Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–2623. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Royalty Management Program, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the notice to make refunds of offshore lease revenues where a refund or recoupment is appropriate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2624. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intention to award specific watershed restoration contracts on National Forest System lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2625. A communication from the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of an interim final rule entitled ''Disposal of National Forest System Timber'' (RIN0596–AB58) received on May 6, 1996; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2626. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the January 1 through March 31, 1996; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2627. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the liner study; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2628. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''The Water Resources Development Act of 1996''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2629. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of four rules (FRL–5502–5, FRL–5502–1, FRL–5500–7, FRL–5468–7) relative to reduced certification reporting requirements for new nonroad engines received on May 6, 1996; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2630. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of four rules (FRL–5461–6, FRL–5503–6, FRL–5503–7, FRL–5503–3) relative to hazardous air pollutants received on May 7, 1996; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2631. A communication from Chief (Regulations Unit), Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of revenue ruling 96–25 received on May 7, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2632. A communication from the Chief (Regulations Unit), Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to the computation of combined taxable income under the profit split method received on May 9, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2633. A communication from the Chief (Regulations Unit), Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of final regulations on qualified cost sharing arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2634. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to provide authorization of appropriations for U.S. International Trade Commission for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2635. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period October 1 to March 31, 1996; order to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1090. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for public access to information in an electronic format, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104–272).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1605. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectively and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104–273).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

The following U.S. Army National Guard officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, United States Code sections 3385, 3392 and 12203(a):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jerome J. Berard, 000–00–0000.
Brig. Gen. James W. Emerson, 000–00–0000.
Brig. Gen. Rodney R. Hannula, 000–00–0000.
Brig. Gen. James W. MacVay, 000–00–0000.
Brig. Gen. James D. Polk, 000–00–0000.

To be brigadier general

Col. Earl L. Adams, 000–00–0000.
Col. H. Steven Blum, 000–00–0000.
Col. Harry B. Burchstead, Jr., 000–00–0000.
Col. Larry K. Eckles, 000–00–0000.
Col. William L. Freeman, 000–00–0000.
Col. Gus L. Hargett, Jr., 000–00–0000.
Col. Allen R. Leppink, 000–00–0000.
Col. Jacob Lestenkof, 000–00–0000.
Col. Joseph T. Murphy, 000–00–0000.
Col. Larry G. Powell, 000–00–0000.
Col. Roger C. Schultz, 000–00–0000.
Col. Michael L. Seely, 000–00–0000.
Col. Larry W. Shellito, 000–00–0000.
Col. Gary G. Simmons, 000–00–0000.
Col. Nicholas P. Sipe, 000–00–0000.
Col. George S. Walker, 000–00–0000.
Col. Larry Ware, 000–00–0000.
Col. Jackie D. Wood, 000–00–0000.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. PRESSLER:

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to improve the administration of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 1759. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that written notice be furnished by the Office of Personnel Management before making any substantial change in the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1760. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve child support enforcement services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 1761. A bill to eliminate taxpayer subsidies for recreational shooting programs, and to prevent the transfer of federally-owned weapons, ammunition, funds, and other property to a private Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firemans Safety; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the commencement of the terms of office of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Con. Res. 58. A concurrent resolution expressing the intent of Congress with respect to the collection of fees or other payments from the allocation of toll-free telephone numbers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to improve the administration of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today that represents the first of several steps I am taking to get action on problems facing our domestic cattle industry. For the past year, I have been pressing the Clinton administration to address meatpacker concentration and utilize existing antitrust laws to make sure that cattle are sold in an open and competitive market. We have seen some action on the part of the administration to solve this problem. Frankly, its proposals offer nothing new. My bill is a necessary first step to pry open the market.

Another step in the process is to get the Senate more engaged on the issue. As part of that effort, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and

Forestry, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation will hold a series of hearings on this subject next month. Cattle producers are facing the worst economic times in recent memory. The President has the authority to order immediate Justice Department action. Antitrust laws should be enforced now.

I have been saying that for months, but my words have fallen on deaf ears. Only by taking action to enforce antitrust laws already on the books can we ensure the long-term economic viability of the U.S. cattle industry.

South Dakota ranchers know that any real solution to beef prices must include antitrust action. It took only a few days and a 14 percent increase in the price of gasoline for the President to ask the Justice Department to establish a five-person task force to investigate possible antitrust violations. The facts are these: first, cattle prices are at their lowest levels in years; second, only a handful of the top packers control nearly 85 percent the market; and third, retail prices do not reflect the dramatically reduced price paid for cattle. Something is not right.

The bill I am introducing accomplishes three things that South Dakota cattlemen have told me must be done. First, the bill would establish a livestock dealer trust. This would protect sellers from any losses when cattle are sold on commission to a dealer or market agency that goes bankrupt. This was part of the Senate-passed farm bill, but was not in the final version that was signed into law. Second, the bill would require the Packers and Stockyards Administration to include formula-priced cattle in the definition of captive supplies. During the Senate Commerce Committee hearing I held last year in Huron, SD, producers made it loud and clear that this needed to be done. Finally, the bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make timely reports on the numbers of livestock and livestock products that are exported and imported, and also require the reporting of prices paid for livestock.

The Senate needs to carefully review this bill and other issues confronting the U.S. cattle industry. Packer concentration, price manipulation, possible price fixing and captive supply all must be looked at and a definite course of action implemented. The introduction of this bill today is the first step in this process.

We need to keep in mind that old saying ''if it ain't broke, don't fix it.'' Well the U.S. cattle industry is broke and it needs fixing, now. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 1759. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that written notice be furnished by the Office of Personnel Management before making any susbtantial change in the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE FEDERAL HEALTH BENEFIT CHANGE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1996

•Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am introducing today, along with my colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, the Federal Health Benefit Change Accountability Act. This bill is also being introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman BEN CARDIN. Our legislation will ensure that Congress has an opportunity to respond to any proposed reductions in retired Federal employee health benefits.

I want to save lives, save jobs, and save money. The 1996 prescription plan for Federal retirees that Blue Cross/Blue Shield negotiated with the Office of Personnel Management [OPM] is jeopardizing jobs, and in some cases may be jeopardizing lives. I want this policy changed for 1997, and I want to make sure that Congress is well informed of any future changes in health benefits.

Our bill will protect retired federal employees from the type of attacks on their earned health benefits that we are seeing with this plan. The bill would require a new reporting process at OPM. OPM would have to provide an annual report to Congress that would describe any significant changes in Federal retiree health benefits. The report would explain how proposed changes would affect retirees—both financially and in quality of care. The report would also explain what cost savings OPM expected to achieve. Congress would have time to react if there were concerns with the changes.

This legislation is necessary because of the terrible situation our Federal retirees find themselves in today with their Blue Cross/Blue Shield prescription benefits. Retirees in this prescription plan have a new 20-percent copayment at their neighborhood pharmacies. This is forcing retirees out of neighborhood pharmacy and away from the pharmacists they know and trust. They are forced to use mail order for most of their prescription needs, where there is no copayment, and where their care consists of an 800 number and a mail box.

I've been meeting with Federal retiree groups and with pharmacy groups, and what I'm hearing about this plan has disturbed me greatly.

I'm hearing about elderly retirees who are confused about how and when to use mail order.

I'm hearing about local pharmacies that are losing as much as 30 percent of their business and that are going to have to lay off employees. I'm hearing about jobs being lost because local pharmacies are being cut out of the business of providing care to Federal retirees.

I'm not antimail order, but I think it should be used under the right circumstances. A person can't wait for mail order when a weekend ear ache or a stomach virus strikes. A local pharmacist must be available right then. That is the safety net that allows mail order to work.

As my colleagues know, retirees have special health needs that are different from the majority of younger Federal employees. They frequently take more than one medication at a time, and they have complicated medical histories.

They also need the personal drug education and counseling that local pharmacy is able to provide. When they don't get this education and counseling, studies show they end up in the hospital because of noncompliance with their drug directions.

Community pharmacy is the last health care professional a retiree will see before taking that prescription. We need to think very seriously about what that means and what the consequences are to retirees. Unfortunately, OPM did not put enough thought into these consequences when the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan was approved.

The very people who are unable to pay the 20-percent copayment because they are on fixed incomes and are forced to use mail order, are the people who are most likely to need the face to face counseling and drug education that they cannot get at mail order pharmacy.

That's why we need a drug benefit that achieves fiscal discipline but that allows retirees choice in their pharmacy care. Otherwise we end up treating prescriptions like a commodity. We end up managing the benefit instead of managing the patient.

Federal retirees have served us honorably and we must value them. We don't value them with words, we do it with actions. They earned and deserve retirement security and health security, and I want to see this government honor the promises that were made to them when they signed up for service.

The legislation we are introducing today will help ensure that the promise of quality health care is not bargained away by the Office of Personnel Management in the future.•

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1760. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve child support enforcement services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE CHILD SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Child Support Improvement Act of 1996.

Fourteen months ago, Senator DOLE and I introduced our bill, the Child Support Responsibility Act of 1995, which later became an important piece of the welfare reform bill. Since that time, Congress has twice passed welfare reform, and twice it has been vetoed.

And now, we are in much the same place we were 14 months ago. While it is my sincerest hope that child support will pass as part of a comprehensive

welfare reform bill this year, I believe that we must seize this opportunity to move forward on child support. Because this issue is too important to the future of American children to stand by and wait any longer.

For many of our Nation's children, the American dream is a rapidly fading mirage—one that they can see but are unable to firmly grasp. I'm talking specifically about the millions of children who suffer from the neglect of deadbeat parents—those parents who help bring a child into the world and then, for whatever reasons, renege on their responsibilities as a parent to care for them and give them the tools necessary to craft a better life than the one we enjoy today.

At a time when one in four children grow up in single-parent households, the crisis of unpaid child support remains a heavy burden. It is a burden that has not only taken an emotional toll on single parents and their children, but an economic toll as well. And it is sapping the financial resources of our State governments.

While many single parents have had some success in winning child support, only half of those who succeed actually receive what is owed. The other half receives partial payments or no payments at all. And an alarming 40 percent of single parents who seek child support do not succeed in winning any order at all. That means that, while the potential for child support collections is estimated to exceed $47 billion each year, only $15 billion or so is ever collected from noncustodial parents.

Worse yet, those single parents who have never been married have a difficult time receiving any child support payments at all. Data collected from the 1990 census indicates that of all mothers who have never been married, 75 percent did not have child support orders and more than 50 percent had household incomes below the poverty level.

These statistics translate into unprecedented burdens for single parents and their children, many of whom struggle to find good child care, quality medical care, warm clothes, or simply put food on the table.

In all fairness, Congress has tried to strengthen child support enforcement mechanisms prior to this term. In 1975, Congress did pass the Child Support Enforcement and Paternity Establishment Program as part of the Social Security Act, and then it enacted further improvements to this effort by way of the 1984 Child Support Enforcement Amendments and the Family Support Act of 1988.

Despite these actions, States have been hard pressed to keep pace with the virtual tidal wave of mothers seeking child support. States are faced with the daunting task of locating parents, establishing paternity, establishing child support orders, and collecting child support payments. Yet States have been hampered by a lack of leadership and technical support from the Federal Government.

As a former Member of the House of Representatives, I have a long history of working to change and improve Federal laws governing child support enforcement, and introduced my own legislation to help relieve single parents and their children of the institutional barriers to progress on this issue. As cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, we made child support enforcement one of our top legislative priorities in previous Congresses, where some 30 bills were introduced to address this problem. But I believe we have come to a point where everyone agrees that child support enforcement is one of the most important aspects of our campaign to revamp the welfare system of this country. It affects every State—children at every income level—and it affects both single mothers and single fathers. As a national problem, child support enforcement merits a national solution. And we must demonstrate our leadership by providing it.

That's why I have joined forces again with the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, to introduce the Child Support Improvement Act of 1996. I should add, Mr. President, that this bill has true bipartisan support, and is intended to complement the efforts of my House colleagues, Congresswomen NANCY JOHNSON and BARBARA KENNELLY, who have introduced companion legislation in the House. Together, we have introduced the same child support provisions which received overwhelming support from both parties of Congress, as well as the administration, during welfare reform.

By passing this legislation, we will send a clear signal to deadbeat parents that their days of irresponsibility are over. We will also send clear signal to States that the Federal Government will provide them with the assistance they need to collect child support on behalf of millions of American families.

The bill contains commonsense reforms which achieve the following:

To strengthen efforts to locate parents, it expands the Federal parent locator system by creating Federal and State data banks of child support orders, and allowing State-to-State access of the network. It also creates Federal and State directories of new hires, to allow for basic information supplied by employers from W–4 forms to be compared against child support data.

To ensure that collected funds go to families as soon as possible, it establishes a centralized State collections and disbursements unit, and requires employers that garnish wages from employees to pay those withheld wages to the State within 5 days.

To increase paternity establishment, our approach simplifies paternity procedures, facilitates voluntary acknowledgement, and encourages outreach.

To ensure that child support orders are fair and equitable to children, it provides for a simplified process for review and adjustment of child support orders, and requires provisions for heath care coverage to be required in child support orders. And to facilitate child support enforcement and collection, it requires States to adopt the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, to encourage the seamless enforcement of child support orders across State lines.

Finally, this bill expands the penalties for child support delinquency to include the denial of professional, recreational and driver's license to deadbeat parents, and permits the denial of a passport for individuals who are more than $5,000 in arrears. My husband, former Gov. Jock McKernan, pioneered a similar program in Maine in 1993. This program has been an amazing success in my home State. Between August 1993 and April 1996, $44 million was collected in outstanding child support payments from 15,000 individuals. In fact, in one case, a long-haul trucker who owed the State $19,000 drove to the State capitol and paid the amount in one lump sum. In another case, a real estate agent who owed more than $11,000 in child support money contacted the State and agreed to sell off some land to pay off his debt. Clearly, it's worth taking these steps. But we can do—and should do—much more.

Mr. President, perhaps if we can replicate the successes of States like Maine on a national level, we can begin to ease and eventually lift the economic and emotional burdens caused by delinquent child support payments, and at last bring the justice, security, and equity to millions of single parents and their children.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that noncustodial parents begin to accept and bear responsibility for their children, who will reap the financial support they so justly deserve and desperately need.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 1761. A bill to eliminate taxpayer subsidies for recreational shooting transfer of federally owned weapons, ammunition, funds, and other property to the private Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety; to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE SELF-FINANCING CIVILIAN MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAM ACT OF 1996

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I introduce the Self Financing Civilian Marksmanship Program Act of 1996. I'm pleased that Senator BUMPERS is joining me in introducing this legislation.

The goal of this legislation is simple: to block the transfer of a $76 million Federal endowment to American gun clubs.

The Defense Department concluded long ago that the Army-run Civilian Marksmanship Program does not serve any military purpose. Even so, until recently the program was sustained by an annual $2.5 million Federal subsidy.

To extricate the Army from this program, while ensuring a steady stream

of firearms to gun enthusiasts, pro-gun Members of Congress established a so-called private nonprofit version of the program in the fiscal year 1996 Department of Defense authorization bill.

In reality, the new corporation is private in name only. In fact, Congress blessed it with a multimillion-dollar endowment.

When the corporation becomes fully operational in October 1996, it will take control of 176,218 rifles worth more than $53 million. It will receive $4.4 million in cash and be given property valued at $8.8 million. Even more remarkable, the corporation will be given control of 146 million rounds of ammunition worth $9.7 million.

The old program was a flagrant example of government waste. The new version makes even less sense, since it relinquishes government control over the program.

In 1993, the General Services Administration reconfirmed a long-standing government policy. Under that policy, the Federal Government does not sell federally owned weapons to the public.

The Congress should not make an exception for the private, nonprofit Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety. The U.S. Government shouldn't be an arms merchant.

Given the plethora of weapons readily available through the private sector, guns for which the federal government no longer has a use should be destroyed, and the corporation should be abolished.

Our bill would do just that. It would abolish the so-called private corporation, block the transfer of this $76 million endowment, and end the federally run Civilian Marksmanship Program once and for all. It would not prohibit gun clubs from operation, but it would not subsidize them with federally owned weapons, ammunition, property, and cash.

This gift of millions of dollars' worth of weapons and ammunition is terrible public policy. In fact, it's outrageous. The Government must work, to stem the rising tide of gun violence in this country, not aid and abet it.

I hope the Congress will approve this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Washington Post article on this program and a copy of the legislation be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1761

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Self Financing Civilian Marksmanship Program Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. PRIVATE SHOOTING COMPETITIONS AND FIREARM SAFETY PROGRAMS.

Nothing in this Act prohibits any private person from establishing a privately financed program to support shooting competitions or firearms safety programs.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF CHARTER LAW FOR THE CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND SAFETY.

(a) REPEAL OF CHARTER.—The Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety Act (title XVI of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 515; 36 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), except for section 1624 of such Act (110 Stat. 522), is repealed.

(b) RELATED REPEALS.—Section 1624 of such Act (110 Stat. 522) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), by striking out ''and 4311'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''4311, 4312, and 4313'';

(b) by striking out subsection (b); and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking out ''on the earlier of—'' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof ''on October 1, 1996.''.

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1996]

UP IN ARMS OVER RIFLE GIVEAWAY—GUN-CONTROL ADVOCATES CALL ARMY WEAPONS A SUBSIDY FOR NRA

A provision of the defense budget that went into effect earlier this year requires the Pentagon to give away 873,000 old rifles from World War II and the Korean War, spurring protests from gun-control advocates who believe the government shouldn't add to gun commerce.

The little-noticed measure was promoted by the National Rifle Association and the congressional delegation in Ohio, home to an annual marksmanship competition that will be financed by the sale of the venerable M–1 rifles and other aged guns with a resale value of about $100 million.

The heavy, nine-pound M–1s are unlikely to be used in street crimes such as drug killings, the program's advocates say, because the main buyers have been and likely will continue to be gun collectors who must be trained in shooting rifles and pass a stringent background investigation.

But critics say the recent congressional action is in effect a subsidy to the NRA. It requires the Army to transfer control over the rifles for free to a new nonprofit corporation. The corporation will sell them to benefit marksmanship programs and the yearly target tournament in Camp Perry, Ohio, which is managed by the NRA.

The old Army-administered program also co-sponsored the annual Ohio tournament with the NRA, and over the years the NRA used its close relationship with the project to market itself, critics of the group said.

Congress's action marked the death of the Army-administered program, called the Civilian Marksmanship Program, which critics called one of the U.S. government's oddest pork-barrel projects. The Pentagon ran it for decades but has sought to disentangle itself in recent years.

The program harkens to 1903, just after the Spanish-American War. U.S. military officials were upset to learn farm boys conscripted for that conflict were not the rustics of romantic American novels who could nail a jack rabbit from 200 yards—in fact, they couldn't hit a barn. Congress established the project, supported by U.S. military guns and money, to promote sharpshooting in future wars.

''The gift of millions of dollars worth of weapons and ammunition is terrible public policy,'' said Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg (D-N.J.) in a column in USA Today. ''In fact, it's outrageous. The government must work to stem the rising tide of gun violence in this country, not aid and abet it.''

''This program historically has been a federal subsidy to the NRA's marketing,'' said Josh Sugarmann, a gun-control activist and author of a 1992 book critical of the NRA. Congress's latest action, he added, is ''a new funding mechanism'' that also helps the NRA.

The great majority of the gun clubs that take part in the marksmanship program are affiliated with the NRA, he said. For decades, in fact, the guns' buyers had to prove to the Army they were NRA members—until a federal judge stopped the requirement in 1979.

Promoters of the 93-year-old program say it's no more sinister than the Boy Scouts, the Future Farmers of America and other youth groups that have taken part in its marksmanship training. The M–1s that are sold are not used in crimes, they said, because the strict background probes of the guns' potential buyers cull out criminals. They also point out that nine of the 10 members of America's 1992 Olympic shooting team learned marksmanship in the program.

''Any link opponents try to draw between this program and urban violence is comparable to linking Olympic boxing competition with hoodlum street fighting,'' said Rep. Paul E. Gillmor (R–Ohio), who sponsored the new measure and whose district draws 7,000 visitors and $10 million in revenue during the summertime rifle competition.

Gillmor added that it would cost the military $500,000 to destroy the guns, while the cost is nothing if it gives them away.

Chip Walker, a National Rifle Association spokesman, said Lautenberg and other critics of the program ''don't want to promote firearms safety and responsibility.'' He added that it's ''ironic'' that gun-control advocates for years have criticized the NRA for its harsh rhetoric, urging it to stick to its traditional mission of teaching firearms safety—and now raise questions about its efforts to pursue even that goal.

Almost all the guns the Army is to give away are M–1s, the bolt-action rifle lugged by GIs onto the beaches at D-Day and Guadalcanal. Replaced in 1958 by the M–14 as standard infantry issue, and later by today's M–16, the M–1 is prized by collectors and war buffs—especially the pristine guns sold in their original boxes by the Army.

Last year the Army charged $310 each for the M–1s stored at its Anniston Army Depot in Alabama—an increase from its recent price of $250. In any case, those are discounts, because M–1s usually sell for $400 to $500. In recent years the program sold a maximum of 6,000 guns a year.

The measure recently signed into law by President Clinton in essence privatizes the program and transfers ownership of the 373,000 rifles to the new Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety, whose board is to be named by the Army. It will then sell the weapons for whatever price the market will bear, and at whatever rate it chooses. (The guns will remain at the Anniston facility until they are sold.)

The law requires the Army to transfer to the new corporation $5 million in cash the Army program has on hand, $8 million in computers and other equipment, about 120 million rounds of ammunition and the 373,000 guns. It's estimated that only about 60 percent of the guns—about 224,000—are usable, and they could fetch about $100 million.

The Pentagon has sought to remove itself as administrator of the program, under which it sold 6,000 guns a year and donated $2.5 million annually to the Ohio competition, military officials said. The main reason, they said, is that they concluded that the program years ago stopped contributing to ''military readiness.'' Moreover, Pentagon officials were uncomfortable being involved in an issue as controversial as firearms.

Finally, last year, military officials were upset by the taint the program suffered when it was learned that members of a Michigan militia had formed a gun club that became officially affiliated with the Army program. Using that affiliation, the militia members

had taken target practice at a Michigan military base until they were stopped.●

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the commencement of the terms of office of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL TERMS INAUGURATION DATE ADVANCE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President. I offer a joint resolution to amend the Constitution to advance the Inauguration dates for the President and Members of Congress from January 20th and 3rd to December 10th and 1st respectively. In offering this resolution here in the 104th Congress, I note for my colleagues that this is an effort I first began in 1981 and with each succeeding set of national elections, I believe that the rationale and wisdom for changing these dates becomes more compelling.

The current date for the Inauguration of the President was set by the 20th amendment to the Constitution in 1933. Prior to that, the Inauguration date had not changed since being fixed by an act of the Continental Congress in 1788 commencing the proceeding of the Government of the United States under the newly ratified Constitution. Under that act, March 4th was chosen simply because it happened to be the first Wednesday in March of 1789 and it was thought at the time that that amount of time was needed for each State to appoint Presidential electors to the Electoral College and for them to meet and cast their ballots. Additionally, there were practical and controlling considerations over the difficulty and length of time it took to travel to and from the Capital City, the necessity for time to allow newly elected officials to tend to the long-term organization of their private affairs prior to their extended departure from home for Washington, and the lack of sophisticated means for the verification of polling results and for communication of news. Thus, in the founding days of our country, March 4th was seen as the earliest possible date by which the Government could, in an orderly and practical manner, bring about the will of the electors as expressed in congressional and Presidential balloting from the previous November.

By 1933, however, it had become clear that it was no longer necessary to postpone the Inauguration of the President and Members of Congress until March 4th. Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska, the Champion of the 20th amendment to the Constitution which advanced the Presidential and congressional Inauguration dates to their current status, said on the Senate floor in 1932:

> When our Constitution was adopted, there was some reason for such a long intervention of time between the election and actual commencement of work by the new Congress. We had neither railroads nor telegraphic communication connecting the various States and communities of the country. Under present conditions, however, the result of elections is known all over the country within a few hours after the polls close, and the Capital City is within a few days' travel of the remotest portions of the country.
>
> . . . The only direct opportunity that the citizens of the country have to express their ideas and their wishes in regard to national legislation is the expression of their will through the election of their representatives at the general election in November. . . . In a government ''by the people'' the wishes of a majority should be crystallized into legislation as soon as possible after these wishes have been made known. These mandates should be obeyed within a reasonable time.

Those words ring true today. With the further advancement in travel, communications, polling, and the ascertainment of election results since 1933, their remains no justification for the present lengthy hiatus between Election Day and Inauguration Day. We now know election results within minutes of the last closing of the polls, indeed, usually before they close through news projections, and travel to Washington is an affair that can be accomplished in a day. The Electoral College could easily complete its duties within a few days time and there is no impediment to the commencement of the terms of the Members of Congress by December 1st. necessary because of the role of the House of Representatives in the ratification of the results of the Electoral College. It is clear then that no structural or logistical justification exists for delaying the implementation of the decision of the voters made at the polls in early November.

With no physical barriers to a more rapid installation of the President and Members of Congress, are there policy reasons for waiting 2 months and more before swearing them into office? In my opinion, the typical arguments of preservation of tradition and the need for time for transition organization are less than compelling. Indeed, I believe that these justifications pale in comparison to the drawbacks of the current state of affairs.

First and foremost, currently when a new President is elected, during the protracted transition period to a new administration that follows, it is unclear for almost 3 months who speaks for the United States on matters of national importance or crisis. As the undisputed leader in world affairs, and in a world ever more closely intertwined and influenced by daily events occurring throughout the international community, this is a needless peril into which we place ourselves. It is never wise not desirable for any country, particularly one with extensive power and influence such as ours, to tolerate any confusion or question about who runs and speaks for the affairs of State. Yet, whenever we elect a new President, we needlessly allow just such a situation to occur. We would substantially reduce the potential hazards of the current lengthy delay in the transition of our Government were this proposal adopted.

Another pitfall of the current lengthy interregnum is that under the present system, the next fiscal year's proposed budget is submitted by the outgoing administration only to be subject to amendment and revision once the new administration takes office. This is a needless duplication of effort and inevitably results in an unnecessary delay of the budget process. Indeed, given the record of the current Congress with regard to the Federal budget, it is clear that any additional time or lack of either redundant or pointless effort would be welcome. If the new Congress were to be sworn in on December 1 and the President on December 10, the new administration would start with a clean slate with regard to the budget and the process would be off to a much smoother and more sensible start.

Another clear benefit of an advance in the dates of inauguration for the President and Members of Congress would be that with the recently completed campaign season more fresh in the memories of the new administration and Congress, the opportunity would be greater to take quicker action on the proposals which collectively brought them to office. The populace, having listened to an extensive campaign and spoken their minds through the ballot box, deserve to have the views they supported formulated into legislation and acted upon in a reasonable and timely fashion. Waiting for 3 months to even begin the process seems to me to be simply too long.

Other reasons for advancing the Inauguration of the President and Congress, while slightly more speculative, seem likely. For example, with the advance, the President would prudently be inclined to have a good idea of who he or she would choose for key positions in the Cabinet prior to the election. Indeed, the composition of the Cabinet could well become part of the preelection debate, something which I feel would be healthy given the enormous influence Cabinet members have over the day-to-day functions of the executive branch.

Another potential benefit would be that given the much shorter period between Election Day and the commencement of the terms of the new Congress, the incentive or need to hold so-called lameduck sessions of Congress would be greatly reduced. This would produce the desirable result of discouraging the opportunity for Members who had lost at the polls to still meet, vote, and decide upon matters on behalf of the constituents who just turned them out. Again, in a democracy, it is the will of the people that should be afforded the greatest chance of being heard and reducing the likelihood of a lame-duck session of Congress would forward that goal.

For all of these reasons, I again propose the constitutional amendment. For those unfamiliar with my earlier efforts to advance the Inauguration dates, a couple of points. First, there is

nothing magical about the dates of December 10th for the President and December 1st for Members of Congress. Indeed, when I first pursued this effort, I proposed earlier dates ranging from early to mid-November. However, at a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1984, there was a general feeling that perhaps that left too little time after the election for an orderly transition. Likewise, there was resistance to interference with the Thanksgiving holiday so early December presents itself as the earliest reasonable and desirable timeframe for setting these Inauguration dates. Incidentally, for those who wish to cling to tradition, establishing a swearing-in date of December 1st for Congress would be somewhat of a return to previous practice. The Constitution originally established the meeting day for Congress on the first Monday of December and this was the practice until the 20th amendment changed it in 1933. Thus, it was not until 1934 that Congress began its sessions in early January. Under my proposal, Congress would resume the commencement of its sessions in early December.

Thus, I offer my joint resolution to advance the Presidential and congressional Inauguration dates. This proposal is good government, it makes common sense, and is both feasible and practical. Furthermore, I believe that failing to change the dates needlessly risks confusion over who speaks for the national government, facilitates undesirable legislative scenarios such as the convening of lame-duck sessions of Congress, and unnecessarily delays the chance for those chosen by the electorate to take their rightful offices and act upon the issues of the day. I urge my colleagues to take the time to carefully consider this proposal and that they join me in this effort to make these straightforward and eminently reasonable changes in our governmental process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point a brief history of the 20th amendment as prepared for the Judiciary Committee in 1985 be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION: A BRIEF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

AMENDMENT XX

Text of amendment

''SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

''SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

''SEC. 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President elect shall qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

''SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

''SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

''SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.''

Background

In accordance with the constitutional provisions written by the Founding Fathers in 1787, the newly established U.S. Government was to become effective when nine States ratified the Constitution.[1] After the ratification process was completed in June of 1788, the existing Congress designated March 4, 1789 as the official date when the Federal Government, as outlined in the Constitution, would begin operation. This date represented an estimate of the time needed to appoint presidential electors in each State and allow them to cast their ballots for President. In addition, the States needed time to select both Representatives and Senators to serve in the U.S. Congress. As mandated by the Constitution, the President was to serve for 4 years, Senators for 6, and Representatives for 2. All legislative and executive offices, then and in the future, would commence on March 4 and end in subsequent odd-numbered years on the same date.

The problem inherent in this system was that the Constitution, under Article I, Section 4, Clause 2, stipulated:

''The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such a meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different day.''

This meant that, although Congressmen were elected to office in November of even-numbered years, they were not entitled to take office until after the terms of their predecessors expired the following March. Moreover, the new Congressmen would not assemble until the following December. This left a thirteen month lapse from the time of election until the new Congress first convened. In the meantime, defeated or retiring Congressmen would meet in their regular session in December of the election year and continue to hold office until their term expired on March 4 of the next year. This short session of Congress, from December to March, was nicknamed the ''lame-duck'' session, deriving its title from the stock exchange term meaning ''one who was unable to meet his obligations.''[2]

The ''lame-duck'' session of Congress was controversial for a number of reasons. For instance, if the election of the President were thrown into the House of Representatives, the election would be decided not by recently elected Congressmen, but by the ''lame-duck'' session. In addition, should a session of Congress require more time to conduct its business, the session could not be extended, since the terms of many legislators expired on March 4. The pending business would either have to be postponed until the following December, or a special session of the new Congress would have to be called. Consequently, the ''lame-duck'' session provided parliamentary advantages for the majority party in Congress. This is why constitutional amendments to eliminate the ''lame-duck'' session continually faced opposition in Congress.

Objections to the ''lame-duck'' session were heard long before proposals leading to the Twentieth Amendment were introduced. On the opening day of Congress' first ''lame-duck'' session in March of 1795, Aaron Burr laid before the Senate a motion introducing a constitutional amendment extending the terms of Congressmen until the first day of June.[3] Again in 1840, Millard Fillmore introduced an amendment that called for the elimination of the ''lame-duck'' session. Fillmore's resolution provided for the terms of Congressmen to begin on the first day of December, rather than fourth day of March.[4] Several other amendments to the Constitution, which would have altered the terms of office and dates of congressional sessions, were introduced during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Each of them was defeated.[5]

In 1923, the first of several resolutions introduced by Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska to eliminate the ''lame-duck'' session was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.[6] The measure, S.J. Res. 253, easily passed the Senate on February 13, 63 to 6, 27 not voting.[7] However, as would be the case with several of Norris' resolutions, the House of Representatives defeated the proposal by delaying further action until Congress adjourned in March. The same thing happened in 1924 with S.J. Res. 22 (68th Cong.), and again in 1926 with S.J. Res. 9 (69th Cong.). In 1928, S.J. Res. 47 (70th Cong.) finally made it to a vote in the House, where it gained a majority but failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote, 209 to 157, 66 not voting and 2 answering ''present.''[8]

On June 8, 1929, another Norris amendment proposal, S.J. Res. 3 (71st Cong.), passed in the Senate and was sent to the House. Once in the House, the Resolution lay on the Speaker's table until April 17, 1930, when it was finally referred to a House committee. In the meantime, a similar House Resolution, H.J. Res. 292 (7st Cong.), was introduced. This proposal, as amended by Speaker of the House Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, would have required the second session of Congress, which convened in January, to adjourn by May 4 of even-numbered years.[9] H.J. Res. 292 passed easily in the House, 290 to 93, 47 not voting and 1 answering ''present.''[10] In conference, representatives from the House and the Senate failed to agree on a compromise measure. As a result, hopes for an amendment to the Constitution once again expired with the adjournment of the 71st Congress.[11]

Legislative history

The elections of 1930 resulted in a Democratic landslide in the House. Unlike Longworth, the new Speaker, John N. Garner of Texas, came out in active support of an amendment to remedy the ''lame-duck'' problem. On January 6, 1932, the sixth Norris Amendment, S.J. Res. 14 (72nd Cong.), was reported in the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary. During floor consideration in the Senate on January 6, one amendment to

Footnotes at end of article.

limit the second session of Congress was rejected before the Resolution passed, 63 to 7, 25 not voting.[12]

In the House, the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress reported S.J. Res. 14 with an amendment in the nature of a substitute measure.[13] Among numerous suggested alterations, the substitute proposed ending presidential terms on January 24 and congressional terms on January 4, providing for succession in the event of the death or lack of qualification of the President-elect or Vice President-elect, making provision in case of the death of candidates from which Congress might have to choose a President or Vice President, and setting an effective date for the first two sections of the amendment.

The House began consideration of S.J. Res. 14 under an open rule on February 12, 1932.[14] On February 13, numerous amendments to the committee substitute were offered, all of which were either rejected or withdrawn. The two amendments withdrawn by their sponsors would have required ratification of the amendment within 7 years of its submission to the States and provided that Congress could, by concurrent resolution, set an assembly date other than January 4.[15] The rejected amendments called for ratification of the Twentieth Amendment by State conventions, extension of Representatives' terms to 4 years, and limitation of the second session of Congress.

After the House debate concluded, the Election Committee's substitute was approved and recommitted to the committee, with instructions to report it back with a new section establishing a mandatory 7-year ratification period.[16] Once the Resolution was amended accordingly and again reported by the Committee on Election, it passed the House 204 to 134, 43 not voting.[17] Minor differences between the House and Senate versions were quickly resolved in conference.[18]

Ratification history

The Twentieth Amendment was sent to the States for ratification in March of 1932; and within 1 year, all 48 States had ratified. Virginia was the first State to ratify, on March 4, 1932; and on January 23, 1933, Utah became the required 36th State to approve the Amendment. The ratification dates of each of the States appear below:

Virginia, Mar. 4, 1932.
New York, Mar. 11, 1932.
Mississippi, Mar. 16, 1932.
Arkansas, Mar. 17, 1932.
Kentucky, Mar. 17, 1932.
New Jersey, Mar. 21, 1932.
South Carolina, Mar. 25, 1932.
Michigan, Mar. 31, 1932.
Maine, Apr. 1, 1932.
Rhode Island, Apr. 14, 1932.
Illinois, Apr. 21, 1932.
Louisiana, Jun. 22, 1932.
West Virginia, Jul. 30, 1932.
Pennsylvania, Aug. 11, 1932.
Indiana, Aug. 15, 1932.
Texas, Sep. 7, 1932.
Alabama, Sep. 13, 1932.
California, Jan. 4 1933.
North Carolina, Jan. 5, 1933.
North Dakota, Jan. 9, 1933.
Minnesota, Jan. 12, 1933.
Arizona, Jan. 13, 1933.
Montana, Jan. 13, 1933.
Nebraska, Jan. 13, 1933.
Oklahoma, Jan. 13, 1933.
Kansas, Jan. 16, 1933.
Oregon, Jan. 16, 1933.
Delaware, Jan. 19, 1933.
Washington, Jan. 19, 1933.
Wyoming, Jan. 19, 1933.
Iowa, Jan. 20, 1933.
South Dakota, Jan. 20, 1933.
Tennessee, Jan. 20, 1933.
Idaho, Jan. 21, 1933.
New Mexico, Jan. 21, 1933.
Georgia, Jan. 23, 1933.
Missouri, Jan. 23, 1933.
Ohio, Jan. 23, 1933.
Utah, Jan. 23, 1933.
Colorado, Jan. 24, 1933.
Massachusetts, Jan. 24, 1933.
Wisconsin, Jan. 24, 1933.
Nevada, Jan. 26, 1933.
Connecticut, Jan. 27, 1933.
New Hampshire, Jan. 31, 1933.
Vermont, Feb. 2, 1933.
Maryland, Mar. 24, 1933.
Florida, Apr. 26, 1933.

With more than the necessary number of States having ratified, the Twentieth Amendment was certified as part of the Constitution on February 6, 1933, by Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson. Section 5 of the Amendment provided that Section 1 and 2 would become effective on October 15, 1933; therefore, the terms of newly-elected Senators and Representaties began on January 3, 1934, and the terms of the President and Vice President began on January 20, 1937.[19]

The Twentieth Amendment appears officially as 47 Stat. 2569.

FOOTNOTES

[1] United States Constitution, Article VII.
[2] Carl Brent Swisher, *American Constitutional Development* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1943), 723.
[3] *Annals of the Congress of the United States, 1795* (Washington, D.C.: Gales & Seaton, 1849), 5: 853.
[4] *Congressional Globe*, 26th Congress, 2nd Session, 1840, 9: 44.
[5] *Congressional Record*, 70th Congress, 2nd Session, 1928–1929, 70; 1–8; H. Doc. 551.
[6] *Congressional Record*, 67th Congress, 4th, Session, 1932, 64, Pt. 4: 3505–3507.
[7] Ibid., 3540–3541.
[8] Ibid., 70th Congress, 1st Session, 1928, 69, Pt. 4: 4430.
[9] Ibid., 71st Congress, 3rd Session, 1931, 74, Part 6: 5906–5907.
[10] Ibid., 5907–5908.
[11] For a summary of these five proposals see: *Congressional Record*, 72nd Congress, 1st Session, 1931–1932, 75.
[12] *Congressional Record*, 1372–1384.
[13] Ibid., 72nd Congress, 1st Session, 1932, 75.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid., 3856–3857, 3875–3876.
[16] Ibid., 3857–78.
[17] 4059–60.
[18] Ibid.
[19] *Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, The Constitution of the United States*, (Richmond, 1965), 36–37.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1491

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1491, a bill to reform antimicrobial pesticide registration, and for other purposes.

S. 1521

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to establish the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Kansas, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1532, a bill to provide for the continuing operation of the Office of Federal Investigations of the Office of Personnel Management, and for other purposes.

S. 1534

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1534, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional support for and to expand clinical research programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation) to the products of Romania.

S. 1646

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1646, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance safety, training, research and development, and safety education in the propane gas industry for the benefit of propane consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 215, a resolution to designate June 19, 1996, as ''National Baseball Day.''

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 58—TELEPHONE NUMBER OWNERSHIP CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF 1996

Mr. D'AMATO submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. CON. RES. 58

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Resolution may be cited as the ''Telephone Number Ownership Resolution of 1996''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) under existing law, the Federal Communications Commission is the administrator, not the owner, of telephone numbers, and has no authority to auction, or impose user fees for, any number within the North American Numbering Plan, nor does any other Federal agency;

(2) auctions of toll-free numbers will increase consumer fraud and confusion by allowing competitors to profit from the established reputation associated with existing toll-free numbers;

(3) there are a total of 21 countries in the North American Numbering Plan, including