carrying on any commercial activities which could be provided by the private sector. Unfortunately, today we face exactly the same problems Congress faced in 1954. The Federal Government continues not only to compete with the private sector by providing its own goods and services but it also competes with the private sector to provide those goods and services for some other unit of Government or to other private sector entities. Of course, that unfair competition kills private-sector jobs, stifles the economy, erodes the tax base, and hurts small business.

One of the top issues the last several times the small business community has held their White House conference—in 1980, 1986, and 1994—was provision for an opportunity to fairly compete. To do that, of course, you have to have a process which takes into account all of the costs for the Federal Government and the private sector and consider other issues like past performance in order to have a fair comparison. It also means over time an agency, if it were going to do a lot of contracting, would change its structure. Instead of being designed to perform these functions and contract out, you would pare the agency down to where its real expertise would be in oversight and supervision of functions that were to be done.

The bill that we have introduced, which I would like to encourage my fellow Senators to consider, codifies the policy that the Government should rely on the private sector for its commercial needs. There are exceptions, of course—inherently governmental functions and exemptions for national security concerns. In addition, the Federal Government, if it can provide a better value to the taxpayer, should do it. But if the private sector can provide a better value to American taxpayers, it should have a chance to do it.

It also provides for OMB to examine these issues and establishes an office of commercial activities within OMB to implement the bill.

Mr. President, I hope that we do consider some of these kinds of changes. The climate is right for action. Congressman DUNCAN, with whom the Senator from Kansas and I both served in the House, has introduced a companion bill. The Senate is already on record in support of this bill. Last year, the Senate voted 59 to 39 in favor of an amendment to the Treasury, Postal appropriations bill that would have prevented unfair Government competition. Unfortunately, it was dropped from the omnibus appropriations bill. It should be a high priority. We ought to be doing some of these things that create fundamental change in the Federal Government. We are going to seek to balance the budget. We will see in the future the benefit of setting those kinds of priorities. If we could save $30 billion annually through this concept, that is a sizable amount of savings which could be transferred to something else or help balance the budget.

In summary, let me say again I think it is a shame we simply go on year after year talking about the same agenda over time, the same kind of Government operation, without taking a look at some of the ways it could be changed. The private sector operates differently, it has to evolve over time. If it does not change, it bows out; it goes out of business.

So there is a compelling reason to make the changes. The Government by its nature—and there is nothing wrong with the people; it is the nature of the beast—does not change unless there are changes forced upon it, and, frankly, programs are developed and they have an advocacy in the country and they just do not change. I think that is our responsibility. It is our responsibility to evaluate the effectiveness, to evaluate not only what is done or how many dollars are spent but results. We are in the process now of implementing a result-oriented law that was passed a couple of years ago, and by this spring each agency is to have a fundamental, systemic plan that measures results. My bill is consistent with that effort.

Mr. President, I urge my fellow Members of the Senate to consider some fundamental changes in the Federal Government which would allow for many of our small businesses to meet its commercial needs and provide a better value to American taxpayers than they are currently getting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT AND MARKET ACCESS ACT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 646, the Customs Enforcement and Market Access Act, introduced by the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. FORD. This measure would provide the American textile and apparel industry with clear oversight and enforcement of U.S. trade law, and the means to mobilize the industry's capability to compete in the increasingly competitive global market.

For years, the U.S. textile and apparel sectors have been struggling to overcome the burdens of trade agreements that appear to mercilessly alter the textile and apparel quotas and tariffs systems, without offering the synergies necessary to compete under the new rules. Unfortunately, these burdens are magnified by unfair competition caused by overseas producers who seek to exceed and bypass these same negotiated agreements.

In West Virginia, 2,900 textile and apparel jobs continue to survive, although the State has lost 3,000 of such jobs since 1990. Textile and apparel jobs are predominantly located in the State's more rural counties and are critical to the local economies. Additionally, these workers may not have the assets to relocate or the skills to easily transfer to another manufacturing sector.

I believe that even the strongest supporters of laissez-faire economic ideologies must recognize the wisdom of negotiating trade agreements that avoid vast costs to, and unfair burdens on, particular segments of our economy. I am not advocating some outmoded retreat to protectionism. The United States must advocate open market and, at the same time, promote an equitable and fair trade system in which the American people have faith, in which American industries have a chance to compete, and which will curtail the shipping of American jobs overseas.

In this regard, I believe that the Customs Enforcement and Market Access Act will provide the necessary impetus to remove the current obtrusive trade barriers from the textile and apparel industry, and invigorate the industry's ability to effectively compete in the global market. The bill's market-access provisions provide requirements for vigorous enforcement of trade agreements and for aggressive action against unfair trade practices by establishing a Special 301 authority. I have long been an ardent supporter of Section 301 and Super 301, and I believe that it is essential that the United States Trade Representative have the tools to quickly make unfair trade practice determinations and then diligently monitor and enforce corrective measures.

This measure also allows reasonable federal investment to help the textile and apparel industry modernize and more effectively compete against overseas competitors. I am aware that there are many who doubt that the U.S. textile and apparel industries can re-establish themselves to be competitive global forces and, thus, will oppose this modest investment. I, however, do not doubt the abilities and spirit of these workers, just as I never doubted the ability of this nation's steel workers, who, against enormous odds, have today reclaimed their position as world class producers, following many years of struggle and uncertainty. I ask my colleagues to carefully weigh such a small investment and its possible returns against the billions we expend annually on various corporate welfare schemes for multimillion dollar industries.

Crafting trade policies that balance domestic and international economic objectives is not easy. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the Customs Enforcement and Market Access Act, which I believe accurately assesses the challenges of the global market and adequately provides the

tools necessary to improve the competitive position of the U.S. textile and apparel industry.

In behalf of the textile and apparel workers in West Virginia, and the nation, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Customs Enforcement and Market Access Act. I thank Senator FORD for his leadership in introducing the bill.

FAMILY PEACE DAY

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the first-annual Family Peace Day in Chicago, IL.

The goal of Family Peace Day is to focus attention on domestic abuse issues, how to combat domestic violence and build healthy families, to address legal issues and to inform Illinois citizens of the resources available to combat domestic violence.

Family Peace Day is a joint project of the Women's Bar Association of Illinois and the Black Women Lawyers' Association of Greater Chicago, Inc. Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley, Justice Mary Ann G. McMorrow of the Illinois Supreme Court, Chief Judge Donald O'Connell of the Circuit Court of Cook County, and Cook County Board President John H. Stroger, Jr., are serving as honorary cochairs. Additional supporters include Attorney General James Ryan, Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Domestic Violence Network, Chicago Public Schools, Chief Judge Donald O'Connell's Domestic Violence Coordinating Council, Cook County State's Attorney Richard Devine, the Department of Children and Family Services, Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council, and many legal, judicial, health care, social service and nonprofit organizations, including the American Medical Association, the Archdiocese of Chicago, the Chicago Police Department, the Council for the Jewish Elderly, the John Marshall Law School, the Mujeres Latinas En Accion, and the Peace Museum. I commend these individuals and organizations for working together to help victims of domestic abuse and to teach individuals how to combat domestic violence and build healthy families.

The Family Peace Day activities will begin with a press conference kickoff rally and award presentation to Chicago public school student winners of poetry, prose, and poster contests depicting their vision of a healthy family. There will be an Expo consisting of booths providing the public free legal and medical advice and counseling or referrals from social service providers, health care providers, and attorneys practicing family law. At noon there will be a luncheon awards ceremony at the Palmer House Hilton, sponsored by the Circuit Court of Cook County, to honor those who have made significant contributions to the administration of justice in the areas of domestic violence and abuse.

There can be no more important goal than healthy, safe, and strong families. I am proud that Chicago is taking the lead in holding the first Family Peace Day and I look forward to communities around the country joining in with their own Family Peace Day activities.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to consideration of S. 672, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 672) making supplemental appropriations and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to the appropriations staff as listed on the request that I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Majority clerks: Becky Davies, Jim Morhard, Mary Beth Nethercutt, Alex Flint, Robin Cleveland, Bruce Evans, Craig Higgins, Christine Ciccone, Sid Ashworth, Wally Burnett, Tammy Perrin, and Jon Kamarck.

Also, Lisa Sutherland, Dona Pate, Susan Hogan, Jay Kimmitt, Carrie Apostolou, Martha Poindexter, Kevin Linsky, and Paddy Linc.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this bill covers several subcommittees. It is just easier to do it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my privilege to present to the Senate S. 672, which provides emergency supplemental appropriations for numerous natural disasters and defense overseas contingencies. This is my first opportunity to come before the Senate as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I am very proud that this first bill from our committee focuses on assisting our fellow citizens in need. I am humbled to be here with my good friend from West Virginia, the distinguished former majority leader, minority leader, chairman of our Appropriations Committee, and now the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I can think of no one I have studied under longer than Senator BYRD. It is a privilege to be here to present this bill with him today.

Our committee reported this bill on Wednesday, and the report has been available since last Thursday for Members. Many of our colleagues will comment later on the terrible events which precipitated this disaster relief bill. They represent the States involved, and I will leave it to them to comment on the specific situations in their own States.

Our committee worked to target spending in this bill to the agencies and accounts that are responding to these crises now. The $5.5 billion provided for emergency relief exceeds the President's request by $2.5 billion. Some of these funds will not be spent this fiscal year. We sought to use the best estimates we could, but in many cases it will be weeks or months until a final assessment of damages can be made in these disaster areas.

As has been widely reported, there are some controversial measures in this bill. I do thank all my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their cooperation during the markup last week. One clear conclusion we reached was that not all the funds in this bill will be directed to the most recent disasters. We have witnessed a steady increase in the Presidential disaster recommendations, which have radically increased disaster relief costs. In addition, the President has waived the matching requirement on many of the programs involved, adding to the Federal costs for these disasters. We cannot and will not try to solve this problem on this bill, but it is something I believe must be addressed by Congress. There ought to be a clear understanding and a clear yardstick for disasters, regardless of the area involved.

All new spending in this bill is offset by corresponding rescissions or budget authority or canceling spending authority. This is sort of complicated. For budget scoring purposes, the disaster-related spending will be treated as an emergency. Those outlays will not count against this year's budget limits.

Part of this difference relates to how CBO scores appropriations bills. The Congressional Budget Office has a unique approach. When we appropriated funds for military personnel in September, the Congressional Budget Office scored those outlays—the money would actually be spent under the authorizations that were previously given by Congress—they were scored at 98 percent. Yet, when we rescind those same funds in this bill, the Congressional Budget Office process credits the committee with only 25 percent of the outlays as savings to offset the money spent. It is the same dollar, but we only get a portion of the credit. The moneys have already been spent; that is the problem. The bias of the CBO process makes offsetting outlays a daunting task this late in the fiscal year.

Our committee did not recommend general cuts against agencies to offset these disaster funds, and I urged Members not to propose reductions against the operating accounts of agencies. The disaster relief funds proposed in the bill are not targeted or earmarked for any region of the country. Again, I ask our colleagues to follow the suggestions the Appropriations Committee