

safety requirements. The purpose of the legislation I am introducing is to allow the *Focus* to engage in the coast-wise trade and the fisheries of the United States.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

S. 1363. A bill to terminate the agricultural price support and production adjustment programs for sugar on the date the President certifies to Congress that a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been entered into that prohibits all export subsidies for sugar, price support and production adjustment programs for sugar, and tariffs and other trade barriers on the importation of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to terminate U.S. agricultural price support and production adjustment programs for sugar contingent upon a GATT agreement which would eliminate export subsidies and price supports in other countries of the world. While I firmly believe that the free market should be allowed to work, it does not make sense to put our producers at a competitive disadvantage in the world subsidized market.

I can't speak for the rest of the country, but Michigan sugar beet producers are some of the most efficient producers in the world, yet without a U.S. sugar program they would most likely find it impossible to compete against less efficient foreign producers who are more highly subsidized. Other countries subsidize their sugar at a level so high that they are able to dump the excess sugar on the world market at a price well below the world's cost of production. Unilateral elimination of our sugar program would put the best producers of sugar in the world at a competitive disadvantage to less efficient producers. This simply does not make sense.

We cannot give up the hope that the world will have a free sugar market. Through the GATT, we have begun and will continue to work diligently toward that goal. I am hopeful that my legislation will prompt other Members of the House and Senate to contact the Administration in favor of further GATT talks that would move us closer to a free world market for agriculture. Until this occurs, however, we must carefully examine the consequences of the steps we take to reform or eliminate our support programs so that we do not put our producers in a position of weakness compared to other countries. Furthermore, we cannot simply assume other countries would follow our lead if we were to eliminate our sugar program. In fact, the result may be quite the opposite. Without a trade agreement, other countries would have greater access to the U.S. market, helping to perpetuate these foreign subsidies rather than encourage their elimination.

Mr. President, I assure you that during my tenure as a Member of this

body I will fight diligently on the issue of free trade. Understanding the importance of global free trade in a growing world market, I will continue to work to eliminate export subsidies and other price supports worldwide so that we may eventually achieve true free trade.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 612

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 612, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a hospice care pilot program for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1248

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1248, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the alcohol fuels credit to be allocated to patrons of a cooperative in certain cases.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1271 a bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 22, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

SENATE RESOLUTION 146

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 146, a resolution designating the week beginning November 19, 1995, and the week beginning on November 24, 1996, as "National Family Week," and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

FORD AMENDMENT NO. 2948

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1357) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996; as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 6 . CONSTRUCTION OF NATCHER BRIDGE NEAR OWENSBORO, KENTUCKY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Transportation may pay the Federal share of the cost of a project to complete construction of the William H. Natcher Bridge near Owensboro, Kentucky.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 80 percent.

(c) DELEGATION TO STATES.—Subject to title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation shall delegate responsibility for construction of the project to the State of Kentucky, on request of the State.

(d) ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION.—If the State of Kentucky has been delegated responsibility for construction of the project and the State—

(1) has obligated all funds made available to the State under this section for construction of the project; and

(2) proceeds to construct the project without the aid of Federal funds, in accordance with all procedures and all requirements applicable to the project, except to the extent that the procedures and requirements limit the State to the construction of projects with the aid of Federal funds previously made available to the State;

the Secretary of Transportation, on the approval of the application of the State, shall pay to the State the Federal share of the cost of the project at such time as additional funds are made available for the project under this section.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Funds made available under this section shall be available for obligation in the manner provided for funds apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that the Federal share of the cost of an project under this section shall be determined in accordance with this section and the funds shall remain available until expended. Funds authorized by this section shall not be subject to any obligation limitation.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund established by section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out the project \$44,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In section 23(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 12001(a), strike "\$110,000" in subparagraph (A) and insert "\$100,000" and strike "\$55,000" in subparagraph (C) and insert "\$50,000".

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, over the next few days, we will be debating the logic of a \$245 billion tax break that adds to the deficit and cuts dangerously deep into critical programs for middle-income Americans—from Medicare to education. My Republican colleagues will justify adding to the deficit and making those cuts by striking the familiar refrain that these tax breaks will boost the economy.

But Mr. President, those tax breaks are not only jeopardizing important investments in our future economy like education and job training, they're jeopardizing critical infrastructure improvements that mean much more to local economies than a tax break for America's wealthiest few.

One of those infrastructure projects is a bridge linking my home State of Kentucky with Indiana. Without a doubt, the Natcher Bridge would mean much more to the local economies of Kentucky and Indiana than this tax break. From the increased interstate commerce to making the region more attractive to future businesses, industry, and tourism, the Natcher Bridge is a long-term investment for every Kentuckian and Hoosier. But, unfortunately, it was sold down the river for a tax break for a wealthy few.