including rules governing adjustments to the adjusted basis of the stock and the earnings and profits of the members of the group.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The proposal would be effective for distributions after April 16, 1997, unless the distribution is: First, made pursuant to a written agreement with an acquirer which was (subject to customary conditions) binding on or before such date and at all times thereafter; second, described in a ruling request that identifies the acquirer and is submitted to the IRS on or before such date; third, described in a Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'') filing made on or before such date, to the extent such filing was required to be made on account of the distribution and identifies the acquirer; or fourth, described in a public announcement that identifies the acquirer on or before such date. The exceptions for written agreements, IRS ruling requests, SEC filings, and public announcements would not apply to distributions of stock within a consolidated group of corporations.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. FRIST):

S. 613. A bill to provide that Kentucky may not tax compensation paid to a resident of Tennessee for certain services performed at Fort Campbell, KY; to the Committee on Finance.

FORT CAMPBELL TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 1997

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to provide much-needed tax relief to the residents of my State who are employed as civilians on Fort Campbell, KY. These Clarksville area Tennesseans are hard working citizens who, I believe, are being taxed unfairly by the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Fort Campbell is the home of the Army's famous 101st Airborne Division. This installation straddles the border between Tennessee and Kentucky. In fact, 80 percent of it lies within the State of Tennessee. But because the post office is located on the Kentucky side of the base, it is best known to most people as Fort Campbell, KY.

Civilian residents of both Tennessee and Kentucky are employed by the Federal Government to perform important nonmilitary functions at Fort Campbell. Approximately 2,000 of the Tennesseans who work on post are employed on the Kentucky side in the schools, at the post office, at the post exchange, and on the primary airfield. Unfortunately, these Tennesseans are forced to pay income tax to the Commonwealth of Kentucky of up to 6 percent of their wages, in addition to the sales and excise taxes they pay to their home State of Tennessee.

Because the State of Tennessee does not have an income tax, Kentuckians employed on the Tennessee side of Fort Campbell do not pay income tax to the State of Tennessee. Nor are Kentuckians required to pay Tennessee sales tax on Fort Campbell. All of the facilities on the Tennessee side of Fort Campbell to which Kentuckians have access, the KFC and the Taco Bell, for example, are exempt from State sales tax. It is only when a Kentucky resident leaves post that he or she becomes subject to Tennessee sales tax on purchases made in the State.

Mr. President, I believe it is unfair of Kentucky to impose income tax on Tennesseans, because Tennesseans who work on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell do not consume any services provided by the Commonwealth. Fort Campbell is a Federal installation. All emergency fire, police, and medical services on post are provided by the Federal Government, not the Commonwealth of Kentucky. All roads on Fort Campbell, both on the Kentucky and the Tennessee side, are maintained by the Federal Government. Water and sewer services are paid for by the Federal Government. If a Tennessean who worked on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell were laid off, he or she would not be eligible to obtain unemployment benefits from Kentucky, despite the fact that he or she had been paying income tax to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Finally, Tennesseans have no voice in the Kentucky legislature to affect change to this law. Tennesseans are being unfairly taxed without the benefit of representation—a principle anathema to this country. As I see it, the Commonwealth of Kentucky is receiving free money from residents of Tennessee who work on a Federal installation that happens to border their State.

And although Kentucky likes to argue that the residents of Clarksville are not forced to work on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell, employees are often moved on the base where a change of buildings means a change of State. A Tennessean forced to move into a Fort Campbell job across the border takes an automatic pay cut of up to 6 percent—just for moving across the street. This situation has been the cause of significant morale problems at Fort Campbell. According to Kentucky, however, those employees can escape paying the income tax by quitting their jobs. I find this alternative an unacceptable one. It is for this reason that I am introducing legislation to prohibit Kentucky from imposing its income tax on these Tennesseans employed either by the Federal Government or by a contractor with the Federal Government at Fort Campbell. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, Senator FRIST. Congressman ED BRYANT has introduced the similar legislation in the other body.

Let me provide some history on this issue. According to legislation enacted by Congress in 1940, the Commonwealth of Kentucky is permitted to impose its income tax on Federal employees working in the State. This legislation, the Buck Act, repealed a prior law prohibiting States from imposing income tax on individuals who live or work on Federal property. However, Congress has also granted exemptions from State income tax to classes of Federal employees based on their obvious special circumstances: military personnel and Members of Congress and their employees. In addition, Congress enacted legislation in 1990 to exempt Amtrak employees from State taxation in the States in which they do not reside but through which they travel while working. Congress intended these exemptions to provide relief from inequitable situations. The Tennesseans employed at Fort Campbell also merit an exemption.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that a State has the right to raise revenue in whatever manner its residents believe is most appropriate. In the case of Tennessee, residents have chosen sales and excise taxes to fund their cost of government—only one of six States in the United States without an income tax. But it should be noted that Kentucky has entered into reciprocal tax agreements with surrounding income tax States to ensure that Kentuckians are treated fairly. Unfortunately, Kentucky has refused to negotiate any type of reciprocal tax agreement with Tennessee, because it knows it has Tennesseans over a barrel. Prohibiting the Commonwealth of Kentucky from taxing Tennesseans working on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell is the best way to resolve this inequitable situation.

During this week in April Americans are reminded of their obligations to government. I believe that Americans are willing to pay their fair share of taxes, but citizens should not be expected to pay tax to a government from which they receive nothing and in which they have no voice.

THE FORT CAMPBELL TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 1997

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to join my friend, colleague, and senior Senator from Tennessee, FRED THOMPSON, to introduce the Fort Campbell Tax Fairness Act of 1997.

We are introducing this legislation today to rectify a tax injustice imposed on Tennessee residents at Fort Campbell in northwest Tennessee. Fort Campbell, a 105,000-acre military installation that serves as America's premier power projection platform, straddles the border of Tennessee and Kentucky. Under current law, about 2,000 Tennesseans who work on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell are forced to pay income tax to Kentucky—even though they receive no benefits or services from the Kentucky State government.

They cannot send their children to Kentucky public schools. In an emergency, these residents cannot use Kentucky fire, ambulance, and police services. Tennesseans who want to attend a Kentucky public university must pay out-of-State tuition. Tennesseans who want to hunt and fish in Kentucky

must pay out-of-State rates for licenses. Most importantly, these Tennesseans who are paying Kentucky income taxes cannot vote in Kentucky elections. I consider this inherently unfair situation a case of ''taxation without representation''—violating a fundamental principle of our American Revolution.

Our bill, like its bipartisan companion in the House introduced by Representatives ED BRYANt and JOHN TANNER, simply provides that Kentucky may not tax compensation paid to Tennessee Federal workers and contractors working on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell. I look forward to working with Senator THOMPSON and other members of the Tennessee delegation to enact this bill into law.

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

S. 614. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide flexibility in the use of unused volume cap for tax-exempt bonds, to provide a $20,000,000 limit on small issue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

TAX-EXEMPT BONDS LEGISLATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise today with Mr. D'AMATO to introduce legislation that will improve the use of tax-exempt bonds as a financing mechanism for small manufacturing facilities and other important uses.

The first thing our bill does is give States more flexibility under the annual $50 per capita or $150 million cap. Under current law, if the State designates bond money for a project and, for whatever reason, that project is not started in 3 years the State cannot put the bond money toward another project. This bill would allow States to reallocate that bond money to another type of project needed elsewhere in the State.

In addition, the $10 million limit on capital expenditures a company can maintain and still qualify for this industrial bond money would increase to $20 million under our bill. The increase reflects the effects of inflation since 1978 when the program was first created and also corrects for future effects of inflation on a company's real worth.

Finally, our bill would further clean up an omission in the current law. The 3-year carryover provision does not apply to small manufacturing facilities. In researching current law, it appears that denying carryover to manufacturing facilities is nothing more than an oversight. The legislation that we are introducing today will correct this error and allow Governors the flexibility to allow tax-exempt authority for manufacturing facilities to be carried over for 3 years in the same way as other activities allocated tax-exempt bonds.

Tax-exempt bonds are essential for States to finance industrial development projects, ranging from small manufacturing facilities to pollution control and resource recovery facilities. Our legislation would help States fund industrial development and better allocate their scarce tax-exempt bond authority.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring 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. 614

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

SECTION 1. UNLIMITED 3-YEAR CARRYFORWARD OF UNUSED VOLUME CAP FOR BONDS, INCLUDING SMALL ISSUE BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 146(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to State ceiling) are amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The State ceiling applicable to any State for any calendar year is an amount equal to the sum of—

''(A) the current year State ceiling of such State, plus

''(B) the unused State ceiling (if any) of such State for the preceding 3 calendar years.

''(2) CURRENT YEAR STATE CEILING.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The current year State ceiling of any State for any calendar year is an amount equal to the greater of—

''(i) an amount equal to $50 multiplied by the State population, or

''(ii) $150,000,000.

''(B) APPLICATION TO POSSESSIONS.—Clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any possession of the United States.

''(3) UNUSED STATE CEILING.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the unused State ceiling of any State for any calendar year is the excess (if any) of the State ceiling of such State for such calendar year over the aggregate State ceiling allocated by the State for such calendar year.

''(4) RULES OF APPLICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), with respect to any calendar year—

''(A) the current year State ceiling shall be fully allocated before the allocation of the unused State ceiling, and

''(B) unused State ceiling shall be allocated in the order of the calendar years in which the unused State ceiling arose.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 146(f)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to elective carryforward of unused limitation for specified purpose) is amended by inserting ''and before 1998'' after ''after 1985''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE; SPECIAL ELECTION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to the State ceiling for calendar years after 1997.

(2) SPECIAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding section 146(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the person or entity responsible for allocating the State ceiling may irrevocably elect to treat (with the consent of each allocation recipient) such portion of the carryforwards elected under section 146(f) of such Code for the 3 calendar years ending in 1997 as unused State ceiling under section 146(d)(1) of such Code (as amended by this section).

SEC. 2. $20,000,000 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE LIMIT ON QUALIFIED SMALL ISSUE BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 144(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to $10,000,000 limit in certain cases) is amended by inserting ''in excess of $10,000,000'' after ''amount of capital expenditures''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to—

(1) obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) capital expenditures made after such date with respect to obligations issued on or before such date.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 615. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide for continued eligibility for supplemental security income and food stamps with regard to certain classifications of aliens; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FAIRNESS FOR LEGAL IMMIGRANTS ACT OF 1997

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today Senators FEINSTEIN, D'AMATO, LIEBERMAN, DEWINE, MOYNIHAN, and MIKULSKI and I are introducing legislation to protect legal immigrants who are facing the loss of critical SSI and food stamp benefits later this summer.

Now that the welfare bill has become law, the crisis facing many legal immigrants, especially the elderly and disabled, is all too evident. For those legal immigrants who face the loss of assistance in August and September, the outlook is grim.

The bill we are introducing focuses on the plight of these legal immigrants. First, our bill grandfathers all legal immigrants who were receiving SSI or food stamp benefits as of August 22, 1996, the date the President signed the welfare bill. Second, our bill grandfathers those refugees who were in the country on August 22, 1996, regardless of whether they were receiving benefits.

Why this approach? To us, it is a matter of fundamental fairness. That is the principle that underlies our bill. We believe that those who were in this country and playing by the rules should not have the rules suddenly changed out from under them. As for refugees, we provide them a slightly broader provision, since unlike other immigrants they do not have sponsors and they come here to flee persecution.

This is a matter of great importance to the residents in the States represented before you today. In my own State, a significant percentage of our total population is immigrants, indeed, measured in those terms, Rhode Island is one of the top immigrant States in the country. Some 10,000 legal immigrants in my State rely on SSI and food stamp benefits, quite a lot by RI standards.

We believe that our approach is a reasonable, commonsense proposal that will appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle and that can be enacted this year. By introducing this bipartisan

bill today, we hope to signal to our colleagues the seriousness of our concern and the strength of our resolve. We intend to fight for passage of this bill, and we have every expectation of meeting with success.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement be submitted in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The welfare reform law that passed last year will have an adverse impact on legal immigrants who are elderly and disabled, the most vulnerable of our population.

That is why I am joining my colleagues, Senators CHAFEE, FEINSTEIN, MOYNIHAN, DEWINE, LIEBERMAN and MIKULSKI in introducing this legislation to protect vulnerable legal immigrants who are facing a loss of their supplemental security income [SSI] and food stamp benefits this August.

Now that the welfare reform law is being implemented, with nearly 900,000 SSI recipients nationwide receiving preliminary noncitizen status notices of the changes in the law, there has emerged a crisis facing legal immigrants who are elderly and disabled.

The Social Security Administration has estimated that these welfare reform changes may result in 434,000 legal immigrants actually losing SSI benefits.

Of the 80,000 legal immigrants at risk of losing their SSI benefits in New York State, roughly 70,000 are in New York City. New York City also expects that more than 130,000 legal immigrants currently receiving food stamps will lose those benefits by 1998.

The bill we are introducing will grandfather those immigrants who were receiving SSI or food stamp benefits as of August 22, 1996, the date of enactment of the Welfare bill. And it will grandfather refugees and asylees who were in this country as of August 22, 1996.

This bill is about making sure that some of the most vulnerable people, the elderly and the disabled, are not pushed out of the SSI and Food Stamp Programs.

The people of America recognize that many people who are elderly and disabled are in fact unable at times to take care of themselves without assistance through no fault of their own. To turn our back on these people would be cruel and not in keeping with our Nation's tradition of supporting those in need.

Refugees who have been granted political asylum also merit that extra consideration that comes from leaving one's own country under duress searching for freedom and a new way of life. They also need a hand up and that too is in the great and long tradition of America.

This is not a welfare bill, it is a bill of fundamental fairness and compassion. These people came to the United Sates and have been living under our laws for years. It is unfair to change the rules on them suddenly. That is the crux of this bill.

This isn't just a matter of statistics and hypothetical situations of what might happen. There are real people out there, and you can be sure that they are going to get hurt if we do nothing. We are not going to let that happen.

We want to work with our colleagues to pass a bill that will not put the elderly and the disabled out on the streets.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, when Congress approved and the President signed the comprehensive welfare reform legislation last year, it was clear to many that it was not a perfect bill.

I, along with many of my colleagues expressed grave concern about a number of provisions that will have a devastating impact, not only on States and counties in terms of a huge cost shift, but on the lives and well-being of many elderly and disabled people—people who are now dependent upon public assistance for their survival.

The provision denying supplemental security income [SSI] and food stamps to virtually all legal immigrants who are noncitizens, even those who are elderly and disabled, who cannot support themselves, who have no sponsor or other means of support, such as refugees, in my view, is one of the most egregious flaws in that bill, and one of the main reasons why I voted against its passage.

Today, Senator CHAFEE and I, along with Senators D'AMATO, MOYNIHAN, DEWINE, LIEBERMAN, and MIKULSKI are offering legislation to correct this flaw.

The Fairness for Legal Immigrants Act of 1997 would grandfather in from the ban on SSI and food stamps: those elderly and disabled legal permanent residents who were receiving SSI and food stamps on or before August 22, 1996 and, those refugees who were in the country as of August 22, 1996.

This legislation prohibits SSI and food stamps for legal permanent residents who are not refugees and who were not receiving SSI and food stamps as of August 22, 1996.

This legislation also prohibits SSI and food stamps for all legal permanent residents and refugees coming to this country following the date of enactment of the Welfare Reform Bill, August 22, 1996.

Mr. President, to not correct this flaw in the bill represents an enormous unfunded mandate to States and counties by simply shifting the cost of caring for the seriously ill, disabled, and elderly legal immigrants who are destitute and have no other way to survive.

As I speak, SSA is sending out 125,000 SSI ban notices per week, to 800,000 legal immigrants who are on SSI nationwide. SSA estimates that more than 62.5 percent or 500,000 people currently receiving SSI benefits nationwide will lose their benefits under the current law—more than 40 percent, 205,000 of them in California. Many of these elderly and disabled legal immigrants have no family or friends to turn to for support and will become completely destitute. Their only recourse will be county general assistance programs or, at worst, homeless shelters.

Let me give you an example from my home State:

My staff met with a 73-year-old legal immigrant on SSI. She was welcomed to this county from Vietnam in 1980. She was a refugee from communism with no family in the United States. She speaks no English and she is suffering from kidney failure. She requires dialysis three times a week. Under this new law, this 73-year-old woman will lose SSI, her only source of support. Her well-being will become the responsibility of the county.

I am the first to acknowledge that prior to welfare reform, there was abuse of the SSI program in this country. Elderly noncitizens could collect SSI, even if they lived with their children, as long as they claimed to be financially independent from the children.

And the number of noncitizens receiving SSI has skyrocketed at a disproportionate rate to that of citizens. The number of noncitizens collecting SSI increased 477 percent in 14 years, from 1980 to 1994, while the number of U.S. citizens receiving SSI increased 33 percent during that same period.

Although I strongly support efforts to hold sponsors accountable for the support of legal immigrants they bring into the country, the welfare reform bill passed by Congress simply went too far. It banned SSI and food stamps for virtually all legal immigrants, even those whose sponsors cannot afford to support them, or who have no sponsors at all.

The current welfare reform bill will not just eliminate fraudulent cases from the SSI rolls. It will eliminate truly needy people like the 73-year-old elderly refugee. Surely, it was not the intent of this Congress to leave elderly, disabled, and destitute people with nowhere to go to except county relief or the streets.

If we do not revise the welfare ban for legal immigrants the financial costs to States and counties will be enormous, and the human toll even greater:

Los Angeles County estimates that 93,000 legal immigrants in its county will lose SSI benefits at a cost of up to $236 million a year to the county.

San Francisco estimates that 20,000 legal noncitizens may turn to the county's general assistance program, at a total cost of up to $74 million annually.

I believe this body must finish what it started last year. In this time of budgetary constraints where tough choices have to be made, we must act with prudence and compassion toward those who truly have no one to turn to, while at the same time preserving portions of the savings needed to balance the budget and enact meaningful reform.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that the SSA table be printed in the RECORD.

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

NUMBERS OF SSI RECIPIENTS RECEIVING PRELIMINARY NONCITIZEN STATUS NOTICES BY STATE, NUMBERS OF SSI RECIPIENTS CODED AS NONCITIZENS BY CATEGORY BY STATE, AND NUMBER OF SSI RECIPIENTS RECEIVING TYPE II NOTICES BY STATE

State	Notices		Noncitizens recipients on SSI	
	All [1]	Type II [2]	LAPR	Refugees [3]
Alabama	9,800	9,215	502	123
Alaska	757	117	569	95
Arizona	8,511	2,979	6,318	1,295
Arkansas	4,958	4,569	335	96
California	310,409	76,356	206,038	80,803
Colorado	6,149	1,898	3,353	1,426
Connecticut	5,071	1,111	3,440	1,009
Delaware	665	334	275	55
D.C	1,473	769	741	127
Florida	77,560	21,999	52,489	15,921
Georgia	13,794	9,474	3,235	1,366
Hawaii	4,616	1,026	3,461	554
Idaho	811	405	364	144
Illinois	27,446	6,783	16,233	6,769
Indiana	2,874	1,749	904	304
Iowa	2,055	1,053	631	454
Kansas	1,928	608	979	412
Kentucky	4,781	4,028	439	357
Louisiana	8,694	6,550	2,002	536
Maine	1,500	1,039	318	191
Maryland	9,645	2,456	5,424	2,087
Massachusetts	27,171	7,782	16,184	7,383
Michigan	12,136	5,232	5,364	2,069
Minnesota	8,025	1,529	3,319	3,362
Mississippi	8,232	7,852	363	72
Missouri	4,971	3,141	996	872
Montana	462	302	103	75
Nebraska	1,023	427	402	238
New Hampshire	510	187	264	100
New Jersey	25,918	6,403	18,918	3,244
New Mexico	4,412	2,195	3,049	360
New York	125,919	28,583	81,701	32,917
North Carolina	9,645	7,468	1,659	627
North Dakota	429	314	66	70
Ohio	9,298	4,281	3,074	2,228
Oklahoma	4,785	3,743	923	243
Oregon	5,511	1,323	2,547	1,952
Pennsylvania	17,176	6,579	6,485	4,737
Rhode Island	3,755	1,194	2,640	724
South Carolina	6,119	5,535	505	124
South Dakota	504	337	56	115
Tennessee	8,952	7,622	968	426
Texas	66,750	31,421	50,434	5,772
Utah	1,753	389	995	503
Vermont	543	385	110	73
Virginia	10,336	3,830	5,247	1,500
Washington	15,583	2,622	7,579	6,242
West Virginia	1,316	1,181	118	23
Wisconsin	7,472	2,562	2,591	2,490
Wyoming	144	97	41	77
Totals	895,204	299,817	526,695	193,142

[1] Number of notices differs from number of noncitizens recipients because some SSI recipients' records do not contain information about their citizenship status (Type II notices) plus some of those designated as noncitizens did not receive notices because SSA records indicated that they met certain exemption from the ban on eligibility. Number reflects status as of 1/31/97.

[2] Type II notice are those mailed to recipients whose records do not contain information on citizenship status as of 1/31/97. These recipients were on the SSI roles prior to 1978 when this information began to be verified in SSA records.

[3] Category includes refugees, asylees, and other noncitizen recipients currently shown in SSA's records as permanently residing in the U.S. status as of 2/20/97.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 616. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to improve the designation of metropolitan planning organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS REFORM ACT OF 1997

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will reform the relationship between central cities and their outlying areas in terms of distribution of highway funds. This issue was brought to my attention by one county in my State and they were quickly joined by several others who feel they have been treated unfairly in their MPO.

The current law governing MPO's is the 1991 Intermodal Service Transportation and Efficiency Act. This legislation established the planning powers of MPO's and also set standards for membership and qualifications for leaving MPO's. A number of counties in my State have indicated they are unhappy in their particular MPO and would like to leave. However, current law prohibits this.

One case in particular that has been brought to my attention is Douglas County's experience since 1991. Douglas County is directly south of Denver and is the fastest growing county in the Nation. Furthermore, they are a linkage county connecting Denver and Colorado Springs, which makes Douglas County's transportation needs tremendous. To meet these needs they have attempted to work with their MPO to receive an equitable share of funds. Douglas County has demonstrated that these attempts have failed, while they are 5.27 percent of their MPO, over the years their funding has been .35 percent for the fiscal year 1993–1995 cycle, 1.2 percent for the fiscal year 1995–1997 cycle, and .4 percent of the fiscal year 1997–1999 cycle. Clearly, there is a problem with how these funds are being distributed.

This issue cannot be dismissed as a one county problem either. In the Denver regional county of governments MPO [DRCOG], with the exception of Denver County, I have received letters from every county supporting the legislation I am introducing today.

This legislation would lower the barrier for disaffected parties that would like to create their own MPO or join an adjacent MPO. This legislation eliminates the 75 percent of the effected population threshold to leave necessary in current law, and lowers that to 50 percent. Furthermore, it would eliminate the central city veto authority.

This legislation will have no effect on those who are content with their MPO. Nor will this legislation have any impact on central cities that have worked with their MPO members equitably. It will only impact those areas where counties are being held in a relationship they feel is unfair. It's my hope that in future deliberations on transportation matters we can address and resolve this issue.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 617. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat, and meat food products containing imported meat, bear a label identifying the country of origin; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE IMPORTED MEAT LABEL ACT OF 1997

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that would require that imported meat and meat food products containing imported meat be labeled for country of origin so that consumers can make the choice to buy meat produced from livestock raised on American ranches and farms. This act would require that these products be labeled for country of origin prior to their sale at the retail level in the United States.

Senator CRAIG, Senator DASCHLE, Senator BURNS, and Senator BAUCUS join me today in introducing this needed policy change. I welcome and applaud their support. I would also point out to my colleagues the support this legislation has received from the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and the American Sheep Industry. From my State, this legislation is supported by the South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Farm Bureau, South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association, and the South Dakota Cattlemen's Association. I hope that other Senators join us in support of this measure and help us to quickly pass this bill.

America's livestock producers are proud of their record of producing quality meat and meat food products from American raised livestock. While labeling products from other industries for country of origin is commonplace, imported meat and meat food products containing imported meat are often not labeled at all. With the passage of the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, NAFTA, and GATT, we are moving toward more imported meat. Exports of American meat are high quality, value added items that American exporters are proud to advertise as American produced. On the other hand, meat imports into the United States tend to be of lower quality and importers generally do not advertise the country of origin.

American consumers deserve to know the source of their meat and meat food products. The legislation that my colleagues and I are introducing will allow America's consumers to know the source of their meat and meat food products. Considering that food safety and the wisdom of production systems in other countries are concerns that consumers consistently have, this legislation allows the competitive free market to determine the prices and demand for imported meat and meat food products.

Finally, American taxpayers have invested heavily in our food safety system—and it is undoubtedly the safest in the world. It just makes good sense for these same taxpayers and consumers to know the origin of the meat they buy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of the legislation printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 617

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 ''Imported Meat Labeling Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING OF IMPORTED MEAT AND MEAT FOOD PRODUCTS.

(a) LABELING REQUIRED.—Section 1(n) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13)(A) If it is imported into the United States unless it bears or is accompanied by labeling that identifies the country of origin of the animal that is the source of the imported carcass, part thereof, or meat or is part of the contents of the imported meat food product.

''(B) If it originates from an animal that was imported into the United States less than 10 days prior to slaughter unless it bears or is accompanied by labeling that identifies the country of origin of the animal.

''(C) If it is a meat food product prepared in the United States using any carcass, part thereof, or meat imported into the United States unless the meat food product bears or is accompanied by labeling that identifies the country of origin of the animal that is the source of the imported carcass, part thereof, or meat.

''(D) In this paragraph, the term 'country of origin' means the country or countries in which an animal is raised before slaughter.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1(n) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act is amended—

(1) by striking ''if'' at the beginning of each of paragraphs (1) through (12) and inserting ''If'';

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of each of paragraphs (1) through (10) and inserting a period, and

(3) in paragraph (11), by striking ''; or'' at the end and inserting a period.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from South Dakota today as an original cosponsor of the Imported Meat Labeling Act of 1997. This act would require the labeling of imported meat and meat products prior to their sale at a retail level in the United States.

For the record, I want my colleagues to know that this type of action is legal under the terms of our GATT Agreement. In addition, a number of groups have policy that support this type of measure including the American Farm Bureau, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and the American Sheep Industry.

Again, I commend Senator JOHNSON for introducing the Imported Meat Labeling Act of 1997 and Senator BURNS from Montana for his additional efforts on this topic. I hope that other Senators will join us in support of this measure. I would pledge my support of addressing any legitimate concerns that this legislation might raise and ask in return that we seek quick resolution and passage of this bill.

One legitimate concern with this legislation is the treatment of Canadian cattle that are slaughtered in the United States. Concern along the northern tier States that border Canada is high among all areas of Canadian trade. Producers in these States might ask how cattle that are born in Canada, fed in Canada, but shipped to the United States for slaughter would be labeled. Realistically, these animals are Canadian and the beef produced from them should be labeled as such. However, if the legal interpretation is different, I state my willingness for the record to amend this legislation and address this type of concern.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to sponsor a bill being introduced by myself, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. JOHNSON on an issue of great importance to my State and the agricultural industry in Montana. The issue is that of labeling meat coming into America from other countries.

We are offering today language, which will require all meat products that come from a foreign country to be labeled with the country of origin of that meat. This will allow all Americans to know and understand where the meat they are purchasing really comes from. This bill will protect the consumer as well as an industry which has had to face severe competition from foreign countries in recent years.

Today when shopping at the local grocery market, the American consumer is buying meat products without all the information they need to make an informed decision on the product they are purchasing. Our consumers go to the market and purchase meat products with no idea of where the meat they are buying comes from. Recent events in foreign countries have made this issue important to the retail consumer. Outbreak of disease and problems with the quality of foreign products makes it necessary that we provide our consumers with all the information they should have when making an informed decision about the food they are buying.

If we look at the vast majority of products that are imported into our country, we find that they are labeled with the country in which that product was produced. We have consumers that for numerous years have established a custom of purchasing only products with a Made in America label. It only seems right that we provide these same consumers with the information that will allow them to make the same intelligent decision when shopping for the food that they consume.

Our consumers today go to the market and buy meat products under the assumption that if it carries a USDA inspection and graded label that the meat they are purchasing comes from the United States. This, we have recently found out, can be far from the truth. Just carrying that label does nothing to inform the consumer that the hamburger they are purchasing is from this country.

As I stated earlier, recent outbreaks of disease in foreign countries has haunted our American meat producers. The public fears that the beef they are buying could be from a European country with a disease that has killed their citizens. Out breaks in meat and vegetable products leads Americans to fear the purchase of American meat and vegetables because they are under the assumption that the product is American in origin. This is not always the case. The recent outbreak of hepatitis found in strawberries is proof.

American agriculture provides the American consumer with the safest most reliable source of food and fiber in the world. With this in mind we then should be informing the American consumer that they really are purchasing American product or if they so chose product raised in a foreign country.

I am proud and very pleased to add my name to this bill and I look forward to moving this through the legislative process so we can give our consumers the information on meat that we have provided to them on other numerous consumer goods.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 618. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1997

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 619. A bill to establish a Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS ACT OF 1997

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing—along with a number of my colleagues—two measures to continue and enhance efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay. Joining me in sponsoring one or both of these measures are my colleagues from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, Senators WARNER, SANTORUM, ROBB, and MIKULSKI.

The Chesapeake Bay is one of the world's great natural resources. It is a world-class fishery that still produces a significant portion of the fin fish and shellfish catch in the United States.

It provides vital habitat for living resources, including more than 2,700 plant and animal species. It is a major resting area for migratory birds and waterfowl along the Atlantic flyway, including many endangered and threatened species.

As our Nation's largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay is also key to the ecological and economic health of the mid-Atlantic region. The bay is a treasured asset for all our citizens, particularly for the nearly 15 million of us who live within the six State watershed. It is a one-of-a-kind recreational asset enjoyed by 9 million people, including many Members of this body.

The bay is also a major commercial waterway and shipping center for the

region and much of the eastern United States. And it provides thousands of jobs for the people in this region. Certainly, we in Maryland regard the bay as a defining element in our State's history, and as a key to Maryland's quality of life.

Most people are aware of these and other dimensions of the bay. Certainly, our Nation's scientists are aware, and have consistently regarded the bay's protection and enhancement as an extremely important national objective.

When the bay began to experience serious unprecedented declines in water quality and living resources in recent decades, people in the region, including those in my State, suffered as well. We lost thousands of jobs in the fishing industry and much of the wilderness that defined the watershed.

We began to appreciate for the first time the profound impact that human activity could have on the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. Untreated sewage, deforestation, toxic chemicals, farm runoff, and increased development resulted in a degradation of water quality and destruction of wildlife and its habitat.

Fortunately, over the last two decades we have also come to understand that humans can have a positive influence on the environment, and that we can, if we choose, assist nature to repair much of the damage which has been done.

We now treat sewage before it enters our waters, and even have a successful waste treatment pilot project here in Washington that utilizes state-of-the-art biological methods to significantly reduce nutrients entering the bay.

We banned toxic chemicals that were killing the wildlife, initiated programs to reduce nonpoint source pollution in the bay's tributaries, and we have taken aggressive steps to successfully restore the striped bass and other species.

We have undertaken the Nation's largest habitat restoration project on Poplar Island in the upper bay, and enacted legislation protecting the estuary from economically and ecologically harmful aquatic nuisance species.

The States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania deserve much of the credit for undertaking many of the actions that have put the bay and its watershed on the road to recovery.

All three States have had major cleanup programs and have made significant commitments in terms of resources. The cleanup has remained an important priority item supported by Governors, State legislatures and the public. And a number of private organizations—the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay come to mind—have done stellar work in this area.

But the Federal Government has played a critical catalyzing role in helping to bring about these successes. Without the Federal Clean Water Act, the Federal ban on DDT, and EPA's watershed-wide coordination of bay restoration and cleanup activities, we would not have been able to bring about the concerted effort, the real partnership, that is succeeding in improving bay water quality and in bringing back many fish and wildlife species that were on the verge of extinction.

The Chesapeake Bay is getting cleaner, but we cannot affort to be complacent. Ever increasing population and commercial stresses are imposed upon the bay. So we must not relax if we hope to maintain, and build upon, our past successes.

The first measure I am introducing today is designed to build upon our National Government's past role in the Chesapeake Bay Program, the highly successful Federal-State-local partnership to which I made reference, that so ably coordinates and directs efforts to restore the bay.

This legislation carries forward and enhances the role of the Environmetnal Protection Agency as the lead Federal agency committed to cleaning up the bay. It redoubles efforts to ensure wide compliance with Chesapeake Bay agreement goals, including habitat restoration and toxics reduction.

And it establishes a mechanism for EPA to further assist communities with local watershed restoration and protection projects in the bay and its tributaries. This is an especially important component of this measure. Let me spend a moment to explain why.

The initial stages of the bay cleanup focused on the mainstem bay. But it became increasingly clear that many of the bay's problems originate in the rivers and streams which flow into the bay. It also became obvious that we must expand efforts within these waters if we hope to achieve nutrient reductions and other improvements in the overall bay watershed.

The bay partners recognized this urgent need with 1992 and subsequent amendments to the Chesapeake Bay agreement that committed the bay partners to develop and implement tributary-specific strategies throughout the watershed, and the States are making tremendous progress in this regard.

It is clear that one of the most cost-effective ways to protect the rivers and streams in the watershed is to help, encourage and promote stewardship among citizens and others who have a direct stake in a specific local situation. After all, stewardship starts with the individual citizens who live in the watershed. And that is what this measure encourages by providing EPA with mechanisms to stimulate such local efforts.

The second measure I am introducing today would connect natural, historic, cultural, and recreational resources to create an innovative Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network throughout the mainstem bay and its tributaries.

The vast bay watershed contains many distinctive treasures that combine to tell a unique story about the evolvement of human settlement and culture within the area. Each region within the watershed is dotted with historic seaports, Federal and State parks, and other natural, cultural, or recreational sites.

Many residents of the bay are familiar with the rich resources within their particular region. Similarly, countless visitors to a particular segment of the watershed are exposed to selective sites, but receive only a limited if any introduction to similar resources throughout the entire bay. They learn little about the bay's collective cultural and natural history, and perhaps little about comprehensive bay cleanup efforts.

What we currently lack—and what this measure provides—is a mechanism that links these many valuable resources and sites throughout the watershed into a unified network of jewels of the Chesapeake.

This shared linkage and identity can improve access to the bay. It can further educate residents and visitors about this treasured resource.

It can boost the already substantial economic activity generated by tourism and recreation within the watershed, and it can entice additional residents within the watershed to play more active roles in the bay restoration effort.

This measure would accomplish these worthy goals in several ways. First, it authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to identify and protect resources throughout the watershed, to identify these individual jewels as Chesapeake Bay gateways, and to link them with trails, tour roads, scenic byways and other sites.

Second, it directs the Secretary to develop and establish Chesapeake Bay Watertrails, consisting of important water routes, and connects these watertrails with gateways sites and other land resources to create a Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. This network will guide residents and visitors alike along important water routes and the many land based resources within the watershed.

Third, this legislation authorizes the Secretary to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local partners for conserving and restoring these important resources throughout the watershed.

The Chesapeake Bay cleanup effort, and Federal-State efforts to protect related resources and to promote economic activity, have been major bipartisan undertakings in this body. The bay has been strongly supported by virtually all Members of the Senate, as evidenced by enactment of three of the five related measures introduced last session. I urge my colleagues to continue the momentum by supporting this legislation and contributing to the improvement and enhancement of one of our Nation's most valuable and treasured natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1997 and the Chesapeake

Bay Gateways and Watertrails Act of 1997 be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that copies of letters from the Governor, State of Maryland, from the Chesapeake Bay Commission, from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and from the Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 618

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 ''Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure and a resource of worldwide significance;

(2) in recent years, the productivity and water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Bay have been diminished by pollution, excessive sedimentation, shoreline erosion, the impacts of population growth and development in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and other factors;

(3) the Federal Government (acting through the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency), the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Chairperson of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia have committed as Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories to a comprehensive and cooperative program to achieve improved water quality and improvements in the productivity of living resources of the Bay;

(4) the cooperative program described in paragraph (3) serves as a national and international model for the management of estuaries; and

(5) there is a need to expand Federal support for monitoring, management, and restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Bay in order to meet and further the original and subsequent goals and commitments of the Chesapeake Bay Program.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to expand and strengthen cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Chesapeake Bay; and

(2) to achieve the goals established in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

SEC. 3. CHESAPEAKE BAY.

Section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267) is amended to read as follows:

''CHESAPEAKE BAY

''SEC. 117. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CHESAPEAKE BAY AGREEMENT.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay Agreement' means the formal, voluntary agreements executed to achieve the goal of restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and the living resources of the ecosystem and signed by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

''(2) CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay Program' means the program directed by the Chesapeake Executive Council in accordance with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

''(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term 'Chesapeake Bay watershed' shall have the meaning determined by the Administrator.

''(4) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—The term 'Chesapeake Executive Council' means the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

''(5) SIGNATORY JURISDICTION.—The term 'signatory jurisdiction' means a jurisdiction of a signatory to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

''(b) CONTINUATION OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with the Chesapeake Executive Council (and as a member of the Council), the Administrator shall continue the Chesapeake Bay Program.

''(2) PROGRAM OFFICE.—The Administrator shall maintain in the Environmental Protection Agency a Chesapeake Bay Program Office. The Chesapeake Bay Program Office shall provide support to the Chesapeake Executive Council by—

''(A) implementing and coordinating science, research, modeling, support services, monitoring, data collection, and other activities that support the Chesapeake Bay Program;

''(B) developing and making available, through publications, technical assistance, and other appropriate means, information pertaining to the environmental quality and living resources of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(C) in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State, and local authorities, assisting the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement in developing and implementing specific action plans to carry out the responsibilities of the signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement;

''(D) coordinating the actions of the Environmental Protection Agency with the actions of the appropriate officials of other Federal agencies and State and local authorities in developing strategies to—

''(i) improve the water quality and living resources of the Chesapeake Bay; and

''(ii) obtain the support of the appropriate officials of the agencies and authorities in achieving the objectives of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement; and

''(E) implementing outreach programs for public information, education, and participation to foster stewardship of the resources of the Chesapeake Bay.

''(c) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator may enter into an interagency agreement with a Federal agency to carry out this section.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In consultation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Administrator may provide technical assistance, and assistance grants, to nonprofit private organizations and individuals, State and local governments, colleges, universities, and interstate agencies to carry out this section, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal share of an assistance grant provided under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the Administrator in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency guidance.

''(B) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—The Federal share of an assistance grant provided under paragraph (1) to carry out an implementing activity under subsection (g)(2) shall not exceed 75 percent of eligible project costs, as determined by the Administrator.

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—An assistance grant under paragraph (1) shall be provided on the condition that non-Federal sources provide the remainder of eligible project costs, as determined by the Administrator.

''(4) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Administrative costs (including salaries, overhead, and indirect costs for services provided and charged against projects supported by funds made available under this subsection) incurred by a person described in paragraph (1) in carrying out a project under this subsection during a fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the grant made to the person under this subsection for the fiscal year.

''(e) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a signatory jurisdiction has approved and committed to implement all or substantially all aspects of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, on the request of the chief executive of the jurisdiction, the Administrator shall make a grant to the jurisdiction for the purpose of implementing the management mechanisms established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(2) PROPOSALS.—A signatory jurisdiction described in paragraph (1) may apply for a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year by submitting to the Administrator a comprehensive proposal to implement management mechanisms established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. The proposal shall include—

''(A) a description of proposed management mechanisms that the jurisdiction commits to take within a specified time period, such as reducing or preventing pollution in the Chesapeake Bay and to meet applicable water quality standards; and

''(B) the estimated cost of the actions proposed to be taken during the fiscal year.

''(3) APPROVAL.—If the Administrator finds that the proposal is consistent with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement and the national goals established under section 101(a), the Administrator may approve the proposal for a fiscal year.

''(4) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of an implementation grant provided under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs of implementing the management mechanisms during the fiscal year.

''(5) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—An implementation grant under this subsection shall be made on the condition that non-Federal sources provide the remainder of the costs of implementing the management mechanisms during the fiscal year.

''(6) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Administrative costs (including salaries, overhead, and indirect costs for services provided and charged against projects supported by funds made available under this subsection) incurred by a signatory jurisdiction in carrying out a project under this subsection during a fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the grant made to the jurisdiction under this subsection for the fiscal year.

''(f) COMPLIANCE OF FEDERAL FACILITIES.—

''(1) SUBWATERSHED PLANNING AND RESTORATION.—A Federal agency that owns or operates a facility (as defined by the Administrator) within the Chesapeake Bay watershed shall participate in regional and subwatershed planning and restoration programs.

''(2) COMPLIANCE WITH AGREEMENT.—The head of each Federal agency that owns or occupies real property in the Chesapeake Bay watershed shall ensure that the property, and actions taken by the agency with respect to the property, comply with the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

''(g) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED, TRIBUTARY, AND RIVER BASIN PROGRAM.—

''(1) NUTRIENT AND WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall ensure that management plans are developed and implementation is begun by signatories to the Chesapeake Bay

Agreement for the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay to achieve and maintain—

''(A) the nutrient goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement for the quantity of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the main stem Chesapeake Bay;

''(B) the water quality requirements necessary to restore living resources in both the tributaries and the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(C) the Chesapeake Bay basinwide toxics reduction and prevention strategy goal of reducing or eliminating the input of chemical contaminants from all controllable sources to levels that result in no toxic or bioaccumulative impact on the living resources that inhabit the Bay or on human health; and

''(D) habitat restoration, protection, and enhancement goals established by Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories for wetlands, forest riparian zones, and other types of habitat associated with the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay.

''(2) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—The Administrator, in consultation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, may offer the technical assistance and assistance grants authorized under subsection (d) to local governments and nonprofit private organizations and individuals in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to implement—

''(A) cooperative tributary basin strategies that address the Chesapeake Bay's water quality and living resource needs; or

''(B) locally based protection and restoration programs or projects within a watershed that complement the tributary basin strategies.

''(h) STUDY OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—Not later than January 1, 1999, and each 3 years thereafter, the Administrator, in cooperation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall complete a study and submit a comprehensive report to Congress on the results of the study. The study and report shall, at a minimum—

''(1) assess the commitments and goals of the management strategies established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement and the extent to which the commitments and goals are being met;

''(2) assess the priority needs required by the management strategies and the extent to which the priority needs are being met;

''(3) assess the effects of air pollution deposition on water quality of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(4) assess the state of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and related actions of the Chesapeake Bay Program;

''(5) make recommendations for the improved management of the Chesapeake Bay Program; and

''(6) provide the report in a format transferable to and usable by other watershed restoration programs.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.''.

S. 619

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 ''Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS SITES.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites'' means the Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites identified under section 5(a)(2).

(2) CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network'' means the network of Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails created under section 5(a)(5).

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay Watershed'' shall have the meaning determined by the Secretary.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERTRAILS.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay Watertrails'' means the Chesapeake Bay Watertrails established under section 5(a)(4).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the National Park Service).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure and a resource of international significance;

(2) the region within the Chesapeake Bay watershed possesses outstanding natural, cultural, historical, and recreational resources that combine to form nationally distinctive and linked waterway and terrestrial landscapes;

(3) there is a need to study and interpret the connection between the unique cultural heritage of human settlements throughout the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and the waterways and other natural resources that led to the settlements and on which the settlements depend; and

(4) as a formal partner in the Chesapeake Bay Program, the Secretary has an important responsibility—

(A) to further assist regional, State, and local partners in efforts to increase public awareness of and access to the Chesapeake Bay;

(B) to help communities and private landowners conserve important regional resources; and

(C) to study, interpret, and link the regional resources with each other and with Chesapeake Bay Watershed conservation, restoration, and education efforts.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to identify opportunities for increased public access to and education about the Chesapeake Bay;

(2) to provide financial and technical assistance to communities for conserving important natural, cultural, historical, and recreational resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed; and

(3) to link appropriate national parks, waterways, monuments, parkways, wildlife refuges, other national historic sites, and regional or local heritage areas into a network of Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails.

SEC. 5. CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical and financial assistance, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector—

(1) to identify, conserve, restore, and interpret natural, recreational, historical, and cultural resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed;

(2) to identify and utilize the collective resources as Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites for enhancing public education of and access to the Chesapeake Bay;

(3) to link the Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites with trails, tour roads, scenic byways, and other connections as determined by the Secretary;

(4) to develop and establish Chesapeake Bay Watertrails comprising water routes and connections to Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and other land resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed; and

(5) to create a network of Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Components of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network may include—

(1) State or Federal parks or refuges;

(2) historic seaports;

(3) archaeological, cultural, historical, or recreational sites; or

(4) other public access and interpretive sites as selected by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS GRANTS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Chesapeake Bay Gateways Grants Assistance Program to aid State and local governments, local communities, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector in conserving, restoring, and interpreting important historic, cultural, recreational, and natural resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

(b) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall develop appropriate eligibility, prioritization, and review criteria for grants under this section.

(c) MATCHING FUNDS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A grant under this section—

(1) shall not exceed 50 percent of eligible project costs;

(2) shall be made on the condition that non-Federal sources, including in-kind contributions of services or materials, provide the remainder of eligible project costs; and

(3) shall be made on the condition that not more than 10 percent of all eligible project costs be used for administrative expenses.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $3,000,000 for each fiscal year.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
April 5, 1997.

Hon. PAUL S. SARBANES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAUL: Congratulations on the introduction of the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1997. Passage of this legislation will enable the State of Maryland to build on the progress that has been achieved in cleaning up the Bay by strengthening and expanding the federal Chesapeake Bay Program.

Your bill provides a much-needed increased focus on watershed planning and management. This effort skillfully complements the Tributary Strategy effort to reduce nutrient loadings into the Bay. The additional federal resources will also greatly increase the effectiveness of our joint effort to protect and restore the Bay.

The Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. Your longstanding determined commitment to its protection and restoration has been key to the improvements in the water quality and living resources of the Bay. I stand ready to help you secure passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

PARIS N. GLENDENING,
Governor.

CHESAPEAKE BAY COMMISSION,
Annapolis, MD, March 20, 1997.

Hon. PAUL S. SARBANES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: I am writing, in my capacity as Chairman of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, to commend you for taking the initiative to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program through the introduction of the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1997.

The Commission strongly supports the legislation. We commit to you our resources and expertise in working to secure its passage.

We believe that the cooperation of government at the federal, state and local level is, and will continue to be, essential to protecting and restoring the Bay. Your bill helps to establish the blueprint for that cooperation. It provides new opportunities on habitat restoration through the creation of low-cost restoration and enhancement demonstration projects. These projects are key to protecting the living resources of the Bay, the main goal of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

As a signatory to the 1987 Chesapeake Bay Agreement, the Commission is committed to the reduction of nutrient and toxic loads entering the Chesapeake Bay. To do this, we have developed a river-specific approach to the implementation of pollution control strategies. The tributary strategy provisions of the legislation will support this effort and ensure that these strategies are implemented, basinwide.

The Chesapeake Bay watershed will face increasing environmental threats in the years ahead. The population of the watershed is growing. Development of our natural resource lands is commonplace. The burdens placed on our pollution control infrastructure are constantly expanding. The Commission has long recognized that coordinated, locally-based programs can help to counter these pressures.

For this reason, we are particularly supportive of the small watershed grants component of your bill. We believe that it will enhance efforts made by non-governmental organizations, local governments and private individuals to implement water quality and habitat protection programs at the local level. The small watershed grants program is also directly complementary to the Local Government Participation Action Plan, developed by the Chesapeake Bay Program in 1996, to better involve local governments in Bay restoration activities.

In our watershed, there are many examples of small watershed projects that would benefit from a cost-share grant program. In Maryland, residents and local government officials in Worcester and Somerset Counties have committed to improve the local economy through well-planned conservation and the promotion of natural, historic and cultural resources. In Pennsylvania, the Lackawanna River Corridor Association has been working to improve water quality by addressing acid mine drainage, combined sewer overflows and urban stormwater flow problems by developing public-private partnerships that leverage resources and expertise. And in my own home state of Virginia, private organizations have joined forces with local, state and federal government officials in the Chesconessex Creek Watershed to establish a project to restore vital habitat and living resources on Virginia's Eastern Shore.

In closing, I want to thank you, and Charles Stek and Kevin Miller of your office, for consulting extensively with our staff, and with the many sectors of the Bay community during the drafting of your legislation. The final product reflects a strong cooperative relationship with the Chesapeake Bay Program and will allow us to build on the progress that we have already made.

I look forward to working with you. We hope that this legislation can be moved forward as quickly as possible, and we offer our assistance with the hope that it will be enacted before this Congress comes to a close. I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. TAYLOE MURPHY, Jr.,
Chairman.

CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION,
Annapolis, MD, April 9, 1997.

Hon. PAUL S. SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: I am writing to express the Chesapeake Bay Foundation's support for the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1997. Although I realize that no single piece of legislation can save the Chesapeake Bay, I believe this bill will help push the Bay Program towards an increased effort to carrying out the commitments made by the signatories.

I am particularly glad to see the section enhancing the oversight responsibilities of the Environmental Protection Agency. CBF has long felt that it is important for the Environmental Protection Agency to take a stronger leadership role in assuring that the participants are held accountable for their commitments.

I am also enthusiastic about the provisions providing for a small watershed grant program. Restoration of the Bay's essential habitat—its forests, wetlands, and grass beds—is a critical component of the effort to save the Bay, and this legislation should help move that effort forward.

In summary, this legislation provides a step forward for the Bay Program, and will help steer it in the right direction. I would like to thank you and your cosponsors for your efforts on behalf of this legislation and on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM C. BAKER,
President.

CHESAPEAKE BAY LOCAL
GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Easton, MD, April 7, 1997.

Hon. SENATOR PAUL SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the Maryland Delegation of the Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC), I would like to offer support for the Bill to amend section 117 of the Clean Water Act which specifies a financial commitment by the Federal Government to the Chesapeake Bay protection effort. Specifically, the Maryland Delegation is in strong support of the Small Watershed Grants Program component of the Bill. This Program holds much promise to augment the important efforts being made by local governments in restoring, protecting, and sustaining the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Additionally, the Bill directly supports policies of the Chesapeake Executive Council. The Executive Council recently adopted the Local Government Partnership Initiative and the Local Government Participation Action Plan. The aim of these policies is to broaden the efforts of local governments in restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The Action Plan includes a commitment to seek a small watershed grants program through reauthorization of the Clean Water Act.

Over 14.9 million people live within the jurisdiction of more than 1,650 local governments within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Each local government has the statutory authority to manage land use, manage infrastructure, including sewage treatment facilities and stormwater, and take a leadership role in fostering a land stewardship ethic in its community. Supporting local governments' collective efforts to restore, protect and sustain the health of Chesapeake Bay is a critical element of the Bay effort.

The Chesapeake Bay is a regional and national treasure that local governments throughout the watershed cherish and value. The LGAC commends the leadership role you have taken in furthering the efforts being made to protect and sustain the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Sincerely,

GARY G. ALLEN,
Vice Chair.

CHESAPEAKE BAY LOCAL
GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Easton, MD, April 7, 1997.

Hon. SENATOR PAUL SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the Pennsylvania Delegation of the Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC), I would like to offer support for the Bill to amend section 117 of the Clean Water Act which specifies a financial commitment by the Federal Government to the Chesapeake Bay protection effort. Specifically, the Pennsylvania Delegation is in strong support of the Small Watershed Grants Program component of the Bill. This Program holds much promise to augment the important efforts being made by local governments in restoring, protecting, and sustaining the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Additionally, the Bill directly supports policies of the Chesapeake Executive Council. The Executive Council recently adopted the Local Government Partnership Initiative and the Local Government Participation Action Plan. The aim of these policies is to broaden the efforts of local governments in restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The Action Plan includes a commitment to seek a small watershed grants program through reauthorization of the Clean Water Act.

Over 14.9 million people live within the jurisdiction of more than 1,650 local governments within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Each local government has the statutory authority to manage land use, manage infrastructure, including sewage treatment facilities and stormwater, and take a leadership role in fostering a land stewardship ethic in its community. Supporting local governments' collective efforts to restore, protect and sustain the health of Chesapeake Bay is a critical element of the Bay effort.

The Chesapeake Bay is a regional and nation treasure that local governments throughout the watershed cherish and value. The LGAC commends the leadership role you have taken in furthering the efforts being made to protect and sustain the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL PETTYJOHN,
Chair.

CHESAPEAKE BAY LOCAL
GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Easton, MD, April 7, 1997.

Hon. SENATOR PAUL SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the Washington, D.C. Delegation of the Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC), I would like to offer support for the Bill to amend section 117 of the Clean Water Act which specifies a financial commitment by the Federal Government to the Chesapeake Bay protection effort. Specifically, the District of Columbia Delegation is in strong support of the Small Watershed Grants Program component of the Bill. This Program holds much promise to augment the important efforts being made by local governments in restoring, protecting, and sustaining the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Additionally, the Bill directly supports policies of the Chesapeake Executive Council. The Executive Council recently adopted the Local Government Partnership Initiative and the Local Government Participation Action Plan. The aim of these policies is to

broaden the efforts of local governments in restoring and protecting the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The Action Plan includes a commitment to seek a small watershed grants program through reauthorization of the Clean Water Act.

Over 14.9 million people live within the jurisdiction of more than 1,650 local governments within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Each local government has the statutory authority to manage land use, manage infrastructure, including sewage treatment facilities and stormwater, and take a leadership role in fostering a land stewardship ethic in its community. Supporting local governments' collective efforts to restore, protect and sustain the health of Chesapeake Bay is a critical element of the Bay effort.

The Chesapeake Bay is a regional and national treasure that local governments throughout the watershed cherish and value. The LGAC commends the leadership role you have taken in furthering the efforts being made to protect and sustain the health of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM RUMSEY, Jr.,
Vice-Chair.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BOND, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KYL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MACK, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide greater equity in savings opportunities for families with children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE WOMEN'S INVESTMENT AND SAVINGS EQUITY ACT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce important and unique legislation known as the Women's Investment and Savings Equity Act, or the WISE bill.

As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Retirement Security, I have worked with other task force members to explore various ways that the Federal Government might better facilitate adequate savings for retirement. I am extremely pleased that Majority Leader LOTT convened this task force, and asked me to lead it, because the problem of ensuring adequate retirement savings has been one in which I have become increasingly engaged. I am extremely pleased to have had the assistance and cooperation of all of the other Senators in the task force.

We are currently in the process of drafting a comprehensive package of legislation designed to increase retirement saving through a diverse variety of means. However, one of these legislative initiatives, the WISE bill, has struck us as being so important that it warrants separate introduction and action. I am very proud of this legislation, and I am gratified to see the rapid growth in support for it.

One thing has become ever more clear in the course of our work: this Nation must increase retirement saving—at every level—in order to meet retirement needs in the 21st century.

The problem for women is particularly severe. They live longer than men, and they have less saving. As a result, they are almost twice as likely as men to spend their retirement years in poverty.

If you wan to see a demonstration of why it is important that we permit greater saving by women in their own name, all that you must do is to review the poverty rates for widows and divorcees. Overall, elderly women have a poverty rate of 15.7 percent. For men, the level is 8.9 percent. Divorcees suffer poverty rates of 29.1 percent, widows 21.5 percent. For too many women, it is the case that they enter their elderly years, after devoting much of their lives to raising a family, only to find themselves alone and without sufficient means of financial support. That is not right.

Current law has an unequal impact on women because they are more likely to interrupt their periods of paid employment in order to raise children. When they finally do return to the work force, and when they finally may have surplus money for saving, the law places tight limits on what they can contribute towards their own retirement.

We shouldn't force women to choose between attentive parenting and saving for retirement. Women shouldn't be more likely to enter poverty in retirement simply because they have taken time out from work to raise a child.

Our legislation would do three things:

First, it would strengthen the homemaker IRA law. We would permit homemakers—and other workers without a pension—to make deductible contributions to IRA, regardless of whether their spouse participates in a pension plan.

This is good for saving. It is also good for women; we shouldn't deprive homemakers of the opportunity to save on the basis of their spouse's participation in a pension plan. This is an idea that already has broad bipartisan support.

Second, we would permit catch-up contributions to 401(k) retirement plans—and other types of elective deferral plans—for parents who miss time from work for maternity or paternity leave.

Under current law, if an individual goes on unpaid leave from work for service in the National Guard or certain other military service, they may make ''catch-up'' contributions to their 401–(k) or similar retirement plans for the time that they missed.

We would make similar ''catch-up'' contributions available to cover the employee portion of contributions that would have been made by parents had they not gone on parental leave. This is good savings policy, and good family policy.

Third, and this is the most creative aspect of the legislation: We would create higher contribution limits—in ''catch-up years''—for parents who have returned to work after a long period of nonparticipation in a pension plan.

Consider a too-familiar story: A woman spends 15 years working at home, raising a family. Or—and let me stress that our provision applies in this case, too—maybe she works part-time, but she cannot contribute to a pension plan because she needs that money for day care. Either way, she spends a large amount of her life, unable to contribute to a pension plan.

If she returns to the workforce at age 45 or 50, and her children are ''out of the nest,'' perhaps only then does she have surplus money to put into retirement savings. But current law is inflexible; she can't ''catch-up'' for the lost years. She is limited by a short number of working years, and tight annual limits on what she can contribute.

Our legislation would simply do the following: For every year that you are unable to participate in a pension plan, and during which you are caring for a dependent child, you may take that number of ''catch-up'' years when you return to plan participation.

During that catch-up year, you can make your normal allowed contribution to a 401–(k) or similar plan, and you can make an additional contribution of equal size to ''catch-up'' for a missed year. You can do this for up to 18 years.

Working people have been telling us that they need some flexibility in being allowed to ''catch-up'' for missed opportunities to save. Not everyone has the money to save when they are 25. The problem is most severe for parents—for mothers. The least we can do is to make the law flexible enough to permit additional retirement contributions when they can afford it.

These issues are not abstractions. For too many women, this is how life works. Maybe they suddenly become widows, or they go through a divorce. And they have forever lost their opportunity to generate saving in their own name. We see the results in the comparatively large number of women in poverty.

This legislation would build additional flexibility into the law so that women—and all parents—are not penalized for making the choice to raise a child.

Current law assumes that you have the same opportunity to save in every year of your life. That is just not so. Families with children often find it very difficult to save money, and this legislation would give them a chance to catch up when they reach a point where they at last can save.

I believe this legislation is worthy of favorable consideration by the Senate. I also believe that prospects are good that we can pass at least a version of it. The chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, has contributed his valuable support, as has the chairman of the Labor Committee, Senator

JEFFORDS. With the support of the leadership, and the support of the appropriate committee chairmen, I believe there is a basis for optimism that such overdue reforms will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, Today, I am proud to join the Republican pension task force chaired by Senator GREGG to introduce the Women's Investment and Savings Equity Act of 1997, known as the Wise bill. I want to commend Senator GREGG for his leadership of the Republican pension task force and his hard work in putting this bill together.

Of the 63 million baby boomers in America, a full 32 million of them are saving less than one-third of what they will need for retirement. This concerns me. It concerns me even further that the overwhelming majority of these Americans, unprepared for retirement, are women. According to the Census Bureau, retired women are almost twice as likely as men to live in poverty. The poverty rate for elderly single women is about four times greater than the rate for those who are married.

I consider the Wise bill one of the beginning steps toward creating an environment where Americans can work for self-reliance and a secure future. It will go a long way toward establishing equity in the Tax Code for stay-at-home parents who want to save for their retirement years. And while it's called the women's investment and savings equity bill—because the majority of those who will benefit are women—it covers both mothers and fathers, whichever serves as homemaker.

The Wise bill of 1997 will allow homemakers and other workers without a pension plan to make a full $2,000 tax-deductible IRA contribution each year, regardless of their spouse's pension plan. In addition, parents who take maternity or paternity leave will be allowed to make catch-up payments to their retirement plans after they return to work. Even homemakers who return to employment after an extended absence, and working parents who cannot afford pension contributions while raising children, will be able to catch-up for the years they were raising children.

This bill is an important first step of a larger retirement savings and security expansion bill by the Republican pension task force. It will give families the tools for a secure retirement.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that members of tax- exempt organizations are notified of the portion of their dues used for political and lobbying activities, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 295

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 304

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 304, a bill to clarify Federal law with respect to assisted suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equity to exports of software.

S. 405

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 405, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit and to allow greater opportunity to elect the alternative incremental credit.

S. 415

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to amend the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve rural health services, and for other purposes.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 438

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] were added as cosponsors of S. 438, a bill to provide for implementation of prohibitions against payment of social security benefits to prisoners, and for other purposes.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 495, a bill to provide criminal and civil penalties for the unlawful acquisition, transfer, or use of any chemical weapon or biological weapon, and to reduce the threat of acts of terrorism or armed aggression involving the use of any such weapon against the United States, its citizens, or Armed Forces, or those of any allied country, and for other purposes.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] were added as cosponsors of S. 575, supra.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 6, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the display of the Ten Commandments by Judge Roy S. Moore, a judge on the circuit court of the State of Alabama.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—RELATIVE TO THE STATUE OF ROGER WILLIAMS

Mr. CHAFEE (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas Roger Williams was the primary architect of the lively experiment of church-state separation as the necessary corollary of religious liberty;

Whereas Roger Williams was an ardent advocate of the legal rights of Native Americans, maintained a close friendship with them and purchased land from them;