

the Senate turn to the D.C. appropriations bill, H.R. 2607, and Senator STEVENS be recognized to offer a substitute amendment and that there be 2 hours of debate to be equally divided in the following fashion: 30 minutes between Senators STEVENS and BYRD, 30 minutes between Senators FAIRCLOTH and BOXER, 30 minutes between Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS, 30 minutes between Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY.

I further ask that no other amendments or motions be in order, and following the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the amendment be agreed to and the bill be advanced to third reading and passage, and all occur without further action or debate.

I further ask that following the adoption, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, all without further action or debate.

I ask unanimous consent that in the event that H.R. 2607 is sent to the President without a conference, the Committee on Appropriations, with the concurrence of the chairman and ranking member, be permitted to file in the RECORD within 2 days of final passage and to print as an official document of the Senate a report on the final version of H.R. 2607 as enacted by the Congress.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of H.R. 2607, the Senate proceed to S. 1502 regarding D.C. scholarships, the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without further action or debate.

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

Mr. LOTT. I want to confirm, as most Senators certainly know, there will be no further rollcall votes tonight, and while the Senators have this 2 hours of time, we don't anticipate the full time will be used.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. I want to commend the distinguished chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. Oftentimes we work through these things, and credit isn't allocated as it should be. In this case, this would not have happened were it not for the extraordinary effort on both sides of the aisle, in particular by the chairman and the ranking member. But I thank all Senators for their cooperation and the extraordinary effort they have put forth to get us to this point.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for making those comments. He is certainly right. Senator STEVENS is very persistent, as is Senator BYRD, his worthy ally in this effort.

This has been a difficult agreement to put together, but it is the right thing to do at this hour. That way, we will have this package in the House and they will have a vehicle with these three bills on which they can act, and that will lead into, hopefully, final passage tomorrow. I do commend them for their very fine work.

I yield the floor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the House bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2607) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1621

(Purpose: Making omnibus consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 1621.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Carl Truscott of my staff be granted floor privileges.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after completion of the pending motion and amendment, and passage, the Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, be granted 10 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, as the 105th Congress draws to a close, we are finally, at last, about to complete action on the District of Columbia appropriations bill. The amendment before the Senate incorporates the conference report to the Commerce, Justice, State spending bill and the Foreign Operations spending bill, together with an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

I would like to speak very briefly to the provisions of the District of Columbia portion of this omnibus package. First of all, the ranking member of the

District of Columbia subcommittee, BARBARA BOXER, and I have ironed out all of our differences and we now have the bill that should have the support of the House and the administration.

At the moment, the District of Columbia is being funded on a temporary basis through a continuing resolution. It is critical that we pass this amendment as soon as possible because the Congress has yet to pass a District of Columbia rescue package and the management reform plan, which we enacted in August. Passage of this bill will ensure that that work goes forward to restructure the city's finances and impose some much-needed management reforms on the city and its various agencies.

The amendment being offered in the nature of a substitute to the District of Columbia appropriations bill will provide funding of \$8 million for management reforms, and these reforms are already under way. But without passage of this bill, the reform program will simply fall apart.

Mr. President, this amendment is very similar to the District of Columbia appropriations bill that has been pending before the Senate for several weeks. This amendment reflects the work of the Congress, city officials, and the financial control board to bring about a balanced District budget. This budget is balanced 1 year ahead of the schedule set by the Congress in 1995 when it created the financial control board to rescue the city from insolvency and incompetence.

To reach consensus on how to balance the budget, the control board and the elected city council first rejected several of the proposed budgets. This budget is a more conservative approach. This amendment actually cuts most city agencies, with a few exceptions, such as public safety. The focus of this bill is to balance the budget and reform the city's management problems.

It is a good bill and I urge its support by my colleagues. I want to especially thank the ranking member, Senator BARBARA BOXER, and KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON for their hard work on the Appropriations Committee. I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, for their help and guidance in the past several months. I also wish to take a moment to thank Mary Beth Nethercutt, Jim Hyland, Dave Landers, of my staff, Jay Kimmitt, and the rest of the minority staff for their help on this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the balance of my time.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members be granted full floor privileges during consideration of the District of Columbia and Omnibus Appropriations bills; James Morhard, Paddy Link, Kevin Linskey, Carl

Truscott, Dana Quam, Vas Alexopoulos, Luke Nachbar, Scott Gudes, Karen Swanson Wolf, Emelie East, and Jay Kimmit.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about the appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for Fiscal Year 1998. The provisions came about through bipartisan negotiations and provides \$31.8 billion, an increase of \$30.9 million above the House level, \$135.3 million above the Senate level, and \$297 million less than the President's request.

Before getting to the details, I want to thank Senator HOLLINGS, and his staff, Scott Gudes, Karen Swanson-Wolf, and Emelie East for all their hard work and dedication to getting this bill written and passed. Their efforts and expertise helped smooth the way for its success through the 99-0 vote in the Senate in July and its presentation to you today.

The committee amendment includes many of the provisions that the Senate gave top priority to in its bill, but the funding levels reflect our negotiations with the House. Within the Justice Department, the committee amendment retains the Senate initiatives to fight crimes against children, increases assistance to state and local law enforcement, strengthens counterterrorism activities, bolsters drug control efforts, and provides funding for new juvenile programs.

We have funded many programs that will further our efforts in preventing and combating crimes against children. The amendment provides \$10 million in additional funding for the FBI's efforts to stop child exploitation on the Internet. In addition, we're making sure those organizations that work closely with the FBI also receive adequate funding to provide much needed support. There is \$1.7 million for Missing Children; \$6.9 million for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, of which \$1.9 million is provided for Internet investigations; \$1.2 million for the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center for State and local law enforcement investigations; and an additional \$2.4 million for State and local law enforcement to form specialized units to investigate and prevent child exploitation on the Internet. These agencies have promising ideas of ways to improve current law enforcement procedures in this area to stop pedophiles from committing further atrocities.

We believe it is the national interest to improve the skills of law enforcement personnel on all levels and supports initiatives to do this. The Community Oriented Policing Services, known as the COPS program, is funded at \$1.4 billion. As part of this provision and with direct funding, we were able to preserve the Senate number of \$25 million for the Regional Information Sharing System so that law enforce-

ment officers throughout the country have increased access to national criminal databases.

The Committee amendment includes an increase in funding for the Violence Against Women Act grants to \$270.7 million. We recognize the need to enhance and expand current women's assistance programs as violent crimes against them continue. The Violence Against Women grants will be given to States to be used to develop and implement effective arrest and prosecution policies to prevent, identify, and respond to violent crimes against women. This funding provides domestically abused women and children with additional support services. Only 20 states received Violence Against Women grants in 1996. We believe there should be sufficient funding for more states to participate in these programs. Consequently, we have appropriated funds for this effort.

In this amendment, we remain committed to ensuring that the U.S. law enforcement and intelligence community has a comprehensive strategy to combat domestic and international terrorism. In May Congress received from the Attorney General a comprehensive counterterrorism strategy compiled with consultation with other key departments and agencies. During subsequent oversight hearings, it became apparent that vulnerabilities to our national security still exist, especially to the emerging threats from chemical and biological agents and cyber attacks on computer systems within the United States. The hearings also emphasized the need for our efforts to be constantly coordinated among the many participating departments and agencies to make this very critical mission successful. To do this, the conference agreement provides \$32.7 million for the Counterterrorism and Technology Crime Threat.

We remain concerned about the proliferation of illegal drugs coming across our borders and its impact on our children. In an effort to support law enforcement efforts to combat the rampant spread of illegal drugs, the committee devotes \$11 million through the DEA to combat the trade of methamphetamine and \$10 million for efforts to reduce heroin trafficking. The COPS Program includes \$34 million to stop methamphetamine production. We have created a new Caribbean initiative that will disrupt the drug corridors and block the flow of illegal drugs into the United States.

Over the last few years, the infrastructure needs of the organizations funded in this bill have been neglected. We have made a point of providing funds to repair buildings throughout our agencies. Over \$300 million will go to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and Bureau of Prisons to make much needed infrastructure improvements.

Regarding the INS, the agreement provides 1000 Border Patrol agents, over \$200 million in new initiatives to

restore the integrity of the naturalization process, and adds 1000 new beds for detention, and the ultimate deportation of criminal and illegal aliens.

As a last mention within the Justice portion of the bill, we have increased funding to \$238.6 million dollars for juvenile justice prevention programs with an additional \$250 million for a new juvenile accountability block grant.

In the area of the Commerce Department, we have made some difficult decisions, but, I think they are constructive ones. We have, for example, provided strong support for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which does high quality research and provides technical data important to our economy. The Sea Grant program, which conducts research of regional importance through colleges and universities, is strongly supported in this bill at a level of \$56 million.

The committee amendment provides increased funding for the National Weather Service. Many of us are concerned that the agency have the necessary resources to ensure timely warnings of severe weather, including tornados and hurricanes.

There is \$23.4 million for the U.S. Trade Representative taking into account the amended request made by the President recently.

The Bureau of Export Administration has two new requirements which deserve mention. First, the Department of State's encryption export control responsibilities have been transferred to the Export Administration. Second, with the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Export Administration will have primary responsibility for enforcing the convention and is thus provided with \$1.9 million to do this.

And I've kept the best for last—well, at least the issue that seems to have the most interest of late—The Census compromise achieved by the White House and the House leadership—it has two parts. First, it establishes a commission to oversee the Census and report regularly on the conduct of the Census. Second, it establishes fast track procedures for judicial review of sampling.

In the Judiciary portion of the bill, we have had to confront some difficult issues, but, I believe we are providing the American people with a better Judiciary through our efforts. The appropriation is sufficient to maintain current judicial operation levels and takes into account the increase in bankruptcy caseloads and probation population. We are also providing the Justices and judges with the 2.8 percent cost of living adjustment requested in the President's budget.

We have established a commission to study the current structure of the circuit courts, especially the controversial Ninth Circuit. During the 1996-1997 session, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned 96 percent of the decisions they reviewed from the Ninth Circuit. This

high turnover rate is a beacon that the Ninth Circuit is not meeting the needs of the people it serves. The debate over whether to split it has raged for some years. The commission should end the debate over the Ninth Circuit once and for all.

Moving on to the State Department, we have fully funded, to the best of our ability, the operations carried out by this Department. We made sure that the day-to-day functions of the State Department are funded at acceptable levels, and we are trying to upgrade their outdated technology systems. Maintaining infrastructure was a top priority for the Senate this year. We are providing \$21.4 million above the President's request for the Capital Investment Fund so that desperately needed upgrades in information and communication systems can be done.

And as a final noteworthy item, this bill covers the first down payment for U.N. arrears as well as the State Department Reauthorization bill which includes U.N. reform and State Department reorganization, which we have worked so hard to achieve.

That is a quick run down of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary provisions before us. I want to thank my staff—Jim Morhard, Kevin Linskey, Paddy Link, Carl Truscott, Dana Quam, Vas Alexopoulos, and Luke Nachbar—for all their hard work. They, and their democratic counterparts, have spent long hours drafting this legislation. I believe this amendment contains sound provisions that have been agreed to by both parties. The departments and agencies funded in this legislation can only benefit from the passage of these new funding levels. I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this committee amendment.

Just to quickly comment on that section of the bill, the language which is in this bill dealing with the funding for State, Commerce, Justice, is similar to the language which passed this Senate by a 99-0 vote. The language which is before the Senate at this time is language which has been agreed to by the Democratic and Republican members of the Appropriations Committee unanimously. Again, I strongly encourage the Senate to pass it.

At this time, I yield back the time allocated to myself and Senator HOLLINGS under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time is yielded back.

Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are awaiting another Member who wishes to ask some questions, so I will not yield my time yet.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I fully support the efforts of the chairman, and I congratulate him for the proposal that he has just described which, if adopted, makes it possible to greatly shorten the process of completion of the remaining appropriation bills.

The pending amendment contains the committee's recommendations for the

remaining three Fiscal Year 1998 appropriation bills, namely, the Commerce/Justice/State, District of Columbia, and Foreign Operations Appropriation Bills. As Members are aware, the Commerce/Justice/State and Foreign Operations Appropriation Bills were passed by the Senate in July of this year and have been in conference with the House. For those two bills, the committee's recommendations include, to a large extent, the agreements reached by the House and Senate conferees. There are, however, certain issues upon which the conferees were unable to reach agreement. For those particular issues, the committee has recommended proposals which we hope will be acceptable to the Senate and, if so, which the House can then accept. The chairman and ranking member of the Commerce/Justice/State Subcommittee, Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS, and the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY, will make statements regarding their portions of the pending amendment. These very capable chairmen and ranking members have worked tirelessly for months on their respective bills, and they are to be commended by the Senate for their efforts.

For the District of Columbia, as Senators are aware, the Senate has not yet passed the Fiscal Year 1998 appropriation bill. Here again, there are a number of issues which, up to this point, have been unresolved. I am certain that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator FAIRCLOTH, and the equally able ranking member, Senator BOXER, will explain in some detail the D.C. portion of the pending amendment and will be prepared to answer any inquiries which Senators may have.

Mr. President, hopefully we are nearing the conclusion of the Fiscal Year 1998 appropriations process. As I have stated, the pending substitute, if enacted, will complete action on the remaining three appropriation bills. Like last year, this has been a very difficult year for the Appropriation Committees. These difficulties, however, like in other recent years, are due largely to attempts to attach controversial legislative riders to appropriation bills. The delays in enacting the remaining appropriation bills are in no way attributable to the chairman or other members of the Appropriations Committee.

In his first year as chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS has carried out his responsibilities in an outstanding manner. At every step of the process, from the first meeting of the committee this year and throughout all of the hearings and markup sessions that he has chaired, he has shown not only great expertise and skill as it relates to all appropriation matters, but, just as importantly and, perhaps more so, my distinguished friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, has unerringly displayed great patience

and bipartisanship on every occasion throughout this, his first year as chairman of the committee. I know that he would have preferred, as I would, to have the thirteen appropriation bills separately adopted and signed into law. But at this late date, I support the chairman's decision and commend him for bringing this proposal to the Senate that, if agreed to, will enable us to complete action on the remaining bills expeditiously.

It may well be that the House will be unable to agree with every recommendation made in the pending substitute. If that is the case, the House may wish to ask for a conference with the Senate on the matter; or, the House could simply amend the Senate amendment and send the bill back to the Senate without the need for a conference. My point is, that even with the adoption of this proposal, we are not out of the woods. Further action may be required by the Senate. But, I am convinced that if we proceed in the regular manner and continued separate conferences on the Commerce/Justice/State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bills, and separately complete action in the Senate on the District of Columbia Appropriation Bills, and then conference with the House on it, we may be in for several more weeks of controversy on these outstanding issues on the remaining appropriation bills. Furthermore, there is no assurance that these separate conferences would ever be able to overcome the impasses which have developed and mired them down.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that if given the opportunity to vote on these three appropriation bills separately, I would have voted against passage of the conference report on the Fiscal Year 1998 Foreign Operations Appropriation Bill. At a time when we are under continuing severe budgetary constraints on discretionary spending for our nation's infrastructure—its highways and bridges, water and sewage treatment projects, education and other national priorities—I am opposed to providing appropriations for foreign countries at the same or increasing levels year after year. For example, in my view, the \$3 billion payment to Israel and \$2 billion payment to Egypt should be reduced under the circumstances facing the nation. Even though we are achieving reductions in the Federal budget deficit, we nevertheless still have a Federal debt exceeding \$5.43 trillion and the interest on that debt each year amounting to \$251 billion.

I strongly urge all members to support the chairman of the committee, as well as the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant subcommittees, in the proposal that is before the Senate, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that we will file a statement within 2 days following passage of the bill after the House has acted on the bill, or Congress as a

whole. That will be printed as a document, to be a report for this bill that combines these three appropriations bills.

The Senator from Michigan has 10 minutes. If he wants to use that now, Mr. President, I would be pleased to yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska.

I wish to speak in relationship to this legislation, and in favor in particular of title II of the District of Columbia portion of this legislation.

Title II incorporates an agreement reached recently between House and Senate negotiators to correct provisions in last year's immigration law. These provisions, as they were being interpreted by the Board of Immigration Appeals and others, would have had the effect of changing the rules in the middle of the game for thousands of Central Americans and others who came to the United States because their lives and families had been torn apart by war and oppression and are seeking permanent residency here. That violates the sense of fairness that is so much a part of the American character.

Mr. President, during the 1980s civil wars rocked Central America. These civil wars in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala were of great importance to the United States. They critically affected our national security policy, as well as our conception of America's role in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1979, the Sandinistas seized power from Anastasio Somoza. Upon gaining control of the state they carried out a program of land seizure, suppression of civil liberties, and other forms of oppression. They also aligned themselves with the communist government of the Soviet Union. A number of groups formed, seeking to overthrow the Sandinista regime, including some who had played an active role in the overthrow of Somoza on account of his civil liberties violations. These groups ultimately were supported by the U.S. government and became known as the Contras.

The Contras' cause ultimately met with success when, in a stunning upset, Violeta Chamorro defeated the Sandinistas in national elections. But the war, combined with a United States embargo on trade and a series of natural disasters, ruined the economy and added to the unrest that endangered many lives. Approximately 126,000 Nicaraguans fled their homeland, came to the United States, and applied for asylum between 1981 and 1991. That was a quarter of all our asylum applications during that time period.

During that same time, El Salvador experienced a brutal civil war which left tens of thousands dead. Over a quarter of the population were driven from their homes. The economy was

left in a shambles. Faced with these terrible circumstances, and with continual danger for themselves and their families, hundreds of thousands of Salvadoran made their way to the United States. They asked for asylum because they feared death at the hands of the leftist guerrillas partially backed by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, or at the hands of the military and the extremist death squads. Between 1981 and 1991 approximately 126,000 of these Salvadorans applied for asylum.

During the same era, Mr. President, the people of Guatemala faced similar tragic and extremely dangerous circumstances. Approximately 42,000 of them made their way here and applied for asylum in the United States.

A great many of the Central Americans who came here during this period received some form of encouragement or support from our government for that decision. This started in 1979, when President Carter's Attorney General used his discretionary authority to protect recent arrivals from Nicaragua by establishing an extended voluntary departure program for them. When that program expired, it was extended further through a variety of other congressional and administrative actions.

During the early to mid-1980s, Nicaraguans' claims for asylum had a high success rate, and very few were deported. That success rate began to decline toward the end of the decade. Recognizing the dangers presented by the civil war, however, the Reagan administration in 1987 established a special Nicaraguan Review Program. Based in part on a recent Supreme Court decision bearing on the standard of proof for asylum, the NRP encouraged Nicaraguans to reapply for asylum under the new standard, thereby providing an extra level of review to Nicaraguans whose applications had been denied.

When Violeta Chamorro won the election in 1990, conditions in Nicaragua began to change for the better and the Nicaraguan Review Program began to dissipate. In the meantime, however, many of the Nicaraguans had laid down strong roots here.

The Nicaraguan Review Program was officially ended in 1995. However, the INS established a special phase out program under which Nicaraguans could remain in the country an additional year and receive work authorization. The work authorizations were again renewed in 1996.

There were a number of reasons for this phase out program. But one of its purposes, as expressly stated in agency documents, was to allow the Nicaraguans who had laid down roots here to utilize the additional time to accrue the 7 years they would need to be eligible to adjust their status to legal residents under a procedure called "suspension of deportation." In one form or another, this relief has been in existence for 40 years. In recent times, and until April 1 of this year, it was available to anybody who had been here for

7 years, was of good moral character, and whose deportation would cause extreme hardship to the person or his or her citizen or permanent resident immediate family members.

The Salvadorans and Guatemalans likewise received special protection from U.S. government authorities. Their asylum claims received a less sympathetic hearing initially. As a result, the Salvadorans filed a class suit, known as the "ABC" class action, subsequently joined by the Guatemalans, in which they challenged the way in which their asylum applications were being handled. President Bush's Administration settled this suit by agreeing to readjudicate their claims, and in order to facilitate this Congress gave the class members a special "temporary protected status" in the 1990 Immigration Act. That temporary status was administratively extended in one way or another while the class members awaited their readjudications.

My point, Mr. President, is that during the 1980's people fearing persecution, fearing death squads, fearing disruptions of their communities, came to America and we took extraordinary measures to make it feasible for them to stay here, even if they had been denied asylum through the official asylum-seeking procedures.

At every step of the way, acts of Congress or acts of the executive branch gave these refugees a very clear signal, that they would be able to remain if they played by the rules then in existence. An informal understanding developed that in the absence of some other mechanism being devised, suspension of deportation would be the means through which they would become permanent residents of this country.

That understanding was undermined when last year's immigration bill changed the rules for suspension of deportation. There are good arguments, Mr. President, indeed, I believe, arguments that would ultimately prevail if tested in court, that those changes were not intended to operate retroactively. That, however, was not the view of some of the leading sponsors of these changes, nor was it the initial view of the INS or the Board of Immigration Appeals. As a result, these Central American refugees—as well as refugees from other countries in like circumstances—face the realistic prospect that a retroactive change in our laws might uproot them yet again.

I am happy to say that, under the negotiated arrangement with the House, this will not happen. The U.S. government will keep its word to Central Americans.

Under the version of the legislation incorporated into this bill, Nicaraguans who were in the United States prior to January 1, 1995 will be permitted to adjust to permanent residence—and get green cards—if they have maintained a continuous presence here. The same right will be extended to their Nicaraguan spouses and children.

In addition, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans who either applied for asylum before 1990 or were members of the ABC class action suit settled with the U.S. Government, as well as members of their families, will be entitled to receive a hearing on their claims for suspension or withholding and adjustment under rules similar to those in effect prior to the 1996 immigration law. Nothing in the amendment precludes the Government from adapting those rules further to the special circumstances of that class.

Similar relief will be available to those who fled communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union by December 31, 1990, and filed an asylum claim by December 31, 1991. They too will be able to seek suspension of deportation or withholding of removal under the rules similar to those in effect before passage of last year's law.

This relief also improves current law as applied to the members of these groups in two other respects. First, members of these groups will be eligible to have their cases adjudicated under the more generous rules whether or not they were in deportation proceedings as of the effective date of last year's immigration law. That makes good sense. There is no reason to apply the more generous rules to someone who filed an asylum application, lost on it, and was placed in deportation proceedings, while subjecting to the new rules someone who filed an asylum application at the same time and whose asylum claim has yet to be adjudicated.

Second, none of these refugees will be subject to the 4,000 cap last year's law placed on the number of adjustments that may be granted in any given fiscal year. Thus they will not have to wait in line for a number to become available before their application may finally be acted on. With Central Americans and Eastern Europeans being placed outside the cap, it is expected that the 4,000 ceiling will accommodate the ordinary flow of successful applicants. Should there be more favorable adjudications than 4,000 in any fiscal year, the legislation assumes the INS will continue with its present approach of only issuing conditional grants until a number becomes available. Thus no one who would be the beneficiary of a favorable adjudication would be forced to depart because of the cap's having been reached.

When the outlines of an agreement along these lines first emerged in the House, it included a proposal to eliminate an entire category of legal immigration, albeit a relatively small one, as the price for allowing these people to seek to stay under the rules they had been told would apply to them. Under the final version of the agreement embodied in this amendment, there will be no elimination of any legal immigration category. There will be a temporary reduction of no more than 5,000 visas per fiscal year in the

"other workers" employment-based immigration category, but only after those now in the backlog receive their visas. There will also be a temporary reduction of not more than 5,000 visas per fiscal year in the Diversity visa program. These temporary reductions will last until the cumulative total of these reductions equals the number of Salvadorans and Guatemalans who ultimately adjust to permanent residence. The numbers will be taken even-ly out of the two categories.

The legislative process of necessity involves compromise. The version of this legislation before us today contains some provisions that were not in Senator MACK's original proposal. I am quick to say I preferred the original for that reason. First, while I think that temporary reductions in legal immigration categories are far superior to elimination of any, as the House originally proposed, I am not persuaded that we should be doing either. Moreover, since we have current categories with unused visas, if we must turn anywhere to "borrow" visas for these refugees, an approach that I feel is at odds with our humanitarian traditions, I would prefer to borrow any unused visas from the previous fiscal year before making any reductions.

Second, while the legislation makes clear that no retroactive change is to be made in the standards for suspension of deportation as applied to Central American, Eastern European, and Soviet asylum applicants, it also makes clear that we are retroactively changing those standards for everybody else. I see no reason to do so. I have opposed the retroactive application of this provision to all individuals, regardless of their nationality. This is not because I take issue with the objective I believe the House is seeking: to make it harder for some people who have been abusing the rules by dragging out their deportation proceedings in order to accrue the 7 years they need for suspension of deportation. The problem is that the legislation does not and cannot distinguish between those who have been taking advantage of this loophole and others who have done nothing wrong and who have been stuck in administrative backlogs through no fault of their own.

Retroactivity is particularly unjustified with respect to refugees from countries not covered by this compromise who have equities similar to those of the Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans. In recent years, many people came to the United States under a legal or quasi-legal status, fleeing tyrannical regimes that were either enemies of the U.S. or allies whose domestic abuses were countenanced because of the country's strategic significance in the struggle for world freedom going on at the time. The retroactivity may force some of these people to leave despite the roots they have laid down and the fact that the conditions they are returning to remain dangerous.

Despite these reservations, I support this agreement. On the whole it will advance the cause of fairness and the promise that America will make good on its commitments better than if we were to do nothing. It will free a large number of people from the threat of immediate deportation. It will allow some of them to adjust to legal status and assure others of a fair hearing on their effort to do so. Accordingly, Mr. President, I urge adoption of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be here, even though it is 7 o'clock on Sunday night, to finally finish up the D.C. appropriations bill. When Senator FAIRCLOTH and I started working together on this, it was way back in the summertime, and in September our bill, this D.C. appropriations bill, was voted out of committee.

It was very easy to do that because the mayor, the city council, the control board, all agreed on the D.C. budget. We basically put it in this bill and we followed on the authorizing committees which had passed the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act. So what we did was to carry forward the will of this Congress and the will of the people of D.C. as repleted by their control board, their city council, and their mayor putting together a consensus balanced budget.

That all was fine until we came to the floor and, of course, suddenly this bill became a very attractive sort of Christmas tree, way before Christmas, and Senator FAIRCLOTH and I found ourselves looking at each other as the debate swirled around us on immigration, on school vouchers and other things that we really did not anticipate being a part of this bill.

The two of us had very much wanted to move it forward, and I was very candid at the time that there were a couple of provisions in this bill that I was not happy about because I did not think it showed enough respect for the women of D.C. in terms of their right to choose and to those who are seeking recognition of domestic partners, which I think is a local issue.

But I stated at that time that majority rules, and I was not going to hold up the bill because I did not agree with these things, and so we were ready to move forward.

I am very pleased tonight that we have a resolution on the immigration portion. It was a very legitimate issue that was raised by Senators KENNEDY, MACK, and GRAHAM, and I think Senator ABRAHAM was very eloquent on the point that there were in fact refugees who came from Nicaragua, Cuba, El Salvador, and Guatemala who were going to be thrown out of the country without any sort of hearing whatsoever. Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN has raised the issue of Haitians in a similar

situation. Although this bill is silent on that, I think we have found other ways to handle her concerns. So it appears to me that we are on our way to having a bill for the people of Washington, DC, and the children of Washington, DC, who desperately deserve to have this bill completed.

The issue of vouchers was handled, I thought, in quite a diplomatic way, which was to remove it from this bill and send it forward to the President as a separate vehicle. I think that really is a way to resolve the problem which right now is very contentious on both sides.

So, Mr. President, I do not have any further comments to make at this time. I stand ready with my colleague from North Carolina to vote on this tonight. I understand we will voice vote it. I understand there are some colleagues who have other things they wish to discuss. I know Senator WYDEN had a provision in the bill, which I strongly supported, dealing with the end of anonymous holds that we have had as a Senate prerogative around here. That appears to be an issue of contention that is no longer in the bill.

So at this time I retain the remainder of my time in case colleagues come over and need it, but at this time I yield the floor.

Mr. President, with the understanding that Senator STEVENS is going to enter into a colloquy with Senator WYDEN, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Oregon as he wishes. I know he has a matter he wishes to discuss, and Senator BYRD and I have time so he can use whatever time of that he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Chair. I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He has been exceptionally kind to me as a new Member of the Senate. I thank him for yielding to me this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that I be permitted to offer my amendment to prohibit secret Senate holds which was agreed to previously in the Senate D.C. appropriations bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, then in light of the time that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has kindly yielded to me, I should like to take a few minutes to describe why I think this issue is so important.

Mr. President and colleagues, I spoke yesterday afternoon in this body on the need to end Senate secrecy. Within an hour of my talk, three of the most senior Members of the Senate came to me and said they hoped this amendment would prevail.

These three Members probably have an aggregate total of 60 years seniority in this body, and each of them told me that they had been frustrated by instances of this hide-and-seek process that the Senate now has with secret Senate holds.

Certainly most of the American people are not aware of what a hold is. But the fact of the matter is, it is now possible for any Member of the U.S. Senate to unilaterally block the consideration of a bill or nomination from coming to this floor. It is an extraordinary power. It keeps the U.S. Senate from even discussing a nomination or a particular bill. It is one thing to object to something, or plan to vote against something. But in the case of the secret Senate hold, one Member of the U.S. Senate, one Member, can block the consideration of a nomination or bill. And during these last days of a session, this power is not just extraordinary, it is essentially a veto. It is a power that is unbeatable.

I would just say to my colleagues that, as a new Member of the U.S. Senate, every day I am impressed by the greatness of this institution. And I don't think that the greatness of this institution will in any way be diminished if this body is open and accountable. I think that is why senior Members of the U.S. Senate have come to Senator GRASSLEY and myself and said, "I hope you prevail on this."

We are not seeking to block the right of a Senator to impose a hold. Under what we have proposed, each Member of the U.S. Senate could still use the hold, block the consideration of a nomination or bill. All we are saying is that it cannot be done behind closed doors. This Senate secrecy doesn't smell right. It doesn't pass the smell test to the American people. What Senator GRASSLEY and I have proposed is that within 48 hours after a Member of the Senate informs the leadership that he or she is going to put a hold on a bill, that be so noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Recently there were more than 40 holds. Outside, much of the day, has been a group of people, outside the Chamber, simply trying to keep track of all the revolving holds, where a Senator imposes a hold for a short period of time and then, in effect, another Senator comes along and imposes a hold again. Outside the Chamber throughout this day there have been individuals trying to keep track of what is going on.

I would say to my colleagues, I subscribe to the not exactly radical notion that public business is done in public. The use of this hold in the last few days of a session is not just some small thing. It is an extraordinary power. It can affect millions of dollars. It can affect the course of the judiciary and other key executive branch appointments. I am very concerned that at a time when the public is so skeptical and so cynical about Government, that this use of the secret hold simply feeds

that cynicism. It contributes to the sense that the American people have that so much in Washington, DC, is not on the level.

So, I am very grateful to Chairman STEVENS for giving me this time to explain my point of view. Senator GRASSLEY and I have indicated that we will be back. We will be back at the beginning of next session. I have tried for almost 15 months to get this issue before the U.S. Senate. The fact is, it is most abused right at this time, which is why we saw last week more than 40 holds. It was the subject of a hilarious press conference with the Senate minority leader, who said then that he couldn't figure out where all the holds were coming from.

So Senator GRASSLEY and I are not going to prevail tonight. I think that is bad news for democracy. I think the secret hold cheapens the currency of democracy. But we will be back. We will be back until we make this institution more open and accountable.

Senator STEVENS has been kind to give me all this time to explain my views. I appreciate that courtesy very much and I thank him for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I regret that I have objected to the amendment. I tell my friend from Oregon that the practice that he seeks to change is embedded in our rules; not in any law. During the period of time that I served here, 8 years as whip, Republican assistant leader, 4 years in the minority and 4 years in the majority, we had a different way at that time of handling what is now known as a hold.

A hold is nothing more than an agreement of another Senator to object on behalf of a Senator at the request of the second Senator to prevent a unanimous consent agreement from coming into play. There is nothing in the rules about holds. It is a practice that has built up. To try to pass a law to deal with a practice of the Senate—I would call to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, there is a law that Congress cannot sit in Washington after July 31st. It has been the law for many years.

We will not change the practices of Senate by law. What we have to do is get some rule changes, or a standing order that would apply to Senators. But the issue is whether a Senator in each instance, in this case whether the leaders, may object on behalf of a Senator who says, "I want to object and I may not be there at the time the subject comes up, and I want you to object for me." That is known as a hold today.

When I first came to the Senate there was an official objectors' committee. It was unofficial in that sense, but on each side they had two or three Senators who agreed to be on the floor. At any time, one of them was here. And they objected to unanimous consent requests if they had been requested to do so by Members.

It later became a prerogative of the leadership to do that. I think I would have to rely on my friend from West Virginia to give the complete history of it. I do not have the memory that he has. But I can assure you that he will instruct us one of these days about the history of this practice.

But I do regret having to object. I understand what the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Iowa are trying to do. I wish them success, because I find holds to be very burdensome to deal with, whether it's from the leadership point of view or the point of view of a chairman of a committee.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the chairman yield briefly for just a moment?

Mr. STEVENS. Just for a few minutes, because I agreed to go to dinner with my wife tonight. If the Senator will be short, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the chairman. Far be it from me to interfere with that.

First, I thank the chairman for his courtesy and say I would very much like to work with him, to get this practice changed. I have, in fact, spent a considerable amount of time with Senator BYRD on this. He was very helpful as well.

I would finally say to the chairman that with respect to this matter of courtesy, I and Senator GRASSLEY have no concern about that. Of course the hold, if we are talking about a few days or a few hours as a courtesy, is not what is at issue. It is when a Senator digs in to try to block a bill that there ought to be some public disclosure.

But to me the chairman has been very helpful, not just on matters from our committee like Internet and the like, but generally. I want to tell him I am very interested in working with him on it because I think this is an opportunity to keep the greatness of this institution and still make it more open and democratic. I thank him for all the time.

CENTRAL AMERICAN REFUGEES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this appropriations bill contains immigration provisions to provide much-needed protection from deportation for Central American refugee families and an opportunity for permanent residence in the United States under our immigration laws.

This legislation is an important step, and I commend Senator MACK and Senator GRAHAM for their extraordinary work and leadership in helping these refugee families and for bringing this issue before the Senate.

I deeply regret, however, that these provisions don't go far enough. Last year, Congress changed the rules and broke the faith with thousands of refugee families from Central America and Haiti who fled civil war, death squads, and oppression. They found safe haven in America, and they have contributed significantly to the United States and to communities across the country.

They were allowed to remain in the United States under bipartisan immi-

gration rules established by President Reagan, affirmed by President Bush, and reaffirmed by President Clinton.

But last year, the Republican Congress withdrew the welcome mat. Now, these deserving families who have suffered so much are suddenly faced with deportation. They had been promised their day in court, but that day has been unfairly denied.

This legislation is a frank admission by the Senate that last year's immigration law treated these families unfairly, and that something must be done to correct this grave injustice.

But instead of correcting the injustice for all refugees, Republicans now propose to pick and choose among their favorite Latino groups, and deny any relief to Haitian refugees at all.

Republicans want a blanket amnesty for Nicaraguans and Cubans, but far less for Salvadorans and Guatemalans who also faced oppression and civil war.

They also provide protection from deportation for Eastern European refugees, but nothing for those who fled for their lives from Haiti.

The Republican proposal is unjust and shamefully discriminatory. These refugee groups faced similar circumstances and have a similar history. First the Reagan administration, then the Bush administration, and then the Clinton administration assured them that they could apply to remain permanently in the United States under our immigration laws. Under those laws at that time, if they have lived here for at least 7 years and are of good moral character, and if a return to Central America or Haiti will be an unusual hardship, they are allowed to remain.

Last year's immigration law eliminated this opportunity for these families by changing the standard for humanitarian relief. It said the families had to live here for 10 years, not just 7, to qualify to remain. It created a much higher standard for proving that their removal from the United States would pose a great hardship to the family. It limited the number of persons who could get relief from deportation to only 4,000 per year. All other families would be deported, even if they otherwise qualified for relief under this program.

Americans across the political spectrum have called on Congress to ensure that the rules are not changed unfairly for these families. President Clinton has urged Congress to give them the day in court they have been promised for the past decade.

They include people such as Zulema, who fled to Miami in 1986 to escape civil war. Her husband and four children are all legal permanent residents of the United States. They have their green cards. Two of the children are now serving in the U.S. Army and have been stationed in Bosnia. But Zulema still does not have her green card and faces deportation.

Her family escaped war and persecution. They rebuilt their lives in Amer-

ica. Her children have put their lives on the line in Bosnia in service of their adopted country. It is unfair to suddenly change the rules and deport their mother.

Roberto, age 6, was abandoned by his parents in El Salvador during that country's tragic civil war. He came to the United States and was raised here by his aunt, who is an American citizen. Today, he is 18 years old and a freshman at Middlebury College in Vermont. He is an honors student planning a career in medicine. His only memories of El Salvador are of the war. He does not even know if his parents are still alive. Roberto, too, faces deportation.

These are the kinds of persons we are talking about. They have played by the rules laid down by both Republican and Democratic administrations. They have obeyed the law. They have made worthwhile contributions to our communities. In fact, the assistant manager of Dade County in Florida estimates that Dade County would lose \$1 billion in revenue if these families are forced to leave.

But while offering assistance to Central American refugee families, the provisions of this amendment contain troublesome inequities that cannot be ignored.

The Republican bill provides for case-by-case consideration of the applications of refugees from El Salvador or Guatemala. Under current INS practices, less than half of those eligible to apply are expected to get their green cards. But refugees from Nicaragua and Cuba get a blanket amnesty.

Refugees from all four countries fled violent civil wars, death squads, rogue militias, and violations of their basic rights. Their families suffered persecution and death threats. Once here, they followed the rules laid out by our Government. But now, one group gets green cards—no questions asked—while the other is considered only on a case-by-case basis.

I am also concerned that this legislation does not also help refugees from Haiti. In the Bush administration—and again in the Clinton administration—Haitian refugees, like Central Americans, were granted temporary haven in America from the rampant persecution and violence in Haiti. Many Haitians risked their lives by opposing the forces of oppression in their country and standing up for democracy and freedom. Yet, this amendment does nothing for these deserving families. They deserve their day in court, too.

Congress should act on behalf of these Haitian families too, and I hope we will do so before the session ends.

Once again, I commend Senator MACK and Senator GRAHAM for their leadership on this important issue.

I regret, however, that the Republican leadership did not see fit to allow us to offer amendments to ensure equal treatment for all Central American and Haitian refugees.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, my thanks to the chairman and ranking member

for their hard work on the District of Columbia appropriations bill and for working with me on an amendment of vital importance to the children and families of the District. I am very pleased that they have agreed to accept my amendment which would allow the District to increase the number of monitors and inspectors responsible for upholding safety and quality standards in day-care centers and home-care operations across the city.

Mr. President, in early October we all had the occasion to read an extremely troubling article on the front page of the Washington Post. As part of a series on welfare reform implementation, the Post discussed the deplorable and unsafe conditions at many District day-care facilities. Many of the problems could be traced to the fact that the people and resources dedicated to overseeing child care centers in the District are woefully inadequate.

We learned that of the approximately 350 public day-care centers in the District of Columbia, more than half are operating without proper licenses. The primary inspection agency has been without a supervisor for almost a year and a half. There are only five inspectors charged with issuing and enforcing licenses to District child care centers, and only three people in charge of certifying which centers should be eligible for public funds. Those who are clearly suffering as a result are the children, far too many of whom are spending their days in an environment where they are unstimulated, uncared for, and even in mortal danger.

The availability and regulation of quality day-care centers and home-care operations in the District and across the country is a crucial component of successful welfare reform. Simply put, welfare reforms will not succeed unless moms and dads across the country have a safe place to leave their children while they are out earning paychecks.

Not only that, welfare reform has and will continue to increase greatly the demand for day-care slots. In the District alone, it is predicted that 4,000 additional slots will be needed to accommodate the schedules of working parents. That number mirrors the situation in the city of Milwaukee in my home State of Wisconsin. As more, new child care centers spring up to meet this new demand, tough, consistent licensing standards, applied and enforced by an adequate number of inspectors, are essential to avoiding more tragedies like we are witnessing in the District.

I am a supporter of welfare reform because I believe the family is strengthened by work. But that premise is destroyed—and the success of true reform, jeopardized—if we force parents to choose between work and the basic safety of their children. As a society, we have a responsibility to help American families become independent, unified, and strong by moving them off welfare and into the work-

place. As a people, we have a moral duty to ensure that children of those families are safe and nurtured while their parents work. We will have crippled more than just welfare reform if, because of inadequate attention to the quality of child care in this country, we force parents to turn their children over to dangerous, deplorable child care situations.

I am very pleased that the Senate has agreed to incorporate my amendment into the spending legislation for the District of Columbia. Obviously, this is a crisis situation which the additional staff will help address.

That said, much more needs to be done. This problem goes way beyond a question of mere staffing numbers. As such, in addition to this amendment, the chairman and I will be writing a letter to the Control Board to ensure that oversight and proper licensing and enforcement of safety and quality regulations by District agencies is an integral part of the comprehensive management reform plans scheduled to be unveiled in December.

Specifically, we will press the Control Board on procedures for day-care center and home day-care licensing, rates of inspection, the effectiveness of safety and quality standards at day-care centers and home day-cares, the effectiveness of public subsidy and case referral services in the District day-care system, the effectiveness of the current system of public oversight of day-care center and home day-care operations as conducted by the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs and the Department of Human Services, and appropriate staffing levels at these agencies.

Again, I am pleased that the Senate has agreed to my amendment. I consider it to be one of many steps we need to take on this very important issue. I look forward to working with the District on finding solutions to this and other pressing problems relating to the quality of life in our Nation's Capital.

Thank you.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FUNDING

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise for two brief colloquies with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I first want to bring to the distinguished chairman's attention some confusion regarding the committee's intent for approximately \$6 million of the Army Corps of Engineers' budget. This money was intended to fund a very important project in Washington State. Unfortunately, we have been informed by the local Corps of Engineers office that without more specific direction from Congress, the agency cannot spend these funds. The Senate accepted the House position on this project, which was to provide \$6 million for the Corps of Engineers to extend the south jetty at the Grays Harbor project to provide

a permanent solution to the ongoing erosion problem. Would the chairman agree that my description of where these funds will be spent is consistent with the Conference Committee's intention?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. The conference committee intends for the \$6 million to be allocated to extend the south jetty at the Grays Harbor project to provide a permanent solution to the ongoing erosion problem.

Mr. GORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My second colloquy pertains to an additional \$2 million from the Corps budget that should be allocated to dredge, monitor, and maintain the channel to determine the potential for cost effective maintenance near the Willapa River. Regrettably, the direction that our committee gave the Corps did not adequately distinguish between two phases of the Willapa Project. The first phase, which called for beach nourishment to protect the highway from wave erosion has been completed. The second phase, calling for channel dredging, monitoring and maintenance, has yet to be started. It was the original intention of the project proponents that the \$2 million allocated for this project be directed to its second phase. The local office of the Corps of Engineers has indicated that it can spend the funds appropriately, provided it be given the necessary direction by Congress. Mr. chairman, given this misunderstanding, do you have any objection to the Corps using these funds for this purpose?

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection to the Corps using the funds for that purpose. We have allocated significant funding for these projects and it is very important to ensure the funds are not wasted on needs which have already been addressed.

Mr. GORTON. Thank you very much for the clarification, Mr. chairman. I greatly appreciate the Chairman's efforts on these two projects which address important economic, environmental, and public safety needs in southwest Washington. I also want to commend the chairman of the Energy and Water subcommittee, Senator DOMENICI, whose efforts were crucial to securing the necessary funds.

Mrs. MURRAY. Would the Chairman yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Of course.

Mrs. MURRAY. I would like to thank the distinguished chairman for his hard work on this bill and for his clarification here today. These projects will accomplish a great deal for two communities in southwest Washington state and I appreciate his hard work, as well as that of the subcommittee chairman's.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section by section analysis of Title II of the D.C. appropriations portion of the omnibus appropriations bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.