confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eldon E. Fallon, of Louisiana, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Joseph Robert Goodwin, of West Virginia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Joe Bradley Pigott, of Mississippi, to be U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

Curtis L. Collier, of Tennessee, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Maxine M. Chesney, of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of California.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

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. GRAMM:

S. 711. A bill to provide for State credit union representation on the National Credit Union Administration Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN:

S. 712. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the award of fees and expenses to prevailing parties in frivolous civil litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 713. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide that the preemption provisions shall not apply to certain State of Oregon laws applicable to health plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 714. A bill to require the Attorney General to study and report to Congress on means of controlling the flow of violent, sexually explicit, harassing, offensive, or otherwise unwanted material in interactive telecommunications systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 715. A bill to provide for portability of health insurance, guaranteed renewability, high risk pools, medical care savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 716. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for criminal penalties for acts involving medicare or State health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 717. A bill to extend the period of issuance of medicare select policies for 12 months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 718. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish an Environmental Financial Advisory Board and Environmental Finance Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 109. A resolution extending the appreciation and gratitude of the United States Senate to Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, on the completion by the Senator of the 4 volume treatise entitled ''The History of the United States Senate'', and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS OF INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BRYAN:

S. 712. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the award of fees and expenses to prevailing parties in frivolous civil litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FRIVOLOUS LAWSUIT PREVENTION ACT

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Frivolous Lawsuit Prevention Act of 1995. This legislation will increase sanctions on lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits.

Almost daily we hear stories about some individual or business settling a lawsuit which has little merit just to avoid the costs associated with a drawn out case. The manhours and resources that can be drained from a business while it goes through such a process can be devastating.

Many of us had hoped that the rules governing the conduct of court behavior would deter frivolous lawsuits. Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorize judges to impose ''an appropriate sanction'' upon an attorney which is ''interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.'' Unfortunately, rule 11 has not lived up to our expectations in curbing abusive lawsuits and, in fact, has been recently watered down.

This legislation is intended to force judges to punish lawyers or litigants who file or pursue cases which the judge regards as frivolous. Judges would be required to impose sanctions when they find frivolous suits, thereby, taking away their discretion. This step needs to be taken because judges have been reluctant to impose sanctions on fellow attorneys. It has always been difficult to get any group to discipline their colleagues, where it is doctors, lawyers or realtors. That is why we must force judges to impose sanctions when frivolous case are filed.

Frivolous lawsuits are a terrible drain on the competitiveness of our Nation. We must provide those who want to fight these frivolous suits rather than settle them the power to go after the perpetrators. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.•

By Mr. HATFIELD.

S. 713. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide that the preemption provisions shall not apply to certain State of Oregon laws applicable to health plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

UNIVERSAL ACCESS AND THE OREGON HEALTH PLAN

• Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, during the 1989 and 1991 legislative sessions, Oregon's Legislature passed a comprehensive health care reform proposal known as the Oregon Health Plan. The Oregon Health Plan consists of four major reform packages. First, the Medicaid expansion which received a Federal waiver and has provided an additional 100,000 Oregonians with basic health care since it was implemented in February 1994. Second, the high-risk insurance pool which covers Oregonians who are unable to obtain insurance coverage due to preexisting conditions or the exhaustion of their current benefits. Third, the small employer basic health plan which provides for a low-cost insurance plan for small businesses of 25 or fewer employees. And finally, the employer mandate which by 1998 will require all employers in Oregon to provide health benefits for their employees or to pay into a State pool which will then purchase insurance for uninsured employees. When fully implemented the Oregon Health Plan will provide near universal access to health care for all Oregonians.

As my colleagues know, I have spoken many times on this floor about the need to allow States to proceed with innovative health care reform proposals. That is why I have joined with the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] in introducing the Health Partnership Act of 1995. The Congress' failure to act on comprehensive national health care reform should not prevent innovative States like Oregon, Florida, Washington, Minnesota, and others from enacting their own health care reform proposals.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has stymied these efforts in several ways. It took Oregon two administrations and almost 3 years to get the approval necessary to move forward with the Oregon Medicaid expansion. The current waiver process at the Health Care Financing Administration is burdensome and at times overregulatory.

Another major roadblock to State reform is the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, otherwise known as ERISA. Due to the broad interpretation courts have given to the so-called ERISA preemption clause contained in section 514(a) of the act, which states that ERISA ''shall supersede any and all State laws insofar as they may now or hereafter relate to any employee