the Line Item Veto Act. For the next several years, this act gives the President authority, within carefully circumscribed limits, to cancel particular items of appropriation, direct spending, or limited tax benefits. The President must send Congress a special message reporting his cancellations within five days after he approves the bill containing the spending or tax provisions, and Congress may then consider, under expedited procedures, whether to pass a new law disapproving the President's cancellation.

Congress delegated this responsibility to the President as a means of furthering our goal of balancing the federal budget. Congress's enactment of the Line Item Veto Act followed vigorous debate in the Senate, in which some opponents raised doubts about the law's constitutionality. All Members recognized that these constitutional questions likely ultimately would be resolved only in the Supreme Court.

Last January, the day after the law took effect, in the case of *Byrd v. Raines,* six of our colleagues filed suit challenging the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act. On January 22, 1997, the Senate directed the Senate Legal Counsel to appear on behalf of the Senate as amicus curiae in *Byrd v. Raines* to defend the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act. In June the Supreme Court dismissed the case on the basis that the plaintiffs lacked legal standing to bring their suit. The Court did not address the constitutional question.

In August, the President began using the Line Item Veto Act's cancellation authority for the first time. As a result of the President's cancellations, three new actions have recently been filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia again challenging the constitutionality of the Act. The plaintiffs assert that the Act violates the lawmaking provisions of Article I of the Constitution by authorizing the President to nullify the effect of portions of recently enacted laws. These challenges call into question the full range of cancellation authority provided by Congress in the Act, as the three cases address direct spending, discretionary appropriations, and limited tax benefits, respectively.

Mr. President, as with the Senate's appearance amicus curiae in *Byrd v. Raines,* appearance in these cases as an amicus curiae would again enable the Senate to present to the courts its reasons for enacting the Lien Item Veto Act and the basis for the Senate's conviction that the law is consistent with the Constitution. Accordingly, this resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in these cases in the name of the Senate as amicus curiae to support the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act.

The Senate would not take a position on questions about the legal standing of any of these plaintiffs, as it did not in the prior litigation. However, as in the earlier litigation, the Senate Legal Counsel will be expected to describe to the courts, in the course of supporting the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act, the statutory limits embodied in the Act that constrain the President's use of this authority to the particular circumstances and conditions carefully prescribed by the Act.

Finally, this resolution also would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in the name of the Senate as amicus curiae to support the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act in any other cases challenging the constitutionality of the Act that may occur during the adjournment of the Senate, if authorized to do so by the Joint Leadership Group. This is the procedure the Senate has used in the past to protect its legal interests during adjournments.

S. RES. 153

Whereas, in the case of *Sherry Yvonne Moore* v. *Capitol Guide Board,* Case No. 1:97CV00823, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a subpoena has been issued for the production of documents of the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members, officers, and employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or document production relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate is authorized to produce documents relevant to the case of *Sherry Yvonne Moore* v. *Capitol Guide Board,* except where a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate in connection with the production of documents in this case.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the case of *Sherry Yvonne Moore* v. *Capitol Guide Board,* pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia under the Congressional Accountability Act, involves claims of employment discrimination by the plaintiff, former employee of the Sergeant at Arms who worked for the Capitol Guide Service.

The plaintiff in this case has issued a subpoena for documents to the Senate Sergeant at Arms. The enclosed resolution would authorize the Sergeant at Arms to produce such documents, except where a privilege or objection should be asserted. It wou8ld also authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Sergeant at Arms in connection with the production of such documents.

S. RES. 154

Whereas, in the case of *Magee, et al.* v. *Hatch, et al.,* No. 97–CV02203, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the plaintiffs have named Senator Orrin Hatch as a defendant;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1) (1994), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend its Members in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Hatch in the case of *Magee, et al.* v. *Hatch, et al.*

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, Magee, et al. v. *Hatch, et al.* is an action arising out of Congress's enactment of the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. The suit names Senator Orrin G. Hatch and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich as the sole defendants. This resolution authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator Hatch in this matter. If so authorized, the Senate Legal Counsel will seek dismissal of the complaint.

MAMMOGRAPHY QUALITY STANDARDS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Labor and Human Resources Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 537 and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 537) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the mammography quality standards program.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 537) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 537

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 ''Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 354(r)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(r)(2) (A) and (B)) are each amended by striking ''1997'' and inserting ''2002''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 354(r)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(r)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''subsection (q)'' and inserting ''subsection (p)''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF CURRENT VERSION OF APPEAL REGULATIONS.

Section 354(d)(2)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(d)(2)(B)) is

amended by striking ''and in effect on the date of enactment of this section''.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF FACILITIES' RESPONSIBILITY TO RETAIN MAMMOGRAM RECORDS.

Section 354(f)(1)(G) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(f)(1)(G)) is amended by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) a facility that performs any mammogram—

''(I) except as provided in subclause (II), maintain the mammogram in the permanent medical records of the patient for a period of not less than 5 years, or not less than 10 years if no additional mammograms of such patient are performed at the facility, or longer if mandated by State law; and

''(II) upon the request of or on behalf of the patient, forward the mammogram to a medical institution or a physician of the patient; and''.

SEC. 5. SCOPE OF INSPECTIONS.

Section 354(g)(1)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(g)(1)(A)) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''certified''; and

(2) by inserting ''the certification requirements under subsection (b) and'' after ''compliance with''.

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE INSPECTION RESPONSIBILITY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

Section 354 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(4), (g)(1), (g)(3), and (g)(4), by inserting ''or local'' after ''State'' each place it appears;

(2) in the heading of subsection (g)(3), by inserting ''OR LOCAL'' after ''STATE''; and

(3) in subsection (i)(1)(D)—

(A) by inserting ''or local'' after ''State'' the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting ''or local agency'' after ''State'' the second place it appears.

SEC. 7. PATIENT NOTIFICATION CONCERNING HEALTH RISKS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 354(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) PATIENT INFORMATION.—If the Secretary determines that the quality of mammography performed by a facility (whether or not certified pursuant to subsection (c)) was so inconsistent with the quality standards established pursuant to subsection (f) as to present a significant risk to individual or public health, the Secretary may require such facility to notify patients who received mammograms at such facility, and their referring physicians, of the deficiencies presenting such risk, the potential harm resulting, appropriate remedial measures, and such other relevant information as the Secretary may require.''.

(b) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—Section 354(h)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(h)(3)), as so redesignated, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) each failure to notify a patient of risk as required by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2), and''

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENT TO COMPLY WITH INFORMATION REQUESTS.

Section 354(i)(1)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(i)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''Secretary'', the first place it appears ''(or of an accreditation body approved pursuant to subsection (e))''; and

(2) by inserting after ''Secretary'', the second place it appears ''(or such accreditation body or certifying entity)''.

SEC. 9. ADJUSTMENT TO SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS.

Section 354(i)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(i)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''makes the finding'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''has reason to believe that the circumstance of the case will support one or more of the findings described in paragraph (1) and that—

''(i) the failure or violation was intentional, or

''(ii) the failure or violation presents a serious risk to human health.''.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 354(q)(4)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263b(q)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''accredited'' and inserting ''certified''.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS—S. 1216 AND S. 629

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that S. 1216, as reported by the Finance Committee, be referred to the Commerce Committee for the consideration of matters within its jurisdiction for a period not to exceed 10 calendar days. I further ask consent if the bill is not reported at that time, the bill be immediately discharged and placed on the calendar.

I further ask unanimous consent that S. 629 be discharged from the Commerce Committee and that the bill then be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

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

DAVID DYER FEDERAL COURTHOUSE

J. ROY ROWLAND COURTHOUSE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Environmental and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of the H.R. 1479 and H.R. 1484, and further, the Senate proceed to their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1479) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast Frist Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the ''David W. Dyer Federal Building and United States Courthouse.''

A bill (H.R. 1484) to redesignate the United States courthouse located at 100 Franklin Street in Dublin, Georgia, as the ''J. Roy Rowland United States Courthouse.''

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent the bills be read the third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bills (H.R. 1479 and H.R. 1484) were passed.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to consideration of S. 1507, introduced earlier today by Senator THURMOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1507) to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998 to make certain technical corrections.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that bill be deemed read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1507) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1507

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE CAPABILITY.—(1) Section 2302c(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''of section 2303(a) of this title'' after ''paragraphs (1), (5) and (6)''.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the amendment to section 2302c of title 10, United States Code, made by section 850(f)(3)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 to which the amendment made by paragraph (1) relates.

(b) COMMEMORATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN CONFLICT.—(1) Section 1083(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 is amended by striking out ''$100,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$1,000,000''.

(2) the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 to which such amendment relates.

AMENDING SECTION 3165 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. 1511, introduced earlier today by Senator THURMOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1511) to amend section 3165 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998 to clarify the authority in the section.