42 U.S.C. 300j–25) are amended to read as follows:

''FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE PROGRAMS REGARDING LEAD CONTAMINATION IN SCHOOL DRINKING WATER

''SEC. 1465. (a)''.

(e) PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF ZEBRA MUSSEL INFESTATION OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Section 1002(a) of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701(a)) 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) the zebra mussel was discovered on Lake Champlain during 1993 and the opportunity exists to act quickly to establish zebra mussel controls before Lake Champlain is further infested and management costs escalate.''.

(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES TASK FORCE.—Section 1201(c) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 4721(c)) is amended by inserting '', the Lake Champlain Basin Program,'' after ''Great Lakes Commission''.

(3) AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES PROGRAM.—Subsections (b)(6) and (i)(1) of section 1202 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 4722) is amended by inserting '', Lake Champlain,'' after ''Great Lakes'' each place it appears.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1301(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 4741(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting '', and the Lake Champlain Research Consortium,'' after ''Laboratory''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(i) by inserting after ''(33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.)'' the following: ''and grants to colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts referred to in the first section of the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat 417, chapter 841; 7 U.S.C. 322)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and the Lake Champlain basin'' after ''Great Lakes region''.

(f) SOUTHWEST CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND POLICY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall take such action as may be necessary to establish the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy (hereinafter referred to as ''the Center'').

(2) MEMBERS OF THE CENTER.—The Center shall consist of a consortium of American and Mexican universities, including New Mexico State University; the University of Utah; the University of Texas at El Paso; San Diego State University; Arizona State University; and four educational institutions in Mexico.

(3) FUNCTIONS.—Among its functions, the Center shall—

(A) conduct research and development programs, projects and activities, including training and community service, on United States-Mexico border environmental issues, with particular emphasis on water quality and safe drinking water;

(B) provide objective, independent assistance to the EPA and other Federal, State and local agencies involved in environmental policy, research, training and enforcement, including matters affecting water quality and safe drinking water throughout the southwest border region of the United States; and

(C) help to coordinate and facilitate the improvement of environmental policies and programs between the United States and Mexico, including water quality and safe drinking water policies and programs.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 2003 to carry out the programs, projects and activities of the Center. Funds made available pursuant to this paragraph shall be distributed by the Administrator to the university members of the Center located in the United States.

(g) ESTROGENIC SUBSTANCES SCREENING PROGRAM.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall develop a screening program, using appropriate validated test systems, to determine whether certain substances may have an effect in humans that is similar to an effect produced by a naturally occurring estrogen, or such other endocrine effect as the Administrator may designate.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, after obtaining review of the screening program described in paragraph 1 by the scientific advisory panel established under section 25(d) of the Act of June 25, 1947 (chapter 125), and the Science Advisory Board established by section 8 of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365), the Administrator shall implement the program.

(3) SUBSTANCES.—In carrying out the screening program described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall provide for the testing of all active and inert ingredients used in products described in section 103(e) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9603(e)), and may provide for the testing of any other substance if the Administrator determines that a widespread population may be exposed to the substance.

(4) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the Administrator may, by regulation, exempt from the requirements of this subsection a biologic substance or other substance if the Administrator determines that the substance does not have any effect in humans similar to an effect produced by a naturally occurring estrogen.

(5) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall issue an order to a person that manufactures a substance for which testing is required under this subsection to conduct testing in accordance with the screening program described in paragraph (1), and submit information obtained from the testing to the Administrator, within a time period that the Administrator determines is sufficient for the generation of the information.

(B) FAILURE TO SUBMIT INFORMATION.—

(i) SUSPENSION.—If a person referred to in subparagraph (A) fails to submit the information required under such subparagraph within the time period established by the order, the Administrator shall issue a notice of intent to suspend the sale or distribution of the substance by the person. Any suspension proposed under this subparagraph shall become final at the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date that the person receives the notice of intent to suspend, unless during that period a person adversely affected by the notice requests a hearing or the Administrator determines that the person referred to in subparagraph (A) has complied fully with this paragraph.

(ii) HEARING.—If a person requests a hearing under clause (i), the hearing shall be conducted in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code. The only matter for resolution at the hearing shall be whether the person has failed to submit information required under this paragraph. A decision by the Administrator after completion of a hearing shall be considered to be a final agency action.

(iii) TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS.—The Administrator shall terminate a suspension under this subparagraph issued with respect to a person if the Administrator determines that the person has complied fully with this paragraph.

(6) AGENCY ACTION.—In the case of any substance that is found to have a potential adverse effect on humans as a result of testing and evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall take such action, including appropriate regulatory action by rule or by order under statutory authority available to the Administrator, as is necessary to ensure the protection of public health.

(7) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

(A) the findings of the Administrator resulting from the screening program described in paragraph (1);

(B) recommendations for further testing and research needed to evaluate the impact on human health of the substances tested under the screening program; and

(C) recommendations for any further actions (including any action described in paragraph (6)) that the Administrator determines are appropriate based on the findings.

(h) GRANTS TO ALASKA TO IMPROVE SANITATION IN RURAL AND NATIVE VILLAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may make grants to the State of Alaska for the benefit of rural and Native villages in Alaska to pay the Federal share of the cost of—

(A) the development and construction of water and wastewater systems to improve the health and sanitation conditions in the villages; and

(B) training, technical assistance, and educational programs relating to the operation and management of sanitation services in rural and Native villages.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the activities described in paragraph (1) shall be 50 percent.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The State of Alaska may use an amount not to exceed 4 percent of any grant made available under this subsection for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1).

(4) CONSULTATION WITH THE STATE OF ALASKA.—The Administrator shall consult with the State of Alaska on a method of prioritizing the allocation of grants under paragraph (1) according to the needs of, and relative health and sanitation conditions in, each eligible village.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 2003 to carry out this subsection.

(i) ASSISTANCE TO COLONIAS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection—

(A) ELIGIBLE COMMUNITY.—The term ''eligible community'' means a low-income community with economic hardship that—

(i) is commonly referred to as a colonia;

(ii) is located along the United States-Mexico border (generally in an unincorporated area); and

(iii) lacks basic sanitation facilities such as a safe drinking water supply, household plumbing, and a proper sewage disposal system.

(B) BORDER STATE.—The term ''border State'' means Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas.

(C) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term ''treatment works'' has the meaning provided in section 212(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292(2)).

(2) GRANTS TO ALLEVIATE HEALTH RISKS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies are authorized to award grants to any appropriate entity or border State to provide assistance to eligible communities for—

(A) the conservation, development, use and control (including the extension or improvement of a water distribution system) of water for the purpose of supplying drinking water; and

(B) the construction or improvement of sewers and treatment works for wastewater treatment.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Each grant awarded pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be used to provide assistance to one or more eligible community with respect to which the residents are subject to a significant health risk (as determined by the Administrator or the head of the Federal agency making the grant) attributable to the lack of access to an adequate and affordable drinking water supply system or treatment works for wastewater.

(4) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The Administrator and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, other entities or border States are authorized to use funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection to operate and maintain a treatment works or other project that is constructed with funds made available pursuant to this subsection.

(5) PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.—Each treatment works or other project that is funded by a grant awarded pursuant to this subsection shall be constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Administrator, the head of the Federal agency making the grant, or the border State in which the eligible community is located. The standards for construction applicable to a treatment works or other project eligible for assistance under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1281 et seq.) shall apply to the construction of a treatment works or project under this subsection in the same manner as the standards apply under such title.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1996 through 2003.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulations of transportation, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COBLE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1788. An act to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measures were read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 1438. A bill to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 1441. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 1996 through 1999 and to abolish the United States Information Agency, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Agency for International Development, and for other purposes.

The following measure was read the first and second time by unanimous consent and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1788. An act to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, 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–1641. A communication from the White House Chief of Staff, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of certification relative to the Executive Office of the President's Drug Free Workplace Plan; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1642. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the list of General Accounting Office reports and testimony for October 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1643. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1644. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend 5 U.S.C. section 5706 to authorize the head of an agency to reimburse Federal employees for taxes incurred on money received for travel expenses; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1645. A communication from the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1646. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize financial institutions to disclose to the Office of Personnel Management the names and current addresses of their customers who are receiving, by direct deposit or electronic funds transfer, payment of Civil Service Retirement benefits under chapter 83 or Federal Employees' Retirement benefits under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1647. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for accrual accounting of retirement costs for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

EC–1648. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1649. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of surplus real property transferred for public health purposes for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1650. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Treasury (Domestic Finance), transmitting, pursuant to law, relative to the debt limit and the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSR); to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1651. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Treasury (Domestic Finance), transmitting, pursuant to law, relative to the debt limit and the Federal Employees' Retirement System Government Securities Investment Fund (FERS); to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1652. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''Performance Audit of the Office of Emergency Preparedness;'' to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1653. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through Septmeber 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1654. A communication from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a resolution concerning proposed D.C. law 11–150; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1657. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11–147 adopted by the Council on October 10, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1658. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11–150 adopted by the Council on October 10, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

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. JOHNSTON:

S. 1442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award a grant for the establishment of the National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 1443. A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building,'' and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award a grant for the establishment of the National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR SICKLE CELL DISEASE RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 1995

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that will support research for a disease which disproportionately affects African-Americans and other minority groups. Sickle cell disease is a painful, life-threatening, genetic disease. Approximately 1 of every 12 African-Americans is born with the sickle cell genetic trait, and about 1 in every 600 is afflicted with sickle cell disease. Sickle cell conditions are also found, although less frequently, in other United States populations, including those of Puerto Rican, Cuban, and southern Italian ancestry. The disease has also recently been found in some Caucasians.

Sickle cell disease is based in the circulatory system and is a painful and disabling disorder for which there is currently no cure. In a healthy body, red blood cells contain the substance hemoglobin which carries oxygen from the lungs to various organs and tissues. This role of hemoglobin is essential to life because all body components require oxygen to live and carry out their functions. Diseased bodies have an abnormal type of hemoglobin which interrupts the flow of oxygen to these vital organs.

Red blood cells that contain normal hemoglobin remain round when they release oxygen. Cells with abnormal or sickle hemoglobin, upon releasing oxygen, become distorted into the shape of a sickle causing a chronic and painful anemia. Distorted, or sickled cells cannot traverse capillaries, further limiting oxygen supply to the body's tissues.

Mr. President, the minority population in the State of Louisiana is about 1.29 million people. Of this number roughly 3,250 people are suspected of having the disease, and of this number, 25 percent will have the most acute and serious form, which is often fatal. Alarmingly, about 130,000 Louisianians carry the genetic trait for this illness.

Mr. President, despite the fact that the cause of the sickle cell disease has been known for many years, progress has not been made in finding suitable treatment. Currently, the most common treatment for the illness is pain relief medication, treating only the immediate symptoms. Treating only the symptoms results in tissue damage, often to major organs, with each successive episode of oxygen deprivation. Consequently, many of those afflicted with severe forms of the disease often do not even live to see adulthood.

Concerned with finding a cure for a disease that has such a devastating effect on the Nation's minority populations, Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA, the largest predominately African-American university in the United States, has committed itself to the creation of a center for sickle cell disease research.

With a single purpose, this center will conduct multidisciplinary research to lead to the discovery of a cure for sickle cell disease. The center will conduct basic biomedical research to determine the types of drugs that can prevent, inhibit, or reverse the sickling process, along with clinical research and joint studies to conduct clinical trials on antisickling agents. In addition, the center will work with other institutions to promote and enhance scholarship and teaching knowledge in order to disseminate newly gained knowledge on the disease.

Mr. President, it is important to note that the Louisiana State Legislature in recognition of the importance of such a center, and even in these exceedingly hard economic times, has committed $7 million to this project. To complete the center, and to be able to provide this valuable public health research, Southern University needs Federal assistance. To provide this assistance, I offer a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award a grant for the creation of this center. This legislation will direct the Secretary to provide a grant to the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals for the establishment and construction of the National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research at Southern University in Baton Rouge.

Mr. President, sickle cell disease is a vital public health problem which this bill would assist in overcoming. Such funding can only aid in the development of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this important 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. 1442

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) Sickle Cell Disease is a serious illness that disproportionately affects African-Americans.

(2) Approximately 1 out of every 12 African-Americans is born with the sickle cell trait, and about 1 out of every 600 is afflicted with Sickle cell Disease.

(3) Sickle Cell conditions also occur in other United States populations, primarily those of Puerto Rican, Cuban, southern Italian ancestry and more recently sickle cell has been found in some Caucasian individuals.

(4) Sickle Cell Disease is a painful and disabling disorder which can lead to untimely death and is cause by inadequate transportation of oxygen due to an abnormal type of hemoglobin molecule in the red blood cells.

(5) Sickle Cell Disease is an inherited disease which can be transmitted to offspring, particularly if both parents carry the genetic trait.

(6) The sickle cell trait carriers show no sign of the disease, but statistically, 1 in 4 of their children will be afflicted with the disease.

(7) There is no national research center devoted to Sickle Cell Disease in the United States.

(8) There is no known cure for Sickle Cell Disease at this time and there is a need for prioritized and specialized research to find such a cure for this severely disabling disease.

(9) Louisiana's minority population is 1,299,281.

(10) Of this number, a suspected 3,248 individuals will have the disease and of those individuals, 25 percent (812 individuals) will have the most acute and serious stage of Sickle Cell Disease, a stage that is usually fatal.

(11) Some 129,928 individuals in Louisiana will carry the sickle cell trait.

(12) Southern University, located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana is the largest predominately African-American university in the United States.

(13) Approximately 16,700 students attend this 112 year old school and Southern graduates are located throughout the United States and the world.

(14) The State of Louisiana through the Louisiana Legislature and Southern University, has shown great leadership and committed significant financial and personnel

resources towards the development of a National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research.

(15) Because Southern University has committed its resources and personnel to seeing this project through to its ultimate goal, finding a cure for Sickle Cell Disease, and because of Southern University's large minority population it is appropriate to locate the National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research at Southern University in Baton Rouge.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to establish a National Center for Sickle Cell Disease at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, that will have the following objectives—

(1) to conduct biomedical research and clinical investigations designed to find a cure for Sickle Cell Disease;

(2) to conduct a wide variety of human behavioral studies designed to provide new knowledge about such issues as the effectiveness of various counseling and education methods, and techniques to improve coping skills on the part of patients and their families;

(3) to establish collaborative arrangements and joint research programs and projects with other Louisiana institutions of higher education, such as Louisiana State University Medical Centers at New Orleans and Shreveport and Tulane University Medical Center to conduct clinical trials on antisickling agents;

(4) to provide expanded opportunities for faculty members at the institutions described in paragraph (3) to publish in the three broad areas of basic biomedical research, psychosocial research and clinical research;

(5) to become a laboratory for training both graduate and undergraduate students in research methods and techniques concerning Sickle Cell Disease; and

(6) to develop, promote and implement joint research projects with other public and private higher education institutions including teaching hospitals on Sickle Cell Disease.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CENTER FOR SICKLE CELL DISEASE RESEARCH.

(a) GRANT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall award a grant to the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals for the establishment and construction of the National Center for Sickle Cell Disease Research at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and for related facilities and equipment at such Center. Prior to the awarding of such grant, the State of Louisiana shall certify to the Secretary—

(1) that the State of Louisiana has provided not less than $7,000,000 to support and operate such Center; and

(2) that the State of Louisiana has developed a plan to provide funds for the continued operation and support of such center.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $21,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act. ●

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 1443. A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, IL, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building,'' and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE EDWARD MADIGAN POST OFFICE BUILDING DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, a bill to designate the post office of Lincoln, IL, as the Edward Madigan Post Office Building.

I served with Ed Madigan in the Illinois Legislature, where we worked on a variety of things together, and then I served with him in the House here in Washington.

He was one of those people who had common sense and a graciousness about him that was infectious.

He knew how to disagree without creating hostility. He was a remarkable person.

When we had a vacancy in the office of Secretary of Agriculture, I called him and said I wanted to call President Bush's chief of staff in Ed Madigan's behalf unless he had an objection. He had none, and I was pleased to call John Sununu and tell him that if they wanted someone who could get along with Democrats and Republicans and still do a very good job, they could not do better than Ed Madigan.

I am sure a great many people with much more influence than PAUL SIMON conveyed the same message.

It was typical of Ed Madigan that I called him, rather than the other way around.

He was a great public servant, but even more important than that, he was just a genuinely fine human being.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation. My only regret is that Ed Madigan is not around to see this building designated for him. He was proud of his hometown of Lincoln, and I know the people in Lincoln are proud of him.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 704

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to establish the Gambling Impact Study Commission.

S. 907

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] were added as cosponsors of S. 907, a bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authorities and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in issuing ski area permits on National Forest System lands and to withdraw lands within ski area permit boundaries from the operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws.

S. 1074

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for expanding and intensifying activities of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases with respect to lupus.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

S. 1279

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to provide for appropriate remedies for prison condition lawsuits, to discourage frivolous and abusive prison lawsuits, and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1344, a bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization for increases in judicial salaries, to provide for automatic annual increases for judicial salaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1423

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1423, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to make modifications to certain provisions, and for other purposes.

S. 1429

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, a bill to provide clarification in the reimbursement to States for federally funded employees carrying out Federal programs during the lapse in appropriations between November 14, 1995, through November 19, 1995.

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, supra.

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, supra.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Commerce Committee on Indian Affairs will hold an oversight hearing on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Public Law 101–601. The hearing will take place at 9:30 a.m. on December 6, 1995, in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a joint hearing with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources regarding OSHA reform on Wednesday, December 6, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Melissa Bailey at 224–5175.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a hearing regarding proposals to strengthen the SBIC Program on Tuesday, December 12, 1995, at

9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Louis Taylor at 224–5175.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, December 12, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to review S. 873, a bill to establish the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor; S. 944, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio River Corridor Study Commission; S. 945, a bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to modify the boundaries of the corridor; S. 1020, a bill to establish the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area in the State of Georgia; S. 1110, a bill to establish guidelines for the designation of national heritage areas; S. 1127, a bill to establish the Vancouver National Historic Reserve; and S. 1190, a bill to establish the Ohio and Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor in the State of Ohio.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224–5161.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the benefit of Members and the public that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has scheduled a hearing on several measures relating to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The measures are:

S. 901.—To amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of certain water reclamation and reuse projects and desalination research and development projects, and for other purposes;

S. 1013.—To amend the act of August 5, 1965, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land for the purpose of exchange for privately held land for use as wildlife and wetland protection areas, in connection with the Garrison Diversion Unit Project, and for other purposes;

S. 1154.—To authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural Water Supply System, to authorize assistance to the Fort Peck Rural Water County Water District, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes;

S. 1169.—To amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize construction of facilities for the reclamation and reuse of wastewater at McCall, ID, and for other purposes; and

S. 1186.—To provide for the transfer of operation and maintenance of the Flathead irrigation and power project, and for other purposes.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, December 13, 1995 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or submit written statements for the record should contact James Beirne at (202) 224–2564 or Betty Nevitt at (202) 224–0765 of the subcommittee staff or write the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO AMEND THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and I ask unanimous consent that the text of a resolution which would make technical corrections to the Senate's gift rule.

There being no objection, the text was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES.—

Resolved, That (a) paragraph 1(c) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 1 of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended—

(1) in clause (3) by striking ''107(2)'' and inserting ''190(5)''; and

(2) in clause (4)(A) by inserting '', including personal hospitality,'' after ''Anything''.

(b) Paragraph 3 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 2(a) of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended—

(1) in the matter before clause (a) by striking ''paragraph 2'' and inserting ''paragraph 1''; and

(2) in clause (b) by striking ''income'' and inserting ''value''.

(c) Paragraph 4 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 2(b)(1) of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended by striking ''paragraph 2'' and inserting ''paragraph 1''.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, REGARDING EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for William Triplett, a member of the staff of Senator BENNETT, to participate in a program in the Philippines sponsored by the Rotary Club of Makati-Legazpi from December 2–8, 1995.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Triplett in this program.●

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE ROSENBERG

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Maurice Rosenberg, who passed away late last summer, was a well-known advocate for judicial reform on the State and Federal levels of government. He was a professor at Columbia University's School of Law. I had the great pleasure of working with him extensively over the years on the issues of court reform and judicial administration. He had a keen legal mind that led him to contribute enormously to our system of jurisprudence.

During his 39-year tenure as a professor at Columbia, Dr. Rosenberg wrote and lectured extensively on the legal system, particularly on issues of procedure and access to the courts. He had an intense dislike for the staggering increase in cases which clog the courts and proposed measures to help ease the burden. One of his recommendations was to replace juries in small-claims cases with arbitrators. During a 1977 interview, he questioned the effect on society as a whole of people being so quick to sue each other in court.

Between 1971 and 1975, Dr. Rosenberg headed the Advisory Council on Appellate Justice and was later on the Council on the Role of the Courts. In 1979, President Carter appointed him Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office for Improvements in the Administration of Justice. Previously, he had served on the mayor's committee on the judiciary in New York City. In 1980, he was appointed by Chief Justice Warren Burger to the Federal Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, on which he served until 1987. A graduate of Syracuse University, he received his law degree from Columbia.

Dr. Rosenberg was an outstanding court scholar, professor, and lawyer who early on foresaw what is now called the litigation explosion. He acknowledged that part of the increase in litigation and in the law's complexity was due to greater public awareness of rights and a willingness to try them out in court. He once said, ''That is certainly preferable to having them tested in the streets.'' But he also felt that law schools should do more to sensitize students to possibilities other

than simply adopting an adversarial frame of mind.

Maurice Rosenberg will long be remembered as one of this century's legal giants. His contributions to the field of jurisprudence will be lasting and will guide scholarly thought for decades to come. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family in the wake of their tremendous loss.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CANADIAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE CHAMPION BALTIMORE STALLIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, my hometown of Baltimore has always been a great sports city. We have a tradition of excellence in baseball with the Orioles, and last summer we celebrated the magical endurance streak of Cal Ripken, Jr.

I am proud to say that a new chapter in our tradition of sports excellence was written on November 19, 1995. The Baltimore Stallions defeated the Calgary Stampeders for the Canadian Football League's championship, the Grey Cup. The Grey Cup is the ultimate achievement in the CFL, and it will now reside in the United States for the first time in the 106-year history of the league.

To win the Grey Cup, a team must combine tremendous athletic ability with leadership, and come together as a team. Last year the Stallions gave the fans their best effort, but came up short for the CFL championship. This year was going to be different. The Stallions came back with renewed intensity and desire. Their goal was to bring the Grey Cup to Baltimore, and they worked until their dream became a reality.

The Stallions' victory gives Baltimore three championships in three professional football leagues. The Stallions join the National Football League's Colts and the U.S. Football League's Stars as Baltimore champions.

I want to extend my congratulations to the owner of the Stallions, Jim Speros, and his dedicated players and coaches. They truly deserve this championship, and they have made Baltimore proud.●

IRONY ABOUNDS AS RETIRED OHIO SENATOR BEMOANS BROWNS' FATE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is no one with whom I have served in my years in Congress for whom I have greater respect than Senator Howard Metzenbaum, our former colleague from Ohio.

One of the few issues where we differed was on the antitrust exemption for professional baseball.

The recent moves of professional football teams, particularly the movement of the Cleveland Browns to Baltimore, suggests that the antitrust exemption for baseball may be a very good thing for professional sports, as well as the communities involved.

Recently, a veteran sports writer for the Chicago Tribune, Jerome Holtzman, had a column about movement of the Browns and its relationship to antitrust baseball. I ask that this be printed in the RECORD. In fairness, I should add that the Chicago Tribune owns the Chicago Cubs, but I have no reason to believe that Jerome Holtzman is not writing from conviction.

The column follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 21, 1995]

IRONY ABOUNDS AS RETIRED OHIO SENATOR BEMOANS BROWNS' FATE

(By Jerome Holtzman)

Put in a call Howard Metzenbaum, the recently retired Democratic senator from Ohio, and had only one simple question.

After years of attempting to rid baseball of its antitrust exemption, what were his thoughts about his beloved Cleveland Browns moving to Baltimore?

''It's horrible,'' Mentzenbaum said from his office in Pompano Beach, Fla. ''It's a travesty. No community was more supportive of its team than the fans in Cleveland. I was back in Cleveland for one day and the feeling of outrage is unbelievable. And I've lived in Cleveland all my life—78 years.''

Certainly, he understood the Browns are able to pick up and hotfoot it to Baltimore because the National Football League does not have an antitrust exemption.

''That argument can be made,'' he conceded.

Yet, as the chairman of the Antitrust Committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he helped introduce legislation that sought to repeal baseball's exemption.

Doesn't he see the irony?

He is losing his hometown football team and if baseball didn't have antitrust protection, Cleveland also would have lost its baseball team. The Indians would have flown the coop years ago.

''I can't argue that,'' he replied. ''They could have been moved.''

He launched into a meaningless panegyric about the difference in ownership today compared with years ago:

''There are not the same kind of owners that were in the field yesteryear. Now, you're talking about multimillionaires who have a plaything. Before, it wasn't a question of making money. It was the pride of having a team in your community. Much of that doesn't exist anymore.''

It certainly seems that way. But the senator is naive. If he had read up on baseball history he would discover most owners have been motivated by money, beginning with the 1869 Cincinnati Red Stockings, baseball's first professional team. To increase attendance, the owner encouraged the players to open with a song:

''We are a band of baseball players
From Cincinnati City;
We come to toss the ball around
And sing to you our ditty;
And if you listen to the song
We are about to sing,
We'll tell you all about baseball
And make the welkin ring.
The ladies want to know
Who are those gallant men in
Stocking red, they'd like to know.''

The only owner in my time who appeared mostly to be a gentleman sportsman was the late Philip K. Wrigley, the longtime caretaker of the Cubs. He didn't need the money because the gum business kept him and his family in vittles.

Metzenbaum was asked if, in his opinion, anything could be done to prevent the Browns from moving to Baltimore?

''The league won't do much,'' he acknowledged. ''If push comes to shove they'll probably be able to move the team.''

But if professional football had the exemption, the carpetbaggers couldn't move their franchises at will. They couldn't transplant without the approval of a majority of their fellow owners. And so the owners jump around like flies, forever devouring the sweetest fruit, a movable feast.

In the last 13 years, the Oakland Raiders have navigated a round trip—to Los Angeles and back to Oakland. The Los Angeles Rams are now in St. Louis. The Baltimore Colts are in Indianapolis. The Phoenix Cardinals were previously based in St. Louis. The Houston Oilers are enroute to Nashville. And the shameless Mike McCaskey, president of our Bears, is threatening to relocate to Gary.

I can't resist mentioning all the baseball bashing since the players' 1994 strike that forced cancellation of the World Series. But which is preferable? A temporary baseball shutdown, with replacements on the field, or no team at all?

Because of its exemption, the baseball map is unchanged since 1972 when the Washington Senators were allowed to move to Texas. In the 23 years since, the San Francisco Giants were denied a ticket to St. Petersburg, Fla. Minnesota's jump to Tampa was aborted, as was the White Sox to Denver, Oakland to Denver and Seattle to St. Petersburg.

The Pittsburgh Pirates and Cleveland Indians, when both were in poverty—the Pirates have yet to escape from the poor-house—repeatedly have sought greener fields. But they were ordered to stay put and could be sold only to local ownership groups. The Houston Astros now are threatening to move to somewhere in Virginia. Will they get permission? I doubt it.

''Fortunately, because of the events of the last four months everyone seems to better appreciate our position,'' said acting commissioner Bud Selig. ''In all the times I have testified in Washington, and especially before Sen. Metzenbaum, I emphasized the exemption has been good for our fans. It has enabled us to stabilize our franchises.''

I mentioned that I was planning to speak to Metzenbaum, formerly baseball's No. 1 congressional nemesis.

''Oh,'' said Selig, ''send him my best regards. And be sure to tell him that in the 26 years I've been in baseball the Indians tried to move out of Cleveland at least four times.''●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES GOMILLION

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Charles Goode Gomillion, who passed away on October 4 at the age of 95, will go down in history as the leader of the struggle to bring political power to the black majority of citizens in Tuskegee, AL. The case Gomillion versus Lightfoot ultimately yielded a landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision on the issue of redistricting. The decision in the case is also recognized by legal scholars as a major step forward in the dual causes of civil and voting rights.

Charles Gomillion will long be remembered as a pioneer who took a firm stand on principle and by so doing paved the way for major advances in the cause of equality. His legacy is

that of social progress; his political moderation and temperament present an outstanding example of how to work within the constitutional system to effect positive change. I extend my condolences to his family.

I ask that a New York Times article on the landmark remapping case be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times]

CHARLES GOMILLION, 95, FIGURE IN LANDMARK REMAP CASE, DIES

(By Robert McG. Thomas, Jr.)

Charles G. Gomillion, who led the fight that brought political power to the black majority in Tuskegee, Ala, with the assistance of a landmark Supreme Court case that bears his name, died on Oct. 4 at a hospital in Montgomery, Ala. He was 95 and until his recent return to Tuskegee had lived the last 25 years in Washington and Roebling, N.J.

Mr. Gomillion, a native of Edgefield, S.C., had a long and distinguished career as a sociology professor and dean at Tuskegee University, but it was his role as a civic leader that made Charles Goode Gomillion a footnote to constitutional legal history in 1960.

As the president of the Tuskegee Civic Association, an organization he had helped found in 1941, he was the lead plaintiff in a suit that successfully challenged a blatant act of gerrymandering designed to exclude all but a handful of black voters from municipal elections.

Alarmed by a voter registration drive led by Mr. Gomillion's organization, the Alabama Legislature redrew the town's boundries in 1957, leaving Tuskegee University and all but a handful of black families outside the city limits.

What had been a perfect square was now a 28-sided figure that some likened to a snake and others to a sea dragon. Whatever the trope, the lines had been so skillfully drawn that although as many as 12 black voters remained inside a city that once had 5,400 black residents, not a single one of the city's 1,310 white residents had been excluded.

Mr. Gomillion and 11 other association members filed Federal suit seeking to bar Mayor Philip M. Lightfoot and other city officials from enforcing the state statute on the ground that it was a transparent effort to circumvent the 15th Amendment's voting guarantees. Two lower courts, citing a 1946 Supreme Court opinion by Justice Felix Frankfurter, ruled that such state action was beyond judicial review.

When the case, Gomillion v. Lightfoot, came before the Supreme Court in 1960. Justice Frankfurter, describing the new configuration as ''an uncouth 28-sided figure,'' found otherwise and so did all eight of his colleagues.

Deftly distinguishing Gomillion, from the 1946 case, which involved Congressional districts of unequal population in Illinois, Justice Frankfurter said the Tuskegee case involved ''affirmative action'' by legislature that ''singled out a readily isolated segment of a racial minority for special discriminatory treatment.''

He and seven other justices said that a statute that had the effect of disenfranchising black voters would be a violation of the 15th Amendment. Justice Charles E. Whittaker, suggesting that there would be no disenfranchisement since the excluded former Tuskegee residents could vote in county elections said it would instead be a violation of the 14th Amendment.

The case was sent back to District Court and the next year Judge Frank M. Johnson Jr. declared the statute was indeed unconstitutional.

The former city limits were restored and within years the black majority has taken over both the city and county governments, much to the consternation of Mr. Comillion, who served for a while on the school board.

A soft-spoken moderate who had worked quietly to enlist the support of liberal-minded white allies in Tuskegee, he was dismayed when a plan to integrate local schools was sabotaged by Gov. George C. Wallace. The Governor ordered the schools closed, creating such rancor that white residents created a private school, black radicals swept Mr. Gomillion and other moderates aside and in turn white families fled. Today, only a handful of white families remain in Tuskegee.

As his dream of a truly integrated community, with black and white leaders working together for the common good, died, Mr. Gomillion, who retired from Tuskegee in 1970, left, too.

Although his moderate approach was rejected by a majority of the black voters, at least one of the former radicals now regrets it.

''The man was right,'' Otis Pinkard said yesterday, recalling that he had once led the faction that opposed the Gomillion approach, ''We should not have run all the white families out of town.''

Mr. Gomillion is survived by a daughter, Gwendolyn Chaires of Roebling; three grandchildren; three great-grandchildren, and one great-great-grandchild.●

ON THE RETIREMENT OF LAUREN F. OTIS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to wish great congratulations to Lauren F. Otis, who retired Thursday, November 30, 1995, after 28 years of dedicated service to the city of New York's department of city planning.

Mr. Otis has been with the department of city planning since 1967, the last 11 as chief urban designer. In this capacity, he has acted as a consultant to the chairman and the city planning commission on a variety of urban matters while developing comprehensive studies of the five boroughs of New York City as an overall framework for individual projects. Prior to becoming the chief urban designer, Mr. Otis was a key member of a team of architectural professionals who developed new zoning and regulatory approaches for the development of Midtown Manhattan and the Wall Street area. Some of his individual urban design highlights include Times Square, the Citicorp Center and the Sliver Building zoning amendment.

A graduate of Harvard College and Harvard University School of Design, Mr. Otis served in the U.S. Navy Civil Engineer Corps from 1955–58 before moving to architectural design, working as a staff architect for I.M. Pei & Partners before joining the city of New York.

In addition to Mr. Otis' work in the department of city planning, his patronage of New York City's cultural spirit as mayor's representative to the New York City Art Commission between 1982 and 1992, the last 7 years as vice president, and as a representative to the New York City Historic Properties Fund deserves recognition.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will join me in wishing him the best of luck in his much deserved retirement.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY WAITING PERIOD

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to make my colleagues aware of a very unfortunate situation involving Social Security disability benefits.

In our law, there is a 6-month waiting period before a Social Security disability applicant can receive payments. If a person is diagnosed with a deadly disease, and is eligible to receive Social Security disability, that person must wait 6 months before the payments arrive. This waiting period often comes at a time in a person's life when treatment must begin immediately. Many of these people simply cannot afford to wait. Far too often, the results of this forced waiting period are financial devastation for families.

One of my Maryland constituents, Mitchell Berman, was stricken by a terrible illness which required full-time care in a nursing home. Mr. Berman and his wife, Marjorie, were forced to sell nearly everything they owned to cover the health care costs. By the time Mr. Berman's payments began to arrive, it was too late; they had spent much of their life's savings. Mr. Berman's disease was not curable, and I am very sorry to say that he has died.

To honor the memory of her husband, Marjorie Berman has started her own crusade to make lawmakers and families aware of the financial effect the waiting period can have. I salute Marjorie Berman for her courage and her steadfast devotion to her husband.

Earlier this year, I encouraged the Senate Finance Committee to explore this issue. In today's political climate, I know that funding for many programs is being cut back and eligibility for some programs is being tightened.

But I encourage my colleagues to take a close look at this issue and ask if the Social Security disability waiting period is serving a useful Government purpose and responding to the needs of people. I also ask my colleagues to listen to the stories of their own constituents who have been affected by this waiting period and have not been able to get the help when they need it. I think my colleagues will find that the waiting period does not serve the needs of people.●

THE PROS KNOW WHY PRISON FAILS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an op-ed written by Coleman McCarthy in the September 9, 1995, Washington Post.

In discussing prison policies, Mr. McCarthy draws an important distinction between professional and amateur

opinions. No matter how we like to flatter ourselves, Members of Congress are amateurs when it comes to understanding what works to reduce crime. The professionals are the people who work in prisons and the criminal justice system every day. Unfortunately, it is the amateurs who get to set policy, and, according to the professionals, we are doing a lousy job.

One year ago, I sponsored a survey of prison wardens asking for their views on our criminal justice and prison policies. Eight-five percent of the wardens said that most politicians are not offering effective solutions to crime. Instead of building more prisons and passing mandatory minimum sentencing laws, the wardens overwhelmingly favored providing vocational—92 percent—and literacy—93 percent—training to prisons, and 89 percent support drug treatment programs in prisons. Congress has been quick to defund these programs, and pour scarce resources into prison construction, in the rush to be tough on crime.

The reality is that most prisoners will at some point be released, and our goal should be to ensure that those released from prison do not return to a criminal lifestyle. The Huron House in Michigan, a community-based alternative sentencing program which Mr. McCarthy refers to his in his piece, costs less and is more effective at reducing recidivism than prisons.

In setting prison policies, we need to be more focused on what works. The best way to find out is to consult the professionals.

I ask that the full text of the op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

THE PROS KNOW WHY PRISONS FAIL

(By Coleman McCarthy)

PORT HURON, MICH.—Robert Diehl, who works with prisoners, believes it's time to get tough on crime. How? To begin with, not by longer sentences, not by building more prisons and not by agreeing with California Gov. Pete Wilson, who announced his presidential candidacy with the preachment that he'll ''appoint judges who know that it's better to have thugs overcrowding our jails than overcrowding your neighborhood.''

Diehl's philosophy of toughness involves the arduous and complex work of rescuing people with messed-up lives. He is the director of Huron House, a nonprofit, community-based alternative sentencing program for felony offenders. The three-story, 30-bed facility—located on a residential street in this small lakeshore community 60 miles north of Detroit—provides intensive 24-hour supervision and comprehensive services ranging from job training and job placement to mental health and drug counseling.

It isn't blind faith, much less addled thinking, that keeps Diehl going. In the 15 years he's been with Huron House, which opened in 1979, fewer than one in five men and women in the program has committed a new crime. The recidivism rate for the imprisoned is two out of three. It's $50 a day to cage a person in a Michigan prison, as against $35 a day to supervise a resident at Huron House.

In his office last week, Diehl, 53, described the futility of the current panic-button solutions to crime mouthed by one Pete Wilson or another: ''Michigan has been trying to build its way out of the crime problem for the past 12 years. We now have three times as many people in our prisons as 12 years ago. It doesn't work. There's been no reduction of crime, and there's no more perception of safety among our citizens. And prisoners' lives are not being changed for the better.''

The public faces a choice: Does it want to follow the counsel of such corrections officials as Diehl or place its trust in politicians who advocate spending money on chain gangs, boot camps, three strikes, death rows, mandatory sentencing—and investing less or no money in inmate education or job programs.

The choice was rarely more stark than a few weeks ago, when two groups met—one in Cincinnati, the other in Washington—to offer prescriptions for fighting crime. One group was the professionals, the other amateurs.

The pros were people who run the nation's prisons and jails and who belong to the 20,000-member American Correctional Association (ACA). The amateurs were such members of the Senate as Texas Republican Kay Bailey Hutchison, testifying before a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on prison reform.

At the ACA conference in Cincinnati, those who toil behind the walls told of the frustration of doing politicians' dirty work and knowing all the time that longer sentences and meaner bastilles are counter-productive.

They listened to corrections officials who detailed the facts on how recidivism is reduced through community programs like Huron House and how the payoffs for public safety are in combinations of education, employment, drug treatment and punishment—not punishment alone.

Few people are wearier of quick-fix politicians than corrections professionals. Bobbie L. Huskey, the ACA president, states categorically that an ''overwhelming consensus'' exists among wardens that ''incarceration, in and of itself, does little to reduce crime or have a positive impact on recidivism.'' Huskey cites a poll conducted by the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution in which 85 percent of the wardens surveyed said that most politicians are not offering effective solutions to crime. Ninety-three percent favor literacy and other educational programs, 92 percent vocational training and 89 percent are for drug treatment.

While the professionals who know struggle on, the amateurs who don't keep popping off. At the Judiciary Committee hearings in late July, Sen. Hutchison accused federal courts of creating ''comfort and convenience'' for criminals in prisons. That was news to the wardens.

In addition to criminal recidivists, it appears that we now have politician recidivists: the Wilsons and Hutchisons who lapse, relapse and relapse again into deadend thinking. Maybe they need a brief stretch at Huron House.●

LEGALIZED GAMBLING

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my Senate colleagues on the progress of important legislation moving through Congress that addresses the issue of legalized gambling in America.

Legalized gambling today is proliferating at breathtaking speed, touching the lives of millions of Americans. Communities across the country are considering casinos, riverboat gambling, pari-mutuel racing, off-track betting, and other forms of wagering. Whereas only 2 States offered casino gambling in 1988, today 23 States have authorized casinos to operate. Overall, 48 States now permit some form of legalized gambling.

A steady stream of news accounts have chronicled the recent growth and expansion of gambling activities in America. Many of these stories describe the enormous profits generated almost overnight by gambling enterprises. Questions are being asked about decisions by State and local leaders to legalize gambling. People are concerned not only about the economic costs of these decisions, but of the human costs as well.

The Wall Street Journal, recently reported that some New Orleans public officials, retailers, and citizens are having second thoughts about the economic impacts of bringing riverboats, casinos, and video poker machines to Louisiana. The New York Times related the personal experiences of local residents in cities and towns across America who visit a casino instead of a restaurant or ballpark, who spend their grocery money on a nearby instant-play video lottery game, or who exhaust their personal or family savings at the casino tables.

In the face of this explosive growth, I joined Senator SIMON last April in support of legislation to establish a national commission to conduct an 18-month study on the effects of gambling. This measure, S. 704, would provide State and local governments with an objective, authoritative resource to use as a basis for making informed choices about gambling. S. 704 does not propose to further regulate gambling activities or to increase taxation of gambling revenues. The bill has been endorsed by the President and enjoys bipartisan support in the Senate with a total of 11 cosponsors, including Senators GORTON, KYL, LIEBERMAN, GRASSLEY, WARNER, FEINSTEIN, HATFIELD, KASSEBAUM, HATCH, and COATS.

The Governmental Affairs Committee on November 2 conducted a hearing on S. 704. Senator SIMON and I testified before the committee along with several other Members of Congress and outside experts concerned about this important issue. I am hopeful the committee will approve this important legislation before the conclusion of this session.

Companion legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman WOLF of Virginia. The House Judiciary Committee held hearings on Representative WOLF's bill, H.R. 497, and approved the measure by voice vote on November 8. Prospects are good for passage by the full House during the 104th Congress.

The Washington Post, in a September 22, 1995, endorsement of the gambling study commission proposal, stated that,

Those pushing casinos into communities make large claims about their economic benefits, but the jobs and investment casinos create are rarely stacked up against the jobs

lost and the investment and spending forgone in other parts of a local economy. The commission's study could be of great use to communities pondering whether to wager their futures on roulette, slot machines and blackjack.

As evidence of the desirability for a comprehensive study of the gambling issue, I ask that the following Chicago Tribune article from November 29, 1995, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 29, 1995]

RISKY BUSINESS: CAN GAMING WIN IN CITIES?—CHICAGO MAY GET TIP FROM NEW ORLEANS

(By Ken Armstrong)

The way casinos have flopped in New Orleans may drive other cities to flip in their views toward gaming, but Chicago still looks like a viable gambling market, according to financial analysts.

As the country's first major city to introduce large-scale gaming, New Orleans was to be a model demonstration of casinos creating tax dollars and jobs. What transpired instead were budget shortfalls, unrealized promises and the threat of municipal layoffs.

''I think there were many municipalities watching this project as an experiment in urban gaming,'' said Jason Ader, a gaming analyst with Bear Stearns & Co. in New York. ''And the fact that it has effectively failed casts a dark cloud over other urban markets considering gaming as an economic engine.''

Harrah's Jazz Co. shut its temporary casino in New Orleans last week and declared bankruptcy. Harrah's Jazz also suspended construction on its permanent casino, which was slated to open in New Orleans next summer.

No longer able to count on lease and tax payments from the casino, New Orleans faces a budget shortfall and has postponed the sale of $15.8 million in general obligation bonds. Mayor Marc Morial said he may have to lay off as many as 1,000 city employees.

Gaming opponents have latched on to the debacle, using it to argue that other cities pursuing casinos would be wise to give up the chase.

Tom Grey, a Galena, Ill., minister spearheading the anti-gambling movement nationwide, said there's reason to believe that what happened in New Orleans would be replayed in Chicago, where Mayor Richard Daley has pushed hard for casinos.

But several financial analysts who specialize in gaming say it isn't necessarily so.

''Everybody in the industry knows Chicago and New York would be layups if they had casinos there,'' said Steve Schneider, an analyst with Stifel Nicolaus & Co. in St. Louis.

He estimated that casinos in Chicago could generate $800 million to $1 billion in gross profits without cutting heavily into the revenues of nearby riverboat casinos.

Daley spokesman Jim Williams said the mayor still views casinos as a good way to attract convention-goers and increase tax revenue for the city and state.

But he added: ''The mayor has never seen gaming as a panacea. He's been steadfast in his belief that it should never be seen as a primary source of income.''

What happened in New Orleans would more likely give pause to marginal markets for gaming such as Milwaukee or Cleveland, Schneider said. The poor performance of the New Orleans casinos also will make it more difficult for gaming companies to secure project financing for future developments, he said.

Brian Ford, director of gaming industry services at Ernst & Young in Philadelphia, said New Orleans hardly proves that casinos can't flourish.

With video-poker machines in truckstops, casinos on riverboats and what would have been one of the world's largest land-based casinos, Louisiana tried to do too much with too small a population base, Ford said.

The shutdown of Harrah's Jazz was New Orleans' second losing hand.

Another project with two riverboat casinos—the $223 million River City complex—closed in June after opening just nine weeks before. Analysts blamed its failure, like that of Harrah's temporary casino, largely on its location.

The riverboat complex was built in an industrial area where its neighbor is Glazer Steel & Aluminum—hardly a tourist draw. A thousand feet of head-high weeds, tractor trailers, piles of gravel and an abandoned Chevette with smashed-in windows separate the complex from the edge of the city's downtown area.

David Anders, a gaming analyst with Raymond James & Associates in St. Petersburg, Fla., said New Orleans shows that while state and municipal governments should rightfully profit from a casino, they shouldn't make the casino's financial burden so great it can't survive.

Harrah's Jazz paid $125 million up front as a franchise fee for the state's only land-based casino and promised payments of at least $100 million a year to the state, regardless of financial performance.

The company's principal partner is Memphis-based Harrah's Entertainment Inc., which grew from a bingo parlor in Reno during the Depression to an industry giant with casinos in all of the country's major gaming markets.

Ralph Berry, a Harrah's Entertainment spokesman, said Harrah's Jazz still wants to open the permanent casino and will try to renegotiate the casino agreement with the state, city and lenders. Critics have accused Harrah's Jazz of using the bankruptcy filing as leverage for more attractive terms.●

NATIONAL VETERANS DAY AND ADDRESS BY ADM. LEIGHTON W. SMITH, JR.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Birmingham, AL has always conducted outstanding Veterans Day events. Each year, the ceremonies commence on the night of November 10, the day before Veterans Day, when a banquet is held to remember our veterans and to formally honor the National Veterans Award recipients.

This year, National Veterans Day in Birmingham sponsors, which include 16 of the national veterans organizations, decided to present the award to 5 World War II Congressional Medal of Honor winners. They were Adm. Eugene Fluckey of the U.S. Navy; Capt. Maurice Britt, U.S. Army; and PFC Jack Lucas, U.S. Marine Corps. There were two members honored from the Air Force, which during World War II was still the old Army Air Corps. They were Col. William T. Lawley and M.Sgt. Henry Eugene Erwin, both Alabama natives. There are a total of five surviving World War II veterans who served in the Army Air Corps and who are Congressional Medal of Honor winners, and we are proud that two of them hail from Alabama. Douglas Albert Monroe, signalman first class in the U.S. Coast Guard was honored posthumously.

On Veterans Day itself, Birmingham hosts the World Peace Luncheon, which this year featured Adm. Leighton W. Smith, Jr., of the U.S. Navy as its distinguished guest speaker. Born in Mobile, Admiral Smith is the commander, U.S. Naval Forces in Europe and commander in chief, Allied Forces in Southern Europe. He was appointed to these posts in April 1994.

He was promoted to vice admiral in June 1991, and served for 2½ years as deputy chief of naval operations for plans, policy, and operations. He was a major contributor to Navy staff reorganization and the development of From the Sea, the Navy's strategy for the 21st century.

I ask that a copy of Admiral Leighton's outstanding address delivered at the World Peace Luncheon be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. LEIGHTON W. SMITH, USN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF ALLIED FORCES SOUTHERN EUROPE, COMMANDER IN CHIEF U.S. NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Senator, Congressman, distinguished veterans, those of you who have worked so hard to put on this celebration, good morning.

No one knows better than I the value of and the sacrifices made by those we left behind.

I am distinctly honored to add my thoughts to those of the many distinguished speakers who have appeared here in previous years.

I doubt I can adequately express my gratitude for having been invited to join fellow Alabamians to pay tribute to our veterans—both those that have joined us here today and those who have gone before us.

It is absolutely right that we pause to reflect on what this day means—what it signifies—what it cost—and why, as Senator Heflin said last night, ''The Strength of our Nation Must Never Be Allowed to Atrophy''.

Few gathered here today can recall the first Armistice Day or the terribleness of the war it commemorated. Time has distanced us from the horror of that conflict.

It was the war to end all wars—but history reminds us that it really wasn't.

Other wars, conflicts and crises have followed, all evidencing the common denominators of destruction and death, but also individuals whose commitment, courage and personal sacrifices have continued to inspire us all.

Senator John Kerry, in speaking at the retirement of our Navy's Vietnam era swift boats, said:

''We were all bound together in the great and noble effort of giving ourselves to something bigger than each and every one of us individually, and doing so at risk of life and limb. Let no one ever doubt the quality and nobility of that commitment.''

Those words could have been spoken about our veterans who served in the trenches of France, at Pearl Harbor and Bataan, at Midway, Normandy and Iwo Jima.

They would have been true at Inchon and the Frozen Chosin, in the jungles and skies of Vietnam, the deserts of Kuwait and Iraq and in other unnamed places where ordinary people do extraordinary things and in so doing, honor their country while preserving the ideals and values for which it stands.

Last year I attended commemorative ceremonies at Normandy.

As I sat waiting for the program to begin, I spotted an usher, a young soldier no more than 18 years old, my he looked so young.

It suddenly dawned on me that this boy was the very same age as many of the men who, 50 years ago, had crawled across those bloody beaches and clawed their way up those terrible cliffs, each staring death square in the face.

Some survived, all were heros, but tragically so many were mown down in the springtime of their youth, their lives ended before they had really begun.

I was awed. What tragedy; what tragedy to rob a nation of its youth, to take a son or daughter from a father, mother, a sister or brother, a husband or wife. What tragedy to deny one so young the joys and excitement of life; the warmth of love, the thrill of watching one's children grow.

But then I thought, what if they had not?

Somehow seeing that young soldier made all those grave markers in that cemetery even more real, more alive. It literally slammed home in me the utter cruelty of war, the awfulness of what man can do to man, and equally as important, the enormous gift that all of those who experienced the terribleness of that war gave to us.

I am told that somewhere in Burma there is a marker inscribed with the message: ''We gave our todays so you could enjoy your tomorrows.''

Those of us gathered here today, and in other places around our country, honor the veterans whose legacy of honor, courage and commitment should not, and shall not, ever be forgotten.

Let me tell you that the actions of the young men and women of your Armed Forces tell me that they are, as Colin Powell said in an address here a few years back: ''worthy successors to what you their predecessors have passed on to them.''

You may all have heard of Capt. Scott O'Grady. He was shot down over Bosnia on 2 June.

On the night of 7 June his squadron mate went on a ''fishing expedition'' to try to contact Scott.

At 0200 he got contact with Scott O'Grady. I immediately called the amphibious commander, Jerry Schill and the Marine commander Marty Berndt. Both were on the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* in the Adriatic.

I told them to close the coast/call away your tactical recovery of aircrew and personnel team.

Didn't ask if—just when.

We discussed risks and the possibility of a trap being set.

I told Colonel Berndt you're in charge, look around, if you don't like what you see, come out.

These were educated risks, and we were operating on the edge of the envelope.

Four hours and thirty seven minutes—I got a call, one word—''pickup''.

Not many understand all that occurred.

We had 60 fixed wing aircraft, special operations backup rescue, Marines backup to that.

Went next day to visit, *Aviano*, *Vicenza*, U.S.S. *Kearsarge*:

There were no complaints, in spite of the mission being early morning, complex, risky.

They thanked me for letting them go.

Says a lot about courage, honor, commitment.

The same characteristics were demonstrated in attempts to locate and rescue the French pilots shot down 30 August.

Plan was developed to recce area of shootdown.

At 0130 I got a call from Mike Ryan.

Same coordination and complexity as the O'Grady rescue.

We tried three successive nights.

All three attempts experienced bad weather, all were shot at.

That this rescue was not consummated in no way detracts from the courage and commitment of those who tried.

These are wonderful stories, and I relive the excitement of those moments each time I tell them.

But the important thing here is that these are real stories about real people who demonstrate, every single time they are asked, the legacy of their predecessors and the strength of our great nation.

There are, in fact, two kinds of strengths. One is capability, and one is character.

Capability is the mechanics, it is the equipment. The machines, the steel, the weapons, the computers, the number of battalions that can be fielded, capability is what we think of when we think of the force.

Character, on the other hand, comes from the commitment of the people. It is the moral fabric that binds a nation together, that gives it purpose and defines its identity.

Yet as different as capability and character seem, it is their combination that makes a nation strong, that empowers it to greatness, that enables it to lead.

I would argue that a nation's strength and greatness is not fully tested until severely stressed, ours has, and we have never been found wanting.

Our veterans defined our strength for us and the memory of what they did gives us strength today.

Joseph Conrad said:

''And now the old ships and their men are gone; the new ships and men have taken their watch on the stern and impatient sea which offers no opportunities but to those who know how to grasp them with a ready hand and an undaunted heart.''

While we thank God for what the old ships and men gave us.

I offer to you, our honored veterans that your worthy successors, the veterans of tomorrow, possess ready hands and undaunted hearts.

They have learned well from your deeds.

We owe you, we owe you a lot. We owe you our thanks, our admiration, and our respect, and we owe you the promise that we shall never allow to be forgotten the deeds performed, nor what you preserved for us.

Your legacy of courage, honor and commitment has been received and will be passed on to future generations.

This has been a singular honor for me and I am grateful to you all for allowing me to join you on this very special occasion.●

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977

● Mr. MACK. I would like to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL. Activities funded under the Department of Energy's Codes and Standards Program are primarily concentrated in two subprograms known as Lighting and Appliances and Building Standards and Guidelines. However, as is clear in the Department of Energy's budget, its activities within these two programs extend to areas outside of that which might be assumed under their titles. This would include setting standards for commercial equipment electric motors, as well as the advocacy of minimum energy codes for residential buildings. Therefore, it was my understanding that the intent of the amendment to H.R. 1977 that placed a 1-year time-out on Department of Energy's use of funds to propose, issue, or prescribe any new or amended standard would extend to Department of Energy's activities in advocating changes to minimum codes for residential energy use.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My colleague is correct. While not specifically spelled out in the statutory language of H.R. 1977, it was my intent that this 1-year time-out extended to the entire program as it related to the establishment of minimum standards and codes. I had hoped that this clarification would be made in the conference report, but since there is no report language addressing this issue, I feel it necessary to clarify it here for the record. Indeed, product manufacturers have raised concerns over the methodology and assumptions in Department of Energy's current cost benefit analysis. Similarly, builders have raised concerns over the minimum mandatory standards found in codes enacted by local municipalities or States that use the voluntary products of code and standard organizations over which Department of Energy has significant influence. Builders have told me that these standards are often not responsive to technological innovation, customer needs, or economic consideration of affordability or payback. Therefore, just as there needs to be a time out to review standards-setting activities conducted by the Department of Energy, the same review should apply to its activities relating to residential building codes.

Mr. MACK. I appreciate this clarification. Indeed, considering that the House language eliminated funding for the entire Codes and Standards program, the intent is clear that the House aimed to institute this 1-year time out on Department of Energy's activities in the standards arena as well as in standards which are part of the codes as well as the standards arena. I think it is important that, since the House agreed to recede to Senate language on this issue, which restored the funds cut by the House, that the Senate ensure that the spirit of the House language be carried out.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would also point out that as means of reaching agreement on Senate language, I was asked to include a caveat stating that the Federal Government was not precluded from promulgating rules concerning energy efficiency standards for the construction of new federally owned commercial and residential buildings. By expressly carving out federally owned buildings, this would indicate further that standards and codes for all other buildings, and thereby privately owned structures, would be covered. It should also be clear that it is not the intent of this language to prevent promulgation of the national Home Energy Rating System voluntary guidelines.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1995

Mr. DEWINE. Seeing no other Members of the Senate who wish to speak, 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 Tuesday, December 5; 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, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and under the previous consent agreement, the Senate then begin consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1058, the securities litigation bill.

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 and 2:15 for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, on Tuesday there is an 8-hour time limitation for debate on the securities litigation conference report. Senators can therefore expect a rollcall vote on the conference report at the expiration or yielding back of that debate time.

Following that vote, it is expected that the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1833, the partial-birth abortion bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DEWINE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:44 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, December 5, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 4, 1995:

NATIONAL CORPORATION FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS

SUSAN R. BARON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CORPORATION FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 27, 1997. (REAPPOINTMENT)

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

BARRY M. GOLDWATER, SR. OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION UNTIL THE DATE OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CORPORATION IN 1998. (REAPPOINTMENT)

PETER S. KNIGHT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION UNTIL THE DATE OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CORPORATION IN 1999. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL IN THE U.S. NAVY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN J. MAZACH, 000–00–0000.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5898 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. HILL, 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. DENNIS M. MC CARTHY, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS A. BRAATEN, 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL P. DELONG, 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD HANLON, JR., 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. GEOFFREY B. HIGGINBOTHAM, 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. GEORGE M. KARAMARKOVICH, 000–00–0000
BRIG. GEN. JACK W. KLIMP, 000–00–0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 12203 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM C. ALFORD, 000–00–0000
GEORGE A. CIBULAS, 000–00–0000
MARK S. DAY, 000–00–0000
ROBERT L. EDLUND, 000–00–0000
KATHLEEN E. FICK, 000–00–0000
MICHAEL D. GREGORY, 000–00–0000
DANIEL F. HAGGERTY, 000–00–0000
MARK Y. HANCOCK, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM E. HOY, 000–00–0000
DENNIS J. KUGLER, 000–00–0000
EUGENE A. MARTIN, 000–00–0000
WILLIAM B. MOOSE, JR., 000–00–0000
SAMUEL W. PATELLOS, 000–00–0000
TERRY W. SCHNEIDER, 000–00–0000
TIMOTHY W. SCOTT 000–00–0000
PAMELA J. SIMONITSCH, 000–00–0000
RICHARD M. YANULIS, 000–00–0000
ROBERT J. YAPLE, 000–00–0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

MARK S. COLLINS, 000–00–0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GARY K. ODLE, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GREGORY F. BREDEMEIER, 000–00–0000
RICHARD A. SMITH, 000–00–0000

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LINDA S. MITCHELL, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, OF THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531 OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8067 OF TITLE 10, U.S.C. TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A HIGHER GRADE THAN THAT INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

ROGELIO F. GOLLE, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

SUSAN P. ABERNATHY, 000–00–0000
BRANT CASFORD, 000–00–0000
DAVID N. KENAGY, 000–00–0000
ROBERT A. MUNSON, 000–00–0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

HERMAN S. DICKERSON, 000–00–0000
RAYMOND W. KAERCHER, 000–00–0000
LISA D. RACKLEY, 000–00–0000
ROBERT C. ZALME, 000–00–0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

PHILIP J. LAVALLEE, 000–00–0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

JEFFREY M. SWARTZ, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR FORCE OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER SECTION 9333(B) AND 9336 OF TITLE 10, U.S.C.

LINE

To be colonel

MICHAEL L. DELORENZO, 000–00–0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

HON. FRED HEINEMAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1995

Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. Speaker, earlier I engaged in a colloquy with my good friend, Chairman JERRY LEWIS of California regarding the prospects of building a new facility for the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] at the Research Triangle Park [RTP], North Carolina. Once again, I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS for his expression of support for this facility, and I would like to submit for the RECORD the following letter from EPA Administrator Carol M. Browner indicating that a proposed new RTP facility for the EPA would save the taxpayers millions of dollars and provide the most realistic, cost-effective option for meeting the EPA's research needs. I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, DC, December 1, 1995.

Hon. FRED HEINEMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEINEMAN: I am writing to express my appreciation for your continued support for a new Environmental Protection Agency building in Research Triangle Park, N.C. As you know, construction of the new laboratory building will consolidate Agency functions now scattered in seven outdated, leased facilities spread across a 15-mile arc in the RTP area. The facility remains the Agency's top laboratory construction project.

As you noted in your November 29 colloquy on the House floor with House Appropriations VA–HUD Subcommittee Chairman Jerry Lewis, building a new facility is the most realistic, cost-effective option for the Agency. The Agency continues to maintain that new construction will bring the most savings to the taxpayers and deliver the best science to the American public and environmental policy makers. All independent cost studies solicited by the Administration have supported construction on Federally-owned land over any leased facility option; the most recent concluded that direct Federal construction would save the government $154 million over 30 years.

It would seem irresponsible to continue to throw away millions of dollars in rent for substandard leased facilities when we can construct a consolidated state-of-the-art lab on Federally-owned land that will meet EPA's research needs and save taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

Again, thank you for your support of this important project.

Sincerely,

CAROL M. BROWNER,
Administrator.

TAIWAN DESERVES A U.N. SEAT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, A.M. Rosenthal has written a superb article on the silly situation that now exists in which the United Nations recognizes North Korea but not Taiwan. I have introduced bipartisan legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 63, to express the sense of congress that this outrage ought to be reversed. I ask for cosponsors of the legislation and insert the Rosenthal article for the RECORD.

THE BLOCKADES OF TAIWAN

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—They come almost every day now—the military threats to this island country from Communist Government in Beijing.

Chinese Army commanders order repeated amphibious landings at the mainland coast nearest the island—the precise kind of operation that would be needed to invade Taiwan—and ''tests'' of missiles in the straits dividing China and the island. In recent days there has been a series of leaked reports that Beijing is considering a naval blockade of Taiwan.

Nobody knows whether the threats are meant only to frighten all Taiwanese into abandoning any thought of independence, however distant, or whether Beijing is readying its people and the world for an attack. If it does take place it is likely to be in the spring of 1996 before or after Taiwan holds its first direct presidential election.

But the evidence is that the military command is beginning to operate and plan independently of the civilian leadership in the Politburo.

This much seems clear from here: The West is operating on the assumption that if it says and does nothing, why, any dangers will vanish in a merciful blip.

The studious silence arises from the fundamental China policy of the West: Rock no Chinese boat lest Beijing throw easy Western access to the Chinese market overboard.

The West manages to maintain its silence because a Chinese blockade of Taiwan already exists: the political and diplomatic blockade created by Beijing after it took over the China seat in the U.N. in 1971.

The government of Taiwan was not only ousted from the U.N. but from the international community. Taiwan, one of the largest trading nations in the world, has been cut off from normal diplomatic and political relations with almost the whole world.

The U.S. maintains an ''institute'' in Taipei headed by a ''director.'' But no flag is flown outdoors to save Beijing a fit. In Washington, representatives of Taiwan cannot sully the State department or White House by their presence. So far, separate drinking fountains for Taiwanese representatives have not been set up.

Taiwan is not only barred from the U.N. but from all its many specialized agencies, including those supposed to deal with such universal subjects as health and agriculture—say, AIDS or starvation.

The blockade is so obsessively enforced that it even excludes aid to refugees. Last year the U.N. appealed for funds for Rwandan refugees, among the most suffering of God's human creatures. Taiwan offered $2 million; refused. The Taiwanese did manage to get their gift accepted—by channeling it through an American committee for Unicef.

Correspondents from Taiwan are not permitted to enter the U.N. As a former reporter at the U.N., in its early days, I have thought of slipping my pass to a correspondent from Taiwan, to annoy U.N. authorities, but I decided it wouldn't work.

Before Beijing commanded the U.N., correspondents from nonmember peoples were allowed in. I learned more about North Africa and Indonesia from independence-movement reporters than I ever did from the colonial French or Dutch.

North Korea and South Korea are members and so were East and West Germany. The Palestine Liberation Organization was given representation at the General Assembly with only a vote lacking.

But when China decided that any dreams of independence, sovereignty or even dignity that Taiwan might harbor were too dangerous to tolerate, this special apartheid was created for the island. The U.S. and most other U.N. members meekly kissed Beijing's iron slipper.

That means Taiwan cannot use the U.N. or any normal diplomatic channel to raise an alarm that had to be officially heard about the open military threats from Beijing. If any other country had threatened another so blatantly the case would immediately have been on the U.N. agenda.

Nor of course most U.N. members, including the U.S., would be paralyzed with economic terror at the very idea of proposing that Taiwan as well as China be represented at the U.N. But perhaps Washington, London, Paris and Tokyo will dredge up enough courage to increase their own diplomatic contacts with Taiwan as a warning to China. Perhaps.

Until now the Chinese diplomatic blockade and Western submission to it have been merely disgusting. Now they are getting dangerous.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a bill worth passing and one which should be enacted without further delay.

If passed by the House without amendment, the bill would be cleared for the President's signature. If amended however, the legislation

must be returned to the Senate for further consideration. This delay will effectively kill lobby reform legislation for the rest of the 104th Congress.

This bill expands the registration requirements for lobbyists and requires more disclosure regarding lobbying activities. Specifically, the bill requires those who lobby congressional staff, senior executive branch officials, and Members of Congress to register as lobbyists.

In addition, lobbyists must identify their clients, the general issues on which they lobby, and how much they are paid for their efforts.

While we must ensure that the constitutional right of the people to petition their government is protected, we must also make certain that paid lobbying activities are adequately disclosed. This bill protects both of these principles and deserves our support.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2564 without amendment and pass these much-needed lobbying reforms.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT L. METTLER

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Robert L. Mettler of Los Angeles for his philanthropic and civic contributions and for his signal achievements in retail merchandising.

Robert Mettler has found the time, energy, and commitment to sustain a deep involvement in numerous community projects in spite of the demands of three decades of leadership in business. He has been especially committed to the Shelter Workshop Program for the Mentally Retarded, a trailblazing organization headed by Eunice and R. Sargent Shriver. During his residency in Texas, he was a leader of the State of Texas Special Olympics and the United Way of Dallas.

In addition to this work, Robert Mettler serves as chairman of the council of trustees of the National Jewish Center for Immunology and Respiratory Medicine in Denver, CO. He also serves on the leadership panel of Brandeis University in Waltham, MA.

Robert Mettler is one of the best known and most respected leaders in fashion and apparel. On Tuesday, December 12, 1995, Mr. Mettler's friends and admirers will pay tribute to him at a banquet in his honor sponsored by the Fashion Industries Division of the United Jewish Fund.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Mettler for the great achievements that have earned him this honor. I wish him many more years of good health and an ongoing active commitment to his philanthropic activities.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 17, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today as the House considers the conference report on the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Act of 1995, we move one step closer to a goal I have supported for a long while. The first bill I cosponsored as a freshman Representative in 1981 amended the U.S. Constitution to require a balanced Federal budget. At that time, I firmly believed it was time to get our fiscal house in order, when the deficit was $79 billion and the national debt stood at $994 billion.

Fifteen years later, the deficit has grown to $206 billion—nearly three times of what it was in 1981. The national debt has jumped to $4.9 trillion or nearly five times the 1981 level. Further, in fiscal year 1995, we spent $234 billion on interest on the national debt alone. That's 17 percent of the Federal budget. It also represents more than we spent on education, job training, child nutrition and public works projects combined.

Unless we balance the budget, interest on the debt will continue to eat into spending on other worthwhile Federal programs. Just look at how interest on the debt dwarfs our spending on certain vital human resources programs: In fiscal year 1995, we spent 66 times more on interest on the national debt than we did on the Head Start Program. We spent 32 times more on interest on the national debt than we did on the title I program which benefits disadvantaged grade-school kids. We spent 149 times more on interest on the national debt than we spent on all elementary and secondary school improvement programs. We spent 158 times more on interest on the national debt than we did on Federal aid to vocational education, 180 times more than on the JOBS program to get people off welfare, and 212 times more than on Jobs Corps. Clearly this is a distorted sense of priorities.

If we continue our spending priorities for the next 7 years, the deficit would balloon from $210 billion in fiscal year 1996 to $349 billion. That's a 66-percent increase. The national debt would increase by $1.7 trillion during that same period.

Just as increased debt interest threatens programs, the lack of balance between our coveted entitlement programs and discretionary programs is alarming. Entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid make up 64 percent of the Federal budget. Discretionary programs, such as defense, education, and job training make up only 36 percent. This disparity is growing and without significant changes in spending priorities, by 2012 entitlement spending will consume the entire budget.

THE SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

I believe that we have made the right choices to put this country on a path toward a balanced budget. Back in June, the House approved the budget blueprint that laid the foundation for this change. Today, we actually implement the changes necessary to slow the rate of Federal spending over the next 7 years.

Over the next 7 years we will reduce spending growth and reduce the Federal deficit by a total of $1.2 trillion. But it is important to note that slowing the rate of growth in spending is not a cut. The numbers amply demonstrate this assertion.

Over the last 7 years, between 1989 and 1995, we spent a total of $9.5 trillion. Over the next 7 years, while balancing the budget, we will spend $13.3 trillion. That's $2.6 trillion more than in the past 7 years. If we do nothing, we would spend $13.3 trillion over 7 years. We are not cutting the budget, but are finally putting our own house in order within a reasonable timeframe.

A comparison between spending levels in fiscal year 1995 and levels in fiscal year 2002 shows the effect of imposing fiscal discipline. Under current assumptions, spending would increase by $600 billion or 40 percent. Under the assumption of a balanced budget, spending would increase by $358 billion or 24 percent. Only in Washington would a $358 billion increase be called a cut.

A LOOK AT KEY AREAS FOR THE THIRD DISTRICT

A quick review of the provisions of the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Act reveals challenging but acceptable changes in Medicare, student loan funding, and tax policy. It also reveals a glaring deficiency—the failure to reform Federal dairy programs.

MEDICARE

The Medicare Program has continued to grow exceedingly fast in recent years. The Medicare trustees reported earlier this year that without strengthening the system, Medicare will go broke by 2002. I believe that the budget package maintains the vital commitment to health care for seniors while ensuring that the program will be around far into the future.

Under the budget package, average per beneficiary spending would increase from $4,800 to $6,700 over the next 7 years, or a $1,900 increase per retiree. Most importantly, premiums would remain at 31.5 percent of part B costs. Just as they have since the program was started, premiums would increase slightly every year.

STUDENT LOAN REFORM

The student loan program has provided essential opportunities to those who wish to further their education. But in order to preserve those opportunities far into the future, the House and Senate agreed to reduce the costs of the student loan program by $4.9 billion over 7 years.

Perhaps what is most important about the House-Senate agreement is that it does not increase costs to students or parents. The plan does not eliminate the in-school interest subsidy for undergraduate or graduate students. It does not eliminate the 6-month grace period for students leaving school to begin repaying their loan. It does not modify eligibility or access to student loans, nor does it increase the origination loan fee paid for by students.

Now, let's look at what the plan would do. The budget package would cap the administration's direct student loan program at its current 10 percent level of the student loan volume. As many know, I do not believe the Government should become banker to students. At a time when Congress is trying to refocus the role of the Federal Government toward functions that it does well, the direct loan program heads in the wrong direction.

The budget package would also gain savings banks, secondary markets and guaranty agencies by lowering reimbursement fees for defaulted loans and other technical changes. Finally, the package would limit certain administrative expenses borne by the Department of Education. I am confident that the budget package does the most to help the budget at the least cost to students, parents and schools.

PRO-GROWTH TAX POLICY

The budget package agreement between the House and Senate provides for $245 billion in tax cuts over 7 years, just 2 percent of the Federal budget. Like many of us, I was genuinely leery of providing tax cuts at the very time we are trying to balance the budget. However, as we are limiting the growth in Federal programs, we still need to promote economic growth in the private sector. The tax package accomplishes this in a reasonable fashion.

The conference agreement would impose a 50 percent capital gains tax cut for individuals and a 25 percent reduction for corporations retroactive to January 1, 1995. There is a misperception that a capital gains tax is important only to rich people, but actually most capital gains deductions are taken by middle class families. In 1993, the last year for which we have data, 60 percent of the tax returns claiming capital gains had adjusted gross incomes below $50,000, and 77 percent had adjusted gross incomes of below $75,000.

Many in western Wisconsin will benefit from the reduction in the capital gains taxes. Most important among these is the retiring farmer that wants to sell his farm and rely on the proceeds for retirement income. At the present time, he must pay a 38 percent tax. Homeowners and small businesses—the businesses that create the most jobs—will also benefit from this middle-class initiative.

The package before us will also benefit western Wisconsin because it includes expanded individual retirement account to spur savings. People would be able to contribute taxable amounts to the account, and then after 5 years would be able to withdraw money tax-free for certain purchases, including first-time home, long-term care expenses, post-secondary education needs, and retirement income. This account is pro-savings, pro-investment and pro-growth.

The package also includes a tax credit of $500 per child under 18 years for all individuals with income below $75,000 a year and all people filing joint returns with incomes below $110,000. Although uneasy with the House-passed version which allowed tax cuts for families with incomes of up to $200,000, I find the reduced income limit is much more acceptable.

REFORM OF FEDERAL DAIRY PROGRAM

What is most troubling about the package brought to us today is that it is devoid of any reform whatsoever in Federal dairy programs. The Congressional Budget Office has consistently estimated that artificial incentives to produce fluid milk in Federal milk marketing orders, the so-called class I differentials, cost taxpayers over $100 million in additional spending on the dairy price support program and the Dairy Export Incentive Program [DEIP] annually.

Obviously, class I differentials which are set by statute without regard to class I utilization also increase the cost of milk in grocery stores to consumers and the cost of the Federal WIC and special milk programs by millions of dollars annually. Their only purpose today is to provide additional revenue to dairy producers in a couple of areas of the country at the expense of producers in other areas as well as taxpayers and consumers around the country.

Simply stated, there is no single Federal program more in need of substantial reform than Federal milk marketing orders. Even the most ardent advocates of the order system acknowledge that fact. That's why our country and our constituents cannot afford to let a small minority of Members forestall these reforms when the time comes to put a second balanced budget package together.

In sum, today we are one step closer to our central goal of balancing the budget. A balanced budget will ensure sustained growth for the future, more opportunity for education, job growth and a better competitive position in the world market. I look forward to the day when we can say that we took the high road toward fiscal responsibility and put our national fiscal house in order.

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 Tuesday, December 5, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 6

9:00 a.m.
Conferees on S. 652, to provide for a procompetitive, de-regulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition.
S–5, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 356, to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.
SD–342

Labor and Human Resources
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Small Business on certain issues relating to modifications to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.
SD–106

Small Business
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on certain issues relating to modifications to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.
SD–106

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101–601).
SR–485

10:00 a.m.
Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters
To continue hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation.
SH–216

10:15 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on the Bosnian Peace Agreement, the North Atlantic Council military plan and the proposed mission for U.S. military forces deployed with the implementation Force (IFOR).
SD–G50

2:00 p.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine the documentation of crimes against humanity in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia this year.
2322 Rayburn Building

DECEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 94, to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to prohibit the consideration of retroactive tax increases.
SD–342

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to examine how to manage Senate technology in the information age.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters
To continue hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation.
SH–216

DECEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 873, to establish the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor, S. 944, to provide for the establishment of the Ohio River Corridor Study Commission, S. 945, to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to modify the boundaries of the corridor, S. 1020, to establish the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area in the State of Georgia, S. 1110, to establish guidelines for the designation of National Heritage Areas, S. 1127, to establish the Vancouver National Historic Reserve, and S. 1190, to establish the Ohio and Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor in the State of Ohio.
SD–366

Small Business
To hold hearings on proposals to strengthen the Small Business Investment Company program.
SR–428A

Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 814, to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and S. 1159, to establish an American Indian Policy Information Center.
SR–485

DECEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1271, to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.
SD–366

Monday, December 4, 1995

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S17875–S17932

Measures Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1442 and 1443. **Page S17924**

Partial-Birth Abortion Ban: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 1833, to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions. **Pages S17881–S17903**

Senate may continue consideration of the bill on Tuesday, December 5, 1995.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Susan R. Baron, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships for the term expiring October 27, 1997.

Barry M. Goldwater, Sr. of Arizona, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1998.

Peter S. Knight, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation until the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1999.

8 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force. **Page S17932**

Messages From the House: **Page S17923**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S17923**

Communications: **Page S17923**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S17924–25**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S17925**

Notices of Hearings: **Pages S17925–26**

Additional Statements: **Pages S17926–31**

Text of S. 1316 as Previously Passed: **Pages S17903–23**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m., and adjourned at 7:34 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, December 5, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S17931–32.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BOSNIA

Committee on Appropriations: On Friday, December 1, Subcommittee on Defense concluded hearings to examine certain funding requirements involving United States interests in Bosnia, after receiving testimony from William J. Perry, Secretary, and John J. Hamre, Comptroller, both of the Department of Defense; and Gen. John M. Shalikashavili, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: On Friday, December 1, committee held hearings to examine the peace process in the former Yugoslavia, receiving testimony from Warren M. Christopher, Secretary of State; William J. Perry, Secretary of Defense; and Gen. John M. Shalikashvili, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

WHITEWATER

Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters: On Friday, December 1, committee continued hearings to examine issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, receiving testimony from Paula Casey and Fletcher Jackson, both a United States Attorney, and Michael Johnson, First Assistant United States Attorney, all of the Eastern District of Arkansas; Webster Hubbell, former Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice; and G. Randolph Coleman,

American Investors Life Insurance Company, Topeka, Kansas.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, December 5.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2064, to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment of the Historic Chattahoochee Compact between the States of Alabama and Georgia (H. Rept. 104–376, filed on November 30, 1995);

H.J. Res. 78, to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois, amended (H. Rept. 104–377, filed on November 30, 1995);

Conference report on H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 104–378, filed on December 1, 1995); and

H.R. 2684, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in the amounts of allowable earnings under the social security earnings limit for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes, amended (H. Rept. 104–379). **Pages H13874–H13929**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Petri to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H13871**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H13871.

Late Report: Committee on Ways and Means received permission to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 2684, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in the amounts of allowable earnings under the social security earnings limit for individuals who have attained retirement age. **Page H13872**

Quorum Calls—Votes: No quorum calls or votes developed during the proceedings of the House today

Adjournment: Met at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No Committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D1398)*

H.R. 2126, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996. Signed December 1, 1995. (P.L. 104–61)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Finance, to hold hearings on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Shipbuilding Subsidies Agreement; to be followed by a hearing on the nomination of Joshua Gotbaum, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings on S. 88, to increase the overall economy and efficiency of Government operations and enable more efficient use of Federal funding, by enabling local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to use amounts available under certain Federal assistance programs in accordance with approved local flexibility plans, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings on S. 984, to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, to resume hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, 10 a.m., SH–216.

NOTICE

For a Listing of Senate Committee Meetings scheduled ahead, see page E2282 in today's Record.

House

Committee on Appropriations, to consider revised 602(b) subdivision for fiscal year 1996, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing regarding foreign bank supervision and the Daiwa Bank, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings on Allegations of FDA Abuses of Authority, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, to continue hearings on H.R. 2131, Capital Markets Deregulation and Liberalization Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Parents, Schools and Values, 1 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996; Conference Report to accompany H.R. 1058, Securities Litigation Reform Act; and H.R. 2684, Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1995, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, executive, to consider pending business, 1 p.m., HT–2M Capitol.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on H.R. 1856, Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act of 1995, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Intelligence Support to U.S. Peacekeeping Forces in Bosnia, 2:30 p.m., H–495 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Conferees, on H.R. 2546, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, 2:15 p.m., S–128, Capitol.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 4 through November 30, 1995

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	186	154	..
Time in session	1,688 hrs., 41′	1,401 hrs., 19′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	17,874	13,870	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	2,277	..
Public bills enacted into law	23	37	..
Private bills enacted into law	0	0	..
Measures passed, total	288	396	..
Senate bills	65	30	..
House bills	58	164	..
Senate joint resolutions	4	0	..
House joint resolutions	4	12	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	11	7	..
House concurrent resolutions	16	23	..
Simple resolutions	130	160	..
Measures reported, total	*209	*347	..
Senate bills	143	5	..
House bills	28	206	..
Senate joint resolutions	7	0	..
House joint resolutions	3	7	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	4	0	..
House concurrent resolutions	0	3	..
Simple resolutions	24	126	..
Special reports	14	5	..
Conference reports	0	25	..
Measures pending on calendar	139	55	..
Measures introduced, total	1,712	3,235	..
Bills	1,441	2,702	..
Joint resolutions	42	129	..
Concurrent resolutions	33	116	..
Simple resolutions	196	288	..
Quorum calls	3	18	..
Yea-and-nay votes	588	257	..
Recorded votes	..	558	..
Bills vetoed	1	6	..
Vetoes overridden	0	0	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 178 reports has been filed in the Senate; a total of 377 reports has been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 4 through November 30, 1995

Civilian nominations, totaling 420, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	230
Unconfirmed	184
Withdrawn	6

Civilian nominations (FS, PHS, CG, NOAA), totaling 2,005, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	1,001
Unconfirmed	1,004

Air Force nominations, totaling 17,630, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	13,550
Unconfirmed	4,080

Army nominations, totaling 12,295, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	9,367
Unconfirmed	2,928

Navy nominations, totaling 12,097, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	10,842
Unconfirmed	1,255

Marine Corps nominations, totaling 2,833, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	2,832
Unconfirmed	0
Withdrawn	1

Summary

Total nominations received this session	47,280
Total confirmed	37,822
Total unconfirmed	9,451
Total withdrawn	7

Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Tuesday, December 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will consider the conference report on H.R. 1058, Securities Litigation.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:30 p.m., Tuesday, December 5

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of the following 11 Suspensions:

1. H.R. 826, Big Thicket National Preserve Land Exchange;
2. H.R. 2336, Amending the Doug Barnard, Jr. 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games Commemorative Coin Act;
3. H.R. 2614, Commemorative Coin Authorization and Reform Act of 1995;
4. H.R. 308, Hopewell Township Investment Act of 1995;
5. H.R. 255, Designating the James Lawrence King Federal Justice Building;
6. H.R. 395, Designating the Bruce R. Thompson U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building;
7. H.R. 653, Designating the Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse;
8. H.R. 840, Designating the Walter B. Jones Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse;
9. H.R. 869, Designating the Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse;
10. H.R. 965, Designating the Romano L. Mazzoli Federal Building;
11. H.R. 1804, Designating the Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building; and

Consideration of H.R. 1350, Maritime Security Act of 1995 (open rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Gunderson, Steve, Wis., E2280
Heineman, Fred, N.C., E2279
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E2279
Solomon, Gerald B.H., N.Y., E2279
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E2280

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. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. 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 the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* 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 for 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.