



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1995

No. 13

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

In a moment of silence, let us remember Senator KENNEDY and the whole Kennedy family in the loss of the remarkable, resilient, Rose Kennedy.

Commit thy works unto the Lord, and thy thoughts shall be established.—Proverbs 16:3.

Eternal God, omnipotent (all powerful), omniscient (all-wise), and omniscient (everywhere at once), we come to Thee on behalf of the Senators and their legislative staffs. Decisions are often difficult to make, even when they involve only ourselves or our families; but decisions made here impact States, counties, cities, and millions of people.

Gracious, all-knowing Lord, grant to these decisionmakers, aware of their limitations and fallibility, wisdom from above as they struggle to fulfill the mandates which they believe were expressed by the people in the last election. Grant the Senators grace to commit their works unto Thee, that their thoughts may be established in the light of truth.

We pray in His name who is the Light of the World. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this morning the time for the two leaders is reserved.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there will be a period for the transaction of rou-

time morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each with the exception of the following Senators: Senators GRASSLEY and PRYOR for 15 minutes equally divided; Senator CONRAD for up to 30 minutes.

At 10:30, the Senate will resume the consideration of S. 1, the unfunded mandates bill. Under the previous consent agreement, there will be no roll-call votes prior to 4 p.m. today. Also, I wish to remind the Senators that under the agreement Senators who have amendments on the list that was agreed to have until 3 p.m. Tuesday to offer their amendments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR and Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 258 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] is recognized to speak for up to 30 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to issue a warning to those in Congress who are suggesting we eliminate or deeply slash the Federal farm programs.

These programs have given American consumers the lowest price and highest quality food in the world. These programs have helped make America's farmers preeminent among the world's food producers. They have helped agriculture produce a \$17 billion surplus in trade, one of the largest of any American industry. These programs are the foundation of a \$950 billion industry employing over 23 million Americans that delivers food and fiber to American families.

To those who would kill our farm programs, I say this amounts to unilateral disarmament in the battle for world agricultural markets. It is an unwise dismantling of our successful national food policy. Our agriculture programs are the foundation on which much of our ability to meet international competition is based. They are also the foundation for our national food policy, which has helped us become the most richly abundant nation in the world. No one would have suggested we do away with our missile defenses during the cold war. Yet some now suggest we do away with the farm programs that work for millions of Americans in the food industry and for all American consumers.

Let me just explain very clearly why U.S. farm policy is right for America. First, our agriculture policy is vital for preserving our international competitiveness. Second, agriculture is a fundamentally unique type of business. Third, Federal farm programs are crucial for American consumers.

Despite these compelling arguments, some people assume farm programs are an appropriate place to slash and even eliminate America's commitment to our most basic industry. Why do they assume this? Mr. President, I believe it is complacency. We have been so well

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1293

fed and blessed with food security for so long that we have forgotten why we created the system.

I am here to remind America that the farm programs are part of an extraordinarily successful strategy to bring ample, affordable food to consumers and help us compete in a tough international fight for markets. Yet there remains a gap between our Federal agricultural policy and an appreciation for the food on our tables.

Complacency has allowed critics to create myths about agriculture. Myth 1 is that farm programs are not necessary in the world economy. Myth 2 is that agriculture is like every other type of business. Myth 3 is that consumers will benefit from the elimination of farm programs.

I am here today to dispel those myths. I say to those who are pointing their finger at agriculture, they should think twice. They are suggesting a reversal of the policy that has made our Nation the world leader in agriculture. They are seeking to dismantle the policy that has provided American consumers with the highest quality, lowest priced food in the world. They are jeopardizing an American industry that is the envy of every other country in the world. They must explain why we should fix a system that is not broken.

Mr. President, myth 1 about agriculture is that we do not need farm programs to compete in the world market. What many critics do not understand is that today there is an intense worldwide battle for agriculture market dominance. Our primary competitor is Europe. They have a plan. They have a strategy to win the world agricultural trade battle. They provide high levels of support to their producers to encourage surplus production. They dump those surpluses on the world market, undercutting our producers and grabbing international market share. They are on the march. They are on the move. Make no mistake.

Meanwhile, we sleep. We are blissfully unaware that our markets are being stolen from us day by day. One day we may awaken to learn that Europe has done to us in agriculture what Japan has done to us in automobiles and electronics. The Europeans understand that there is a war being waged for markets, and they believe ultimately there will be a cease-fire. They believe there will be a cease-fire in place, and they want to occupy the high ground. The high ground is dominating world market share. And, oh, how well their strategy is working. In a few short years, Europe has transformed itself from the largest net importer of wheat to the No. 2 exporter.

This chart shows precisely what has happened from 1960 to 1992. The red line shows European exports of wheat. The blue line shows imports. As one can see, Europe that was once the largest importer has now moved to the No. 2 exporter in the world. They have a plan. They have a strategy.

Let me just tell you what we are up against. The Europeans support their producers at rates 2 to 20 times the level of support we give our farmers. For example, the Europeans spend \$119 per metric ton to support their wheat producers; 2½ times the U.S. level. This chart shows the difference. This is just government levels of support. Europe, \$119 per ton, the United States, \$46 per ton; over 2½ times our level of support. It does not stop with wheat.

The same is true for beef producers. Again, they support their producers at 2½ times the level we support our producers. Again, not surprisingly, Europe is No. 2 in beef exports.

This chart shows European support versus U.S. support for beef. This is in dollars per metric ton. Europe is \$2,274 per metric ton. The United States is \$378 per metric ton. Europe is supporting their producers at 2½ times the level that we are supporting our producers.

If that is not bad enough, Mr. President, let us look at oilseed. They give their oilseed producers 23 times the level of support we give our oilseed producers. While world oilseed demand and acreage have increased over 40 percent in the past 15 years, U.S. oilseed plantings have increased a minute 0.3 percent. European plantings have skyrocketed 330 percent.

Mr. President, this chart shows European support in oilseeds versus U.S. support—a dramatic difference. It is \$329 a metric ton in Europe, \$15 a ton in the United States. And we wonder why Europe is capturing market after market.

Mr. President, I hasten to point out that these examples demonstrate how much the European governments are supporting their producers. It does not count European consumer subsidies to their producers, which would make the levels of producer subsidy much higher.

Mr. President, this is not a level playing field. This means that American farmers must not only compete against French and German farmers. American farmers must compete against the French Government and the German Government. This means that Europeans take income from American farmers. This means that Europeans take jobs from Americans working in processing, transportation, and the input industry.

We can see how well this European strategy is working in trade negotiations, as well. While Europe supports their farmers at high levels, we consistently slash agriculture spending in this country. My colleagues should remember the early stages of the Uruguay round of GATT. The European GATT negotiators sat back, watched us cut our own programs and then toughened their negotiating position. We could have won more for our farmers and our agribusiness industry if we had not unilaterally cut our farm programs.

Instead of a level playing field, Europe held out for equal percentage re-

ductions from these unequal levels of support. That assures they will remain on top.

Mr. President, again, I emphasize to those who are listening, the Europeans have a plan and a strategy to dominate world agricultural markets. Their plan, their strategy is to continue high levels of support—much higher levels than ours—on the assumption that at some point in this world trade battle, there will be a cease-fire. They believe there will be a cease-fire in place. They want to occupy the high ground. So in area after area, we see the European strategy playing out. Oh, how well it is working. We let them take advantage of us. We cannot allow that to happen again.

The Europeans support their producers at high rates for simple yet compelling reasons. They've been hungry. They know what it is like to go through war and not have a stable food supply. They have made conscious decisions to avoid that ever happening again. They also know that every field of wheat and every field of sunflowers creates jobs and processing, transportation and input industries. I admire them for their foresight and commitment.

Against these odds, agriculture in America is still one of the few sectors of the economy that contributes positively to our balance of trade. While the rest of the economy is heading for a \$180 billion trade deficit, agriculture is producing a \$17 billion trade surplus. The farm programs are the foundation on which our farmers are able to compete against these overwhelming odds. Remember, if American farmers do not grow it here, American workers do not transport, process and market it here.

I repeat, we are in a worldwide battle for market dominance. The Europeans hope the United States will give up and give in. They hope we will roll over. They hope we will flinch.

Mr. President, I am here to deliver a message. We must not back down. We must not unilaterally disarm. We must not retreat. We must fight if we are to preserve jobs and economic activity in this country.

The current battle in this global market is crucial for millions of American jobs. That is precisely what is at stake—American jobs. The question is this: Will we stay in this fight? We cannot win the battle with our hands tied behind our backs. If we give in, we lose. This is not a question of subsidies. It is a question of whether we are going to stand behind our farmers in this global market battle. It is a question of whether we are going to stand for American jobs.

Today, we are at a crossroads. We are beginning debate on the 1995 farm bill, a bill that will set American agriculture and food policy into the 21st century. At the same time, debate on another round of GATT will begin in

the next few years. The choice is ours. We engage, or we retreat.

Mr. President, myth two about agriculture is that it is like every other type of business. That is simply not the case. Unlike any other sector, farmers produce a basic human need: food. To sustain that abundant food supply, we maintain a reserve of basic commodities to fulfill our food and feed needs in times of shortfall. The reserve is a national food security system, an insurance policy for consumers against shortfalls in crop production. Inherently, reserves depress prices and reduce farmers' incomes.

For many decades, the people of this Nation have believed that maintaining a stable reserve of critical commodities is in our national interests. For decades, we have believed that we should maintain producers' incomes at levels sufficient to sustain a stable supply. That is why we have farm programs.

Not only do farmers produce a basic human need and maintain large inventories, but farmers must also deal with a highly volatile factor—the weather.

In other parts of the world, droughts have killed hundreds of thousands of people. Thankfully, our Nation has always been spared famine. We have had a rational food policy. Americans need not think long to recall the last time weather had a disastrous impact on U.S. agricultural production—the last time we made a claim on our national food insurance policy. The 1993 flood reduced corn production by one-third. Luckily for the American consumer, we had stocks of grain on hand, a land reserve to increase plantings, and favorable weather in 1994 to replenish our supply.

How much would consumers have spent on higher food costs without a farm program? The answer is billions of dollars. On top of the billions of dollars consumers saved in 1993, food stocks in hand during the 1988–1989 drought saved consumers some \$40 billion in higher food costs. That is how a national food policy should work, and that is how our national policy does work.

Moreover, the research that agriculture supports has given consumers a second insurance policy. Insects and disease have always presented formidable and destructive problems to agriculture. For example, 1993 wheat production in some counties in North Dakota was cut 50 percent by disease. Farmers burned literally millions of acres of wheat destroyed by that disease. Researchers are now hard at work to prevent the spread and find a cure.

We can remember what happened in other times, in other countries that did not have such a vigorous effort, such as an insurance policy.

The potato famine of the mid-19th century in Ireland provides a dramatic example of the importance of disease research. One single fungus destroyed Ireland's potato crop, forcing many into starvation. Fortunately for U.S. consumers today, food production re-

search in the U.S. targets disease early, limits the spread, and prevents that type of human devastation.

Mr. President, myth three about farm programs is that their elimination will benefit consumers. The purveyors of myth three ignore clear evidence to the contrary.

First, American citizens enjoy a safe, high-quality, abundant, and stable food supply. Second, we spend less of our disposable income on food than any other consumers in the world.

I have brought this chart to show what we pay in this country versus what other consumers in other countries pay. I think it is very revealing. This shows the percentage of income that goes for food. In Italy, 26 percent of their country's income goes for food—26 percent. In Australia, 23 percent; in Japan, 19 percent; Germany, 19 percent; France, 16 percent; the United Kingdom, 12 percent; Canada, 11 percent; and in the United States, 8 percent of our income goes for food, the lowest cost food in the world. And there are those who suggest we eliminate the underlying programs that make this possible. Mr. President, that makes no sense.

We have been in a time when we spend less of our income for food than do the consumers of any nation, but at the same time we have achieved that result, we see food prices continuing to fall. According to the USDA, consumer spending has dropped from 10 percent of income in 1970 to 8 percent today. So not only have we achieved the lowest cost food in the world, but we have also kept food costs going down. In 1970, 10 percent of the average American's income went for food. In 1991, it was down to 8 percent.

And of that declining percentage, only 22 cents of each dollar goes to the American farmer. Further, the cost of marketing food has been the principal factor affecting consumer costs.

Let us just look for a moment at the price of bread. This chart shows what has happened with U.S. wheat prices versus what happened to bread prices. Wheat prices have been relatively stable. Bread prices have continued to rise. In other words, there is virtually no relation between the consumer cost and the price the farmer receives. Clearly, the increase is not going into the farmer's pocket. To further illustrate, from 1983 to 1993, 85 percent of the rise in consumer food costs went to the marketing bill, not to farmers.

Returning to our examples of the 1993 flood and the 1988–89 droughts, while production dropped sharply, consumer prices remained stable. Again, this is how the farm programs are supposed to work and it is how they do work—protecting consumers against the dramatic fluctuations in supply that can occur because of weather-related and disease-related disasters.

What would happen if farm programs were eliminated? Very likely, reserves of grains would be reduced, prices would fluctuate, and consumers' cost of

food would increase. Does that sound like something that is good for the American consumer? Absolutely not.

Mr. President, we are now engaged in a debate about how to reduce the budget deficit. I support a balanced budget. I have not only voted for deficit reduction measures, I have offered my own plans, as a member of the Senate Budget Committee, every year I have been in the U.S. Senate.

But let us look at what you get if you eliminate agriculture spending. You do not get much. Agriculture represents less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

This chart shows Federal outlays from 1996 to 2002, the period about which we are talking about balancing the Federal budget. Here is interest on the debt, nearly \$2 trillion over that period; defense, over \$2 trillion; Social Security is nearly \$3 trillion; domestic discretionary spending, just over \$2 trillion; Medicare, almost \$2 trillion. Where is agriculture? Where is agriculture, Mr. President? It is this little, tiny slice right here. You almost cannot see it.

That is because, of the \$13 trillion that we are projected to spend over the next 7 years, \$87 billion is for agriculture—\$87 billion out of \$13 trillion, far less than 1 percent of Federal spending.

Mr. President, I repeatedly encounter press reports of someone suggesting we cut agriculture and that cutting agriculture will somehow solve our deficit problems. It simply will not.

Not only is it a small pot of money, it is a dwindling pot. Agriculture spending has suffered dramatic cuts in recent years. In constant dollars, farm spending dropped a full two-thirds since 1986. Still, some continue to point their finger at agriculture as the cause of our deficits. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. President, this chart shows in constant dollars agriculture program spending: In 1986, expressed in 1994 dollars, \$35 billion; in 1994, down to less than \$12 billion, a dramatic reduction. In fact, if other parts of the budget had suffered the same reductions that agriculture has experienced, there would be no deficit problem. We would be in surplus.

Mr. President, many critics of farm programs suggest that because some forms of agriculture production in the United States survive without Government programs, all commodities should be able to operate in that manner. Most often mentioned are livestock and fruits and vegetables.

Let us just take livestock off the table right away. Anyone who suggests the livestock industry operates without the benefit of feed prices stabilized by our farm program is sorely misinformed.

Fruits and vegetables are another case. Fruits and vegetables are perishable. While a reserve would be highly impractical, the prices of many such commodities are stabilized through

marketing orders administered by USDA. So, in fact, we do have price stabilization programs for the vast majority of agricultural commodities. That is why consumers enjoy stable supplies, high quality, and modest food prices.

Mr. President, I believe I have demonstrated how important farm programs are to consumers. Now let us take a hard look at how the elimination of farm programs would affect producers.

Who are these producers? They are good citizens. They are hardworking people. They get up early. They work late. They support their communities. They pay taxes. And, Mr. President, far from the media-generated image of wealthy folks, the average net farm income in North Dakota is \$20,000 a year. I know that is hard to believe when one sees portrayed over the media these images of wealthy farmers who are farming the mailbox.

Mr. President, that is not the way it is. I come from North Dakota. I go across the State of North Dakota, through cities and towns, visiting farmsteads. I get a chance to see what the condition is in rural America.

The hard reality is that the average farmer in my State is earning \$20,000 a year. They have strong families. Farming is a family business. They raise good children; children that grow up with a strong work ethic, a good education, and good values.

But those children rarely come back to farm because they do not see a future in it. They do not see a good opportunity. They do not see a secure and profitable profession. They see a struggle. They see a struggle to raise a good crop, a struggle to withstand low prices, a struggle to persevere through hail, drought, or flood.

They watch their parents struggle and they ask why.

Mr. President, I think we find farm families staying on the land not because it makes sense financially, because the rate of return for agriculture is as low as any industry one can find. I believe they stay with it because it is a way of life.

What will the cuts that some people are suggesting do to this way of life? In North Dakota, the effect would be dramatic. According to USDA statistics, in 1993, farm program payments represented 82 percent of net farm income—82 percent of net farm income represented by Federal farm program payments. Nationally, startling statistics from the U.S. Department of Agriculture provide a clear picture of what is happening on the farm. Let me quote:

*** recently, entry has fallen fastest for farms operated by those under 35.

They go on to say:

*** the most noticeable change in the 1992 census (of Agriculture) was among 35-to-44 year-old farmers. Farm exits for this age group increased ***

What does this tell us? It tells us that farming is not an economically at-

tractive business. It is high risk, not high income.

Again, according to USDA:

Approximately 90 percent of all farm operator households received some income from off-farm sources.

If farming were such a profitable business, far fewer households would have to search for alternative sources of income to meet their needs.

Finally, the difference between the Consumer Price Index and the prices received for farm commodities clearly portrays the pressure that farmers face.

Mr. President, this chart shows the farmers' financial squeeze. The Consumer Price Index rises much faster than farm prices. This chart shows from 1982 to 1993 the relationship between the Consumer Price Index, the prices that farmers pay for things, and farm prices, the prices that farmers get. This chart tells us a very clear story:

From 1982 to 1993, the red line shows farm prices. It has been relatively stable. The blue line shows what has happened to the Consumer Price Index. It has risen each and every year on a steady course. So the gap between what farmers pay and the prices they receive has steadily grown.

Farmers are being squeezed by low farm prices and rising costs. Further, agricultural program cuts will damage rural America in profound and irreversible ways. At a time when we need sustained economic growth in both rural and urban areas, the needs of rural America cannot be ignored. It would be flawed economic policy.

In conclusion, let me restate why we need to maintain our agriculture policy. First, agriculture programs are the foundation for our international competitiveness. Without them, we unilaterally disarm in the world trade battle. That would harm American farmers, eliminate American jobs and threaten America's economic security.

Second, agriculture programs are insurance policies for consumers. Without farm programs, consumers lose security over a basic human need: Food.

Finally, agriculture is a fundamentally different form of business. To work properly, it must maintain a reserve, but that reserve depresses prices for farmers and benefits consumers. Because of agriculture's differences, farm programs are essential.

We as a nation have maintained an agriculture policy for decades to protect producers and consumers. This is not blind generosity. This is not aimless policymaking. This is not luck. Those who seek to destroy the farm program must demonstrate why their way is right for America. The burden of proof is on them. I think the facts prove they are dead wrong.

Our agriculture policy works. We have proof that it works. We must not destroy a program that is proven to deliver an abundance of low-cost, high-quality food. We must not destroy a program that has made America the

world leader in agriculture. We must not destroy a program that has worked. We must not unilaterally disarm.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, is leader's time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been reserved.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WHITE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the official State motto of Texas is just one word. And that word is "Friendship."

That word was also the motto of John White, one of the great sons of Texas, who passed away on Friday.

John was a Democrat through and through. But John knew that partisanship is not as important as friendship. He knew that partisanship is not as important as decency. And he knew that partisanship is not as important as patriotism.

Friendship. Decency. Patriotism. These were the hallmarks of John White's career in public service. It was a career that saw him serve for over a quarter of a century as Texas Agriculture Commissioner, as Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and as Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

But John's influence extended far beyond the jobs he held. Former Congressman Jake Pickle said,

John was a small-town man who grew into national prominence because he had a lot of just plain common sense.

Almost from the day he arrived in Washington, Presidents, Senators, Congressmen, and countless others called upon John for counsel and for common sense.

And no matter how busy he was, John always answered the call.

Mr. President, I know that all Members of the Senate who had the privilege to know John, join with me in extending our sympathies to his wife, Nellie, and to his entire family.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE KENNEDY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, along with all Members of the Senate—and all Americans—I join today in mourning the passing of a true American treasure, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Services for Mrs. Kennedy will be held tomorrow in Boston, and our thoughts and prayers are with Senator KENNEDY and his entire family.

Rose Kennedy's remarkable life was full of hills and valleys. And through moments of triumph and tragedy, Rose Kennedy exhibited a seemingly endless supply of grace, grit, and courage.

There were two enduring principles at the center of Rose Kennedy's life. The first was love of family—and what a remarkable family it is. Over the past half-century, the Kennedy name has become synonymous with public service.

Indeed, during Rose Kennedy's life, she would see three of her sons serve in the U.S. Senate—one of whom, of course, became President of the United States.

One daughter currently serves as Ambassador to Ireland; another is regarded as one of the great humanitarians of our time.

Two grandsons currently serve in the U.S. Congress; and just last week a granddaughter was sworn-in as Lieutenant Governor of Maryland, and a grandson became a member of the Maryland House of Delegates.

The other principle at the center of Rose Kennedy's life was love of God. And it was that love that enabled her to survive through the deaths of four of her children.

Many words will be written and spoken in the coming days about Rose Kennedy, but none will be more eloquent than those of our colleague, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, who said, "She was the most beautiful rose of all."

ROSE KENNEDY

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I want to join my voice with so many other voices in expressing sorrow at the loss of Rose Kennedy, a woman who epitomized, I think, strength and class and grace; and say to Senator KENNEDY and all the members of the Kennedy family that our thoughts and our prayers are with them as we celebrate the life of that remarkable woman.

THE PASSING OF GREATNESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as one of millions upon millions of Americans mourning today the passing of a great woman, I want to extend to our colleague Senator EDWARD KENNEDY from Massachusetts, and to his extended family, my wife Erma's and my condolences on the death yesterday of his mother, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy—Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, as we knew her best.

Some Americans have expressed a regret that our representative democracy precludes the granting of titles of noble recognition as is common among our British cousins.

To be certain, if titles were granted in America to those most worthy, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy would long, long ago have been known affectionately as "Lady Kennedy."

Indeed, given her innate intelligence, political acumen, and enviable sense of self, had Rose Kennedy been born per-

haps 50 years later than she was, she might well have been the first United States Senator in her family.

Instead, being born 104 years ago, from her childhood and youth, Rose Kennedy imbibed the air of the politics of Boston, of Massachusetts, and of America, and learned to play magnificently the role of wife to her husband and mother to her sons and daughters as she brought her incomparable strengths and graces to bear on their successes.

Rose Kennedy's life spanned more than half the history of the Republic of the United States. For much of that history, Rose Kennedy was a frontline participant in the great events of our era, and in more than a peripheral fashion.

Where else in American history can be recorded that one woman was the wife of an Ambassador to the Court of St. James, the mother of an American President, the mother of three United States Senators, mother of the Attorney General of the United States.

And, perhaps, above all else, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy will live on in the hearts and memories of untold millions of Americans who witnessed her fortitude and faith in the face of pitiless tragedy in the loss of three of her sons in the service of our country—her son Joe, Jr., in World War II, and her sons John and Robert to the mindless hatred of the previously nameless assassins on whom infamy will forever rest through the sins against our country and history itself that they committed in murdering these two outstanding men.

Mr. President, I hope that the members of the Kennedy family will experience some degree of comfort in the condolences that we offer them today, and, more importantly, that the Kennedy family will find increased strength in consolation in recalling the strength and character that Rose Kennedy embodied and in realizing the affection and reverence in which she was held by the American people and by people around the world.

Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy, Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy;

Which come, in the night-time of sorrow and care,

And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!

Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled,—

You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,

But the scent of the roses will hang round it still.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I would like to compliment the Senator from West Virginia for a beautiful tribute to a remarkable woman. I know that will be of great, soothing comfort to the family.

I think on behalf of many people, I say how much we appreciate the tribute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. It is hard to believe that Rose Kennedy in her 104 years comes close to encompassing almost half the time period that this country has been in existence—a little short of that, but not very much.

It has been my pleasure to know her from some years ago. I have not seen her in recent years, but we were visitors with the Kennedy family on a number of occasions years ago when she was there. We got to know her as a very gracious lady.

I think Senator BYRD has very properly given the accolades that he has, that she has so well deserved. And I associate myself with his remarks at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

ROSE FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to extend my wife's and my deepest sympathy to our colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on the death of his mother, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy. I extend condolences also to two of her grandsons, my Rhode Island colleague Representatives PATRICK KENNEDY and Representative JOSEPH KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

No other woman in American history can match the distinction of Rose Kennedy in nurturing progeny for distinguished service to the Nation. Three sons who became U.S. Senators, one of them a President, and now in the next generation two grandsons in the House of Representatives, a granddaughter who is a Lieutenant Governor, and another grandson in a State legislature.

History will look back in wonder and admiration at such a family and especially at the woman who instilled it with so much vitality and high sense of purpose.

Rose Kennedy was privileged to savor the highest of life's triumphs but she also had to bear the burdens of tragedy of almost unbearable weight. Where lesser mortals would have been crushed by such adversity, Rose Kennedy remarkably kept on course, guided, as it were by some strong inner compass.

We know now that the compass was steadied by her own great faith and religious commitment, and that these were the sure cornerstones on which she built her extraordinary family.

Rose Kennedy left a legacy like no other to the Nation, and the Nation will always be grateful.

Mr. President, there is only one other woman in history that comes anywhere near Rose Kennedy, in my memory or in my view. That is the mother of Napoleon, Madam Le Mere. She ruled the known world at the time, most of Europe and the countries there. And she, herself, gave her imprimatur to all kings and queens and rulers around Europe.

I send all my sympathy to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCERN OVER MEXICAN DEBT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to rise to say a few words about the Mexican debt situation and about our relationship with Mexico. I have been very troubled that our leadership has agreed to support this loan guarantee package with Mexico without further analysis.

There are two things that give me great trouble, and as a member of the Finance Committee I will be asking some very hard questions. First of all, why can we not get this package collateralized? Why can it not be attached either to the Mexican oil resources or to some other collateral, because I am afraid the American people may not get their money back.

Many who are advocating this are going around saying it will not cost us anything. But I have been in this body since 1978, and the House since 1975, and I have heard this again and again, and the U.S. taxpayers frequently end up paying the bill.

The second thing that troubles me a great deal is the Chile example. Economists tell me that the example of what happened in Chile in the early 1980's is almost perfectly analogous to what is happening in Mexico. For example, in Chile in the early 1980's they had a similar economic crisis where their money had been devalued and Chile was unable to get any assistance from the United States at that time because General Pinochet, the dictator, was not approved by the United States and the United States had cut off all aid and even economic relations with Chile so Chile had nowhere to turn.

Under General Pinochet's leadership Chile made economic reforms. They tightened their belt, they went through the steps necessary to restore their economic health internally, and today Chile is one of the most prosperous and booming countries in the world. Indeed, Chile is emerging like one of the supereconomies that we have seen emerge in Asia. Chile is the first such supereconomy of South America. And

Chile now seeks to join in a trade agreement with the United States. Its businesses are competing around the world.

If we roll history back and imagine that in the early 1980's Chile had been a democracy and we had been giving aid to Chile, we would have given Chile a series of loan guarantees and aid and Chile would not have made the necessary economic reforms. And Chile would probably still be a struggling Third World country today.

So I say the same is true with Mexico at this time, 1995. Mexico has not taken many of the strong measures necessary. I had great hopes for the last Salinas government. It seemed, as it got toward the end of that time, Mexico, and the PRC, in wanting to win the election, took softer and softer economic policies, devaluing, trying to create artificial wealth, printing money, and doing all the things they are not supposed to do in terms of sound economic decisions.

Now should the American taxpayers be asked to pay for that? Once again we are in one of these circumstances where a lot of aid would be going to some of our large bond funds and banks in the United States. Mutual bond fund types who bought a lot of the Mexican paper would be bailed out. We would be bailing out a lot of our own mutual bond funds, banks and others.

We are also bailing out the Mexican politicians who did not make the right decisions and the hard decisions, who did not tell their people the truth in their speeches as they went about Mexico. But the worst part of the whole thing is, aside from bailing out private groups who maybe do not deserve it, the worst of all is that we may well be delaying real reform in Mexico. Would it not be better to let 6 months or 1 year pass and observe that Mexico is taking some of those tough economic measures? Why do we have to act on this so quickly?

I think Mexico should be required to make internal economic reforms and also to collateralize the loan guarantee. The Mexicans refuse to sell their publicly owned oil fields and oil industry, which was nationalized at one point. It is a socialistic endeavor and a very unhealthy one in terms of what it produces for Mexico. Here we are, a free-enterprise country, giving a noncollateralized guarantee to Mexico while not requiring them to sell their oil industry. The economists tell me if they were willing to privatize their oil industry, they could have far in excess of the billions of dollars they are seeking from the United States.

So in closing I would like to say, let us call this what it is. It is a bailout. There are many arguments that are made—the specter of refugees coming across the border, et cetera, et cetera. But we are going to have the same problem again in 2 or 3 years unless Mexico makes the economic reforms that are necessary. Let us look at the Chile example, the example of a coun-

try that made the reforms, did not get any aid from anybody, and is one of the healthiest countries in the world today.

In terms of foreign aid, I have observed over the years the countries that have developed the most economically in the world have been those that have not received economic aid from the United States—with one or two exceptions. All the tigers of the Far East did not receive aid packages from the United States. They did it themselves. Many of the countries that we have consistently given foreign aid to have faltered, have not made internal decisions, have expected a handout, and have remained very, very poor. So we have not done these poor people a favor. As Chile, when they needed help and they were looking for international grants and aid—nobody gave it to them. They have become the most prosperous country in South America as a result of it.

So I think there is something to be learned here. I know it may sound harsh. Maybe it sounds cold and calculating. But if we really want to help people, sometimes we should require they make reforms before we give them aid, or we should try to give them trade rather than aid. Also, I point out the huge budgetary deficit we have in our own country and the number of people we have in need of some kind of small business assistance here within the United States.

So, I have made it known to the leadership I was disappointed that both sides, both the President and Republican and Democratic leadership, endorsed this plan without further consulting and assessing the feelings of other Members of the Congress. As a member of the Finance Committee, I do not feel obligated to support this until I see much more collateralization, until I see much more performance on the part of the Mexicans in terms of getting their house in order, and until I see the American taxpayers reassured.

Recently I have been in on some debates about privatizing public broadcasting in this country, and I have been criticized for things I have never said. I find that privatizing sounds bad to some people inside the beltway. The fact of the matter is, there are ways that public television can make a great deal of money through programming rights, through working with regional communications companies, and through working with other communications companies. In terms of marketing the product that they have, they can make a lot of money and they can save the taxpayers money. But in the whole debate the taxpayer is almost forgotten.

So it is with the Mexican debt issue. Let us think about the taxpayers of this country as we consider the Mexican debt situation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes.

IS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? YOU BE THE JUDGE OF THAT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is a lot like television's well-known energizer bunny—it keeps going and going—at the expense, of course, of the American taxpayer.

Many politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But so many of these same politicians regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills during the 103d Congress, which perhaps is a primary factor in the new configuration of U.S. Senators.

This is a rather distressing fact as the 104th Congress gets down to business. As of Friday, January 20, 1994, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,796,537,934,595.60, or \$18,207.74 per person.

Mr. President, it is important that all of us monitor, closely and constantly the incredible cost of merely paying the interest on this debt. Last year, the interest on the Federal debt totaled \$190 billion.

Mr. President, my hope is that the 104th Congress can bring under control the outrageous spending that created this outrageous debt. If the party now controlling both Houses of Congress, as a result of the November elections last year, does not do a better job of getting a handle on this enormous debt, the American people are not likely to overlook it in 1996.

A TRIBUTE TO SEATTLE'S BRAVE FIREFIGHTERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, four Seattle firefighters died in the line of duty: Lt. Walter Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, and firefighters Randall Terlicker and James Brown. They are heroes in the truest sense of the word. Jon Gillis, president of the Seattle Firefighters Union, said these four men gave their lives for the noblest of causes, for the safety and protection of others. I join him in that sentiment.

In the midst of this tragedy, the community came together to pay homage to these fallen firefighters. But the pain of this loss extended beyond Seattle: More than 10,000 firefighters, police officers, paramedics, and citizens from across North America and from as far away as Australia, came to Seattle to honor these firefighters.

Too often, we fail to say thank you to these brave men and women who serve us as firefighters, police officers, and members of the Armed Forces. The professions they have chosen are full of risk. Seattle Mayor Norm Rice recently reminded us these guardians of our society play a special role, and, tragically, sometimes pay the ultimate

price for their service. They are extraordinary individuals and make a real difference in our lives and in our communities. They are quiet heroes who deserve our respect, our admiration, and our gratitude.

Their families also share the hardships and pain that come along with these jobs. I know because one of my brothers is a firefighter in Tacoma, WA, and I can tell you the danger inherent in his job is felt by his immediate and extended family. I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank the men and women, and their families, who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities.

I am deeply saddened by the death of these four firefighters, and want to pay tribute to the sacrifice these extraordinary individuals have made. Lt. Walter Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, and firefighters Randall Terlicker and James Brown truly represent what is best about America.

ON THE LIFE OF MARIYAMA DOROTHY COLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to take this opportunity to remark on the life of Mariyama Dorothy Cole, who passed away this month.

Mariyama, a resident of Windsor, was an inspiration and joy to her family and friends. She was Marie to all who knew her. Marie was a girl of unique and distinctive beauty, but it was her inner strength and serenity that were most remarkable.

To understand what made Marie a person so deserving of recognition one must know the awesome changes Marie helped inspire and the incredible perseverance she demonstrated on a daily basis.

Today, because of Marie, children in the State of Connecticut who have complex health care needs of disabilities are better able to live at home with their families. Mariyama and her family challenged existing policies that were contrary to family unification. She was instrumental in the passage of several pieces of legislation that will foster better services for families and children. She was the first child with special needs to attend totally inclusive classes in her hometown high school.

Throughout her 18 years of life, Marie gave more love and educated more people than most individuals do in two lifetimes. Mariyama's determination was mighty; her courage and fortitude fierce; her presence impossible to ignore. She asked for nothing and yet taught her family and friends how to give and share with others the love that overflowed from her.

Marie has left an indelible mark on my State. Thousands of children have already benefitted from Marie's life, and many more will benefit from her legacy.

MEDICAL EMERGENCY FOR SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to inform my colleagues that Senator LEAHY was not present for votes Thursday evening due to a family medical emergency. On behalf of the Senate, I extend our prayers to his entire family and our hopes that he will be able to resume his official duties very soon.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year marks the 30 year anniversary of the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. In 1965 Senator Jacob Javits and I sponsored this legislation to foster the development of excellence in American art and culture. After a long and distinguished history of nurturing the arts in our Nation, the National Endowment for the Arts has in recent years become the subject of some controversy concerning the funding of certain works which many of our citizens consider offensive. In light of this, I would like to explain why I believe that the National Endowment for the Arts has been a tremendous boon to our Nation and should continue as a viable entity for the support of American culture.

Our Nation's Arts Endowment provides critical assistance for cultural works and presentations in music, theater, literature, dance, design arts, and folk arts around the country. This year, in my own State of Rhode Island, the Endowment provided funds to renovate painting and sculpture facilities in the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design, supported an after-school arts education program for minority neighborhood youth in the fourth and fifth grades, and funded the Trinity Repertory Theater, one of the Nation's premier theaters. In other areas, the NEA funded a Music in our Schools program in Providence and aided a folk arts apprenticeship program. Without this funding, Mr. President, many of these programs would simply not exist. In this context, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials from the Providence Journal and others from around the country in support of the National Endowment be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 15, 1995]

WE NEED THE NEA

The Newt Congress has cast a cold eye on the National Endowment for the Arts, the federal agency that provides grants to arts organizations and individual artists.

As federal budget items go, the NEA is no behemoth. Its allotment this year is \$167.4 million, nearly \$3 million less than the endowment had to work with a year ago, and an annual outlay of roughly 65 cents for every man, woman and child in America. (When was the last time you could get into

even a neighborhood puppet show at that price?) Compared with governments in most Western European nations, ours expends a pittance on art. And the NEA budget is dwarfed by the \$9 billion Americans give privately to the arts each year.

Yet despite its modest draw on federal revenues, the NEA has for some time been a favorite target of some conservatives, who like to focus on the few projects they consider obscene, and an offense to family values, while ignoring the much greater sums that help keep small orchestras, ballet troupes and less controversial artists going.

In Rhode Island, \$829,700 in NEA money went to 15 artists and arts groups in the fiscal year that ended last September. The bulk went to the Rhode Island Council on the Arts, which distributes support to a variety of projects. Other stipends went to four individual artists (in visual arts, dance, literature and translation), and to such groups as the Rhode Island Philharmonic, Trinity Repertory Theater, RISD, Brown and the Langston Hughes Center for the Arts.

Massachusetts, during the same cycle, garnered 153 grants worth \$4.9 million.

A legitimate philosophical question lies beneath the often vituperative attacks on the NEA. That is, should the federal government play any role at all—however small—in supporting the arts? In an era of deficits and taxpayer discontent, the question has new urgency. Certainly no program should be shielded from a rigorous appraisal of cost-effectiveness; and all agencies must share in overdue federal fiscal discipline.

In the 1960s, when the NEA was conceived, the rationale seemed simple. Most popular forms of entertainment (movies; TV; recordings) paid for themselves. But what about the artistic and cultural experiences that many people had less contact with?

Who would make opera accessible to more than just the wealthy; assure that painters received training and a chance to paint; and help keep classical musicians playing? The government saw a role for itself in nourishing work that might not instantly withstand the judgment of the marketplace but might enrich culture over time.

Minus certain Cold War distortions, the rationale for subsidizing the arts was little different from that for supporting academic and scientific research. Not every American should have to agree with the worth of each individual project; it was the idea that the general category was a good to an advanced society.

But why not imply turn all of this over to the private sector—nonprofit institutions supported by business and individuals? First, such institutions are simply not equipped now to shoulder what for them would be such a heavy transfer of obligation. Many arts organizations would be left foundering during the interim. Additionally, federal arts dollars function as seed money, attracting extra financing from local governments and the private sector. The federal imprimatur lends legitimacy, and helps to guide private involvement. As a result, it is easier for artists and arts groups to raise the money they need than if they had to appeal solely to the private sector.

But finally, a federal arts program has important symbolic value. Merely by existing, it makes a statement about what we as a nation value—in this case, something beyond getting and spending. If values truly are the fundamental crisis in this country, as conservatives suggest, eliminating the NEA would send exactly the wrong message. Congress should spare it.

[From The New York Times, Jan. 13, 1995]

DON'T AX FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ART

The National Endowment for the Arts, now in its 30th year, has been a brilliant though

sometimes controversial success. At a modest cost to the taxpayers, \$167 million this year, it has helped channel private donations to an impressive variety of nonprofit arts institutions across the country. Institutions report that each dollar granted by the Endowment generates an average of \$11 in matching private funds. As a result, many more Americans have been able to experience original art firsthand, and talented artists have been encouraged to pursue their work.

This is just what the Endowment was created to do. But now, for a variety of reasons, some conservative Republicans want to use their new Congressional majorities to cut off funds for the Endowment and shut it down. They should not be allowed to succeed.

The Endowment has some devoted conservative Republican defenders, for example Senators Orrin Hatch and Alan Simpson. But other conservatives remain ideologically opposed to public subsidies for the arts. Yet subsidies by governments and wealthy patrons are an ancient and necessary tradition. Even artists whose greatness has been acknowledged by posterity have had to struggle to support themselves during their lifetimes, particularly if their originality consisted in challenging received tastes. Enlightened societies all over the world recognize that there is a clear public interest in supporting such talents and to sustaining the traditions represented by an museums, libraries, symphonies and dance, opera and theatrical companies and making them available to wider audiences.

This is a wise and historically validated role for governments. The real risk of government subsidies lies not in overgenerous use of the taxpayers' money but in the potential for political interference or censorship. The Endowment's designers wisely guarded against this danger by leaving initial grant-making decisions to panels of people knowledgeable about the arts. The awards are then subject to two higher levels of expert review. Most grants are awarded not to individual artists or productions but to institutions with a good track record. But a good track record in the arts includes a willingness to take the occasional risks on a promising new or controversial talent.

It is these risks that have gotten the Endowment in trouble with demagogic politicians like Jesse Helms who will seize on provocative aspects of particular exhibits or performances put on by institutions receiving some Endowment support to caricature the whole of the Endowment's work. The most recent controversy, for example, centered on a bloodied paper towel flung by a performance artist, Ron Athey, at the Walker Arts Center in Minneapolis. The Endowment had awarded some \$100,000 to the Walker to help support its entire season. The Walker in turn awarded about \$150 of this money to Mr. Athey.

Not all great art is controversial and not all controversial art is great. But themes like eroticism, homosexuality and the provocative use of religious imagery that so upset the Endowment's critics have been entwined with great art for centuries. In recent years, the Endowment has tried to play it safe on these issues to appease its Congressional critics. But excessive caution shortchanges an important part of the Endowment's mission.

The zealous and small-minded are always willing to attack art and artists. But there is no reason to elevate their attacks to general Government policy. To do so would be a distortion of the mandate of the November election. To be blunt about it, prominent New York Republicans with ties to the city's extraordinary cultural institutions have an obligation to see that their more rambunctious

members of Congress do not destroy the National Endowment for the Arts.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 13, 1995]

MAINTAIN SUBSIDIES TO SUPPORT THE ARTS.

American voters say they want a leaner, more effective government. And like most federal programs, the National Endowment for the Arts could survive with less. But it would be a mistake to eliminate the NEA and its \$167 million budget.

Attacking the NEA has become good symbolism for political conservatives. They believe the federal government has no business subsidizing the arts and they object to the choices the NEA makes in choosing which artists to subsidize.

We disagree on both counts. In our view, government can play a legitimate role in subsidizing the arts, and political disagreement over which artists to subsidize is both inevitable and worth it.

By any definition, the arts are important to the nation's quality of life. There is no evidence that self-interested consumers, corporations and foundations can adequately meet funding needs.

Since the NEA was founded in 1965, grants have been awarded to traditional as well as avant-garde artists. These grants often serve as vital seed money for artists, projects and arts organizations. For every \$1 individual artists and groups get from the NEA another \$11 in private donations is raised.

The arts also have positive economic impact. Museums, art galleries and theaters attract tourists and conventions. On an annual basis, the arts generate \$37 billion in revenues, employ 1.3 million people and pay \$3.4 billion in various taxes.

Eliminating federal subsidies also would cripple state and local arts programs which get 35 percent of their funds from the NEA. The Illinois Arts Council for example, will get \$896,000 or 11.7 percent of its \$7.6 million budget, from the NEA.

The world would not come to an end if the NEA were eliminated. But all that would be satisfied are the political aims of today's congressional leadership. In the real world, the federal government is running an annual budget deficit of \$203 billion. Cutting \$167 million for the arts would do much more harm than good.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 13, 1995]

SHUNNING THE YAHOO POINT OF VIEW

(By Raymond Sokolov)

As the new Congress starts to debate whether to zero out the pitifully small (\$176 million) budget of the National Endowment for the Arts, everyone should take a look at the section of "Gulliver's Travels" where Gulliver visits the Houyhnhnms and the Yahoos. The Houyhnhnms are equine intellectuals, the Yahoos hairy, uncouth louts in human form. In our day, while the cultivated Houyhnhnms whinny and prance in futile protest, we are well on the road to becoming a nation of Yahoos.

Christina Jeffrey's appointment as historian of the House of Representatives was a warning. Speaker Gingrich was rewarding her because in 1993 she had supported his attempt to keep his course at Georgia's Kennesaw State College alive while other faculty there were protesting it as improperly contaminated with politics. But Ms. Jeffrey, an associate professor of political science, was not just a complaisant right-winger at a Podunk college. She was already on record in

1986 denouncing a federal history program about genocide because it did not include the Nazi point of view on the Holocaust. When this statement resurfaced a few days ago, Speaker Gingrich said he hadn't connected Ms. Jeffrey with its author because she had used her maiden name back then (before he met her). So, to stem the tidal wave of furious public outrage, he up and canned the lady.

This flaplet raises several interesting questions, but the most interesting is, What kind of intellectual milieu could bring Speaker Gingrich and Ms. Jeffrey into contact as historians?

Wishing to believe in the good faith of all parties, I accept that the speaker did not know about the Nazi memo, that he agrees with the angry protesters, and that the intellectual milieu in Georgia where this odd couple found common cause is exactly the kind of unenlightened backwater in which the Holocaust can be blithely dismissed by a professional historian as a subject primarily of interest for religious discussion (as Ms. Jeffrey argued to the federal government).

Anyone who thinks that way is an unreconstructed anti-Semite, of course, but, worse still, such a person has managed to remain completely untouched by the overwhelming facts of history as they have been documented, discussed and accepted by historians and others in the overwhelming majority of mainstream America and the rest of the world. It is one thing to hate Jews. Any moral dwarf can do that. But it takes an especially ignorant and fact-resistant sort of historian to believe that there is a viable Nazi point of view on the subject.

But let's stop for a moment and try to take Ms. Jeffrey seriously. What would the Nazi point of view on the Holocaust be? Why obviously it would be a positive point of view. Unlike most of us who think the sadistic incineration of six million people because they had at least one Jewish grandparent was among the great crimes of history, the Nazis believed it was a great and necessary achievement. The Nazi point of view must have been that annihilating Jews was a social good for Nazi Germany and the world. And, on reflection, I agree with Ms. Jeffrey that any good course on the dynamics of genocide would have to include this point of view, expressed as vividly as possible with documents and photographs. This is actually the approach that the Holocaust Museum on the Mall in Washington takes, and it is an extremely effective method of discrediting the Nazi point of view.

The trouble with Ms. Jeffrey's point of view about the Nazi point of view is that she thinks the Nazi point of view has real merit worth airing in a classroom. Ms. Jeffrey has obviously not considered the unusual facts of the Nazi record, or she wasn't interested in them. She is therefore a historian outside history. She is a Yahoo.

Does that sound like the harrumph of a member of the cultural elite? I certainly hope so, because I think that the Jeffrey affair obliges people committed to the preservation of our heritage to defend the idea of cultural elitism against the Yahoos. If we who speak for culture retreat from the fray now, we really are an effete corps of impudent snobs, in Spiro Agnew's immortal phrase.

What we should be saying, as the fight for the National Endowment budgets and their survival begins, is that the arts are everybody's province, that their health is a matter of highest national interest.

Speaker Gingrich, no doubt trying to look like a non-Yahoo in an effort to assume presidential stature, recently expressed his admiration for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and for Atlanta Opera. He

should go further, if he wants to shake off the hairy mantle of Georgia Yahoo. He should put his (our) money where his mouth is.

Newt, get down and support the arts. Don't zero out the NEA budget. Increase it manyfold under wise and stringent supervision, to put our cultural heritage in museums, libraries and concert halls on a solid footing for the future. Help America join the rest of the world in making sure that the treasures of the past—and the arts education system that makes that possible—will prosper. Otherwise, we will all be provincial Yahoos with no point of view worth having.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 10, 1995]

MAKING A CASE FOR THE ARTS

Chairwoman Jane Alexander of the National Endowment for the Arts believes House Speaker Newt Gingrich is crusading to abolish her agency—a sandbox for the cultural elite, he calls it—because he doesn't understand how it works.

And so, much in the same manner as first lady Hillary Clinton, Alexander has invited the Georgia Republican to a get-acquainted meeting to answer his questions and, she hopes, to dispel his misgivings.

The opportunity to enlighten is narrowing. The tentative date for hearings on reauthorizing the endowment is Jan. 20, and the 104th Congress is loaded with newcomers eager to cut government spending who look to Gingrich for guidance.

First, Alexander ought to disabuse Gingrich and his following of the misconception that a significant blow can be struck for deficit reduction with the demise of the endowment. As vital as its support is to needy arts groups, its budget—\$167 million or about one ten-thousandth of all federal spending in fiscal '94—is minuscule by comparison with the billions in cuts required to restore fiscal sanity in Washington.

Second, Alexander needs to counter the fiction that the endowment is a plaything of the affluent and the avant-garde. True, some cultural colossi, like New York's Metropolitan Opera, receive funding from the endowment and have enough wealthy patrons that they might be weaned without great sacrifice. True, too, a few experimental artworks funded by the endowment have turned out to be highly offensive, but the chances of recurrences should be minimized thanks to new accountability procedures instituted by Alexander.

The point for Alexander to stress is that if the endowment were terminated, the real victims would be medium-size and smaller arts organizations scattered throughout the country, too little appreciated except in their own back yards. In Gingrich's bailiwick, that would include Marietta's splendid Theatre on the Square and by extension a host of Atlanta assets—the Symphony, the Opera, the Ballet, the Center for Puppetry Arts, the High Museum, the Alliance Theatre and so on.

What these institutions have managed to do ought to be celebrated by the GOP cost-cutters as a triumph of public-private partnerships—leveraging each dollar of endowment funding into \$11 from private and other public sources. They are able to attract that support mainly because recognition by the endowment is widely viewed as a national seal of artistic merit.

There are other good reasons to save the endowment—its youth education mission, its anti-crime programs, even the beneficial economic spinoffs from the arts attractions it supports. But the clincher ought to focus on this generation's legacy to posterity.

John Boehner of Ohio, chairman of the House GOP conference, opposes the endow-

ment because he calls it “living high off the hog and passing on the bills to our kids and grandkids.” But what kind of country will our kids and grandkids inherit if the quality of our serious music, art and drama is diminished and concert halls, theaters and galleries go dark for want of the endowment's precious seed money?

No one disputes that the endowment must maximize its efficiency. But above all, the NEA deserves to survive.

[From the Washington Edition—Los Angeles Times, Jan. 11, 1995]

GOP HAS A SONG FOR NEA: TAPS—SOME CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS SEEK TO ABOLISH FEDERAL ARTS ENDOWMENT

What kind of art should our hard-earned tax dollars go to support, traditional American folk art or sexually explicit avant-garde art? “Neither,” the new Republican majority in the House seems poised to answer. That's a shame.

Two years ago, the arts-funding question was shaped by the scandal of Andres Serrano's “Piss Christ.” Robert Mapplethorpe's homoerotic photographs and Karen Finley's nude performance art, all of which had enjoyed some degree of support from the National Endowment for the Arts. But even though the Supreme Court struck down a “decency clause” that the NEA imposed under pressure, the entire controversy subsided as the federal agency, under the leadership of Jane Alexander, simply exercised better discretion in selecting artworks to endow.

This year, however, the philosophical ground has shifted. The House Republican leadership wants to abolish the NEA on principle. Its claim, a familiar conservative one, is that, in the words of House Majority Leader Dick Army (R-Tex.), “there is no constitutional authority for this agency to exist.” This year, as a result, federal funding for all art is in equal jeopardy, including funding for such mainstream, old-fashioned arts festivals as “Masters of the Folk Violin” and “Masters of the Steel String Guitar,” both sponsored by the National Council for Traditional Arts.

Plain-folks art does not cost as much money as fancy-folks art. Putting together an evening of “Sacred Harp Singing,” another NCTA effort, or the annual “Cowboy Poetry Gathering” does not cost as much as mounting a great classical ballet. But it doesn't come free, either, and the NEA has spent much of its modest appropriation as seed money: small matching grants and other sensible efforts to help groups like the NCTA, Chicago's Old Town School of Folk Music and Los Angeles' Craft and Folk Art Museum find their way to private support.

The argument that there is no constitutional authority for an educational agency such as the NEA rests on the truth that the Constitution makes no provision for public education of any kind. If from that fact we must infer that there can be no funding for an arts endowment, then there can also be none for a National Endowment for the Humanities, a National Science Foundation or any other federal initiative in higher education.

Army and the Republican majority can argue against funding the NEA even if the constitutional authority for the agency exists. But if and when they do so, we hope they will not pretend that only a wealthy elite has been served by the NEA, for the opposite is the case. Through the NEA, the spirits of millions of ordinary Americans have been lifted through the traditional craft, song and story of their native land. Those Americans will be spiritually poorer, and the American tradition weaker, if the

budget line of the NEA is spitefully reduced to zero.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 17, 1994]

AMERICA'S ART AND SOUL

Conservatives looking for Government fat to trim say they can't wait to take a cleaver to the National Endowment for the Arts—That naughty, left-wing frill in the federal budget. They should look and think before they chop, because the NEA is hardly a luxury. It's American bedrock, as solid as the summer concerts on the town green, or dance programs at the local high school, or the puppet shows at the community center.

While the NEA has hit the headlines for controversies, most notably the funding for photographer Robert Mapplethorpe, the endowment's primary business is supporting family-oriented entertainment, about which it has received little publicity since it was founded in 1965.

In Boston the NEA money goes to such places as the Handel and Haydn Society, the Berklee College of Music, the Huntington Theater Company, the Boston Ballet, the Chinese Culture Institute, the Boston Center for the Arts and Boston Dance Umbrella, to name a few. The list reflects a national portrait of community involvement and grassroots culture that is as vital to a country's strength as the defense budget or a jobs program.

The NEA's budget is \$167 million—approximately 65 cents for every American. This investment provides 5,000 grants, which put up seed money to be matched by local funding. It also stimulates the economy, for the arts put 3.2 million people to work and provide \$3.4 billion in federal income taxes. According to the NEA one study showed that the arts generated \$37 billion to local businesses around the country.

A wise investment, not only for the psyche but also for the bottom line. Members of Congress eager to wield the axe should consider the real work and economics of the NEA rather than the aberrations that have made news. Since 1965 it has provided 11,000 individual artists with fellowships—42 Pulitzer Prize winners, 47 MacArthur grant recipients and 28 National Book Awards authors. The grants came to people as they were struggling to create their art. A country that fails to encourage this loses its genius and its soul.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I fully understand that many Americans are troubled when they hear of works distasteful to them that are funded in part with their tax dollars. Nevertheless, while the Endowment has awarded well over 100,000 grants, fewer than 40 have resulted in any controversy whatsoever—a success rate of 99.96 percent. Over the last year Chairman Jane Alexander has instituted a series of most valuable changes in the agency's procedures. The agency will no longer accept applications from organizations, other than the State arts councils, which subgrant Endowment funds out to other projects. In addition, the Endowment will now require that progress reports be submitted before the release of the final third of a grant award. Permission from the agency will be necessary before a grantee can modify its activities from those approved by the Endowment. These changes give the chairman greater oversight over Endowment grants and I believe they will go a long way toward addressing the concerns of many of our citizens.

Chairman Jane Alexander has increased the Endowment's focus on rural communities and the inner cities. The Underserved Communities Program grants \$8.7 million specifically to broaden public access to the arts. Even the very limited funds appropriated for the Endowment help keep ticket prices reasonable, thus enabling lower income citizens, young people, the elderly, and the disabled to gain access to our common culture.

Nothing could be further from the truth than the suggestion that support for the arts provided by the National Endowment constitutes a subsidy for the wealthy. One of the primary missions of the Arts Endowment has been to encourage the spread of American culture beyond those individuals, communities, and regions affluent enough to afford it on their own. Uncharacteristically among Federal programs, Endowment dollars multiply and foster national support for the arts. Yearly Endowment grants draw matching grants of approximately \$1.4 billion from private, State, and local patrons. Thus, before the National Endowment for the Arts came into existence, there were only 22 professional theaters in the entire country and 1 million people attended each year. Today, our Nation boasts 420 and 55 million attend. There were 58 orchestras before the agency, today, there are over a 1,000. Fifteen million more Americans attend symphony performances each year.

I think it is rather unfair to our citizens for some individuals to assert that only wealthy Americans are interested in the development of the arts. I firmly believe and the evidence supports the fact that Americans from every walk of life, from every economic level, strongly desire and seek access to cultural events in their communities for themselves and for their children. The National Endowment for the Arts is a testament to the continuing development of our unique culture, to our enduring faith in our own creativity and to our world leadership in artistic achievement.

From an economic point of view, the dollars sent by the Arts Endowment to communities around the Nation have been an extraordinarily successful investment. For every dollar the Endowment invests, there is created a tenfold return in jobs, services, and contracts. The arts fostered by the National Endowment encourage national and international tourism, attract and retain businesses in our communities, stimulate real estate development, increase production of exportable copyrighted materials and contribute to the tax base. Governors and mayors from around the country can attest to the manner in which Endowment-supported projects have breathed new life into the downtown areas of their towns and cities. New businesses and tourists congregate in those areas which have a developed cultural life. San Antonio, TX; Cleveland, OH; Greenville, MS;

Oklahoma City, OK; and Birmingham, AL are among the cities whose studies have shown the enormous economic contribution of the arts.

Mr. President, every parent knows that the arts are crucial in our school curricula because they teach young people creativity, increase self-discipline, and are a critical means of passing on an understanding of American culture and civilization to the next generation. Study of even a single artistic discipline is of immense value to a child, who may go on to become an avid amateur or patron. Last year, the Arts in Education Program distributed millions of dollars in partnership grants to the States to pay for artist residencies in schools and art teacher training.

I am most gratified that Chairman KASSEBAUM and Chairman JEFFORDS will be holding hearings over the next few weeks on authorization of the Endowments. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to share with those of us on the committee their concerns and ideas so that we can work together to shape the Endowment's future role in our society as effectively as possible. This tiny investment in our Nation's culture makes a statement to ourselves and to the world that we view the development of American culture and its availability to our citizens as of significant importance. We must not become the only Western industrialized nation to declare that our Government cares nothing for the development of our culture. National support for the arts fosters the creation of community—locally and on the national level. Regardless of our differences of wealth, race, religion, and political belief, our cultural development binds us together, develops our character as Americans, and establishes our common heritage. As President John F. Kennedy once said:

Art and the encouragement of art is political in the most profound sense, not as a weapon in the struggle, but as an instrument of understanding the futility of the struggle between those who share man's faith. Aeschylus and Plato are remembered today long after the triumphs of imperial Athens are gone. I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we too will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or politics, but for our contributions to the human spirit.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the

partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I look forward to the beginning of this week and beginning debate on S. 1, our efforts to curb these unfunded Federal mandates.

I have comments I would like to make which give an overview of the bill itself, what an unfunded mandate is, a couple of examples, why we are now on our sixth day of debate, what has transpired to this point, and what is the likelihood as we proceed.

Mr. President, because the Senator from Oregon has a time constraint, I would like to yield so the Senator from Oregon could make his comments on S. 1 and following that then I would like to give the overview of this legislation. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President. I am speaking today as a supporter and original cosponsor of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. I feel very strongly that this legislation before us strikes a balance between the Federal Government's responsibilities: First, to acknowledge the burden that unfunded mandates have on State and local governments, and, second, to ensure the rights of all persons contained in the U.S. Constitution are protected.

The Federal Government has imposed over 170 unfunded laws on State and local governments which have resulted in thousands of unfunded Federal regulations. The Federal Government has not viewed itself as dependent on State and local governments in the past two decades.

I want to underscore that point, Mr. President, because we have been talking about dollar obligations that are involved in these unfunded mandates. But much of that is because of the thousands of regulations that follow these mandates. In fact, it has been estimated that perhaps as much as \$500 billion is expended each year to administer at the Federal, State, and local levels mandates initiated and adopted by the Federal Government.

The major policies of the Federal Government have reflected a Washington D.C.-based arrogance; "we"—"we" the Federal legislators and "we" the bureaucrats—know best how to solve the problems of the country. In many respects, the Federal Government has overstepped its bounds in its relationship with State and local gov-

ernments, and the intergovernmental system has ceased to function. This problem became very clear over the recent debate over health care. Washington believed it could prescribe a solution with a single piece of legislation. This approach was not the answer to health care problems and it is not the answer to any issue that requires intergovernmental cooperation.

I have received numerous letters from national organizations praising this legislation for making the decisionmaking process for future Federal proposals and regulations more open, accountable, and informed. The number of letters and the diversity of groups which have written in support of this legislation speak to its importance to our Nation.

More importantly, this national support is joined by hundreds of letters of endorsement from local governments throughout the State of Oregon. In the past few years, officials from local governments have written to me about the problems that unfunded mandates pose for Oregon communities. While the letters ask for support of mandate relief, they also note the need for Congress to make more informed decisions related to mandates for State and local governments. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 addresses both of those issues.

My support for this legislation does not mean I will turn my back on my responsibility to uphold the Constitution to ensure all persons are treated equally in this country or protected from health and safety risks, and, of course, civil rights. We must not forget what good the Congress has done for people throughout history, including passing civil rights laws, voting rights laws, and ensuring the rights of the disabled through the Americans With Disabilities Act. Some—and I would say probably most—may view these bills as unfunded mandates, technically. I view them as the Federal Government playing its proper role in ensuring persons that their rights, their constitutional rights and their civil rights, as guaranteed under the Constitution prevail.

We must also remember that the same Federal Government which has mandated certain actions in the past, is also ready to help citizens who have suffered enormous losses in the recent flooding in the State of California and earthquakes in California. It was not so long ago that my State was hit with an earthquake which caused severe damage—and that same Federal Government provided relief and assistance to literally thousands of people in need. The Federal Government does have an important role to play in this country, and we should not dismiss it lightly.

Mr. President, while the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act looks into the future at new unfunded mandates, it does not look back at the current regulatory burdens that are imposed on State and local governments in ad-

ressing the needs of their citizens. We must look back as well as forward, and that is why I introduced S. 88, the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act of 1995, on the first day of this Congress. The need to provide flexibility to local and State governments is enormous, and that is why I submit S. 88 as an amendment to the unfunded mandates bill before us.

AMENDMENT NO. 181

(Purpose: To increase the overall economy and efficiency of Government operations and enable more efficient use of Federal funding, by enabling local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to use amounts available under certain Federal assistance programs in accordance with approved local flexibility plans)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] proposes an amendment numbered 181.

Mr. HATFIELD. 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.")

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act is designed to create a new spirit of cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments. It is important to remember that the solution to the problems in our intergovernmental system is a recognition that all of our bodies of government—Federal, State, local, and school districts—are interdependent. Each part of our system brings special talents, special skills, and special needs to the service of the people of the United States. It is time to transform the Federal-State-local relationship. This transformation must build on the strengths of all of the different governments in our country and must be based on trust, cooperation, and flexibility.

The Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act will lead to strategic and realistic decentralization and deconcentration of power throughout the Government. The idea behind this legislation has four key aspects.

First, different governments of this Nation have different strengths. The Federal Government does two things well: Effectively establishing broad goals that tie us together as a Nation; and achieving certain economies of scale which cannot be attained at the local level. The Federal Government often forgets that local governments bring a great deal of resources to the table. Perhaps the greatest strength is that States and local governments are innovators. Local and State governments have demonstrated again and again that they find the most creative ways to tackle problems in solutions

that fit the local context. This legislation recognizes the fundamental interdependence of governments and builds on the strengths of all governments that deliver services.

I might note that many of our national laws that we feel today perhaps even originated at the national level did not do so. They were tried. They were experimented with. They were created by local governments at the State level, particularly Social Security, unemployment compensation, industrial accident compensation, and civil rights. Many of these things were tried at the local level as part of the creative nature of our federalism, our whole idea of federalism.

Second, the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act will not only permit variation in how local governments meet national goals, but will encourage solutions that best fit the local context. Federal laws and regulations have tended to treat every area of the country the same. Universal requirements force Congress to legislate to the lowest common denominator, and consequently, few governments perform to their full capability.

We are penalizing the progressive States like my own State in order to find that common denominator. We all strive to meet the average instead of to excel. Politically, socially, structurally, local and State governments are very different from one another. Why should the Federal Government declare that citizens in Oregon have the same needs as people in Florida, Kansas, or Maine? Adding flexibility to the Federal-State relationship will encourage local governments to find solutions that fit the local context. In addition, providing flexibility will eliminate regulations that force local governments to solve problems that they do not have.

Third, this legislation will create a new system of accountability. Currently, the Federal Government holds State and local governments accountable through regulation, procedures, and paperwork. The existing accountability structure is very good at determining where Federal money is spent, but it tells us very little about whether we are actually achieving results. Hundreds of hours and dollars are invested in complying with these regulations, and the investment in bureaucratic processes does nothing to improve the quality of services that we deliver to citizens. Moreover, our current structure of accountability has made us very responsive to each other. That is, we are responsive bureaucrat to bureaucrat at all levels of our government, rather than to the people who we serve. We need to reorient our system of government and to view taxpayers as investors and our citizens as customers.

Fourth, we must help retool all new governments for this new relationship. We need to reequip our Nation's governments to function in a new, cooperative environment. The Federal bu-

reaucracies need to recreate the ability to listen to local governments. In the 1980's, we witnessed the destruction of the intergovernmental affairs offices at most Federal agencies. They were supposed to be the focal point of cooperation, of listening. The Federal Government must actively solicit and use the ideas and experience of State and local governments.

I believe these two bills, Senate bills No. 1 and No. 88, strive to accomplish many of the same goals, including better informing the legislative process in Congress, stressing the need for flexibility for State and local governments to better meet the needs of the people they serve in an efficient and effective manner, and making it a goal that the Federal Government actively seek out and consult with State and local governments through the legislative process.

Mr. President, I commend those who have worked so diligently in bringing this legislation before us, especially the author, Senator KEMPTHORNE of Idaho. It is important that the balance contained in this legislation I alluded to earlier be kept intact. It is equally important that we pass this legislation.

As it is not my intention to bog down this important bill, I want to indicate that at a particular moment in time I will withdraw my amendment. I will, however, pursue action on Senate bill No. 88 at the earliest opportunity. I am very hopeful that I can get the ear and the attention of the Governmental Affairs Committee. I will personally visit with Senator ROTH, the chairman of that committee, and the ranking member, in order to get some assurance that this proposal, which has had its experience proven by the experience in my State of Oregon.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I would like to commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for the common sense and wisdom of what he just stated. I know in our case, in Idaho, we know that Atlanta, ID, of a few hundred people is quite different from Atlanta, GA, of a million people. We have to have flexibility. The requirements have to fit. I have met with Senator HATFIELD in his office and discussed the proposal and I was taken by the common sense of it, and by the enthusiasm by which he is proceeding with this. Again, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, we now have before us Senate bill No. 1, our efforts to curb unfunded Federal mandates.

This begins now the sixth day of debate on this bill. During the course of the debate, we had concerns that were expressed because committee reports

were not available. That has been rectified. So all Members of the Senate now have committee reports in their possession, which they have had the opportunity to read. It is, through the process, necessary for us to deal with any committee amendments that were added in through either the Governmental Affairs Committee or the Budget Committee. We have taken those. Whereas, in some instances, committee amendments will be agreed to, en bloc, with this particular bill, it was necessary because of concerns expressed by Members of the Senate that we take them one at a time. We have now dealt with all of those committee amendments, so that we now have the actual language of the bill before us and we can begin discussing the amendments that Members of the Senate would like to suggest be made part of this bill. There are something like 60 amendments that we have been notified may be brought forward.

We talk about an unfunded mandate, but what does that really mean? Well, the definition is that it is an enforced, nonvoluntary duty imposed by the Federal Government on State and local governments, tribal governments, or the private sector. Enforced, nonvoluntary.

In doing that, the Federal Government has not followed the practice of providing the funds to carry out those responsibilities of those new Federal programs. The reality is that it precludes State and local officials from being able to set their own priorities. Again, as a former mayor, I know when we would begin a new year and talk about our priorities, we knew full well that those priorities that we thought were important at the local level would be impacted by what the Federal Government then sent down as an unfunded Federal mandate saying, "You will do this." You do not have a choice and you will provide the funds to do it. Oftentimes, cities and counties, for example, have no recourse but to use local property taxes to pay for these unfunded Federal programs.

It is estimated that anywhere between 10 and 15 percent of a local community's budget right off the top goes to pay for the Federal programs. At the State level, I have heard numbers as high as 25 and 35 percent right off the top that must go to pay for these Federal mandates. What are the costs of these mandates? Well, I think the American public has now come to realize that while we have practiced the imposition of these unfunded mandates, Congress has not been required to ask before making a decision, "How much do these cost?" They are multimillion and multibillion dollars in size and, yet, our practice has been that someone might ask as we are voting during that 15-minute period, "Does there happen to be a mandate in here and does anybody have an idea as to how much it might be?" because it was not required.

I find it amazing because I cannot think of businesses or many other entities that can make multimillion-dollar decisions and not know the impact or dollar amount before they make those decisions. So, really, these take on the nature of a hidden Federal tax paid for by local property taxes. In Moscow, ID, it was pointed out that during 1994, local property taxes and user fees went up 73.5 percent because of unfunded Federal mandates; a 73-percent increase. In Boise, ID, at a water treatment facility it was determined by the Federal Government that the standards needed to be adjusted. In order to do that, it required that that treatment facility had to be reconstructed at a cost of \$15.5 million. Now, that cost of the reconstruction was not done because of any health risk, because of any increase in customer load, and was not done for any greater efficiency for the delivery of water; it was done because a Federal standard was adjusted. And so the ratepayers had a 30-percent rate increase.

From Kooskia, ID, which is a community of just a few hundred people, I received this letter the other day from Inge Stickney, who is the mayor of Kooskia, ID. She started off by saying:

On C-SPAN today, I listened to you as did a lot of my neighbors. Many phone calls later, all of us agreed that you served us and the State of Idaho very well today.

The unfunded mandates are not only an impossible burden for all of us to carry, most of them are senseless.

Nobody wants to cut down the last tree, we all want clean air and good, clear water. Reality is that more and more people are going to require that much more of those precious resources. No amount of preservation will save this planet for humankind until we face the facts, all of which you well know.

I am mayor of Kooskia, a small logging town in Idaho county. It is of the greatest concern to me to where we are headed in the 21st century. Our small town has spent thousands of dollars on water tests which do not reflect our geological area. With our revenue declining, we struggle to be in compliance with State and Federal laws, some of which make no sense and cost too much.

As a private small trailer court owner, I am facing the loss of a business which was supposed to see us through our older years. I am 68 years young now. I cannot afford water testing costs in excess of thousands of dollars yearly. We have 15 trailer spaces and three one-bedroom apartments. We charge \$50 per trailer space and \$125 for the apartments. Most of our renters have been there for many years. They are old people who live on a monthly income averaging below \$500 per month. We do not make enough money off this small court to pay for the expensive tests. We have an excellent well with beautifully clean water, never had trouble with the well water. The EDQ people told me to raise the rent. Well, for our renters, even \$5 more a month is a problem. The EDQ people told me to sell * * *, well, where will those people go?

Because we have another income, we have chosen to maintain status quo for now. We are willing to do everything we can to comply with all laws, as long as we can afford it.

I think this drives the point home, Mr. President. In Kooskia, ID, a small business operator who happens to be the mayor of Kooskia, with a trailer

community of 15 trailers, and some people in Government are saying, "Well, if you can't afford it, then you should sell." Well, if Inge sells, the next owner is going to have to raise the cost of the rental on those trailer spaces and then, really, these people that live there and have lived there for years, many of whom are retired loggers and farmers, will not have much choice. It will push it beyond their income. It may push it to the point that they then need to have Government help in order to continue their livelihood.

But, that shows you the extent of the decisions that we make here at the Federal level. Therefore, I think it is incumbent upon us to have as much information as is meaningful before we cast these votes. So that is what S. 1 is all about.

To give you just an overview of the process, the first thing that happens is that the committee considering this proposed legislation will notify the Senate Budget Committee of its intent to consider the legislation so that the Congressional Budget Office can begin the process of assembling the statistical data to develop cost estimates.

Next, at the request of the chairman or ranking member of any House or Senate committee, the Congressional Budget Office shall study this legislation for its cost impact. In doing that study, CBO will consult with State and local elected officials—the very people that are going to be impacted—first-hand so that we have their input at that stage of the process.

Also, Federal agencies are to provide the Congressional Budget Office with the information and assistance it needs to fulfill its cost-estimating responsibilities. I expect that most committees would take advantage of this provision because they will be charged with cost information that they will need to ultimately write the bill. That is why S. 1 enhances this whole process.

Next, the committees will have hearings, and all interests, both public and private, will have an opportunity to express their views. Both public and private interests will make known if they have concerns about this proposed legislation that the committee is considering.

At any time during the process, committees have a choice. They can either seek to comply with the provisions of S. 1, meaning that they will get the cost estimates and funding for public sector mandates; or they can decide that they wish to have a waiver of this process. And if a majority of this body agrees with that, then the waiver is granted.

Committees will then markup the bill. And for the first time, committees will know that the Congressional Budget Office has looked at cost mandates to both the public and private sectors and that State and local officials were consulted in that process. Armed with this information, committees can de-

cide, again, either to seek the waiver of the point of order, or it can decide to provide direct spending for each fiscal year or to provide an increase in receipts or to identify a subsequent and specific appropriations bill that will fund the mandate.

I want to emphasize a key point here. S. 1 says that authorizing committees should be responsible for funding the mandates that they establish. We keep the responsibility for the funding of these mandates on the authorizing committees, which is where the mandates originate.

Suppose the appropriators—we have the authorizers and then, of course, the appropriators—that provide the actual money do not fund the mandates? S. 1 takes that issue into account. In the authorizing bill, committees need to do two additional tasks: Designate the agency responsible for establishing procedures for imposing less costly responsibilities on State and local governments to meet the objectives of the mandate to the extent that appropriations may pay for the mandate; or designate a responsible Federal agency and establish the criteria and procedures to declare the mandate ineffective on October 1 of the fiscal year.

Once committees have approved legislation that includes Federal mandates, they must submit the legislation to the Congressional Budget Office and identify mandates contained in the bill.

Once committees have approved legislation that includes Federal mandates, they must submit accompanying committee reports that identify and describe the Federal mandates in the bill.

The committee report must also state the degree to which a Federal mandate affects both the public and private sectors, the extent to which Federal payment of public sector costs would affect a competitive balance between State and local governments and the private sector, and whether there are any adverse impacts to the private sector as a result of the funding modification or termination of public sector mandates.

Next, if the bill contains any intergovernmental mandates, the committee report must include a statement of the amount, if any, of an increase or decrease in the amount of authorization of appropriations to pay for the mandate, whether the committee intends for the mandate to be partly or entirely funded, and sources of funding to pay for the mandate.

Again, if it is a mandate on the public sector that exceeds \$50 million annually, then the Federal Government should provide the funds for that.

Committees must also include a cost estimate from the CBO director in committee reports.

The Congressional Budget Office must estimate the direct costs of all intergovernmental mandates that exceed \$50 million in any of the 4 fiscal years following the first year funds are

provided; the amount, if any, of increase in authorization or appropriations under existing Federal financial programs that will be used to pay for the mandates that are contained in the bill; and the amount of private sector mandates in excess of \$200 million a year.

If the committee fulfills all of these requirements, then this point of order does not lie against the bill.

I will also make the point, Mr. President, that the point of order is not self-initiating. A Member of the Senate must proceed in making the point of order.

Mr. President, a very important point, and that is, this bill is not retroactive. It does not affect existing mandates that are currently in place and on the books.

While I say that, Mr. President, I would like to make this point. When we say this bill is not retroactive, I think the debate has been retroactive. I have found so often while we have debated this bill, the different occasions when you may have Members on this side of the aisle or Members on that side of the aisle who will stand up and say, "But don't you remember back in 1974 when your side did this?" "Oh, yes, but don't you remember back in 1979 when your side did this?" "Yes, but that is because you had done this to us previous to that."

Mr. President, I think that the debate should not be retroactive. This piece of legislation is bipartisan. We have 63 Senators that have put their name on this bill saying this is a bill they are proud of and they want to go forward. It was developed by the chairman and ranking member of the Governmental Affairs Committee, the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee, my office, and many, many people from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I will close by just issuing this invitation to all Senators that have amendments that have been filed at the desk, or notified us of amendments, that, to the extent and as early as possible, you make copies of those amendments available to us so that we could determine those amendments that we find acceptable, that make improvements to this bill, so that we could move on through this list of 60-plus amendments and get to the point that we can have the final discussion and final vote on S. 1, our efforts to curb unfunded Federal mandates.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I had noticed three amendments to this legislation and had sent them to the desk early Friday morning. So they have been properly filed and called relative to a unanimous-consent request.

I inquire of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio—I would very much like to proceed, as well. I think the points made by a number of Senators are well taken. I am very interested in proceeding to debate the

amendments that I have offered and vote on those amendments.

Let me ask if it is appropriate to call up one of the amendments and we could set it aside. I know there is at least one other Senator who wishes to speak on at least one of my amendments. If other Senators are interested in speaking on the amendment I would call up first, then we could call for a vote on that amendment and have it after 4 o'clock.

Mr. GLENN. Parliamentary inquiry. As I understand our situation, amendments can be called up today, we can debate them during the day, but it is just that no votes will occur until after 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, but there is an amendment by Senator HATFIELD.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, has that order been set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this point.

Mr. GLENN. Would we need to formally set that aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would have to be requested.

Mr. GLENN. So that we can get on with the business of the Senate on this, I ask unanimous consent that the Hatfield amendment be temporarily set aside so we can continue with debate on other amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 180

(Purpose: To provide for the treatment of Federal requirements for the utilization of metric systems of measurement)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 180.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 38 after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR METRIC SYSTEM OF MEASUREMENT

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government may require that any State, local, or tribal government utilize a metric system of measurement.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government may require the utilization of a metric system of measurement by a State, local, or tribal government in a particular activity, project, or transaction that is pending on the date of the enactment of this Act if the head of such department, agency, or other entity determines that the termination of such requirement with respect to such activity, project, or transaction will result in a substantial additional cost to the Federal Government in such activity, project, or transaction.

(c) SUNSET.—Subsection (a) shall cease to be effective on October 1, 1997.

On page 41, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(4) TREATMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR METRIC SYSTEMS OF MEASUREMENT.—

(A) TREATMENT.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), the Commission shall consider requirements for metric systems of measurement to be unfunded Federal mandates.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term "requirements for metric systems of measurement" means requirements of the departments, agencies, and other entities of the Federal Government that State, local, and tribal governments utilize metric systems of measurement.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me describe this amendment. But before I do, let me also explain that I intend to speak and, hopefully, offer two amendments today. I have three amendments that I have noticed, one of which I will hold until tomorrow. The two amendments I hope we can consider today—and I would like to receive a vote on both—are this amendment, which is the issue of mandating the metric system requirements on State, local, and tribal governments. I will discuss this amendment in a moment.

The other amendment relates to the ultimate mandate which may occur this week: That is, the Federal Reserve will meet again and mandate increased interest rates in our country. And my amendment with respect to the Federal Reserve is very simple. It simply says that when the Federal Reserve Board meets, as always in secret, and mandates an increase in interest rates that will affect virtually all Americans, that within 30 days of taking that action they shall submit to the Congress and submit to the President a report assessing how much that mandate has cost the Federal Government in interest payments on the debt, and has cost State and local governments and the rest of the private sector. So that will be the second amendment I will offer.

Again, I have no intention of delaying these things. I would very much like to offer them and debate them. There are a number of Senators who want to speak on the Federal Reserve Board amendment. My intention will be to move forward these two amendments, and vote on them.

Let me, if I can, describe the metric system amendment that I have called up.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I yield.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Based on your comments—and I appreciate them—this is how we need to proceed. Would the Senator be willing to enter into a time agreement?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would enter into a time agreement on both amendments, but before I do that, give me a little time to check with the other folks who want to speak. I would not expect either amendment to take a great length of time. Let me, if I

might, speak on the amendment I have called up first. Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator REID may wish to speak and I do not know who else wants to speak on the metric system amendment. I do not expect to consume a great deal of time. At the conclusion of both amendments I will ask for a recorded vote on each.

Let me describe the amendment with respect to the metric conversion. This country, some many years ago, decided that it wanted to proceed to enforce the utilization of the metric system of measurement in our country. I do not have any strong feelings one way or the other about the metric system of measurement. I do have some feelings about the Federal Government's enforcement of it in a manner that really defies common sense.

We can, it seems to me, get to the point where the Federal Government says we shall move toward the metric system of measurement and we will enforce that by requiring the Federal Government to be the leader. What we do at the Federal level is tell the Department of Transportation we would like the Department to go out in the country and tell all the States to take down all their green highway signs that say how many miles it is to the next rest stop or how many miles it is to the next off ramp on the highway. We replace those signs with signs that tell the American people how many kilometers it is to the next rest stop or to the next exit or ramp.

I have been in Congress for 14 years and I have yet to have a constituent write to me and ask if we could not please make some adjustment in the road signs. I have not had a constituent tell me it bothers them they cannot get into their car and access information about kilometers to the next rest stop or fuel stop. Not one constituent has ever indicated to me that that is a major problem.

But the Federal Government says that there is a problem and here is the solution. The solution is we spend money to take down the English signs and put up metric signs.

This controversy brings me to the floor today. I will give another example of one little project. We are trying to build some houses, the money for which has already been appropriated to house health service workers on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, workers that are desperately needed to staff a health service center that is being built to address very serious health problems on this Indian reservation.

The problem is that they do not have housing available and we need to build some housing units. So, money was appropriated to do that. The plans, then, to build the houses proceeded. But then we discover that these houses, I believe it is some 20-housing units, to house health service workers, have to be built in the metric system on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation.

Why? Because a Federal agency says they must. It is an enforced mandate.

What is the consequence of that? The consequence is that it will cost more and it will take longer. The consequence is that if we have contractors up there that do not have workers skilled in using metric measurements, we have to get contractors from somewhere else. If we have suppliers that cannot supply in metric units, we buy from somewhere else.

This does not make any sense. Does it make sense for General Motors to use the metric system when it is engaged in commerce in other countries, selling products where the metric system is standard? Of course it does, and they do. The market system tells them what to do and when to do it. But there is no market system I know of that says the Federal Government ought to enforce a metric system when building a few houses on an Indian reservation in a manner allowing us in the end to say this cost more and took longer because we want to satisfy a requirement that someone had some time ago to say we want to enforce the Metric Conversion Act.

Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator REID and I are proposing a 2-year moratorium on any Federal department or agencies requiring State, local, and tribal government to use the metric system of measurement.

I am not suggesting we go back and revisit everything that has been done, but I am saying that in the next 2 years we should ask the commission that will study all Federal mandates to also evaluate the consequences and the costs of requiring the metric system of measurement on State, local, and tribal governments and who will bear those costs.

My amendment would impose a moratorium on metric mandates to State, local, and tribal governments for a 2-year period. During that period the Commission that is called for to study mandates in this legislation will study and evaluate and report to Congress the cost of metric mandates.

There are some who will argue that "we have been through this debate and the metric system makes good sense." I will not contest that. The point I am making today is not that there are not some areas in this country where we already have moved to the metric system and where we will continue to convert to the metric system in the future. My point is when we are short of money and when we are discussing unfunded mandates, I would like us at the same time to at least put the brakes on this conversion—a conversion manifested by virtually every Federal agency with a metric enforcement officer.

From my perspective, requiring the few little houses up on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation to use the metric system is a good example why some good ideas do not make much sense and have an impractical impact on some small projects out in the country.

My hope is that the Senator from Idaho and others reviewing this amend-

ment will decide that a 2-year moratorium will make some sense. Again, I am not repealing the Metric Conversion Act nor am I suspending all metric conversion activities in the Federal Government. I am simply asking for a 2-year moratorium to have the very Commission we are describing in this bill study it and report back to us.

This is a classic mandate, one which I think we should address. As I have said before, Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator REID will be over to support this legislation, as well. I will be happy, after I consult with their offices, to reach a time agreement so we can get a time certain on this.

I will be happy to yield the floor at this point.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, is there any estimate as to how much costs have been sent to the States to comply with the metric law as passed and as now being administered?

Mr. DORGAN. I say to the Senator from Ohio, I have no estimate of that. That is part of the problem and part of what has caused this legislation to come to the floor today. We have very little information about who does what and on whom our various costs are imposed. That is why I simply want to just suspend metric mandates for 2 years.

I should say to the Senator from Ohio, there is an exception here. If you have an agency or other entity of the Federal Government with a project that is well down the road, and the termination of the metric requirement they now have with respect to that project would result in substantial additional costs, the project would be able to continue. I do not intend to interrupt that at all. I do not know what metric mandates are costing State and local governments. That is precisely why I think it would be useful to have this Commission study it for 2 years.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I will look at this later today, and we will listen attentively as others speak on this subject pro and con, but let me give you my impression of the metric bill that was passed some years ago.

I supported it then, for a very good reason; I thought and still think that we have to become more metric literate in this country and more competitive in this particular area in our worldwide commerce. So it takes on a new relevance to me when we are moving with GATT and all the increased international trade that expands every year that we have more of our businesses, particularly small business, for example, that become metric literate so they can compete in the international marketplace.

My distinguished colleague mentions some of the manufacturing that goes on. I think where you have the big

international manufacturers of Ford and GM and Chrysler, and others, they already have moved into metric because it is required in the international marketplace, and to do business, they have to have metric.

So they have moved in that area. One reason I supported this legislation earlier—and, in fact, was interested enough in it I made a nomination to the metric board—one of our newspaper editors in Ohio, Paul Block out of Toledo, the Toledo Blade, was very interested in this metric conversion. He was a scientist in his own right, a chemist, and was concerned that we be competitive in the international marketplace and that we move to metric as most of the rest of the world has; that we are not completely alone in our adherence to the old English measuring system, and so on. We are certainly in the minority of the major manufacturing areas of the world in not basing our manufacturing on a metric system.

We have seen our major industries convert, but I have been encouraged that we seek more metric literacy so that our students and our people growing up understand it better and understand how a kilogram relates to a pound and all the other measures and the number of screw threads per inch or per centimeter that is important in manufacturing. So I have supported this.

I would be interested if there are any figures, or if other speakers today on this particular amendment can provide any figures as to cost estimates of how much costs have been increased to the States by this particular piece of legislation.

It was my impression, and I would have to go back and check the law on this, that the road signs that were referred to by my colleague were only required to have metric on them if replaced. It was not a requirement that the States take down every road sign and go out and have metric on every single road sign. I thought that it was as those road signs had to be replaced, which was over a period of time, that then metric had to be included on them. I may be wrong on that. We have to go back and check the requirements on it.

I would be particularly interested in any cost estimates as to how much this has cost the States to comply with this mandate.

Let me say something else. I visit schools in Ohio on a reasonably regular basis. I have been encouraged to go into some of these classrooms and find out now for the first time they are requiring students to get into the metric system and really understand it, not just as some passing thing where you can look up in a book how to convert, but actually use it and understand it.

That bodes very well for the future because as these students come out and move into business themselves, they are far more literate in this area and much more able to conduct business in the area of international commerce than they otherwise would be.

So I would be interested in any estimates of costs that have been incurred or estimates thereof that we could use in this debate today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I observe that the appetite for agencies to enforce is a never-ending appetite. I would not expect the Senator from Ohio has a great deal of faith in the bureaucracy looking at enforcing mandates and then deciding, "Well, let's do this in a commonsense way; let's do this only when the highway sign wears out so we have one highway sign that says 'Next exit 30 kilometers' and then 2 miles later, another highway sign that says 'Next exit 18 miles.'"

What happened there? One sign had worn out and the other sign had not. So you have a highway that has kilometers and miles.

The fact is, the Department of Transportation and the enforcement officers intent on enforcing this have a scheme in mind of tearing down the highway signs that exist and putting up metric signs across the country. The problem is, that costs an enormous amount of money. It costs the American taxpayers a substantial amount of money they ought not have to spend.

All of the things the Senator from Ohio said I largely agree with. It is in this country's best interest, where it is engaged in international trade, to trade in units where those with whom we are trading are using those common units. In many cases, that is the metric system. In trade-sensitive industries, they have long since converted to metric. But you get a perverse result, it seems to me, when we have an enforcement mechanism in the Federal Government to require State, local, and tribal governments to convert to metric.

That is my only point. I really believe that every good idea is taken to the end of its pendulum swing by someone whose belief it is to be an enforcement officer. I would like us to find out what is the answer to the question the Senator from Ohio raised. What is the ultimate cost to the taxpayer? And then maybe we can evaluate the cost-benefit with respect to a mandate.

So that is the purpose of my amendment. Again, I have no quarrel with the notion that in order to trade internationally we ought to deal in those units. Last week, we discovered with last month's trade figures that this year we will have the worst trade deficit in the history of civilization. Not just this country, but the worst trade deficit anyone in the world has ever known. So it may just be that with that kind of trade strategy and those kinds of trade deficits, we will someday, of course, be directed to do certain things by others who now have enough American dollars in their pockets to order mandates in this country that they choose. But my hope is that we

will straighten out this trade mess and redefine what global responsibilities are long before we get to that point.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his comments and think that we do not disagree on the merits of using the metric system where it is important and where it is useful for the interests of this country or, conversely, the merits of using the English system of measurement where that is important and where that is useful to the interests of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, in response, I do not know who the Senator referred to as those who are scheming, as he put it, to go beyond what was originally intended with this law. If there are those in the agencies who are doing exactly that, then we have to disabuse them of that and bring them up short in a very short period of time.

I am interested in what the law actually provided, period. What we required the States to do, what we required schools to do, universities, whatever. We gave some latitude to the metric board, the commission that was formed to administer this. But as far as other people being able to scheme to force the States to take highway signs down or to force action like that, quite apart from what was provided in the law, then I think we ought to be very careful of that. We all could give chapter and verse of examples where the people over in the agencies writing the rules and regulations pursuant to well-intentioned legislation passed here in the Congress go too far and they have to be brought up short.

There are two ways we do that in our regular, normal scheme of things in Government. One, all the regulations are to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, and they are to pass on what rules and regulations are legitimate and permit them to go forward and make sure at that point, at OMB and OIRA, the requirements of law are being carried out and nothing more.

So we do not propose to let the people over in the executive branch of Government in a particular agency administer the laws up here to their own liking. And if that is being done, then I will join my distinguished colleague today or any time in the future in seeing that we bring them up short on that and make sure they do not go beyond the realm of what was in the law itself as written here and what the legislative history shows is the intent of the law. If they are going beyond that and requiring things that the law as written and signed into law by the President did not provide, then we should stop them immediately.

So I would join him in that effort here. But I have not seen any evidence

yet that that really is a major problem. I have not heard any real major complaint from the States in that regard.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I might make one additional comment, there are some areas where the mandate will require someone to pay more and take more time because there is a conversion and some areas where it will not. Let me give you an example with respect to the highway signs.

The taxpayer is the one who pays for the replacement of the highway signs. Whether it is the taxpayer paying Federal taxes or State taxes probably has less importance to the taxpayer because they still have to pay the taxes.

In August 1993, DOT announced in a notice in the Federal Register that ISTEA now permitted Federal aid to reimburse States for costs that will be incurred when they install the metric highway signs.

What they said is we are now prepared to give you funds for converting those signs. They are not talking old signs or new signs. They are saying here are the funds available, and of course what they will do is find devices to say there are no funds, there is no cost to this mandate. But this is a mandate. Go do this.

My point is I do not want the American taxpayers to have to be paying out of any pocket for any mandates that are not mandates considered by this Congress. And that is the reason I bring this to attention in this piece of legislation. The fact is they are paying for an activity the American taxpayer should not have to bear at this point. We do not have to take down perfectly good highway signs and put up new signs with kilometers. That is an enormous waste of money, in my judgment.

I just have, I guess, enough experience to know that the bureaucratic system, left to its own devices, will try to find the end of this pendulum swing, and I think it will end up costing the taxpayers money. That is why I would like to put on the enforcement brakes for 2 years and have this commission study it. Now, if the study determines that this is not imposing any significant costs on anyone, is not very troublesome, then that is fine. That is an answer, I guess, that we would have then that we do not now.

If they find, on the other hand, that this can impose a substantial amount of additional costs with very little additional gain, I say let us step in here on the part of the American taxpayer and give them a little help. At least let us get the facts before someone runs ahead with the mandate.

That is the point I am making in the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I might speak in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

UNFUNDED MANDATES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, if urgent work comes up on behalf of the managers, I will step aside. But I just want to make some brief comments about a fascinating activity observed here by me on the Senate floor for these past several days.

I noted this with some whimsy, because I recall that after the November election returns there was a great deal of speculation as to how the minority party would act, now, in its wake. What would the President now try to do to, say, out-Republican the Republicans? Would the Democrats hop on board the Republican train or would they lie down on the tracks?

Interesting questions, all of them. Questions were also asked about how the Republicans would deal with having the majority. Would the House Republicans provide for a more open process, more consideration of minority views, or would they resort to the same ramrod tactics that the Democrats employed with some apparent relish, at least as I have observed it for 16 of the past 40 years?

Somehow lost to the media amid all of this questioning is a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats as to how, really, willing the two parties are to be on record, to have their votes scrutinized, and to be held up to the folks back home. Anyone who has watched the proceedings here in the Senate or the House the last several years has witnessed the strain and the energy that the Democratic Party has had to employ to avoid being put on record on any number of sensitive issues. Let me just cite a few examples I could not help but think of.

When we had the pullout from Somalia, and that was considered, the House Rules Committee attempted to protect the Democrats by adopting a "King of the Hill" rule. You remember that one—the rule that enables you to vote for one pullout date and then immediately following another one, a different one that supersedes it. We have another name for those. The Democrats seem to truly, truly enjoy those "CYA" amendments, one after another, so you can send the press release home, still having not done anything, but cover yourself nicely.

Then you remember the balanced budget amendment. Do you remember that one? We had enough cosponsors to pass that one last time around. But every manner of contortion was used to

enable the Democratic sponsors of the balanced budget amendment to find some reason to vote against the balanced budget amendment which they had cosponsored—a little bit of hypocrisy; just a touch.

I think we recall the vexations facing the House Rules Committee last year when they were confronted with health care legislation of the type which the Republicans favored more than did the President. They had to keep it from getting to the House floor because they knew it would pass.

You name the issue—whether it is the death penalty, gun control, term limits, balanced budget—the list is endless. And the struggle in this Chamber for years has been between Republicans trying to force votes on these issues and the Democrats attempting to prevent them, with all sorts of rationale, all thinly veiled, and all of that veil remarkably pierced on November 8.

So the Democrats would shriek "gridlock" when we would introduce one of these amendments for Senate consideration. But it was nothing of the sort. Those bills favored by the majority—virtually every one of them—did eventually pass but not before Senators had put themselves on record on a number of issues. Finally, all the chickens came home to roost in November. Finally voters across the country realized that the man or woman they had sent to Washington really did not believe in the death penalty after all, did not really believe in lower taxes, did not really believe in spending cuts, did not really support the balanced budget amendment, and they sent them all packing.

Why do I review this litany of activity? Because it is highly relevant to the situation we find ourselves in and found ourselves in this past week. I found in speaking to my Republican colleagues on the House and Senate side that the question has come up as to how open and inclusive our legislative process should be. Invariably, the answer has been, "Of course. Of course, we can keep it as open as is humanly possible because unlike the previous Democratic overlords of years past, we have precious little to fear from the Democrats forcing votes on various issues. What can they possibly make us vote on that we are less willing to confront than are the Democrats? Where, precisely, are we out of step with the body politic, while they are in step, especially with our constituents?"

Put that way, it becomes clear that the Republican majority have precious little to fear from the various stonewalling tactics from the other side. So I personally, having watched the Democratic minority at work here, am not in the least troubled by this remarkable strategy. It has deprived me of some light rest, but not of any certainty that we in the majority will prevail. In fact, I wonder with which political consultants they are working? Has

someone advised the Democrats that there is a political benefit to be gained from trying to block the unfunded mandates legislation, congressional accountability legislation, and the balanced budget amendment, or any one of a host of measures so eagerly awaited by the American public? If my Democratic friends wish to be shown to be on the wrong side of those issues, while at the same time pretending to support them, by all means I would hope they would be my guest because I will enjoy watching it.

I feel many of those measures are going to pass anyway because of the overwhelming support they enjoy from the American public and the majority in both Chambers. Many are going to pass.

I must say it astonishes me—and somewhat amuses me and bemuses me greatly—that somehow the opposing party has found someone who is willing and who is telling them to be seen as a party of trying to delay this train, to continue to support endless Federal mandates on States, counties, localities—and that means local taxpayers. We all know the saying: Lead, follow, or get out of the way. The Democrats seem to want to add a fourth option—lie down on the tracks.

I actually read in the paper the other day that the Democrats were considering making a court challenge to the rule recently passed in the House requiring a supermajority to raise taxes. Now there is a political masterstroke. Sue the Representatives and the American public in order to be able to raise their taxes. How stunningly brilliant that is.

So let me just close by thanking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for tactics employed this week and last on the unfunded mandates legislation for a piece of legislation that has been requested by most thoughtful people who administer local government. I think it makes me even more certain that the Republicans will enjoy a majority for many years to come.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I have to rise to comment on the statements just made by my distinguished colleague from Wyoming.

I think we need to review what has happened here. This revisionist view that was just expressed of what happened last year, and what so far has occurred this year, is a little strange to me having lived through last year and what has happened this year.

You know, we voted it out of committee. I was chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee last year. We voted out in August the unfunded

mandates legislation. Senator Mitchell wanted to bring it to the floor. We tried to bring it to the floor. There was so much delay, I think we had 20 some cloture votes filed against the Republicans last fall. It was a scorched-earth policy and they were taking great pride—some, not all—on the other side. Some absorbed what was going on to their credit. But on the other side there was a scorched-earth policy of, “Don’t let anything get through.” And we found objection and all sorts of procedural matters being brought up just to delay, to delay. To say now that after November 8 there is some great mandate that says that we move forward on all these things that we considered last year and wanted to bring up and could not because of the Republican filibusters on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and now to blame us for not getting these things through, is about as clearly a revisionist view of what happened last fall as anything could be.

The statement was made that the Democrats enjoy this kind of delay, and we are putting through what was referred to as CYA amendments. And I think we all know on the floor what that means. Those are not my words. Those are the words of the Senator from Wyoming.

No one enjoys delaying anything on our side that I know of around here because most of the people on our side of the aisle are in favor of the unfunded mandates legislation. We just want to see it go through in a form that it can be administered and be good.

It was said that we put out our press releases on this thing, and talked about how we ignored completely the fact; that the reason we did not have congressional coverage legislation last year and unfunded mandates last year was somehow the fault of Democrats. Nothing could be further from the truth. We had them on the calendar ready to be brought up. That is fact. That is not a revisionist view of what happened last year.

Now somehow my colleague from Wyoming indicates that the Republicans are trying to force this and the Democrats are opposing it as though the Democrats were not for it last year, and we were being opposed by the Republicans last year.

He talks about Democratic gridlock of the past. He says that November 8 brought all of this home, that all the chickens came home to roost. Why bring up this litany? Well, he said the situation of the past week where the Democrats were somehow—and I think I wrote down the words correctly—were trying to continue their policy of being “overlords” of years past. Those are harsh words. And the “stonewalling”—that is another word—“stonewalling” of the Democrats, and that the majority would eventually prevail; and that the Democrats seem to think with their gurus that there is some political benefit to blocking unfunded mandates.

Mr. President, those remarks are about as ridiculous as I can think of

here after we tried last year to get congressional coverage and get unfunded mandates through and were blocked repeatedly because of procedural steps taken on the Republican side to block us even from consideration. We did not have time to consider unfunded mandates. We brought them out of committee in August.

There were statements about we were trying to delay their train. No. That is not true. Let me just recount for the record so we get the facts straight. S. 993 was introduced last year in the Senate. That is what we were trying to get through. After the November 8 election it was felt that the House was probably going to come up with a stiffer, tougher bill than S. 993, although all parties, including the big seven of State, county and, local officials—the big seven different groups, as they are called—were in favor of S. 993 last year, and we had some 67 cosponsors. We could have passed it, just like that, if we had not had the delay occasioned by the Republican’s scorched-earth, do-not-let-anything-go-through policy of last fall. We could have gotten it through last fall.

But what happened then after the election this year? I will tell you what happened after the election this year. They said the House is going to come up with a tougher bill and we had better move our bill here to make it a little bit tougher so that perhaps the Senate bill can prevail, something the whole Congress can get behind and get passed because we need to deal with unfunded mandates. So I did not fight that. Our staffs all worked together and came up with some new proposals here, and there are some tougher mandates here. Maybe we have gone a little far in some of the consideration of our people that were one or more of the 67 cosponsors of last year. But we came up there with a new bill, S. 1.

(Mr. THOMAS assumed the chair.)

Mr. GLENN. Senator DOLE, the majority leader, went before the Governors Association and said he thought this was important enough that he would make it S. 1, the prime bill before the Senate, to be brought up as the first bill this year. I agreed with that. I have been an advocate of correcting this unfunded mandates problem for a long time. We worked on this for the better part of 2 years with my distinguished colleague from Idaho, Senator KEMPTHORNE, the floor manager on the other side. I did not quarrel with that. But now we are being blamed somehow for not going ahead with this. That is just not right.

But what happened this year? Let us follow this thing through. Because of the priority accorded this legislation, it was referred to committee on the following timetable: Voted off the Senate floor to committee; sent to committee. It was introduced on the floor one day, and sent immediately to committee with a hearing to occur the following day, with the agreement that the

markup on the bill would occur the next day—one, two, three; introduction, committee hearing, committee markup. Just like that, and bring it back to the floor in short order.

Now what happened? We got it over and had the markup, and a lot of people had some legitimate concerns about some of the things that had been put into the bill when it became S. 1 this year—using the basis of S. 993, but going beyond that. There were concerns about this. So I requested that the committee markup not be done, as I recall, on a Friday. We asked that this be put off over the weekend so people could find out what the changes were; so we would know what we were voting on. This was not going to be a rubber stamp. There was no mandate that came out of the November election that said we now have to approve everything the Republicans now suggest because they are in the majority. We wanted to know what the changes were and let everyone else know what the changes were. That was the purpose of asking that this be put off over the weekend.

So it was put off over the weekend. We had the markup on Monday. Then what happened? We went to the committee and we had a number of substantive changes—these were not frivolous or delaying items at all. They were amendments that we had prepared. I had some and Senator LEVIN, in particular, who did a real analysis of this legislation, had substantive amendments about how specific parts of this bill would be applied. He wanted to clarify some of those things. Do you know what happened in committee? In committee, we were not even permitted to bring up our amendments. We requested to bring up amendments and were told, “No, leadership wants this back up on the floor right away and any amendments will be dealt with on the floor.” We thought this was not the way to go. We objected and we had some rollcall votes on different substantive things. These were not delay items, they were substantive items to be brought up in committee.

On a straight party-line vote, it was said, no; we cannot consider those things. Those will be considered on the floor. We were voted down on a party line basis. We got rolled on every single one of them. Then it was stated, “We are going to send this to the floor without a committee report.” The importance of a committee report—if anybody has ever read through one of these bills with the technical language, the whereases and therefore, and everything that makes it conform to the whole United States Code, to the average layman, it is virtually unintelligible, and to a lot of Senators, too.

So what do we have? Normally, as a requirement, we have a committee report, and it is carefully written. It explains in layman's language, going through each section of the proposed legislation, exactly what it means, giving the pros and cons on it so every

Member and staff member working on a particular piece of legislation, when it comes to the floor, will be able at that point to have an understanding of what the legislation provides.

By and large, we rely on those committee reports. That is the importance of them. We objected to sending the legislation to the floor from the Governmental Affairs Committee without the committee report being filed. In fact, we thought it was important enough that after some discussion of it, and we were still being denied that right, it was brought up where we finally insisted on a record rollcall vote on it, and, once again, we got rolled—still with the provision that we could bring up anything we wanted on the floor. So over our objection, it was voted out.

I understand that our committee chairman, Senator ROTH, was under considerable pressure from leadership to bring this to the floor that day, no matter what. I appreciate his position on that. Let me just say this. I have been around the Senate now for over 20 years, and I was chairman of the committee 8 years. Never in the 8 years I was chairman did I ever have our majority leader say: I want you to roll this through committee no matter what, and bring it out to the floor without a report on any piece of legislation.

Occasionally, we sent legislation from the Governmental Affairs Committee to the floor without a report, but only with the agreement of the minority, and then usually only on bills that were comparatively innocuous and not major pieces of legislation, as this is.

This is landmark legislation. This changes the way we have operated for 60 years and starts moving things back in a different direction, to a different Federal responsibility, a different relationship, Federal, State, and local. That is the reason I call this landmark legislation. It makes the first steps—it is the first major piece of legislation that makes steps in that direction.

What happened? We got to the floor, the bill is called up, and all at once there is a move to try to curtail amendments, keep them to a minimum, saying “We have to get this through; we have to beat the House,” as though this was a legislative drag race, and more important than the substance of this legislation.

I predicted in committee before this was voted out—first, I will give a little bit of background. Usually, in committee, you try to take care of all of the substantive amendments anybody has and they are focused on that piece of legislation. Usually, you do not have a lot of extraneous amendments come up in committee because people are focused on that piece of legislation. We were not permitted to do that this time around. Then when a bill comes to the floor, if it has had all that kind of due consideration in committee, what happens on the floor? Then you are on

good grounds to say we have dealt with the substantive matters as we see it in committee, and we brought this out as a pretty good, clean bill.

If somebody really has something that deals with substance, let us consider it. But other than that, we are going to try to defeat other amendments that can be put on in the State, extraneous amendments that can be put in, because the Senate has no germaneness rules, unless we are under cloture or for certain applications on certain appropriations bills. But we are going to say that—we will try to say, OK; whichever side of the aisle puts on extraneous amendments, we have dealt substantively with this in committee, and so we are going to oppose all those, no matter how meritorious they might be on their own freestanding bill, if it was put in as such. We are going to oppose it in legislation on the floor.

I predicted in committee that if we brought this bill out without the substantive amendments being taken care of in committee, this bill—I think my words in committee were that this bill was going to draw amendments like flies to honey. And it sure has. We got to the floor—and I think it is important that everybody understand this so the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming of a few minutes ago are understood. His revisionist view of what happens does not square with the facts.

We got to the floor and what happened? Senator BYRD objected to the fact that we had not had the committee report. I indicated the importance of that a few moments ago for legislation like this, which is landmark legislation. Senator BYRD very properly objected. He said that this was important legislation, he wanted to see the committee report. When could we have that committee report available?

That is what the debate was about, for about 2 days here. The debate was not about the substance of whether unfunded mandates problems should be corrected or not corrected. The debate was about the procedure that was used in bringing this to the floor and whether we should have a report so all Members would have the benefit of the thinking of committee members and would be permitted to put minority views in that committee report.

Now, in committee they said that they would put the committee report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We said, “What about the minority views that usually goes along with it?” They said, “You could also put those in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you wanted.” That is a very, very poor substitute for our normal procedures here. That is exactly what Senator BYRD disagreed with and what we fussed about back and forth on the floor here for 2 days.

At the end of that time was when the majority leader decided that he felt that there was delay on this and he filed a cloture motion. What did that do? What did that do? Just as I predicted in committee, it flushed out more amendments than anybody

thought. Why? Because if your amendment is going to be considered and cloture is going to be voted, your amendment has to be filed at the desk before cloture is invoked.

And do you know what happened? We had 117 amendments—117 amendments—put forward to try to beat that cloture deadline, largely because of the procedure that had been used up to that time. Now that really threw things in a cocked hat.

I did not know where we were going at that time, because I knew that the Republicans—and both sides knew this—did not have the votes for cloture; did not have the votes for cloture. Did this mean, then, without having the votes for cloture with 117 amendments, was this going to kill our consideration of unfunded mandates? I did not know whether it would or not.

It was in that context that I mentioned to my distinguished colleague from Idaho, who has been on this for a long, long time—and he and I have dealt very straightforwardly with each other on this—I mentioned to him, if things really got bogged down—and it was bogged down over the lack of a committee report and the fact we did have all the new provisions in S. 1 that had not been in S. 993—that this was going to delay things and it looked like we might not get it through the Congress at all—and I think it is important we are getting legislation through the Congress; I reiterate that I support this legislation, fought for it as chairman of the committee, brought it out of the committee last fall as S. 993—I suggested to my colleague from Idaho that if push came to shove and it looked like we were not going to get cloture and it was going to be a long stalemate on this and maybe even have to pull the whole thing down eventually, we might want to consider dropping back to S. 993 so we get something through. I think it is important we do that.

And while the big seven that I referred to a little while ago certainly does want S. 1 more than they wanted S. 993 last fall—they were happy with that; now that they have gotten more, the chance of getting more, they are very much enamored of S. 1. I understand that—any drop back in that position to S. 993 would have been something that they would abhor.

I mention this only in the context of where we were in the legislative process at that time, with the possibility that there was going to be an inability of the Republicans to invoke cloture, which requires 60 votes, and they only had 53 for sure and what they could peel off on our side. But that meant they had to get another seven votes off the Democratic side and they could not do that, at least not in the early round on this. If it meant this was going to be delayed too much, then we were going to have to consider what we would do. Would we pull down S. 1, as I saw a possibility of at that time, and go back to passing something which everyone

thought was adequate last fall, although they liked the additional provisions of S. 1 now? That was the context of where I talked to my distinguished colleague from Idaho about that possibility.

The cloture vote was held. Cloture was not invoked. And so here we are, with all of the delay of the past week, with nothing having really substantively happened on this legislation.

Meanwhile, while all this was going on, we did have a group meeting, both sides trying to define what amendments were important, which ones were not, who really wanted to put their amendments in or who had put in frivolous amendments of the 117 that we had submitted at the time before the cloture vote. Fortunately, that group finally made some progress on this. And so, after the Republican side did not invoke cloture, we fell back to what was reality, I guess, and said, "OK, we will now try to get a unanimous-consent agreement that only about 60 of those ones that people said yes, they really wanted to put them in, only about 60 of these would be eligible to be placed in consideration as amendments on this legislation."

Meanwhile, we had gone through on the floor, during another 2 days or 2½ days, we had worked our way through a number of amendments. But the way those had been structured, they had been submitted as second-degree amendments by the parliamentary situation we were in at that time, so before we went to this unanimous-consent agreement, Senator DOLE moved to strike through a series of five amendments that he proposed. We went through the stripping of everything we had done there. And that was probably the best thing to do. I do not quarrel with that.

So now we start over with this finite list of amendments that can be considered, and those are all to be submitted by 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Now, today, we can get on with these amendments. We can debate amendments today, but no votes will occur before 4 o'clock today.

Why do I go into all this detail? It is beginning to get a little aggravating. I do not normally get up and gripe back and forth. I usually stay out of these back-biting things, where these inflammatory words are used here. And I think my record on the Senate floor would show that I only rarely get up and try to respond when some of these things are said. I leave it to other people who sort of enjoy getting locked into that kind of verbal combat, I guess, for whatever partisan purposes it may provide on either side of the aisle.

But for my distinguished colleague to come in this morning and talk about us opposing this legislation when we tried to get it out last fall and were blocked by the Republicans; tried very hard to get it out. I was still trying down to the last 2 days of the session last year to get it out on a unanimous-consent

request and could not do it. We had objections on both sides. The final objection did fall on the Democratic side, let us be fair about this.

But the reason we got down to even considering it on a UC basis was because there had been this scorched-earth, do-not-let-anything-through policy on the other side that had prevented consideration of a lot of bills, of which this and the congressional coverage bill were two.

To come on the floor and say that we are creating gridlock on the Democratic side and say that we are using tactics we used when we were "overlords of years past" and to talk about the Democrats stonewalling this legislation is about the biggest revisionist view of history that I can think of.

That there are political beliefs being pushed for unfunded mandates by our political gurus, our advisers, somehow advising us in this area that we are trying to delay—"trying to delay this train" was another quote—that just is not true.

The reason I have taken this time to lay out what happened on this bill is because I think it is important that everyone know exactly what has happened. This is not a filibuster of S. 1 this year. The filibuster, if there has been anything to be construed as a filibuster on the floor of the Senate this year, is objections to the ramrod procedures that were used to roll the minority in committee and not even permit a regular committee report to be sent to the floor with this legislation. Now, that was flat wrong. I have never seen that done. I have been here 20 years. I have never seen that done before on any committee I have been on where at the specific request of the minority, even a record rollcall vote that the minority requested, to try to say a report will accompany this legislation, did I ever, ever, hear the majority say, "No, it has to go. We cannot have a committee report. We will just put something in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If we want minority views they can be put in the RECORD. This is such a fast track we have to bypass everything. We are in a legislative race with the House of Representatives so we do not get behind the people in the House somehow."

If this was some little innocuous bill that made no difference whether it passed or not or of very little importance, I would not think it is worthy of even standing up to correct the statements made on the floor a little while ago that I am responding to.

This is not that kind of legislation. The days when I was growing up, days of the Great Depression, were tough days. Okies headed west. People headed for soup kitchens and so on. There was unemployment of over 20 percent for 4 years, 25 percent for 1 year. They were tough days.

Families had taken care of families up until that time, a Norman Rockwell type of existence. In the days of the depression, people could not do that anymore. People were hungry. There were

soup kitchens. People were moving out of whole sections of the country because communities and States could no longer take care of their own and do it in an adequate fashion. Either could not or would not. What has happened? The New Deal came in. FHA was put in. There were a lot of programs. I will not try to detail all of those.

Starting with that premise—that States and local communities were unable to take care of their own—was the premise of the New Deal, and it moved into a whole new area of Federal activity.

Now, have some of the programs over the last 60 years built up and gone too far? I would be the first to say that certainly we should correct those. There is a move now to go back to let the States take over a lot of these things that the Federal Government has been doing. I think that is OK in some areas but not completely. I would not agree with all of it. We need to do this carefully to make sure that the social safety net that has been put together over the last 60 years and that people have come to depend on, we can say rightly or wrongly, depending on Democrat or Republican view, if that social safety net is just thrown out and we let some States take up these services and some States not, that will deal very unfairly with millions of Americans.

Now, I am all for unfunded mandates legislation. I support it. I supported S. 993 last year and am a cosponsor of S. 1 this year. Do we need to consider it carefully? Yes, we absolutely do, to make sure that we do not do some damage while we are trying to do good and prevent these unjustified mandates. Many of them are being just heaped upon the States, heaped upon the States, at the same time, over the past 5 or 6 years, that we have been cutting down on some of the programs—community development block grants, things like that. We have been cutting down on programs that have sent much money back to help the States.

So we have to do this very carefully. And to think that somehow the minority is going to roll over and play dead and say, "Yes, whatever you want to do we will do it," without consideration of important pieces of legislation, important amendments to correct some of these matters.

Let me just very briefly—and I know I am taking a long time and people are waiting—but let me just say this. Senator BYRD wants to have an amendment, which was listed the other day, which would say, basically, that as part of this bill where we say to an agency if the emergency is not there but there is less money available, the agency, then, can bring this up or can somehow judge how the money will be spent and so on.

In other words, the question he raises is a good one. I am in support of S. 1. I repeat that again. What he raises is a question: Are we passing our legislative authority over to unnamed bu-

reaucrats over there; and what guarantee do we have that they will not go too far with them. That is just one.

I have a series of some of the things that were left out with regard to color and age discrimination. That was one. Another as to when the point of order would lie. Are we going to permit it on every single amendment? Are we going to have a point of order lie to begin with or at the end of the amending process before final passage of whatever the legislation is?

There is some uncertainty as to who would determine applicability where we have a judgment is something a mandate or not. Is that justified by the way the bill provides now with the presiding officer—for example, meaning the Parliamentarian—who would determine what a mandate is, or should that be by the Governmental Affairs Committee? We have an amendment on that. That is substantive.

We have some that would clarify the differentiation between what would apply in a public sector—that is, governments—as opposed to what would apply in the private sector at the same time. We have another one that would clarify that where a bill is reauthorized from a past provision of law, a bill comes up at the end of its time to be reauthorized—as the bill is now, it is not clear enough; it says that this could not be challenged if it is over \$50 million. We clarify that the \$50 million would only apply if a reauthorization went \$50 million beyond its previous requirements, which makes it compatible with the rest of the bill.

Senator LEVIN has some amendments. He wants to propose that this is important legislation, maybe we ought to sunset it so we are forced to reconsider the implementation at the end of a certain time period. He would have another one that, if a committee determines that there is a significant competitive disadvantage to the private sector—for instance, where there are competing electric generating plants between the government and private sectors—should we clarify whether we are beginning to have to move in and subsidize a requirement on the public sector and not do the same thing on the private sector, which would give a major advantage in some areas of light generation, sewer provision, water, whatever, where there are competitive interests between public and private businesses. I think that should be corrected also.

We have a number of others here. I will not go through the rest of them. I want to show that these are substantive.

Now, some put in over on the Republican side deal with judicial review, when there is any question about a particular provision of the bill, if a person could file suit in Federal court right off the bat. Can we figure any way to possibly bring the Government to a halt faster than that? By allowing everybody that disagreed with a particular item to say, "We will file suit." What

is substantive is the point I am making. I do not want to argue the merits. It is substantive. That would be proposed by Senator BROWN, I believe.

Motor-voter has been brought up again as a cost to the States. We will have to go through motor-voter. Is that substantive? It certainly is.

Impact analysis for independent agencies by Senator DOMENICI would ensure analysis for impacts included for certain independent regulatory agencies as FCC, FERC, FTC, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

One on our list at this point that Senator GRAMM may bring up is an amendment requiring three-fifths of the Senate, making it much more difficult to waive a point of order and get on with consideration of a certain bill.

CBO estimates on conference reports would be required by another amendment.

Senator GRASSLEY has one that is on our list, at this point at least, and I do not know whether he intends to push it, which would extend application of the act to past and current mandates. I do not know, if we went back on all previous Federal mandates without some limitation, I do not know how many trillion dollars that might involve. That is an amendment and it certainly is substantive.

I will not go on with these. There are a number of others like this. The point I want to make by listing just some of these is that these are very substantive amendments. They are things that are important to iron out so that this landmark legislation, when it is enacted—I hope it will be enacted—is done with all the best thinking of the Senate and the House of Representatives so it can be as workable as possible, can be used for, really, changing the direction of the relationship between the Federal, State, and local governments.

Now, Mr. President, there are some others that I could list here also, but I will not go through them. That is the reason I wanted to go through this and explain exactly what happened and how we got to where we are. And the fact of the argument so far, the debate back and forth, has been about 90 percent on consideration of procedure and whether we are adequately protecting everyone who might want to make substantive changes to this piece of legislation, changes that might be very valuable and be good and that all the big seven and everybody can agree with are good.

And so being prevented from doing that in committee and the attempt made here to push very rapidly once we got to the floor, that has been the heart of the debate so far. That has been the disagreement so far.

So when I hear words that the Democrats are the ones delaying—it is Democratic gridlock; it is just Democrats trying to be "overlords of years past," we are trying to stonewall—nothing could be further from the truth. I do not care how many statements are made on the floor to that effect.

The statements that were made previously which triggered my response here just were flat not true. I know from my personal experience in caucuses on this side, what happened in committee last year, and having been in committee this year where this big, unnecessary push was made to push this stuff through too fast. We need to consider this. It is very, very important legislation. I yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have listened to what my friend from Ohio has said. I listened to what my friend from Wyoming had said. I just go back to what I am trying to say, and that is, just as one of the critical elements of the Senate bill before us, S. 1, is the fact that it is not retroactive. I hope that we will refrain from being retroactive on the history of what may or may not have happened with this bill, that bill, what this side did, what that side did.

One of the benefits of S. 1 is the fact that there are 63 Senators who sponsor this bill. I am proud to be a primary sponsor, but I would not be here if I had not had the tremendous assistance of the Senator from Ohio, and I would not be here if we did not have, during the recess, the great assistance of Senator ROTH, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator EXON. Just in naming those individuals, I think we all realize it is bipartisan. So here is an opportunity for this new Congress to take up this vehicle which has been developed in a bipartisan fashion. It is what our partners in the State and local and tribal governments have said they want. It is what the private sector says they want.

So I ask all—and I am speaking to my side also—let us start looking forward and not backward so that we can move this. I am committed to the passage of S. 1, and I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio said as to why he was discussing S. 993. But I think we all agree that is not an option at this point.

This is the legislation for this Congress to consider, to pass, and we will take what time is necessary through the amendment process to perfect this so that a majority of Senators will know that this is exactly what should come out of this body.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes for debate on the pending amendment, to be equally divided in the usual form; and that no amendments be in order prior to the disposition of the pending amendment; and that following the conclusion, or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho retains the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Was a question put to me?

Mr. REID. I was just attempting to seek recognition.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I should point out that apparently there has been an agreement that there will be no votes until 4 p.m. tomorrow, so that any votes that we establish will have to be after 4 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. GLENN. The 4 o'clock limitation was 4 o'clock today, was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the 4 o'clock applies to tomorrow.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. GLENN. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wonder if I could go ahead with my statement and they can work out the problem.

Mr. GLENN. That will be agreeable to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Idaho with the provision the Senator's remarks not be in the middle of our conversation about when the votes are going to occur.

Mr. REID. My remarks are on the amendment that is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am in support of the legislation now before this body. I listened closely to what the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Idaho said, and I agree. This is bipartisan legislation. I not only appreciate what the Senator from Idaho said, but the manner in which he said it: That this legislation is sponsored by a majority of the U.S. Senate and, as a result of that, the legislation should pass.

But one reason it will pass is that there is ample opportunity for amendment, and that is what is now going on. There are amendments pending. The amendment that is now before this body asks that the Mandate Commission analyze the costs associated with mandating States convert to the use of metric measurements. It does not prohibit the metric system or our efforts to convert to the metric system. It simply recognizes that these efforts cost money and this cost is often borne by State and local governments. This amendment requires the Mandate Commission examine these costs and report on their amounts.

The reasons I support this legislation are myriad. But one main reason why I support this legislation is that I have worked for a number of years, going back to 1992, with Senator NICKLES, from Oklahoma, on legislation that would require that when bills come be-

fore this body, there would have to be a cost estimate as to how much this legislation would cost.

In addition to that, Mr. President, Senator NICKLES and I would have required that before regulations were promulgated by a Federal agency, they would have to affix the cost to that regulation. That seemed reasonable. Senator NICKLES and I worked on this for a number of years. In fact, it passed this body last year and was killed during the conference aspects of the legislation. The previous year, it almost passed.

The legislation that Senator NICKLES and I sponsored would have required the General Accounting Office to do the things I mentioned: Report on costs to consumers and business, impact on national employment, ability of U.S. industries to compete internationally, cost to State and local governments, cost to the Federal Government, and impact on gross domestic product.

So the unfunded mandate issue has been approached in a number of different ways. The way that Senator NICKLES and I approached the legislation was a way of handling the congressional mandate issue. This legislation, S. 1, is a more direct method, which I support.

However, I believe that the amendment process is going to make this a better piece of legislation.

The amendment that is now before this body dealing with the metric system is highly pertinent to this legislation. When Federal regulators say to State and local governments, "You utilize the metric system," they are saying a lot, because without question, Mr. President, that is an unfunded mandate.

What costs must the State of Wyoming bear as a result of changing all the road signs? It is a cost. The State of Nevada has the same problem, and every other State. Federal regulators may impose this requirement for the most well-intentioned reasons, but it can cost States a significant amount of money to comply. We must recognize the significance of requiring adherence to this new form of measurement and recognize that there are increased costs associated with this transition.

Are the costs necessary? That is what we are saying. These costs ought not be shifted to State and local governments, and that is where the cost is now being shifted.

While the amendment does not address this, maybe they really ought not to be borne by private contractors also who do business with the Federal Government. And they also will have to bear this burden.

The amendment now before this body that is pending would remedy this cost shifting by establishing a 2-year moratorium on any Federal entity requiring State or local governments to use the metric system of measurement. It

would allow agencies to continue pending projects if suspension of the requirement would result in a significant increase in costs.

This amendment, like the underlying legislation, is really about unforeseen costs. It is about the unforeseen costs associated with the implementation of legislation that, if passed, would really be burdensome. And there may be some meritorious reason for the underlying mandate—unfunded, I might add, requiring the metric system conversion—there may be some meritorious reasons for that, but should we not know the costs before we decide the merits of that issue? Under this legislation that is now before this body, there is a mandate commission which will study these types of costs and we will better understand them in the future. Under the amendment now before this body, the Commission will be required to study the costs associated with the Federal Government's mandating the use of metric measurements.

Metric conversion is costing my State money. If the Federal Government provides highway funds to Nevada, it can require that all work be performed in conformity with metric requirements. I think that is a waste of money. It require metric measurements regardless of the costs borne to carry out this mandate.

We are building a new courthouse in Reno, NV. I think it would have been a shame, as will be the requirement in the courthouse we are going to build in Las Vegas, that they submit their bids using metric measurements. The Las Vegas courthouse will require that. The Reno courthouse that is now under construction did not require the contractors to submit bids using metric measurements.

Mr. President, not only would this cost additional money for Nevada and the city of Las Vegas and the city of Reno, but it would also cost money to the local contractors. Indeed, this type of mandating needlessly drives up costs of construction and frustration of the people seeking these contracts. For these contractors that are unable to convert, too bad; their bids are deemed unacceptable because they do not employ a measuring system which they were never taught or never knew would be required in the first place.

The State of Nevada and its cities are already suffering from the imposition of costly unfunded mandates. And one reason I support this legislation is because I hear from so many Nevadans about these costs. Look, for example, to a small entity like Carson City, NV. According to Price Waterhouse, the cost of Federal mandates for the fiscal year 1993 is over \$4 million; for north Las Vegas, NV, about \$1.5 million for 1993. These costs have consequences because State and local governments are required to pay for them. Other programs, local in nature, are basically laid aside because the money has to be spent on the mandate. There is a limited amount of money to go around,

and therefore there are a limited number of projects they can undertake—worthwhile projects.

Requiring metric conversion is just an added unfunded mandate. In north Las Vegas, the money that was spent in 1993 for unfunded mandates could be used to hire additional police to operate a safety key program for children. That is one of the things they want but have not the money to do; to improve and enhance maintenance of the waste water treatment system in north Las Vegas; provide additional parks or renovation of parks, maybe even hire some people to make sure the parks are being operated correctly and are safe.

We could go on and on with the list of things that have not been done as a result of the unfunded mandate money that had to be spent. Why should we add the metric system conversion as another unfunded mandate? Because that is what it is. If it is important enough to do the unfunded mandate after the studies we require in the amendment, then we will go ahead and do it. We can balance whether or not we need additional police, more public works inspectors, improvement in our parks, all these things, or we could waive those. But if left unchanged, these costs simply will be used for things that the local governments feel are unnecessary.

So, Mr. President, I congratulate and applaud my friend from North Dakota for his wisdom in being the author of this amendment. As soon as it was mentioned to me, I knew it was something I wanted to get involved in because it is the right thing to do. This is what unfunded mandates are all about. We have identified an unfunded mandate. Why not examine the costs of this mandate?

AMENDMENT NO. 180, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the support of my friend from Nevada, Senator REID. Again, to restate it in one sentence, I am not opposed to the metric system. I am opposed to the Federal Government imposing mandates across this country on the metric system in a way that does not make any common sense. I guarantee you, without some intervention from this Congress in the past, we would already have had road signs replaced all across this country that tell people how many kilometers it is to the next rest stop because that is where the bureaucracy goes with a mandate.

My only point is that I do not think we ought to spend taxpayers' money pushing a mandate that makes no sense. If the private sector wants to use the metric system to compete in the European countries or wherever, fine. That is what they are doing; that is what the market system would direct them to do. I do not want us to spend precious taxpayers' money doing things that do not make common sense, and that is the concern I have about the current mandate conversion act.

Now, Mr. President, I visited with the Senator from Idaho, and I think the Senator from Ohio also understands—I visited with him as well—I am willing to modify the amendment in a manner that I think is acceptable to the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio. I would like, if appropriate at this time, to say that my modification is at the desk and ask the desk to report the modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify it. If there is no objection, the clerk will read the modification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 180, as modified.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent the modification be considered as read.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 41, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(4) TREATMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR METRIC SYSTEMS OF MEASUREMENT.—

(A) TREATMENT.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), the Commission shall consider requirements for metric systems of measurement to be Federal mandates.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term "requirements for metric systems of measurement" means requirements of the departments, agencies, and other entities of the Federal Government that State, local, and tribal governments utilize metric systems of measurement.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will simply observe that what I have done with this modification is removed the moratorium portion of the amendment but retained the portion of the amendment that will require the Commission on Unfunded Mandates to give us the information in the 2-year study of these costs so the next time we come with this kind of amendment, we have the data necessary to support it.

I do not expect to cease and desist in my efforts to prevent the Federal Government from leading in a direction that I think is unwise. I admit, and I think others admit, we do not know what this costs. That is the point of it. Retaining that portion of the amendment will require the study be done to give us the information so that we do know what it will cost, and in 2 years I hope we can come back and squash the requirement that exists for the Government to want to do things that are unreasonable.

I might also say, in the middle of all this, we will intend once again to prohibit DOT from doing anything that spends the taxpayers' money to convert road signs in the meanwhile. So with that, I ask that the two managers of the bill support this modification.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I compliment my friend for moving in this direction. I think this makes a lot of sense. Since there are a lot of questions

about this, to do a study of it I think is fine.

I would like to clarify in the legislative history here on the floor, though, as to whether it is the Senator's intent that the study being done will include the estimated costs? After all, that is what this bill deals with and unless the costs were going to be above \$50 million it would not be a threshold item for this particular item.

Mr. DORGAN. That is my intention.

Mr. GLENN. In the remainder of the legislation, outside the part that was stricken, I do not see any specific reference to costs. It said it will consider requirements for a metric system of measurement to be Federal mandates. I would like the legislative history to show that would include in this study that will come back to us an estimate, if at all possible, of the costs to the Federal, State, local, and tribal governments.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is written in a manner designed to overcome any problems that would have been imposed by the threshold of the bill. This would require the Commission to study it irrespective of the threshold.

Mr. GLENN. But I ask my colleague, is it his understanding this would include an estimate of the cost of executing this Federal mandate?

Mr. DORGAN. That is the purpose of it. That is correct.

Mr. GLENN. That is fine. I am willing to accept it.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from North Dakota because, again, as I listened to the points he has raised, this is exactly why we need to have a bill like S. 1. I listened to my friend from Nevada, and I will have to paraphrase, but very close to this: Senator REID said that there may be merit to this unfunded Federal mandate, but should we not know the cost before we implement it? And he is absolutely right.

That is why with S. 1, once it is enacted, we are going to have that process so Congress will know the cost, any adverse impact to the competitive balance between the public and private sector, before we cast our votes.

Again, I appreciate what they have said. I think they are helping us to lay out the fact that there is a need and the fact, too, that S. 1 fills that need.

So I am happy to accept the amendment as modified from the Senator from North Dakota, and thank him for his amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator DORGAN's amendment, which seeks to address burdensome metric mandates. As my colleague from North Dakota has stated, metric requirements impose serious burdens on State, local, and tribal governments and offer a perfect example of the careless practice that the underlying legislation seeks to address.

I became involved in the metric debate during the last Congress, when I introduced legislation that would have

prohibited Federal agencies from requiring State and local governments to convert highway signs to metric units. At that time, the Federal Highway Administration was considering plans which would have, in effect, forced financially strapped State and local governments to cancel or postpone highway and infrastructure improvements in favor of metric sign conversion.

Literally thousands of Kansans contacted me to protest this unnecessary and costly change and to ask why we in Washington write laws and then pass the costs along to State and local governments. Fortunately, their opposition and our efforts in Congress were successful in convincing the Federal Highway Administration to abandon its plans for metric sign conversion.

While I was pleased with that decision, I remain concerned about the prospect of similar metric mandates and believe that we must act to ensure that their effect on State, local, and tribal governments is fully understood. This amendment would accomplish that goal, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 180), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. Mr. President, I would also like to note Senator KASSEBAUM. I know, has an interest in this issue. So we would like to certainly note that. And, too, in S. 1, there will be a process, the ACIR, which will look at existing mandates such as this mandate. So again we have laid out a process that I think will be effective.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 178

(Purpose: To require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to submit a report to the Congress and to the President each time the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee takes any action changing the discount rate, the Federal funds rate, or market interest rates)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 178.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—INTEREST RATE REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 501. REPORT BY BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the Board or the Committee takes any action to change the discount rate or the Federal funds rate, the Board shall submit a report to the Congress and to the President which shall include a detailed analysis of the projected costs of that action, and the projected costs of any associated changes in market interest rates, during the 5-year period following that action.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include an analysis of the costs imposed by such action on—

(1) Federal, State, and local government borrowing, including costs associated with debt service payments; and

(2) private sector borrowing, including costs imposed on—

(A) consumers;

(B) small businesses;

(C) homeowners; and

(D) commercial lenders.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

(2) the term "Committee" means the Federal Open Market Committee established under section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I might, I would like to describe very briefly this amendment. I know Senator REID would like to speak on behalf of the amendment, as well, and I think there are a couple of other Senators, also. I would like to, following that, get a recorded vote ordered on this amendment. This is an amendment I shall not modify and I very much intend to get a recorded vote on.

This amendment deals with the Federal Reserve Board. The mere mention of the Federal Reserve Board puts students to sleep, at least in high school and in college. Start to study issues of the Federal Reserve Board and monetary policy and you very soon have a class that is fast asleep. Yet, the Federal Reserve Board and its conduct of monetary policy in this country has a substantial impact on virtually every American. The Federal Reserve Board controls America's money supply.

Why am I talking about it in the context of a bill on mandates? Very simply, because the Federal Reserve Board will meet in a closed room, shut the door, and make a decision about America's money supply and mandate—it has at least in the last six instances—an increased interest rate be paid by the American people.

That is kind of the mother of all mandates, if you think about it. Every American will have their lives changed as a result of a decision made by folks who portray themselves as a bunch of chaste economic monks who get in this room and make decisions about money. What they are is a bunch of economists and bankers who find themselves a room down in the Federal Reserve

Board. They convene in the room, incongruously named the Open Market Committee, in a room that is closed. So I would like to call it the Closed Market Committee. Let us no longer call it the Open Market Committee. These folks go into the Open Market Committee in a closed room, lock the door, and make decisions about America's money supply. And at least in the last six instances over the last year, they have decided to increase interest rates. That is, as I said, the mother of all mandates.

You do not enjoy the opportunity of saying, "I am sorry, I disagree; I am not going to pay increased interest rates." Everybody pays them. The Federal Government pays them. I will bet there are not many Members of the Senate who know how much the Federal Reserve Board's six interest rate increases will have increased the Federal deficit in the coming 5 years. Any guesses? Somewhere about \$125 billion.

About 1½ years ago, we wrestled in this Chamber with this issue of deficit reduction. We had massive debates. The American people were involved. Some were upset and incensed and sending letters and calling. Others were supportive. We were trying to reduce the Federal deficit in a democratic way: Increasing taxes, decreasing spending. All of it very controversial, and all of it subject to great emotional debate in the open. But the Federal Reserve Board goes into a room, shuts the door, and in a secret process decides we are going to mandate six interest rate increases, and they have imposed an additional cost on serving the public debt of close to \$125 billion.

In other words, they took back with no public debate one-fifth of all that we did—one-fourth to one-fifth of all that we did—in this deficit reduction debate that we had in Congress.

They did not ask us if they could do that, they just did it. But that is not the half of it. It is not just the \$125 billion increase in serving the debt, debt service costs, that we will have experienced in the next 5 years. It is the private sector. Everybody who has a home with an adjustable rate mortgage is now paying more.

I had a fellow come up to me this weekend and tell me he is paying \$125 more for his house payment than he did a year ago. Why? Magic? Voodoo? No. The Federal Reserve Board, that is why. They made decisions that affect the lives of virtually every American. I mentioned what the public sector cost is, just for the Federal Government, of the decisions by the Fed, the mandate in interest rate increases: a \$125 billion increase in 5 years. What about the private sector? Mortgages they pay, all kinds of other consequences? Mr. President, \$218 billion in increased costs over 5 years for the private sector.

So the plain fact is the Federal Reserve Board imposes, by its mandate on interest rates, enormous costs on the American people. My amendment is very, very simple. No one—not the

slowest thinker—can allege not to understand this. My amendment says when the Federal Reserve Board meets and increases interest rates—incidentally, they are meeting in the next week or so and some suggest they will probably increase interest rates again—they have a responsibility within 30 days to send to the Congress and to the President their evaluation of how much additional cost they have imposed on, yes, the public sector, the Federal Government, State and local governments, and also the private sector.

I asked Alan Greenspan in hearings some while ago: Do you, before you make these decisions, assess how much you are going to impose on others in terms of costs? If they do, it is not available to us. So I do not know. But I submit that they ought to. If someone will be making decisions in this country that will increase the Federal deficit by \$125 billion in 5 years, or lay on additional costs in the private sector of \$218 billion over 5 years, they ought to be telling us that.

The Senator from Idaho, when he talks about mandates, or the Senator from Ohio—you can describe dozens of mandates—I defy anybody, and I am going to listen for the next week, I defy anybody under any circumstance to describe for me any mandate that comes even close to this mandate, comes even close to imposing \$218 billion in added costs on the private sector. You will not find one. This is the big mandate. This is the big one. This is the one that imposes enormous costs, and it is done in secret; done really without very much debate. It is interesting. Very few people want to talk about interest rates in the Federal Reserve Board. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Fed, came up here the other day, and, he said, "I think that the Consumer Price Index really boosts inflation one-to-one and a half-percent beyond where it really is." I guess he said one-half of 1 percent to 1 percent. He said it overstates what inflation is.

We have had 4 successive years of decreased inflation. This year it is 2.7 percent. If Alan Greenspan thinks maybe that is a percent and a half over where it ought to be, that means the real inflation is 1.2 percent. Then I would ask him, if that is the case, what on Earth are you doing increasing interest rates six times putting your foot on the brakes to shut down the American economy and throw this country into a recession if inflation is at 1.2 percent? What on Earth are you doing? On whose behalf are you doing it?

We have different constituencies in this country. The Federal Reserve Board serves it. I might say its constituency represents the large money center bank interests. In fact, the open market committee that goes into the room and makes decisions there are people who are voting on those decisions who are each regional Fed bank presidents that are appointed by no one that I am aware of except their private

boards of directors which are controlled by bankers in their region. They are not confirmed by anyone. So they are making public policy decisions in a manner designed—I assume in a manner designed—to serve their interests. Do you think they will come to town and say, "The heck with my board of directors, I could care less about those folks, and I am going to serve somebody else's interests?" I have great trouble with the whole concept of the way the Fed has been structured, and the way it has been behaving.

But my amendment in this circumstance is very clear and very simple. When the Federal Reserve Board takes action to increase interest rates, that is the big mandate in this country. Let us have them within 30 days send a report to the Congress and a report to the President saying here are the costs from our assessment, here are the added costs that we have imposed on governments and on the private sector.

I intend to seek a record vote on this. I would hope very much that it might be accepted. To those who are concerned about mandates, I say let us not be concerned about the little ones, not the nuisance mandates so much. Let us be concerned about the biggest one. Let us be concerned about the center pole in the mandates, the center pole Federal Reserve Board mandating mandates aside from the wisdom of the fact that what they are doing is completely out of sync with what they should be doing. When they do it any time in the future, it seems to me they have an obligation to report to us who will bear the cost of these mandates.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I note my colleague, Senator REID from Nevada, is also going to speak on this issue.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Senator from North Dakota of course for offering his amendment of which I am a sponsor, but more importantly for speaking out about the Federal Reserve.

For years I have sponsored legislation that would call for an audit of the Federal Reserve system. I have offered that amendment every year. Every year the legislation gets nowhere.

I think it would be interesting to know about the Federal Reserve. I think we should audit the Federal Reserve. It is taxpayers' money that is being used there. But we do not do that.

Senator DORGAN spoke out on the secrecy of the Federal Reserve system. He has spoken out on the Federal Reserve more than anyone that I know in either body. But even though there is no entity in the world that controls

our lives more than the Federal Reserve System, his speeches go unnoticed. And I am sorry to say that. People just do not care it seems about the Federal Reserve. Maybe it is because it is a subject that is not very interesting. It is not pornography. It is not murder. It is not an issue that deals with the Wild West water, grazing. It does not deal with issues that we talk about here a lot. But we do not talk enough about the Federal Reserve and the impact it has on our lives.

So I acknowledge the work that my friend from North Dakota has done on this issue. I am sorry that his very lucid statement have received very little attention.

I was thinking as the Senator from North Dakota was outlining the secrecy of the Federal Reserve System that maybe what we should do—the Central Intelligence Agency has received a lot of criticism lately for not doing a real good job; one reason maybe is that they are not secret enough in some of the things they do—maybe we should combine them with the Federal Reserve Board. What the Federal Reserve Board does nobody knows. Nobody knows what they are doing. It seems that everyone has some idea what the CIA is doing. Maybe we could combine the two. It might not be a bad idea.

Mr. President, the Federal Reserve has raised interest rates six times since February 1994. If someone likes this legislation generally speaking—that is, we are going to try to stop unfunded mandates—then they should love this amendment. If the principle of unfunded mandates being stopped sounds good to Senators, then they should jump with joy and run over here and cosponsor this legislation because this really overshadows all other unfunded mandates because these go on all the time. Not only do they affect government because of the moneys that governments borrow, but they also affect the private sector significantly.

There is not a person that is listening to this debate who is not impacted as a result of higher interest rates. It does not matter if they are homeless or making a multimillion-dollar transaction on Wall Street as we speak. Higher interest rates affect everybody in this country. What we are saying is that the Federal Reserve Board should provide a report to Congress and to the President about anticipated costs of changes in interest rates on the public and private sectors so we are aware each time the Fed raises interest rates of how much more we pay. We should have a little foundation as to what really we pay.

This amendment requires the Fed to prepare a report. This report will detail the costs imposed by interest rate changes within 30 days after the Fed decision to change those rates. The report will include an analysis of the aggregate costs that interest rate changes would impose on Federal, State, and local governments. It will

provide a cost analysis of interest rate changes on the private sector borrowing. This will allow us to see the increases in borrowing costs for consumers, small business, homeowners and conventional lenders.

I am glad that there has been a roll-call vote called on this matter. I think it is important to people who are in favor of doing away with unfunded mandates—because they support the largest unfunded mandate we have in America today.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Dorgan amendment regarding the Federal Reserve. Actions by the Federal Reserve, most notably the six interest rate increases in the last year, have a huge effect on our economy. In impact, it is an independent powerful fourth branch of Government, a branch of Government that has effectively been able to deflect reasonable examination. The impact of the Federal Reserve's actions needs to be better understood by the public and by the Congress. This amendment is a very rational and well thought out step in that direction.

Many would argue that one of the most significant changes in Government policy was the passage of the 1993 Reconciliation Act which among other things reduced the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years, about one-third of the way we needed to go to get to balance. Dozens of articles appeared on front pages of newspapers as that controversial hard fought measure went through the legislative process. The \$500 billion sum, was in fact, an amount suggested by Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Each component was scrutinized by some degree. Many parts of the measure involving less than 5 percent of the whole were bitterly fought over.

In 1994, the Federal Reserve took what might be the second most significant Government action of the last 2 years. Six times, they increased the interest costs on everybody from the Federal Government and local governments, to families with mortgages and credit cards, to almost every business in the Nation.

While many fought bitterly against the tax increases that were included in 1993 Reconciliation Act, there was barely a word from most about the huge tax increase that resulted from the Fed's rate increases. While the first measure cost a typical family under \$20 a year in higher taxes, the second cost many modest income families with an adjustable mortgage over a \$1,000 in a year, 50 times the impact.

This wave of interest rate increases has been estimated to cost the Federal Government \$107 billion over 5 years. And, the cost to the private sector is probably a lot higher. That is a huge impact with minimal public discussion on a governmental decision so significantly affecting both the Federal Government, local governments, and the private sector.

This amendment would help us to understand the impact of the Fed's ac-

tions and that would be a significant improvement.

The six increases in interest rates were largely justified by the Fed on the basis of their fear of rising inflation. In 1994, the CPI increased by a meager 2.7 percent, exactly last year's rate of inflation. When more volatile food and fuel costs were taken out, the rate increased by 2.6 percent, the lowest level of inflation since 1965. And, Alan Greenspan, the Fed's Chairman said he believed that the CPI was actually overstating inflation by .5 to 1.5 percent. If he were right about the CPI, and I have my doubts, Greenspan has pushed a huge burden on our economy when he believes that inflation has been under 2 percent a year over the past 2 years.

Where is this inflation that the Fed has been expecting?

Now, there are indications put out by the Fed's rumor mill that they will raise interest rates for a seventh time by another half percent or more on February 1.

The Fed says it takes a long time for the pain of their interest rate increases to work their way through the economy and cause the economy to slow down; that is, to cause enough people to be fired and for enough unemployed people to stay that way. It may take from 6 to 18 months.

I would like to ask: Is it logical to rush forward with a seventh increase in interest rates when we have not seen the impact of the earlier increases? If the Fed Chairman believes inflation has been running at less than 2 percent, I would think he would want to wait.

I would think the Fed would not want the slope of interest rates to rise too quickly. Because the higher we climb, the harder it will be for the economy to have the soft landing that we all want.

Some say that the Fed has an economic model that assumes that whenever unemployment drops to a certain point, it will put pressure on employers to provide some wage increases. And those wage increases will cause inflation. So, under this model, every time employment levels are good and people are working, the Fed fights to get that favorable situation reversed.

The Fed seems to work to create a guaranteed minimum level of unemployment and to minimize any general increase in wages.

I believe the Fed is, to some extent, fighting the last war.

Some have suggested that the tremendous growth in discount stores and the growing willingness of consumers to use private labels creates a real difficulty of manufacturers and retailers to raise prices. Some people see a new culture developing in many manufacturing areas which place considerable pressure on suppliers to avoid cost increases and to develop new lower cost methods of producing goods. To some extent, gains in computer design are

providing methods to accomplish that goal.

And, as our country is more and more integrated in a world economy, the ability to raise the price of many U.S. goods and the ability to seek wage increases not related to greater productivity are declining.

Coming back to the analysis required by this amendment, clearly, this is important information that the public and policymakers should have about our economy and the effect of Federal Reserve actions.

Lastly, I wanted to comment on why this amendment should be on this bill. The Fed's interest rate increases are a mandate, a mandate on every city, county, and State in the Nation that issues bonds. It is a mandate on every business in the Nation that has loans based on the prime rate. It is a mandate on every family with a variable rate mortgage and many other kinds of loans. As Senator DORGAN said, the Fed's interest rate hikes are the mother of all mandates.

I commend Senator DORGAN for all of his work in this important area and urge adoption of his amendment.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to rise in opposition to the Senator from North Dakota's amendment—an amendment, which in my view is misplaced, unwise, and dangerously myopic.

The independent role of the Federal Reserve in setting monetary policy remains critical to the long-term stability of this country.

Cries for more public input in monetary policy decisionmaking misapprehend the necessary role of a central bank in our market system and jeopardize a carefully crafted balance between independence and public accountability.

Public accountability, in contrast to public input, already exists under the current structure of the Federal Reserve.

The Fed and its activities are already highly scrutinized by both Houses of Congress pursuant to the Humphrey-Hawkins Act—and I dare say that Chairman Greenspan spends about as much time on the Hill testifying before one committee or another than he does at the Federal Reserve engaging in monetary policy decisionmaking.

This amendment is not about public accountability, Mr. President. Rather, this amendment is about a trade-off between long-term stability and short-term gain.

This amendment represents a rough attempt to influence monetary policy for short-term political purposes.

And yet even if it were successful in its purpose—to try and keep interest rates artificially low—it would still be ineffective, Mr. President, because long-term interest rates are not determined by U.S. monetary policy alone.

The Fed does not make decisions in a vacuum. Long-term bond and currency values reflect international confidence in the conduct of our monetary policy,

not simply the Fed's pegged Federal funds rate. And a loose monetary policy, set through a politically influenced decisionmaking process would send a strong message to the rest of the world.

It would basically be telling our international neighbors that we are more concerned with macroeconomic gain than price stability and strong, long-term economic growth.

Mr. President, soft money means a soft economy. Adopt the view endorsed by this amendment and we won't have to worry about bolstering the Mexican economy through billion-dollar subsidies—we can make the peso look good by encouraging a lack of confidence in United States monetary policy and the dollar.

This amendment is not only unwise and myopic, it is misplaced.

It would force the Fed to report to Congress and the White House what costs are imposed on the market every time it raises interest rates. How do you define what comprises costs on the public and private sector? Do you net costs and benefits?

Would the proponents of this amendment agree the way many of them did during the health care debate that the short-term costs are outweighed by the long-term benefits? It would appear so.

Even if you could quantify such costs—which I nonetheless believe would be a specious exercise at best—this amendment is an unnecessary regulatory nightmare.

Congress already has the ability to ask the Fed about the costs of raising interest rates and it has, both through committee oversight and by individual Member queries to the Fed.

So what is the purpose of this amendment? To bog the Fed down in more reporting requirements and politicize its decisionmaking process by triggering the reporting requirements only when the Fed decides to increase interest rates.

Mr. President, the amendment also misapprehends its populist appeal.

It seems to me that on November 8 the American people were pretty clear about a couple of things—one of which is that they can rarely trust Congress to conduct the responsibilities it already has, like making fiscal policy.

I'm quite sure that such a healthy skepticism for this body's abilities would certainly extend to any ideas of Congress extending its reach further into Fed monetary policymaking.

I bet the American people would be much more interested in seeing the Congress report on the costs to the public and private sectors every time it votes to raise taxes.

I like low interest rates, too, Mr. President, but I'm not willing to sacrifice the long-term health of our economy to obtain them.

Mr. President, this amendment has nothing to do with unfunded Federal mandates, but instead is strictly about challenging the role of the Fed in setting monetary policy by making it

more politically accountable to Congress.

Costs imposed by rising interest rates are not unfunded Federal mandates. As I've stated before, the Fed can only do so much to affect interest rates, the market will influence the rise or fall in interest rates no matter what the Fed does.

If anything, this amendment is about imposing new mandates by requiring the Fed to comply with new and extensive reporting requirements.

Mr. President, this bill is not the appropriate piece of legislation for this amendment and I would urge my colleagues to support the Senator from Idaho's motion to table the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. What is the present parliamentary situation? Is there an amendment to be voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment by the Senator from North Dakota is pending.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Are we going to stay on that until 4 o'clock when we vote? Is that the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. President, while I do have the floor, could I put up an amendment or how can that be arranged? Will there be no more amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may ask consent to set aside the pending amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily set aside the pending amendment so that I can introduce one.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair. I thank the distinguished managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I want to talk about the biggest unfunded mandate of all, which is not just interest costs on the Federal debt, but the entire Federal budget. We just heard—and I want to join the leadership of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Nevada in their concern relative to interest costs. I will momentarily put into the RECORD a table that will show my colleagues exactly where we are.

Prior to that, let me speak to some of the problems facing our Nation. We are really in crisis, Mr. President, with respect to our fiscal situation and also in crisis in our cultural situation.

We all know the litany: There are some 40 million Americans in poverty. Some 10 million are homeless, sleeping in the streets; another 12 million children are hungry. The cities are a cesspool of crime and violence; the land is drug infested; the schools have turned into shooting galleries. Even more alarming, we now find that of those between the age of 17 and 24, 73 percent cannot find a job out of poverty. In sum, we are dividing into a two-tiered society, the haves and the have-nots.

The middle class that everybody seems to want to address is disappearing. Rather than offering up a State of the Union, rather than coming up with contracts premised on the dismantlement of Government, what we need is a plan to start the Government back up again, for it is only the Federal Government that can solve these problems. With all 50 States joining hands and pulling together, we can work our way out of this dilemma.

Mr. President, our security is like resting upon a three-legged stool. We have the first leg, the values we have as a country, and those are very strong. We readily sacrificed lives to feed the hungry in Somalia; we sacrificed lives again trying to promote democracy in Haiti; and we are now willing to send earthquake relief aid to Japan. We, as an American country—not as a middle class or lower class or underclass or rich class—willingly sacrifice and give assistance where it is needed.

Similarly, the second leg of our security rests on the leg of military power, and the strength of that is unquestioned. Finally, the third leg is that of our economic security, and that leg is fractured, in disrepair, and about to break because of the very litany that we have all enunciated on the floor.

We act as if it is the best of times, and all we need to do is give to the various interest groups their wants. For those in California, we will now finally have a program on immigration after we just passed a multibillion-dollar bill on that subject. It makes a difference. But we have never even given the additional border patrols and everything else a chance to work, including the new offices that were set up. The thrust of such pollster-driven policies would be to say, "We have not done anything," and "Let us start doing something there," because California is important in the Presidential race.

Of course meanwhile, both sides are trying their dead-level best to flatter the middle class with gifts such as tax cuts. Mr. President, we do not have anything to give. The tenor and tempo of the moment should rather be that of John F. Kennedy back some 30 years ago when he said, "My program is not a set of promises of what I intend to give the American people, but rather a set of challenges of what I intend to ask of the American people."

Rather than facing challenges and bringing reality, we are off on a toot, chasing around in a veritable contest, a foot race, if you please, trying to dismantle the Government and saying that the Government is the enemy. The truth of the matter is that the Government is a friend. We have valid programs working which need to be expanded upon—women, infants, and children feeding, 50 percent receive funding and 50 percent go wanting. But for every dollar I spend on women, infants, and children feeding, I save \$3. For if I do not spend that money on nutritional supplements, I have, by account, an in-

crease low birthweight infants. The average stay in an incubator for the low birthweight infants is 30 days, at \$1,000 a day, or \$30,000.

Getting to the needs of the hour, we need to embellish the WIC Program and the Head Start Program. We can furnish the studies that show for every \$1 that we invest in Head Start—not to the cities or to the States or to get it back to the people or to dismantle it and all the other gobbledygook they are giving us—Head Start saves \$4.50 for every \$1 we spend. We ought to extend that to the other 40 percent of Americans that are not participating.

With respect to funding for the disadvantaged, half of those eligible are not receiving benefits, but for every \$1 we spend there, \$6.25 is saved. Biomedical research, which is a distressing thing to me, we have cut back under President Clinton's administration on top of the cuts that we have had under Reagan-Bush. But for every \$1 we spend in biomedical research out at NIH, we save \$13.50.

Indeed, the Federal Government has a lot of good roles to perform. Welfare reform—you are getting another unfunded mandate, Mr. Governor, I can tell you now. Some will get welfare and some will not. Those recipients in the "have-not" States with the bigger burden will start moving to those "have" States. In fact, that is what brought about the Federal program.

I can tell you, once they get to welfare reform and try to set up those jobs to make people work, no money is going to be saved. It is going to cost more. Welfare reform is going to cost more. Name the odds and I will take all bets.

Similarly with health reform. Yes, we can slow down the growth of rising health costs, but the savings that we achieve through reductions in all of the entitlements will leave us far short of our goal. My point is while we may save some, we will not save enough. So, it is important that we come and start looking, if you please, at what we really need in this land of ours. And I will get into that on another occasion, because I want to address the problem of this unfunded mandate, the Federal budget.

Mr. President, we need a Marshall plan for America. If we are going to have a capital gains tax cut, we need to have it for inner-city investment to industry, not just for the rich just to write off. In addition, we need to promote savings. We need targeted IRA's and incentives to promote investment in research and development investment here in the United States. With respect to technology, we need the advanced technology program, which is subject to peer review by the National Academy of Engineering and devoid of any political pork.

Regrettably, you see some shouting in the contract that these are pork barrel programs. We have to get into competition with a competitive trade and industrial policy. We can go down the

list of the needs, but we do not have any money.

Looking at what is available, I find myself much like the famous character in "Alice In Wonderland," where to stay where I am, I have to run as fast I can; to get ahead, I have to run even faster.

Let me turn momentarily to the interest costs on the public debt. I can tell you, before Chairman Greenspan raised interest rates, the CBO estimated \$311 billion for the 1995 gross interest costs on the public debt. Now, comes January, it has jumped some 28 billion bucks to \$339 billion and is projected to rise to \$408 billion by 2002.

So what I have tried to do in this particular exercise is to bring into focus the magnitude of our current fiscal situation. I have been in a drill now all this month with my staff and the best of minds. I have summarized it on one sheet of paper. And I will ask my staff to distribute this sheet to our friends on the floor and any others who are interested. Yes, statistics are boring, but it is a reality.

We start, Mr. President, with reality check No. 1, that it will require approximately \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts to execute item No. 1 of the Contract With America; namely, to balance that budget.

Now, balancing the budget is not a new thing. I have tried dutifully as a Member—and Senator DOMENICI and I are the only remaining Members since the initiation over 20 years now of the Budget Committee—and as a former chairman, I have conscientiously tried freezes. I have tried Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—which, incidentally, my colleagues, Mr. GRAMM and Mr. Rudman, joined in abolishing in 1990 when we went from fixed to floating targets. We had the discipline. We needed to maintain that discipline, but in October of 1990, I guess it was—we will find out the exact date—at around 20 minutes to 1:00 in the morning, I will never forget making the point of order; the point of order was appealed and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, for all intents and purposes, was abolished.

Do not say, "It did not work." That is what I hear is said in these meetings and seminars, that Gramm-Rudman-Hollings did not work. The fact of the matter is that it was not the law that failed, but rather a bipartisan failure on the part of Congress to meet the targets.

The problem continues to worsen—and I emphasize, Mr. President, "worsen"—because if we had had the freezes that my distinguished friend on the other side of the aisle, the majority leader, Howard Baker of Tennessee, and I once offered, we would have a balanced budget this very minute.

After failing with freezes, I then came with taxes. Now, I have been in public service 40 years and I am not some loon who is off trying to get a headline. I do not need it. Instead, I try to make headway.

And I know that taxes are unpopular. Because of pollster politics in this land, every politician is told, whether Republican or Democrat, conservative or liberal, that Americans are all against taxes. Uniquely and ironically, we are in such a position that the only way we can stop increasing daily interest taxes by \$1 billion is to raise taxes. Now think about that statement. I said to stop increasing daily interest taxes of \$1 billion. Or save a few Sundays, we pushing gross interest up to \$339 billion. That interest cost to me is the worst tax of all, because it cannot be avoided. That is the first thing that comes off the top. So, we have spending on automatic pilot and tax increases on automatic pilot. That is why I say our country is in crisis.

The truth of the matter is that we have not paid for the Congress in years. We have not paid for the FBI in years. We have not paid for the DEA in years. We have not paid for the Departments of Commerce, the Interior, Agriculture, and other Departments in years. Why? Because if we look to see domestic discretionary—not defense—domestic discretionary spending right this minute is \$253 billion. Defense spending is \$270 billion; international affairs is \$21 billion for a grand total in discretionary spending of \$544 billion.

Get that figure in your mind and turn to the size of the deficit. The true deficit figure for 1995 is \$283 billion and not the \$176 billion that the press continues to report. They do not want to speak the truth in budgeting. I offered the amendment along with my late friend, Senator Heinz, to prevent us from using the Social Security trust fund to mask the size of the deficit. They do not adhere to it. OMB and CBO give two figures, one using the trust funds, one not using them.

As an aside, I might mention that Social Security is paying its way. It is not in the red. In fact, by the end of the century we will owe Social Security \$1 trillion. One trillion dollars we have borrowed. We are using these little IOU slips in the trust fund drawer to mask the true size of the deficit.

Now we will jump back to the \$253 billion we spend on domestic discretionary programs. The courts, the Congress, the President, the FBI, the judges—all of these Departments of Government add up to \$253 billion. Similarly, at the present time we have a deficit of \$283 billion. Thus, we could eliminate all of Government and we would still be facing a deficit.

When we come around with the Contract with America and say we will balance the budget with spending cuts, eliminate the Government, so to speak, we will still have a deficit. This is the unpardonable crisis we have worked our way into. I have continued to search for ideas. I appeared with the best of experts, Mr. Charles Walker, former Undersecretary of the Treasury, Dr. Cnossen of the Netherlands, who helped write the Japanese value-added tax, the United Kingdom's value-added tax.

I have been to countries like Argentina that are operating on a balanced budget. I have been to Chile where they are operating on a balanced budget, and I am lecturing them? I am embarrassed. I have the biggest foreign debt. I have gross interest, the biggest domestic account that we can possibly think of, and we act like all we are here to do is make the headlines with contracts, identify with the family, identify with the middle class, identify with California on immigration, and get past, if you please, the election.

I have tried to work on those entitlements. I wish Senators could have been at some of the meetings that I had with Claude Pepper. I learned that senior citizens were willing to sacrifice as long as everyone shared in shouldering the load. At a meeting with Claude and some senior citizens, I asked everyone to raise their hands if they were willing to just hold the line, freeze Social Security not cut it, but not get any increase so long as no one else got any increase. I would pick up half of Claude Pepper's audience. They would raise their hands and some would stand. After that, the distinguished Congressman from Florida and chairman of that particular committee quit inviting me to the meetings.

I have stood the fire on COLA freezes. Someone on the other side might try and say, "Oh, you did not vote that way in September 1985, when they wheeled in Pete Wilson for the Republican freeze of Social Security." That's true, I did not because it did not apply to every other particular program.

In addition, I have tried to reduce other entitlements. Along with the Senator from Kansas, now majority leader, I attempted to reduce the waste and inefficiencies in the Food Stamp Program, but the promised savings never materialized. Instead, we saw more and more children qualify for the program. I can tell Members here and now what causes latchkey children. It is that the average family's income has steadily declined. So both parents have to get out and they both have to hustle. That is the case in my family and perhaps in your families and everybody's family. That is the fact of life.

Some of them have to get out in order to support their children. The child is left at home.

And there it is. If you think you are going to save on aid for dependent children, look at what the distinguished majority leader said in the morning paper that I read: Babies having babies we deplore, but we are not cutting the children off. I agree with him. It is a child problem, it is not a political problem with the next election to identify: "I got hold of those riding around in Cadillacs and buying T-bone steaks with their food stamps". I have heard that ad nauseam for years and have written a book on hunger. We will talk on that at length on a different occasion.

My point in this whole particular amendment is that we are really in a

crisis condition relative to spending on automatic pilot, and the need of the hour is not a delay for a constitutional amendment.

The time for the discipline has passed, so to speak. What we need to do is do it. We all are like a bunch of players that have run up into the grandstand hollering, "We want a touchdown; we want a touchdown; we want a touchdown." Darn it, get down on the field and score a touchdown. We are the players.

I remember when Ronald Reagan came to town. He said he was going to balance the budget in 1 year. When he got here, after he had gotten elected on that pledge, he said, "Oops, this thing is way worse. It's going to take me 2 years."

We went back, thinking he was serious, in the Budget Committee and said, "All right, we'll make it 3 years so it will be realistic and we can get it done."

That was 1981, and by 1985, we had not done anything. In fact, we had this growth, growth, growth. We were supposed to grow out of our problems and give the people back their money so they can spend it better than Washington. We have been through that.

But the fact of the matter is, by 1985 in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, we had to make a 5-year plan. Now they are jumping it to 7 years. If you agree to that, I can tell you the next Congress is going to come for 10 years. Up, up, and away, just so long as you do not face the music.

I am saying now is the hour to face that music. We cannot do all we want done. But we can make a good start of providing a Marshall plan to rebuild the economy of this land so that we can go back to providing jobs for Americans.

The reality is that you cannot save enough on entitlements. What about defense? There are those who want to increase it inordinately. There are those who want to decrease it inordinately. I think the best judgment at this hour is to hold the line on defense and let the Defense Department really stabilize under the Bottom-Up Review.

With respect to domestic discretionary spending reductions, they have to come from freezes and cuts. But once you go over the list, you find out that there are not enough savings to balance the budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this cover sheet, with the list of the cuts, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Non-Defense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997
Space station	2.1	2.1
Eliminate CDBG	2.0	2.0
Eliminate low-income home energy assistance	1.4	1.5
Eliminate arts funding	1.0	1.0
Eliminate funding for campus based aid	1.4	1.4

Non-Defense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997
Eliminate funding for impact aid	1.0	1.0
Reduce law enforcement funding to control drugs	1.5	1.8
Eliminate Federal wastewater grants	0.8	1.6
Eliminate SBA loans	0.21	0.282
Reduce Federal aid for mass transit	0.5	1.0
Eliminate EDA	0.02	0.1
Reduce Federal rent subsidies	0.1	0.2
Reduce overhead for university research	0.2	0.3
Repeal Davis-Bacon	0.2	0.5
Reduce State Department funding and end miscellaneous activities	0.1	0.2
End Public Law 480 titles I and III sales	0.4	0.6
Eliminate overseas broadcasting	0.458	0.570
Eliminate the bureau of mines	0.1	0.2
Eliminate expansion of rural housing assistance	0.1	0.2
Eliminate ATP	0.1	0.2
Eliminate airport grant in aids	0.3	1.0
Eliminate Federal highway demonstration projects	0.1	0.3
Eliminate Amtrak subsidies	0.4	0.4
Eliminate RDA loan guarantees	0.0	0.1
Eliminate Appalachian Regional Commission	0.0	0.1
Eliminate Untargeted funds for math and science	0.1	0.2
Cut Federal salaries by 4 percent	4.0	4.0
Charge Federal employees commercial rates for parking	0.1	0.1
Reduce agricultural research extension activities	0.2	0.2
Cancel advanced solid rocket motor	0.3	0.4
Eliminate legal services	0.4	0.4
Reduce Federal travel by 30 percent	0.4	0.4
Reduce energy funding for Energy Technology Development	0.2	0.5
Reduce Superfund cleanup costs	0.2	0.4
Reduce REA subsidies	0.1	0.1
Eliminate postal subsidies for non-profits	0.1	0.1
Reduce NIH funding	0.5	1.1
Eliminate Federal Crop Insurance Program	0.3	0.3
Reduce Justice State-local assistance grants	0.1	0.2
Reduce export-import direct loans	0.1	0.2
Eliminate library programs	0.1	0.1
Modify Service Contract Act	0.2	0.2
Eliminate HUD special purpose grants	0.2	0.3
Reduce housing programs	0.4	1.0
Eliminate Community Investment Program	0.1	0.4
Reduce Strategic Petroleum Program	0.1	0.1
Eliminate Senior Community Service Program	0.1	0.4
Reduce USDA spending for export marketing	0.02	0.02
Reduce maternal and child health grants	0.2	0.4
Close Veterans hospitals	0.1	0.2
Reduce number of political employees	0.1	0.1
Reduce management costs for VA health care	0.2	0.4
Reduce PMA subsidy	0.0	1.2
Reduce below cost timber sales	0.0	0.1
Reduce the legislative branch 15 percent	0.3	0.3
Eliminate small business development centers	0.056	0.074
Eliminate minority assistance score, small business institute and other technical assistance programs, women's business assistance, international trade assistance, empowerment zones	0.033	0.046
Eliminate new State Department construction projects	0.010	0.023
Eliminate Int'l Boundaries and Water Commission	0.013	0.02
Eliminate Asia Foundation	0.013	0.015
Eliminate International Fisheries Commission	0.015	0.015
Eliminate Arms Control Disarmament Agency	0.041	0.054
Eliminate NED	0.014	0.034
Eliminate Fulbright and other international exchanges	0.119	0.207
Eliminate North-South center	0.002	0.004
Eliminate U.S. contribution to WHO, OAS, and other international organizations including the United Nations	0.873	0.873
Eliminate participation in U.N. peacekeeping	0.533	0.533
Eliminate Byrne Grant	0.112	0.306
Eliminate Community Policing Program	0.286	0.780
Moratorium on new Federal prison construction	0.028	0.140
Reduce Coast Guard 10 percent	0.208	0.260
Eliminate manufacturing extension program	0.03	0.06
Eliminate Coastal zone management	0.03	0.06
Eliminate National Marine sanctuaries	0.007	0.012
Eliminate climate and global change research	0.047	0.078
Eliminate national sea grant	0.032	0.054
Eliminate State weather modification grant	0.002	0.003
Cut weather service operations 10 percent	0.031	0.051
Eliminate regional climate centers	0.002	0.003
Eliminate minority business development agency	0.022	0.044
Eliminate public telecommunications facilities program grant	0.003	0.016
Eliminate children's educational television	0.0	0.002
Eliminate national information infrastructure grant	0.001	0.032
Cut Pell grants 20 percent	0.250	1.24
Eliminate education research	0.042	0.283
Cut Head Start 50 percent	0.840	1.8
Eliminate meals and services for the elderly	0.335	0.473
Eliminate title II social service block grant	2.7	2.8
Eliminate community services block grant	0.317	0.470
Eliminate rehabilitation services	1.85	2.30
Eliminate vocational education	0.176	1.2
Reduce chapter 1 20 percent	0.173	1.16
Reduce special education 20 percent	0.072	0.480
Eliminate bilingual education	0.029	0.196
Eliminate JTPA	0.250	4.5
Eliminate child welfare services	0.240	0.289
Eliminate CDC Breast Cancer Program	0.048	0.089
Eliminate CDC AIDS Control Program	0.283	0.525
Eliminate Ryan White AIDS Program	0.228	0.468
Eliminate maternal and child health	0.246	0.506
Eliminate Family Planning Program	0.069	0.143
Eliminate CDC Immunization Program	0.168	0.345
Eliminate Tuberculosis Program	0.042	0.087
Eliminate Agricultural Research Service	0.546	0.656
Reduce Agricultural Research Service	1.579	1.735
Reduce WIC 50 percent	1.579	1.735
Eliminate TEFAP:		
Administrative	0.024	0.040
Commodities	0.025	0.025
Reduce cooperative State research service 20 percent	0.044	0.070
Reduce animal plant health inspection service 10 percent	0.036	0.044

Non-Defense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997
Reduce food safety inspection service 10 percent	0.047	0.052
Total:	36.942	58.407

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

I been trying to put us on a reasonable path to get our deficit down to zero. But to do that through spending reductions alone requires \$1.2 billion in cuts over 7 years and \$37 billion in the first year.

Thirty-seven billion dollars in domestic discretionary looks attainable until you try it on. That is why I have listed them, doing my dead-level best to get up to the \$37 billion. I have listed the space station, eliminate it; the community development block grants; the lower-income home energy assistance; the arts funding, the funding for campus-based aid; the funding for impact aid; the funding to control drugs; SBA loans should be eliminated; the Federal aid to mass transit; eliminate the Economic Development Administration; reduce the Federal rent subsidies; reduce overhead for university research; repeal Davis-Bacon—I am going down a list of all these things they have been thinking about.

I am going down a list of all these things they have been speaking about.

Reduce the State Department funding and end miscellaneous activities, end P.L. 480 title I and title III sales, eliminate the overseas broadcasting, the Bureau of Mines, eliminate expansion of the rural housing assistance, eliminate U.S. Trade and Tourism and Travel Administration, the advanced technology program, the airport grants in aid, the Federal highway demonstration programs, eliminate Amtrak subsidies, eliminate the RDA loan guarantees, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the untargeted funds for math and science, cut Federal salaries by 4 percent, charge Federal employees commercial rates for parking, reduce agriculture research extension activities, cancel the advanced solid rocket motor, eliminate Legal Services Corporation, reduce the Federal travel by 30 percent, reduce the energy funding for energy technology development, reduce the Superfund cleanup costs, reduce the REA subsidies, eliminate the postal subsidies for nonprofits, reduce the NIH funding, eliminate the Federal Crop Insurance Program, reduce the Justice-State local assistance grants, reduce the export-import direct loans, eliminate library programs, modify the service contract, eliminate the HUD special purpose grants, reduce housing programs, eliminate community investment programs, reduce strategic petroleum program, eliminate the senior community service program, reduce the U.S. Department of Agriculture spending for export marketing, reduce maternal and child health grants, close the veterans hospitals, reduce the number of political employees, reduce the management costs for the VA health care, reduce the PMA subsidy, reduce

below-cost timber sales, reduce the legislative branch 15 percent, eliminate the small business development centers, eliminate the minority assistance on SCORE, technical assistance programs for women's business assistance, international trade assistance and import zones—all that is minority assistance gone, just like they did the caucus over across the hall there—eliminate new State Department construction projects, eliminate the International Boundaries and Water Commission, eliminate the Asia Foundation, eliminate the International Fisheries Commission, eliminate the Arms Control Disarmament Agency, eliminate the National Endowment for Democracy, eliminate Fulbright and other international exchanges, eliminate the North-South Center, eliminate the United States contribution to the World Health Organization, Organization of American States, and the other international organizations, including the United Nations, eliminate participation in U.N. peacekeeping, eliminate the Byrne grants, eliminate community policing programs, a moratorium on new Federal prison construction, reduce the Coast Guard 10 percent, eliminate manufacturing extension program, eliminate coastal zone management, the national marine sanctuaries, the climate and global change research, the national sea grant program, eliminate the State well and modification program, cut the Weather Service operations 10 percent, eliminate the regional climate centers, eliminate the Minority Business Development Agency, eliminate the public telecommunications facilities program grant, eliminate children's educational television, eliminate the national information infrastructure grant, cut Pell grants 20 percent, eliminate education research, cut Head Start 50 percent, eliminate the meals and services for the elderly, eliminate title II social service block grant, eliminate community services block grant, eliminate rehabilitation services, eliminate vocational education, reduce chapter 1 20 percent, reduce special education 20 percent, eliminate bilingual education, eliminate JTPA, eliminate child welfare services, eliminate CDC breast cancer program, eliminate the CDC AIDS control program, eliminate the Ryan White AIDS program, eliminate maternal and child health, eliminate family planning program, eliminate the CDC immunization program, eliminate the tuberculosis program, eliminate Agriculture Research Service, reduce WIC 50 percent, eliminate TEFAP administrative commodities, reduce cooperative State research 20 percent, eliminate animal/plant health inspection services 10 percent, reduce food safety inspection service 10 percent, and you have in outlays for the year 1996, \$36.942 billion.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it would be good at this time to include in the

RECORD a letter the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire dated January 11, 1995, to his colleagues saying, "As part of this process * * * to head up an effort to find dramatic spending reductions in entitlements," and list of reductions in entitlements be included in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, January 11, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, we are aggressively proceeding to address the development of next year's budget under the leadership of Senator Dole and Senator Domenici. As part of this process, I have been asked to head up an effort to find dramatic spending reductions in entitlements. I would appreciate your help in this effort.

We are going to attempt to identify entitlement savings in the range of hundreds of billions of dollars over the next five years. To accomplish this, we are using the following documents:

(1) Last year's Republican budget which entailed nearly \$215 billion in entitlement savings (Appendix A);

(2) An allocation formula of additional savings based on the approximate percent that various spending categories represent of total entitlement spending (Appendix B) and;

(3) A working draft of potential areas for savings (Appendix C).

Social Security is not to be included in any of this activity.

Using the enclosed documents and any other materials or ideas that you may have, I would appreciate it if you or your staff would get back to us no later than January 17th as to any specific suggestions or proposals that you would like to make.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

JUDD GREGG.

CHAPTER 1: PROPOSALS TO REFORM THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

I. OPTIONS TO REDUCE REPLACEMENT RATES FROM THE START OF RETIREMENT FOR CSRS AND FERS

A. Modify the salary used to set pensions: Cost savings: \$510 million over 5 years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999).

II. OPTIONS TO RETAIN INITIAL REPLACEMENT RATES BUT REDUCE BENEFITS DURING RETIREMENT THROUGH COLA RESTRICTIONS FOR CSRS AND FERS

A. Limit COLAS to one-half percentage point below inflation for CSRS:

Cost savings: \$2.45 billion over 5 years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999).

B. Defer COLAS until age 62 for all non-disabled employees who retire before that age for those under CSRS:

Cost savings: \$1.210 billion over five years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999: No savings in 1995).

III. OPTIONS TO INCREASE THE CSRS AND FERS RETIREMENT AGE

A. Raise the retirement age from 55 to 65 prospectively for all new hires after 1993:

Cost savings: Because of the prospective implementation, there would be no immediate savings.

B. Raise the age of civilian retirement to 62:

Cost savings: \$14 billion over 5 years (1994-1998).

IV. OPTIONS TO RAISE DEFINED BENEFIT CONTRIBUTIONS IN CSRS AND FERS

A. Increase employee contributions to Retirement Fund in CSRS from 7 percent to 9 percent over two years:

Cost Savings: \$4.180 billion over 5 years. (CBO Projection from 1995-1999).

V. OPTIONS REGARDING CSRS AND FERS SURVIVOR BENEFITS

A. Conform the maximum entitlement age for CSRS/FERS child-survivor benefits to that of Social Security:

Cost savings: \$50 million over 4 years. (1994-1997).

B. Base survivor annuity on the retiree's reduced annuity:

Cost savings: \$350 million over 4 years. (1994-1997).

VI. OPTIONS TO DECREASE THE EMPLOYER MATCHING RATE FOR VOLUNTARY THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN (TSP) CONTRIBUTIONS

Option 1: Eliminate the 50-cents-per-dollar match for the fifth percent of salary available under the current thrift savings plan for all new hires:

Cost savings: \$144 million over 5 years.

Option 2: Eliminate the 50-cents-per-dollar match for new employees:

Cost savings: No saving over 5 years.

Option 3: Limit the Federal match to a federal matching rate of 50 percent against the first five percent of pay:

Cost savings: \$2.34 billion over 5 years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999).

Option 4: Reduce the Federal matching contributions from one dollar to 50 cents for contributions above the first one-percent of pay contributed by employees:

Cost savings: Does not indicate separate cost savings.

CHAPTER 2: PROPOSALS TO REFORM THE MILITARY RETIREMENT SYSTEM

I. OPTIONS TO REDUCE REPLACEMENT RATES FROM THE START OF RETIREMENT

A. Modify the salary used to set pensions: Cost savings: \$110 million over 5 years. (CBO Projections from 1995-1999).

II. OPTIONS TO RETAIN INITIAL REPLACEMENT RATES BUT REDUCE BENEFITS DURING RETIREMENT THROUGH COLA RESTRICTIONS

B. Defer COLAs:

Option 1: For those who enlist after 1993, defer the COLA on their retirement benefits until age 62:

Cost savings: None over 5 years. (1994-1999).

Option 2: Defer COLAs for all future military retirees until age 62:

Cost savings: \$4.45 billion over 5 years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999: No savings in 1995).

B. Limit COLAs:

1. Limit COLAs to one percentage point below inflation for all the future military retirees.

Cost savings: \$2.77 billion over 5 years. (CBO projections from 1995-1999).

CHAPTER 3: PROPOSALS TO REFORM MEDICARE Part 1: Proposals To Reform Medicare Part A, Hospital Insurance (HI)

I. PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM (PPS)

A. Eliminate Medicare payments to hospitals for enrollees' bad debts:

Cost savings: \$1.75 billion over 5 years. (CBO Projection for 1995-1999).

B. Eliminate Medicare's additional payments to sole community hospitals (SCHs).

Cost savings: \$1.33 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995-1999).

II. PPS—UPDATE FACTOR PROPOSALS

Cost savings: \$17.76 billion over four years. (HHS projection for 1997-2000).

A. Update Medicare payments to hospitals for inpatient care on a calendar-year basis:

Cost savings: \$4.6 billion over 4 years. (HHS projection for 1994-1997).

B. Freeze Medicare's part A payment rates and limits for 1 year:

Cost savings: \$8.45 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995-1999).

C. Extend OBRA-93 skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) savings:

Cost savings: \$920 million over 5 years. (HHS projection for 1996-2000).

III. CAPITAL PAYMENTS

A. Mandated reduction in capital reimbursement payments to hospitals:

Cost savings: \$4 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection based on \$800 million savings annually).

B. Reduce capital payments by the following three changes:

Cost savings: \$6.2 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection for 1996-2000).

IV. INDIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION

A. Reduce Medicare's payments for the indirect costs of patient care that are related to hospitals' teaching programs:

Option 1: Lower teaching adjustments to 6 percent:

Cost savings: \$4.79 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995-1999).

Option 2: Lower teaching adjustments to 3 percent:

Cost savings: \$13.55 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995-1999).

Option 3: Lower teaching adjustments to level supported by HCFA's empirical data, or 5.65 percent:

Cost savings: \$5.225 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection based on annual savings of \$1.045 billion).

Option 4: Lower teaching adjustments to 3.2 percent:

Cost savings: \$8.71 billion over 5 years. (GAO projection 1992-1996).

B. Replace indirect medical education adjustments with a transfer support system:

Cost savings: \$18.45 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection for 1996-2000).

Part 2: Proposals to Reform Medicare Part B, Supplemental Medical Insurance

I. FEE SCHEDULES—PHYSICIANS SERVICES

A. Relative value units:

1. Payments to medical staffs would be limited.

Cost savings: \$2.45 billion over 3 years (HHS projection for 1998-2000; no savings in 1995-97).

B. Geographic adjustment:

There are no current options that affect the geographic adjustment.

C. Conversion factor:

1. Reduction in conversion factor for 1994.

Cost savings: \$2.85 billion over 6 years. (HHS projection for 1995-2000).

D. Update factor:

1. Beginning in fiscal year 1996, use the change in real gross domestic product (GDP) to adjust the volume and intensity factors of the MVPS calculation.

Cost savings: \$5.775 billion over 4 years. (HHS projection for 1997-2000).

2. Set cumulative growth targets for MVPS.

Cost savings: \$5.475 billion over 4 years (HHS projection from 1997-2000) Note: includes \$75 million cost in 1997.

V. MEANS-TESTING

A. Phase in an increase of the deductible from \$696 to \$2000 for hospital stays under Medicare Part A for individuals with AGIs above \$70,000 (couples above \$90,000):

Cost savings: \$1.6 billion over 5 years. (1995-1999).

VI. DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITAL ADJUSTMENTS

A. Eliminate the disproportionate share adjustment for hospitals in Medicare's prospective payment system:

Option 1: Eliminate the DSH payment immediately.

Cost savings: \$20.3 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995-1999).

Option 1: Phase out the DSH payments over 5 years.

Cost savings: \$12.55 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

B. Reduce DSH payments:

Cost savings: \$17.25 billion over 5 years. (HHS projects an additional 1.5 percentage points would be added for primary care services. Projection for 1996–2000).

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS OPTIONS

A. Do not reimburse Medicare providers for substandard medical care:

Cost savings: \$550 million over 5 years. (HHS projection based on annual estimated savings of \$110 million).

II. CLINICAL LAB SERVICES-FEE SCHEDULES

A. Include laboratory services in outpatient or office visits in the charges:

Cost savings: \$6 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection).

B. Change the way Medicare pays for clinical laboratory test:

Cost savings: \$2.13 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection).

C. Permanently extend the 2 percent annual update of Medicare reimbursement rates for clinical lab services:

Cost savings: \$740 million over 4 years. (OMB projection for 1994–1997).

III. OUTPATIENT TREATMENT/SERVICES

A. Treat hospital admissions as outpatient services when there is no overnight stay:

Cost savings: \$1.05 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection based on annual savings \$210 million).

B. Bring outpatient-services payments in line with ambulatory service center (ASC) approved insurance:

Cost savings: \$645 million over 5 years. (HHS projection).

C. Continue Medicare's transition to prospective rates for facility costs in hospital outpatient departments:

Cost savings: \$340 million over 5 years.

D. Require Medicare payments to equal the blended amount less any amount the hospital may charge as coinsurance:

Cost savings: \$9.75 billion over 7 years. (HHS projection for 1994–2000).

E. Reasonable cost reimbursements:

1. Increase the 5.8 percent reduction of payments for hospital outpatient services to 10 percent reduction.

Cost savings: \$2.6 billion over 4 years from 1993 estimate. (OMB estimate as reported in Medicare: FY94 Budget (Updated December 13, 1993)).

IV. CO-INSURANCE FOR PART B

A. Increase the part B coinsurance rate to 25 percent on all services that are currently subject to a coinsurance rate of 20 percent:

Cost savings: \$16.25 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

B. Clinical lab services:

1. Collect 20 percent coinsurance on clinical lab services under Medicare.

Cost savings: \$6.18 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

V. DEDUCTIBLE

A. Increase Medicare's deductible from \$100 to \$150 and index for inflation:

Cost savings: \$9.29 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection over 1995–1999).

VI. PREMIUMS

A. Increase the part B premium to 30 percent of program costs:

Cost savings: \$17.37 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999). (Note: Savings is actually over 4 years because no change in 1995).

VII. MEANS-TESTING

A. Phase out the premium subsidy for higher income beneficiaries:

Option 1: Gradually reduce the Medicare part B premium subsidy for high-income enrollees with AGIs beginning at \$70,000 for in-

dividuals (\$90,000 for couples). The subsidy would be phased out completely at AGI of \$95,000 for individuals (\$115,000 for couples).

Cost savings: \$7.34 billion over 5 years.

Option 2: Phase out part B subsidy through gradual reduction in subsidy for enrollees earning more than \$50,000 (\$65,000 for couples):

Cost savings: \$16.3 billion over 5 years.

Option 3: Raise the part B premium to cover 75 percent of costs for individuals with incomes exceeding \$90,000 (\$115,000 for couples):

Cost savings: Not Available.

Option 4: Raise the premium for physicians' services under Medicare to cover 75 percent of costs for individuals with incomes exceeding \$75,000 (\$100,000 for couples):

Cost savings: \$8 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1996–2000).

Option 5: Raise the part B premium to cover 50 percent of costs for individuals with incomes exceeding \$60,000 and for couples with incomes exceeding \$80,000:

Cost savings: \$6.02 billion over 5 years.

Option 6: Income-related premiums would cover 100 percent of costs for individuals with incomes exceeding \$125,000 and for couples with incomes over \$150,000:

Cost savings: \$5.375 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

Option 7: Raise the premium for physicians' services under Medicare to cover an additional one-third of program costs for individuals with incomes exceeding \$100,000 (\$125,000 for couples):

Cost savings: Not Available.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Charge a fee for supplementary medical insurance (part B) claims that are not billed electronically:

Cost savings: \$550 million over 4 years. (CBO projection 1994–1998).

B. Competitive bids:

1. Require the Secretary of HHS to establish competitive acquisition areas for the awarding of contracts to furnish selected items or services, effective January 1, 1995.

Cost savings: \$980 million over 6 years. (HHS projection for 1995–2000).

2. Require the Secretary to reduce lab fee schedule payment amounts if competitive acquisition did not result in a 10 percent reduction in payments that would otherwise have been made.

Cost savings: \$1.55 billion over 6 years. (HHS projection for 1995–2000).

IX. EXTEND CURRENT LAW

A. Permanently extend OBRA-90 5.8 percent reduction of Medicare reimbursement for hospital outpatient department (OPD) reasonable costs beyond 1995:

Cost savings: \$950 million over 4 years. (OMB projection for 1994–1997).

Part 3: Proposals Affecting Part A and Part B

I. MEDICARE SECONDARY PAYMENT (MSP)

A. Extend MSP provisions for beneficiaries whose Medicare eligibility is based on end stage renal disease (ESRD) from the current law limit of 18 months to the duration of treatment of the disease:

Cost savings: \$3.018 billion over 5 years.

II. HOME HEALTH SERVICES

A. Home health co insurance:

Option 1: Establish 20 percent coinsurance for home health services under Medicare from beneficiaries with Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) above 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. (The 150 percent poverty level in 1992 was \$10,094 for individuals age 65 or over and \$12,730 for two-person families with a head age 65 or older):

Cost savings: \$13.675 billion over 5 years.

Option 2: Establish 10 percent coinsurance on home health services under Medicare

from beneficiaries with AGI above 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. (The 150 percent poverty level in 1992 was \$10,094 for individuals age 65 or over and \$12,730 for two-person families with a head age 65 or older):

Cost savings: \$7 billion over 5 years. (1994–1998).

Option 3: Establish a 10 percent copayment from those receiving home health services:

Cost savings: \$11 billion over 5 years.

Option 4: Establish a 10 percent copayment for all home health services, except for those received within 30 days of discharge from a hospital for inpatient care:

Cost savings: \$8.02 billion over 6 years. (HHS projection for 1995–2000).

Option 5: Collect 20 percent coinsurance on all home health and skilled nursing facility (SNF) services under Medicare:

Cost savings: \$20.45 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

B. Other home health proposals:

1. Extend OBRA-93 home health saving.

Cost savings: \$2.1 billion over 4 years. (HHS projection for 1997–2000).

2. Establish home health median limit.

Cost savings: \$600 million over 4 years. (HHS projection for 1997–2000).

III. GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

A. Reduce Medicare's direct payments for Medical education:

Option 1: Base Medicare direct medical education payments on a national per resident amount derived from the national average of salaries paid to residents in 1987, updated annually by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for urban areas:

Cost savings: \$1.07 billion over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

Option 2: Base Medicare direct medical education payments on a national per resident amount derived solely from the average of salaries paid to residents:

Cost savings: \$1.4 billion over 4 years. (OMB projection for 1994–1997).

Option 3: Reduce teaching and overhead payments for non-rural, non-primary care residents in their initial residency period and eliminate these payments beyond the initial residency, but continue to pay salaries and fringe benefits:

Cost savings: \$1.225 billion over 5 years. (1994–1995).

IV. ELIGIBILITY AGE

A. Raise the Medicare entitlement age to 67:

Cost savings: Savings would begin in the year 2000 and build as the increase is phased in over 26 years. The potential savings would be approx. \$60 billion per year immediately after the entitlement age reaches 67 in 2027. This amount is between \$4.7 and \$14.6 billion per year, depending on the measure used.

V. MEANS TESTING

A. Establish an income-tested deductible for the sum of payments under part A and part B of Medicare:

Cost savings: \$55 billion annual savings. The authority of this option (CATO) estimate that it would reduce the growth of outlays from medical care by at least one percentage point.

VI. HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS (HMOs)

A. Standardize payments to HMOs:

Cost savings: \$1.285 billion over 6 years. (OMB projection for 1995–2000).

VII. EXTEND PROVISIONS OF CURRENT LAW

A. Medicare secondary payment (MSP):

Cost savings: \$2.680 billion over 2 years (HHS projection for 1999–2000; no savings in 1995–1998 because the current system covers up to 1998).

B. Permanently extend the data program to identify Medicare secondary payment (MSP):

Cost savings: \$465 million over 2 years. (HHS projection; no savings before 1999 because current system is in effect through 1998).

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS OPTIONS

A. MSP Overpayments:

Cost savings: Savings from this proposal depend on administrative action, including the allocation of sufficient discretionary funding to the HCFA to collect the estimated overpayments. While the maximum savings would be \$961.6 million in the first year, it is unlikely that all of this sum would be collectable.

B. Increase Medicare oversight funding for the contractors that do claims processing:

Cost savings (savings in mandatory spending, but costs in discretionary spending):

Heritage Foundations—\$5.4 billion over 5 years.

GAO—stated that CBO does not make estimates of this type of savings but does not disagree with GAO.

CHAPTER 4: PROPOSALS TO REFORM MEDICAID

1. Institutionalized care.

A. Nursing facility care (NFC):

1. Mandate state regulation of growth in the number of nursing home beds.

Cost savings: \$625 million over 5 years. (CBO projection for 1995–1999).

B. Institutions for the mentally retarded:

1. Reduce to legally authorized levels of Medicaid payments to institutions for the mentally retarded.

Cost savings: \$3.415 billion over 5 years. (HHS projection based on annual savings of \$683 million).

MISCELLANEOUS

A. Managed care:

1. Require states to phases in managed care programs for Medicaid patients.

Cost savings: \$10 billion over 5 years. (1995–1999).

B. Merge Women Infants and Children (WIC) with Medicaid:

Cost savings: \$4.4 billion over 4 years. (1992–1996).

C. Impose higher premiums on Medicaid recipients with incomes over 100 percent of poverty:

Cost savings: \$600 million over 4 years. (1992–1996).

D. Eliminate Medicaid transition benefits for AFDC recipients:

Cost savings: \$750 million over 4 years (1992–1996).

E. Eliminate Federal matching in the Medicaid Program for the State Medicare buy-in:

Cost savings: \$3.6 billion over 6 years. (1992–1996).

CHAPTER 5: PROPOSALS TO REFORM FEDERAL HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

I. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

A. End the pay-as-you-go policy for Federal employees health benefits program and prefund Federal retirees' health insurance (pay-as-you-earn policy):

Cost savings: \$11.6 billion over 5 years. Estimates of savings could vary greatly, depending on CBO's estimate of the timing of a Postal rate increase to finance this proposal. The recorded deficit would not change by adopting this proposal because the increased agency payments would simply represent transactions between accounts within the budget. But the option's coverage of government enterprises, primarily the Postal Service, would reduce the Federal budget deficit in the near term. The option would increase agencies' current costs, but the agencies could offset these increases by absorbing the costs through program reductions, or by increasing the postage and utility rates and thus decrease the budget deficit. Almost all of the savings would come from the Postal

Service because it is highly labor intensive. Rate increases could not be effective before late 1996 or early 1997.

II. HEALTH CARE BLOCK GRANTS

A. Reduce funding by 50 percent for the maternal child health (MCH) block grant and the preventive health services block grant:

Cost savings: \$1.7 billion over 5 years. (1992–1996).

CHAPTER 9: PROPOSALS TO REFORM MEANS-TESTED PROGRAMS

Part 1: Proposals To Reform Supplemental Security Income (SSI)

I. PROGRAMMATIC REFORM

A. Reduce the \$20 exclusion from income in SSI:

Cost savings: \$1 billion over 5 years.

B. Replace cash benefits with medical vouchers for SSI benefits to disabled children:

Cost savings: Not Available.

C. Review status of SSI child disability recipients upon eighteenth birthday:

Cost savings: Not Available.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS THAT REQUIRE NO CHANGE IN LAW

A. Overpayments and debts:

1. Report the admission of SSI recipients to nursing homes in a timely fashion in order to stop overpayment of benefits.

Cost savings: \$110 million over 5 years.

2. Use income tax offsets to recover SSI overpayments.

Cost savings: \$82.5 million over 5 years.

3. Improve recovery SSI overpayments by offsetting reductions in Social Security payments.

Cost savings through legislation: \$120 million over 5 years.

Cost savings without legislation: \$46.5 million over 5 years.

Part 2: Proposals To Reform Welfare

I. NON-CITIZENS/ALIENS

A. Restrict eligibility for recipients of welfare assistance:

Option 1: Rescind the PRUCOL standard for AFDC, SSI, and nonemergency Medicaid and replace with a uniform standard for programs with a restricted list of eligible recipients.

Cost savings: Not Available.

Option 2: Deny all aliens, except refugees and elderly permanent residents, from eligibility for 61 programs, not including emergency Medicaid:

Cost savings: Not Available.

Option 3: Deny all aliens, with limited exception, from eligibility for 58 programs, not including emergency Medicaid:

Cost savings: Not Available.

II. FAMILIES AND CHILDREN

A. Cap the AFDC-emergency program:

Cost savings: \$1.6 billion over 5 years.

B. Reduce benefits to AFDC families who also receive public housing benefits:

Cost savings: \$3 billion over 5 years.

C. Eliminate the \$50 child support payment to AFDC families:

Cost savings: \$630 million over 5 years.

D. Decrease Head Start funding by 50 percent:

Cost savings: Not Available.

E. Limit Federal participation in States' costs for administering the Foster Care Program:

Option 1: This option would limit annual increases in payments to each state for administrative costs to 10 percent a year:

Cost savings: \$150 million over five years (CBO Cost projections).

Option 2: This option would limit annual increases in payments to each state in the four following ways:

Cost savings: \$1.793 billion over 5 years.

F. Require States to develop criteria and implement procedures for assuring that foster care agencies refer appropriate cases to State child support agencies:

Cost savings: \$55 million over 5 years.

Part 3: Proposals To Reform the Food Stamp and Child Nutrition Programs

I. ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS

A. Merge AFDC, food stamps, public housing assistance, the earned income tax credit (EITC), and other welfare programs into a cash assistance program requiring recipients without children to work for assistance:

Cost savings: \$10 billion over 5 years.

II. CHANGES IN FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT PROCEDURES

A. Change Federal administrative-cost reimbursements in welfare programs:

1. Reduce the reimbursement rate for administrative costs in AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamps to 45 percent.

Cost savings: \$5.7 billion over 5 years.

2. Consolidate the administrative costs of AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamps into a single system, requiring states to pay at least half of all administrative costs and placing a cap on total reimbursable expenditures.

Cost savings: \$6.3 billion over 5 years.

3. Require states to reimburse the Federal government for all food stamps overpayment errors caused by state administrators.

Cost savings: \$5.6 billion over 5 years.

4. Deny Federal matching of administrative costs for expenses related to states appealing quality control sanctions in the Food Stamp, AFDC, and Medicaid programs.

Cost savings: Not Available.

III. PROGRAMMATIC REFORM

A. Eliminate food stamps, public housing, and other welfare benefits for all able-bodied adults:

Cost savings: \$6 billion over 5 years.

B. Require all employable food stamp recipients to engage in workfare or job search:

Cost savings: \$600 million over 5 years.

C. Food Stamp Benefits:

1. Eliminate small food stamp benefits.

Cost savings: \$300 million over 5 years.

2. Limit child nutrition program subsidies.

Option 1: Increase targeting of school lunch and child and adult care food program on low-income persons by eliminating subsidies for children from families with relatively high incomes:

Cost savings: \$3.07 billion over 5 years.

Option 2: Restrict child nutrition and school lunch subsidies to families below 185 percent of the poverty threshold:

Cost savings: \$5.7 billion over 5 years.

Option 3: End all child nutrition program subsidies for children with family income above poverty:

Cost savings: \$1 billion over 5 years.

D. Count certain non-cash benefits in determining housing and food stamp assistance:

Cost savings: \$6.15 billion over 5 years.

Part 4: Proposals To Reform the Unemployment Compensation Program

I. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION (UC)

A. Deny UC benefits to military personnel who leave voluntarily:

Cost savings: \$1.4 billion savings over 5 years (1994–1998).

B. End unemployment compensation benefits for individuals with taxable income exceeding \$120,000 a year:

Cost savings: \$361 million over 5 years (1994–1998).

C. Substantially reduce unemployment benefits by delaying benefits for 1 month and reducing the benefit by 5 percent per week for 20 weeks:

Cost savings: \$5.0 billion savings over 5 years (1994–1998).

D. Require a two-week waiting period before unemployment compensation benefits begin:

Cost savings: \$4.6 billion savings over 5 years (1993-1997).

II. TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

A. Eliminate trade adjustment assistance, including training and cash benefits:

Cost savings: \$990 million over 5 years (1995-1999).

B. Eliminate trade adjustment assistance cash benefits:

Cost savings: \$660 million over 5 years (1995-1999).

C. Congressional proposals:

1. Reemployment Act of 1994.

Cost savings: Not available.

2. Job Training Consolidation Act of 1994 (Sen. Kassebaum).

Cost savings: Not available.

III. PRIVATIZATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Cost savings: Not available.

Part 5: Proposals to Reform Veterans' Programs

I. GENERAL BENEFIT PAYMENTS

A. Eliminate subsidy for administrative costs of life insurance programs:

Cost savings: \$113 million over 4 years.

B. Restore GI Bill Education Program funding ratio to 9:1:

Cost savings: \$339 million over 4 years.

II. FACILITIES

A. Close or convert inefficient or underused VA facilities:

Cost savings: \$1.2 billion over 5 years.

III. HEALTH CARE

A. Adopt a prospective payment system for veterans health care (Similar to the Medicare system):

Cost savings: \$2.25 billion over 5 years.

IV. DISABILITY PAYMENTS

A. End VA disability compensation for non-service-related injuries and illnesses:

Cost savings: \$950 million over 5 years.

B. Eliminate disability payments to veterans with diseases presumed not to be related to military service:

Cost savings: \$616 million over five years.

CHAPTER 10: PROPOSALS TO REFORM THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

I. ELIMINATE THE VARIABLE RATE PREMIUM CAP BY 1997 AND RAISING THE VARIABLE RATE PREMIUM FROM \$9 TO \$18 FOR * * *

* * * * *

3. Extend authority to recover costs from health insurers of veterans for non-service-related conditions.

* * * * *

C. Restrict eligibility for disability compensation benefits:

Option 1: End payments to veterans with low-rated disabilities.

Cost savings: \$3.25 billion over 5 years.

Option 2: Phase-out payments to veterans with non-service related or low-rated disabilities.

Cost savings: \$2.6 billion in 2000.

V. LOANS

A. Loan fees:

1. Raise the loan fee for housing loans guaranteed by the VA.

Cost savings: \$1.4 billion over five years.

B. Require down payment and fee for multiple use of loan guaranty:

Cost savings: \$68 million over four years.

C. Permanently extend resale loss provision:

Cost savings: \$80 million over four years.

VI. EXTEND PROVISIONS OF CURRENT LAW

A. Eliminate all "sunset" dates on certain provisions for veterans:

1. Permanently extend income verification through IRS.

Cost savings: \$25 million in 1999.

2. Permanently extend pension limit to veterans receiving Medicaid care.

Cost savings: \$190 million in 1999.

CHAPTER 11: PROPOSALS TO REFORM FARM PROGRAMS

I. CONSERVATION

A. End the Conservation Reserve Program:

Cost savings: \$9.3 billion over 5 years.

(While the program costs about \$1.8 billion per year it is estimated that the program saves about \$1 billion in Federal expenditures in other farm programs. The \$9.3 billion estimate probably does not account for this. Thus, the actual savings could be only \$800 million per year, or \$4 billion over 5 years.)

II. FARM SUBSIDIES

A. Crop subsidies

1. Phase out agricultural crop subsidies over 5 years at a rate of 20 percent each year.

Cost savings: \$6.5 billion over 4 years.

2. Lower target prices subsidized crops.

Option 1: Reduce prices by 3 percent annually starting in 1995.

Cost savings: \$11.2 billion over 5 years.

Option 2: Reduce prices by 1.5 percent in 1995 and 1996, and 3 percent for 4 years thereafter.

Cost savings: \$4.5 billion over 5 years.

3. End Federal subsidies for rice and cotton.

Cost savings: \$6.8 billion over 5 years.

4. Eliminate the 0/85 (formerly 0/92) and 50/85 (formerly 50/92) programs for participants in USDA commodity programs, which pay farmers to leave land idle.

Cost savings: \$1.34 billion over 5 years.

5. Reduce the CCC outlays by lowering the number of acres eligible for deficiency payments from 85 percent to 75 percent of base acreage.

Cost savings: \$3.94 billion over 5 years.

6. Increase assessments on "non-program" federally-subsidized crops starting in 1996.

Cost savings: \$900 million over 4 years.

7. Require specific "Endings-Stock-To-Use" ratios for setting acreage reduction programs for feed grains.

Cost savings: \$600 million over 5 years.

B. Livestock subsidies:

1. Dairy subsidies and supports.

a. End all Federal dairy subsidies.

Cost savings: \$1 billion over 4 years.

b. Reduce costs for the dairy price support program by increasing the assessment on producers.

Cost savings: \$1.2 billion over 5 years.

c. Reform milk marketing orders to reduce milk price support outlays.

Cost savings: \$1.05 billion over 5 years.

2. Eliminate Federal support for honey.

Cost savings: \$32 million over 4 years (assuming restrictive appropriations language does not continue in the future).

C. Means testing of subsidies:

1. Restrict eligibility for benefits from price support programs and reduce the payment limitation.

Cost savings: \$2.73 billion over 5 years:

Limit farm price support payments to \$50,000/person: \$670 million over 5 years.

Limit farm price support payments to \$40,000/person: \$1.28 billion over 5 years.

Disqualify people whose Adjusted Gross Income exceeds \$100,000: \$300 million over 5 years.

Disqualify people whose gross revenue from commodity sales exceeds \$500,000: \$670 million over 5 years.

2. End Federal farm subsidies for individuals with annual net taxable income of more than \$120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income of more than \$5 million.

Cost savings: \$1.04 billion over 5 years.

3. Target CCC farm subsidy payments to farmers with off-farm incomes below \$100,000.

Cost savings: \$470 million over 5 years (1994-1997).

D. Cash repayments of USDA commodity loans:

1. Require cash repayment of USDA commodity loans and allow program administrators to set local repayment rates closer to prevailing market prices so the Federal Government no longer covers additional, unnecessary costs.

Cost savings: \$320 million in 5 years.

III. AGRICULTURAL EXPORT PROGRAMS

A. Export subsidies:

1. Eliminate the Export Enhancement Program.

Cost savings: \$4.16 billion over 5 years.

2. End EEP for individuals with annual net taxable income of more than \$120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income of more than \$5 million.

Cost savings: \$6 billion over 5 years.

B. USDA's Export Credit Programs; reduce loan guarantees made and eliminate loans to high-risk borrowers:

Cost savings: \$1.14 billion over 5 years.

C. The Market Promotion Program:

1. Eliminate the Market Promotion Program.

Cost savings: \$500 million over 5 years.

2. Permanently extend MPP at the lower OBRA-93 level.

Cost savings: \$2.6 million over 5 years.

3. End Federal MPP subsidies for individuals with annual net taxable income over \$120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over \$5 million.

Cost savings: \$500,000 over 5 years.

IV. DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND CROP INSURANCE

A. Replace the Federal Crop Insurance Program with standing authority for disaster assistance:

Cost savings: \$1.6 billion over 5 years.

B. Require the FCIC to set premiums and pay indemnities based on an areas performance rather than that of an individual farmer

Cost savings: \$551 million over 5 years.

CHAPTER 12: PROPOSALS TO REFORM MISCELLANEOUS ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS

GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

A. Charge market prices for electricity sold by power marketing administrations:

Cost savings: \$4.8 billion over 5 years.

II. NATIONAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

A. Improve pricing for commercial and recreational uses of public land:

1. Reform Federal water policy.

Option 1: Allow farmers who grow agricultural commodities that are in surplus to receive only one of the Federal subsidies: either crop price support payments or Federally subsidized water.

Option 2: Require that farms of more than 960 acres be charged the full cost of Federal irrigation water. Although current law contains this requirement, it is often circumvented because of the vague definition of the term "farm."

Cost savings: \$110 million over 5 years.

2. Raise recreation fees at Federal facilities.

Cost savings: \$720 million over 5 years.

B. Change the revenue-sharing formula from a gross-receipt to a net-receipt basis for commercial activities on Federal land:

Cost savings: \$880 million over 5 years.

C. Index nuclear waste disposal fees for inflation:

Cost savings: \$255 million over 5 years.

D. Charge royalties for hardrock mining on Federal lands:

Cost savings: \$280 million over 5 years.

III. COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

A. Increase FCC user fees to cover all costs currently financed through the general fund:

Cost savings: \$575 million over 5 years.

B. Charge a user fee on commodity futures and options contract transactions:

Cost savings: \$310 million over 5 years.

C. Grant the Government an option to buy shares of depository institutions that convert from mutual to stock form:

Cost savings: \$310 million over 5 years.

IV. TRANSPORTATION

A. Establish charges for airport takeoff and landing slots:

Cost savings: \$1.5 billion over 5 years.

B. Establish user fees for ATC services:

Cost savings: \$7 billion over 5 years.

C. Impose user fees on the Inland waterway system:

Cost savings: \$3.14 billion over 5 years.

V. EDUCATION

A. Reduce subsidies to students for Stafford loans:

1. Require students to pay in-school interest.

Cost savings: \$9.56 billion over 5 years.

2. Raise the Loan Origination Fee.

Cost savings: \$1.53 billion over 5 years.

B. Reduce Stafford loan spending by including home equity in the determination of financial need:

Cost savings: \$400 million over 5 years.

VII. ALLOWANCES

A. Charge a penalty for early redemptions of saving bonds:

Cost savings: \$240 million over 5 years.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Now, Mr. President, if you want your knees to buckle, read that. DICK ARMEY is right. If you want your knees to buckle, read that one, or listen to the discretionary cuts. I would not favor half of these. I probably would not favor 70 percent of these cuts. I have not gone down and said what I would cut.

I am trying, as I would, when I was chairman of the Budget Committee, to pose to the colleagues here the art of the possible. Here is what is necessary. Here is what has to be done. And then, assuming it is done, the key point here is those are 1996 outlay amounts. That amounts in 1997 to only \$58.407 billion in cuts. If you look at 1997, you have to have \$74 billion in spending cuts, so you are still \$16 billion shy next year when you work on the budget. The same will be true the year after that, and the year after that, and the year after that.

You see, this is what my colleagues have to understand. If they do not put the budget on a glidepath to zero now, you will always be playing catch-up. The next thing you know, you'll be moving the targets.

Now, let us not talk fancifully. I will never forget, Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico—we all act like government started up when GINGRICH came to town. We have been in government for quite a while, and several items in the contract, of course, we not only have favored, we cosponsored 10 years ago. The line-item veto. I used the line-item veto as a Governor 35 years ago. So it is not an invention in a contract. Last year, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, and I tried again. We got 53 votes. The idea is separately enroll individual items so the President can veto legislation like we do at the State level.

Many of these so-called new ideas have been tried before. Back in 1986, the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee got nettled in the debate because colleagues on both sides of the aisle were chastising him saying, "Why don't you put in the cuts? Why don't you put in the cuts?" So in a fit of, let us call it, sobriety, the Domenici-Chiles modified amendment was introduced expressing the sense of the Senate that some 44 programs be terminated. And I will ask that the list be included in the RECORD. You hear the same song in the Contract With America. We are going to do away with the ICC. We are going to do away with weatherization assistance. We are going to do away with the community services block grants and the travel and tourism administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those programs be reprinted at this particular point in the RECORD.

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

REAGAN BUDGET CUTS—1986

Work incentive program (WIN).
General revenue sharing.
Conrail.
Trade adjustment assistance to firms.
Appalachian Regional Commission.
Economic Development Administration.
Urban development action grants.
U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration.
Export-Import Bank direct loans.
Community services block grant.
Rental housing development action grant (HODAG).
Section 312 rehabilitation loan fund.
Postal Subsidy.
FEMA supplemental emergency food and shelter.
Advanced communications technology satellite.
OPIC insurance programs.
Amtrak.
Interstate Commerce Commission (terminations and transfers).
Washington Metro construction grants.
Maritime cargo preference expansion.
EPA sewage treatment grants.
Impact aid (type "b" students).
Library programs.
Small higher education programs.
State student incentive grants.
College housing loans (new loans).
Public Health Service (health profession subsidies).
Legal Services Corporation.
Certain soil conservation programs.
Federal crop insurance program.
Rural housing loans/grants.
Small Business Administration (eliminations and transfers).
Rental rehabilitation grants.
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation.
Section 202 elderly and handicapped housing.
Section 108 loan guarantee program.
Rural development program.
Rural Electrification Administration subsidies.
Weatherization assistance program.
LANDSAT (eliminate future subsidies for contractors).
Sea grant and coastal zone management grant programs.
Juvenile justice grants.
Justice State-local assistance grants.
Public debt reimbursements to Federal Reserve Banks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. So the Senator from New Mexico, under the best of the best dismantlers of Government, President Ronald Reagan, made the motion that we terminate these programs. In other words, what he did was take the Reagan spending cuts.

Everyone has said, "Oh, if they only took the cuts." They have claimed that Congress went ahead with increases in defense and other programs, but never enacted the cuts like we were supposed to do. We tried with a sense-of-the-Senate. Do you know how many votes they got? Mr. President, 14 votes out of the 100.

So we have a track record. We have tried it before, 10 years ago. We will try it again. But we have to face the facts as the facts face us. We could not get it done then and I am sincerely concerned that we will not get it done now. But that is no reason not to try. I am not trying to mislead the colleagues. I am willing to consider every spending cut offered by my colleagues. But my colleagues must realize that every dollar in savings we fail to achieve through spending reductions, we must make up through taxes.

With a 5-percent VAT, we can get the job done. We had eight votes for this particular initiative in the Budget Committee. The distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle from Minnesota, Senator Boschwitz, and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Senator Danforth, joined with the Senator from South Carolina and we were conscientious about our charge. And none of us wanted to vote for taxes. If you want to run for reelection on this particular platform, do not come to South Carolina. I tried it, and barely survived. I was known as "High Tax HOLLINGS" for putting out such proposals.

Nowhere did the press say I was trying to cut interest taxes. Nowhere did the press say I was trying to cut spending. You cannot get that explanation on a 20-second sound bite. So they take advantage of the printed RECORD and they distort what you are trying to do.

If we exclude the trust funds, cut spending by \$406 billion, and enact a 5-percent VAT, we can finally eliminate the deficit by 1999. Even then, though, we will still have annual gross interest costs of \$368 billion—that is more than a billion a day—on interest costs on the debt. So interest taxes are still on automatic pilot. It is not until the year 2002, when you have dropped from \$368 billion to \$354 billion, that you have finally have gross interest costs on a downward path. But it has to be done.

I have one sheet of paper here that outlines the scope of the problem. Here it is. This does not include the billions necessary for middle-class tax cuts. Both sides have been misguided in pandering to the middle class. Brother, this is no time for middle-class tax cut

or any other tax cut. The problem is a shortage of revenues. The only way to stop spending on automatic pilot, the only way to stop raising interest taxes is to make the spending cuts you can and to raise taxes. I have outlined one way of doing it.

I am going to introduce this amendment but I want to remind my colleagues what we have created is a matter of record. It is what the distinguished Presiding Officer has come into town to confront.

We were here and we went through this charade. We dignified it with a commission. This Senator went through with it with President Richard Milhous Nixon. He said get rid of the Government and send it back in block grants.

Then came President Reagan and he had appointed a Presidential Advisory Committee on Federalism and the Coordinating Task Force on Federalism. This Senator, at the appointment of the distinguished President, served with other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that we have printed in the RECORD this list of commission members.

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

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
FEDERALISM
GOVERNORS

Gov. George Busbee (D-Georgia).
Gov. Scott M. Matheson (D-Utah).
Gov. Lamar Alexander (R-Tennessee).
Gov. James R. Thompson (R-Illinois).
Gov. Pierre S. DuPont IV (R-Delaware).
Gov. Richard A. Snelling (R-Vermont).

STATE LEGISLATORS

Representative T. W. (Tom) Stivers (R-Idaho).
Senator Ross O. Doyen (R-Kansas).
Senator Ann Lindeman (R-Arizona).
Speaker Benjamin L. Cardin (D-Maryland).
Speaker John J. Hainkel, Jr. (D-Louisiana).
Assemblyman Dean Rhoads (R-Nevada).

MAYORS

Mayor Edward I. Koch (D-New York City).
Mayor William H. Hudnut III (R-Indianapolis).
Mayor Margaret Hance (R-Phoenix).
Mayor Ferd Harrison (R-Scotland Neck, N.C.).
Mayor Tom Moody (R-Columbus, Ohio).

COUNTY OFFICIALS

J. Richard Conder (D-Richmond County, N.C.).
Roy Orr (D-Dallas County, Tex.).
William Murphy (R-Rensselaer County, N.Y.).
Sandra Smoley (R-Sacramento County, Calif.).
Bruce Neslande (Nonpartisan-Orange County, Calif.).
Donald L. Smith (R-Anchorage Municipality, Alaska).

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE.

Senator William V. Roth, Jr. (R-Delaware).
Senator David Durenberger (R-Minnesota).
Senator Pete V. Domenici (R-New Mexico).
Senator David L. Boren (D-Oklahoma).
Senator Ernest F. Hollings (D-South Carolina).
Senator Paul Laxalt (R-Nevada).

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative Richard T. Schulze (R-Pennsylvania).

Representative Richard Bolling (D-Missouri).

Representative L. H. Fountain (D-North Carolina).

Representative Clarence Brown (R-Ohio).

Representative Frank Horton (R-New York).

Representative Jack Brooks (D-Texas).

PRIVATE CITIZENS

F. Clifton White.
Dr. Robert B. Hawkins.
C. D. Ward.
Former Senator Clifford Hanson.
Former Gov. Otis Bowen.

THE COORDINATING TASK FORCE ON FEDERALISM

Senator Paul Laxalt, Chairman.
Secretary Terrel Bell.
Secretary Samuel Pierce.
Secretary Donald Regan.
Secretary Richard Schweiker.
Secretary James Watt.
Director David Stockman.
Edwin Meese III.
James A. Baker III.
Richard S. Williamson.
Martin Anderson.
Robert Carleson.

Mr. HOLLINGS. We went into the Cabinet room and sat around the table. You could see the beginning of unfunded mandates for the cities, the counties, and the States. They said get rid of the Government, get rid of it, send it back to the cities, the counties, the States. But what they did was eliminate the money in October 1986. The first bill that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Senator Howard Baker, introduced was a revenue sharing bill. I had already introduced mine on February 1, 1967. We had both come from State governments and we were complaining then about unfunded mandates.

So this has gone on from 1971 to 1995, some 24 years. I came to Washington and identified with the problem. We did get revenue sharing. But then, we unfunded the edicts of the Congress in October 1986, when we did away with revenue sharing.

Coming right to the point, I want to refer to the former director of the Office of Management and Budget, David Stockman. In the spring of 1992 he had an article that appeared in a magazine called the New Perspective entitled "America Is Not Overspending." That ought to throw everybody into shock.

The distinguished Congressman from Georgia along with our friend, Congressman KASICH are putting government on trial. But I do not mean to tuck tail and run, as Lyndon says. I mean to try the case.

Where we can get a line-item veto, where we can get a balanced budget amendment, where we can get progress on reducing the deficit, they will have my vote. If we do not adulterate the legislation, like the unfunded mandates bill. I did not realize many of the changes made in S. 1 until the distinguished Senator from West Virginia came here and brought them to my attention.

I publicly stated that I favored the legislation to address the problem of unfunded mandates. Such a bill was brought to the floor last year.

Unfortunately, in their zeal to demonstrate how they can really run government up here, the Republicans have been overreaching. I want to help them. But I do not want to end up with a problem worse than the one we started with. If we do not move in at this particular hour in history, how will we ever get on top of this spending hemorrhage?

Let me get back to David Stockman. I quote:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake of fiscal governance and their own culpability in it ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with the mindless stream of antitax venom while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit. It ought to be obvious by now that we cannot grow our way out.

Mr. President, very quietly, let me read that first sentence because it is almost heretic. "The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability." That is exactly what we have going on now. History repeats itself. As Ronald Wilson Reagan says, "Here we go again."

As Governor of South Carolina, my first order of business was to raise some taxes, balance the budget, and get for the first time in our history a triple-A credit rating. Moody's has raised us back to us a triple-A credit rating. We had lost it for the past couple of years. Standard and Poor's still has yet to do so. But the need to get that triple-A credit rating reveals a funny juxtaposition of politicians running for office. I cannot run for Governor of South Carolina unless I promise to pay the bill; I cannot run for Senator of South Carolina unless I promise not to pay the bill.

As a House Member of the South Carolina House of Representatives in 1950 I was trying to catch up with North Carolina. They had passed their sales tax for education in 1936. Following suit, I authored the sales tax. I heard arguments about its regressivity. But if we had not passed that 3-percent sales tax—which now is at 5 percent—we would never have had the schools. In addition to balancing the State budget, we would never have had the educational system to attract investment, to attract blue chip corporations, to attract Japanese and German industries.

I was here in Washington the last time we had a balanced Federal budget. We called back over to Marvin Watson and said, "Ask the President if we can cut another \$5 billion." The entire budget—Medicare, defense, domestic discretionary, everything else, interest on the national debt—was \$178 billion.

Watson called back and said, "President Johnson said cut it another \$5 billion." We cut it and gave President Richard Milhous Nixon a balanced budget.

I am hearing all this stuff about a revolution 40 years in the making. They are getting away with a lot of flourish and rhetoric and headlines. But I have listened now since the beginning of the session, and somehow, some way we have to develop some bipartisanship. We are never going to do that unless we can get some truth in budgeting.

If they do not want to raise taxes and want to balance the budget only through spending cuts, then they are whistling Dixie. You have to do both. You have to freeze everything to begin with, obey the caps, and then follow with additional spending cuts. And even with the spending cuts and the 5-percent VAT, you do not really get into the black until 1999.

Mr. President it is a very, very difficult thing that the contract has taken up. That is why this Senator is

not trying to out-headline the Republicans on the other side of the aisle. I prefer headway to headlines. I will continue to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle. I worked last year with Republicans on the telecommunications superhighway. We have had hearings galore on the subject and we had a bipartisan bill 18 to 2 out of the committee.

The overwhelming majority of Republicans, with an overwhelming majority of Democrats, in a bipartisan information superhighway bill that had been worked out with various groups who all wanted these services to be extended to the poor and to the public education systems. That was ready to be passed. But the distinguished majority leader—and it is of record—the Senator from Kansas held it up. I do not say that lightly. I can show it to you in the RECORD. We were ready to go bipartisan then, and I am ready to go bipartisan now. Let us not come with just the headline and no headway. As Tennessee Ernie Ford sang, "Sixteen tons

and what do you get, another day older and deeper in debt."

Mr. President in closing I ask unanimous consent that a table entitled "Senator Hollings on Truth in Budgeting" which I have been referring to throughout my speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATOR HOLLINGS ON TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Reality No. 1: \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts necessary.

Reality No. 2: Not enough savings in entitlements. Yes, welfare reform but job program will cost; savings questionable. Yes, health reform can and should save some, but slowing 10 percent growth to 5 percent—not enough savings. No, none on Social Security; off-budget again.

Reality No. 3: Hold the line budget on Defense—no savings.

Reality No. 4: Savings must come from freezes, cuts in domestic discretionary—not enough to stop hemorrhage in interest costs.

Reality No. 5: Taxes necessary to stop hemorrhage in interest costs.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Deficit CBO Jan. 1995 (using trust funds)	207	224	225	253	284	297	322
Freeze discretionary outlays after 1998	0	0	0	-19	-38	-58	-78
Spending cuts	-37	-74	-111	-128	-146	-163	-180
Interest savings	-1	-5	-11	-20	-32	-46	-64
Total savings (\$1.2 trillion)	-38	-79	-122	-167	-216	-267	-322
Remaining deficit using trust funds	169	145	103	86	68	30	0
Remaining deficit excluding trust funds	287	264	222	202	185	149	121
5 percent VAT	96	155	172	184	190	196	200
Net deficit excluding trust funds	187	97	27	(17)	(54)	(111)	(159)
Gross debt	5,142	5,257	5,300	5,305	5,272	5,200	5,091
Average interest rate on the debt (percent)	7.0	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7
Interest cost on the debt	367	370	368	368	366	360	354

Note.—Doesn't include billions necessary for middle-class tax cut.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] proposes an amendment numbered 182.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET

It is the Sense of the Senate—

(A) that the Congress should move to eliminate the biggest unfunded mandate—interest on the national debt, which drives the increasing federal burden on state and local governments, and

(B) that prior to adopting in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget—

(1) the Congress set forth specific outlay and revenue changes to achieve a balanced federal budget by the year 2002; and

(2) enforce through the Congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced federal budget in the year 2002.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, they always say, "He who seeks equity must do equity." If we are asking the other side to lay it out, then I think it is our duty over here to lay it out, too. That is what I have attempted to do.

So, Mr. President, I see my distinguished colleague wants to come back and be recognized. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first of all, I want to commend my colleague from South Carolina for this amendment. I know there will be those who will argue that this amendment is an inappropriate amendment on this particular bill because we are dealing with unfunded mandates. But I suggest, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is consistent fully with the matter before us—unfunded mandates. In the likely event that we adopt a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, particularly one that includes a requirement that three-fifths of the Congress approve new tax increases, we will be imposing a huge mandate on States and localities. It may not be a de jure mandate, but it will be a de facto mandate.

What Senator HOLLINGS is suggesting with this amendment is a radical notion, I suppose, in the minds of some. It is an outrageous idea that we should have some idea of how this constitutional mandate requiring a balanced budget in 7 years is going to be achieved. I know there are those who think it is unfair to be asking such questions, but they are questions we are asked as Members of the U.S. Senate by our constituents all the time.

Many of our constituents are telling us, too, that they support a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We all know the polling numbers on this issue. Eighty percent of the American public supports a balanced budget amendment as long as it remains a slogan or a simple statement of principle. They are all for the concept of the balanced budget. But what happens when people are presented with various spending cut options?

If you say, "Do you want a constitutional amendment to balance the budget?" They say, "Absolutely, we want that." But if you then say, "You understand, of course, that may include some cuts in Social Security." They say, "Well, now, wait a minute, you did not tell me that." You say, "How about Medicare?" They say, "Wait, you are getting a little far afield here. I said I want the budget in balance. That is what I want. I did not say I wanted Social Security or Medicare cut." You say, "How about education?" They say, "That is not what I meant either. Just balance that budget." Then you start talking about how you get there from here, and you start to get what you always get. It is like the old saying that "Everyone wants to go to Heaven, but no one wants to die." So we all want a balanced budget but we are all very nervous about how you get there.

Let me back up a bit, because I listened to my colleague from South Carolina talk about his history on this issue, and he has a distinguished one, going back to the very days the Budget Act was adopted. He is one of only two people who served on the original committee and chaired the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. President, I am familiar with the Senator's record because I worked with him on a number of important budget issues going back to my first days here in the early 1980's. I was the second Democrat after the Senator from South Carolina to cosponsor the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation. Really, it was the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Dodd bill. I thought that the Senator from Texas and the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from South Carolina had a good idea, to try statutorily to get our arms around the budget of the United States. I will not take a back seat to anybody in our efforts in try to achieve that goal.

In 1982, I offered a requirement that any new increase in spending must be paid for fully—a pay-as-you-go budget. I offered this amendment from the very last chair in the far corner of this floor when I was the most junior Member of this body. I got 22 votes. I was in the minority in those days, not unlike today. Had we done it then, we are told we could have actually had the Federal budget in balance by 1986 or 1987. With all the talk about the need for constitutional amendments, there are those of us who have been through these battles, trying all sorts of ways to inject discipline into the process.

I hope, as we examine the constitutional amendment, we would answer our constituents' questions. They want to know how we are going to do this. That's what this amendment requires. It simply says if you're going to talk the talk of balanced budget, you've got to walk the walk of how you get there. I hope it will be adopted so that we will be able to lay out to the taxpayers in our communities exactly how we are going to keep the promises that a balanced budget amendment would require.

The GOP spending cut plan is like Forrest Gump's box of chocolates—you don't know what you're going to get when you dip your hand in.

All the Senator from South Carolina is suggesting is that we have a description of the chocolates before we put them in our mouths. Otherwise, we're talking about a huge potential stomach ache.

That is all this amendment asks. It does not say, "Do not cut in these areas." It just says, "Tell us. If this is what you are going to do, at least somebody outline it."

I might point out, there are some significant proposals outlining how we might do some of this. I would like to lay one of these out, if I may.

Mr. President, this is a chart based on the Republican budget staff pro-

posal reported in the Washington Times earlier this month. This is the so-called Republican path to a balanced budget amendment in the year 2002.

The deficit estimates are lower than CBO and Treasury projections, but they are still useful.

As you can see, the proposal estimates that it will cost more than \$1 trillion to balance the budget over 7 years. The GOP tax cut proposal, according to the Republican staff analysis will cost \$346 billion more.

The Treasury Department estimates that the tax increases will be somewhat higher. I am not going to use these numbers, though, Mr. President. I will use only the staff numbers from the majority side of the Budget Committee so that no one can accuse me of using biased numbers prepared by a Democratic administration.

The GOP proposal also says that we are not going to reduce Social Security. That has been said over and over and over again by the majority. In fact, we are told that Social Security will go up \$12 billion in the next 7 years.

We have been also told that there will be an increase in defense spending of \$82 billion.

So if you take all of these numbers together—again, not numbers from the Democratic Policy Committee, or the Department of the Treasury, or even the Congressional Budget Office, but from the Republican Budget Committee staff—then the price tag for all of these promises is \$1.53 trillion. This is the total cost that will have to be made up by the year 2002 if we are going to achieve a balanced budget in that year.

How will we pay for all of these promises? Where will they be made up? If we increase defense and Social Security spending, cut taxes, and balance the budget, what will we cut?

This second chart shows where the cuts to pay for these promises will come from. According to the Republican staff numbers, more than \$970 billion will come from Medicare cuts, Medicaid cuts, and other mandatory spending. And \$386 billion will come from nondefense discretionary spending.

If we make these cuts, then we should get a debt service reduction of \$164 billion. So that number in green here, is the number which would depend upon these other two numbers being achieved. And that would get you to \$1.53 trillion, equaling the amount I mentioned earlier. That is how we reach balance.

All this amendment says is, "Would you mind giving us some idea so we can go back to our taxpayers and constituents and tell them specifically how we are going to achieve more than \$1.5 trillion in spending cuts? Where will the cuts come from? Don't go around asking us to support a conclusion without giving us some idea of how we are going to achieve those results."

Earlier the Senator from South Carolina introduced into the RECORD, Mr.

President, a list that was put together by our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG outlining options for spending cuts. They include reducing student loan subsidies, means testing Medicare, cutting in half funding for Head Start—maybe one of the finest programs for children and early education ever devised—the maternal child health block grants, and preventive health services block grants, deferring military COLA's, cutting veterans benefits, and eliminating Medicaid transition benefits for AFDC recipients. The list is 50 pages long.

I am not suggesting that these items should not be touched at all, but it seems to me you are beginning to get some sort of a blueprint here of what is involved.

As the Senator from South Carolina pointed out, when you start counting whether or not you have 51 votes here for cutting out student loans—at the very time when working families are trying to make it more feasible for their kids to afford higher education—you are going to realize you cannot pass these cuts.

Nor do you have the votes for cutting Head Start. I was responsible for the reauthorization of the Head Start Program last year. There was not a dissenting vote or voice out of 100 U.S. Senators on the reauthorization of Head Start—not one. It was passed unanimously by voice vote. And yet now some are talking about cutting that program in half.

I do not know many Senators here who honestly believe you ought to be cutting Head Start in half. And if there are some, there may be 3 or 4 or 5 or 10. I do not think there are 51 here who studied the program and believe it should be cut. Head Start has not been a Democratic program, or a Republican program—it has always enjoyed broad, bipartisan support.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] worked tirelessly to put together a good Head Start Program last year. Without her support, we would not have gotten it done. I am not going to speak for her here. But again, there was not some great battle out here on the floor of the U.S. Senate to reauthorize and fund Head Start.

Does anyone really believe there are 51 votes to cut veterans benefits? Are we going to defer military COLA's—at a time when we are trying to strengthen the military budget, and attract and retain the most talented people we can find. Are there 51 votes? I do not think so.

It seems to me, before you start jamming this into the Constitution we ought to think through all of these important issues. If a balanced budget amendment is adopted and we are unable to balance the budget, then we will turn the Supreme Court of the United States into a Budget Committee deciding every major budget

choice. The Supreme Court will be deciding whether or not the legislative branch achieved the constitutional requirement of a balanced budget, and then they will decide how to allocate funding levels.

I remember a few years ago people railing, and I think rightfully so, against an unelected, lifetime appointee sitting on a bench legislating—legislating. I do not know how many speeches I heard in this body objecting to the nine members of the Supreme Court legislating.

That is the business of this body, to legislate. And yet, in effect, we will be asking the Supreme Court of the United States to legislate on the budget when we do not achieve, if we do not achieve, the balance which is required by an amendment in the year 2002.

So I again suggest and emphasize here what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is proposing makes some sense. We are likely to create a train wreck, an absolute train wreck. An absolute train wreck. Now, we have done that in the past. But the problem in the past was not as significant because it was a statutory train wreck. It did not go to the organic law of the United States. What is being talked about here is changing the organic law of the United States. Of course we know when we do that we run the risk of having a far more difficult time adjusting if we are wrong.

In the 1980's, we did things by statute. We had the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings proposal, and a number of freezes and the like. We found out they did not quite work as expected. When tested, the theories did not add up. We went back and changed the statutes and began to get on our feet.

The people who paid the greatest price, of course, for our mistakes were middle-income workers. They always do. And, they will be undoubtedly called upon to do so again when the next train wreck occurs. We always go back to the people that fight the wars and raise their taxes. They are the ones who will pay the bill if this does not work.

The difference here is organic law. When we change organic law and then discover a mistake, it is very difficult to correct. I think we should proceed cautiously and carefully and ask the types of questions that our constituents are asking of us.

Where will the cuts be made? How will you do this? Are you really going to go after Medicare? We saw what happened on the surveys conducted on the balanced budget amendment, 80 percent or so are for it. But when we talk about cutting student loans, education, Medicare, Social Security, et cetera, the support for that amendment drops dramatically. I am not suggesting these programs should never be reduced. I would not want to suggest that we should never make changes in any of these programs. I would not subscribe to that view.

I have been here long enough to know what happens when we try to make dif-

ficult budget choices. As I mentioned a while ago, I offered a pay-as-you-go proposal. I did not pick out a particular program. I said how about paying for everything? We had 22 votes for paying for things. Now when we start requesting details, people start trying to take things entirely off the table. Forget Social Security some will say. That is off entirely. Others will say take defense spending off the list of any potential cuts. Although there is an argument being raised by some that we can do with a lot less, I, for one, would raise some reservations about that. The world is changed, more complicated, requires different thinking in this area.

I do not know of anyone who really believes, at least not a majority, that we ought to take a meat ax to the defense budget. We have heard over and over again from the military leadership that it is difficult to retain good people. We do not have a draft any longer. We have to recruit, and we need the best educated, sophisticated people in the military that this country has to produce. And it does not make sense to be talking about slashing COLA's for people in the military.

Let me again point out if I can, Mr. President, what these cuts may mean. A recent study by the children's defense fund reports that the costs of balancing the budget alone—while protecting Social Security and defense spending—would result in: 7.6 million children losing federally subsidized school lunches—I do not think there are 51 votes here to do that; 6.6 million children losing health care coverage through Medicaid; dropping more than 5 million child support cases that hold absent parents accountable for supporting their children; 4.3 million children losing food stamps; and 2 million young children and pregnant women losing nutritional assistance through the WIC Program—one of the strongest supported programs in Congress. The Women, Infants, and Children Program historically has had strong bipartisan support.

This analysis does not consider the costs of financing the Contract With America tax breaks at all—more than 30 percent of which would benefit households with incomes of greater than \$200,000.

So, Mr. President, I suggest we look through the eyes of a child at what this means. We should face the realities here. I do not know of anyone in the body who honestly believes that children ought to be asked to pay the price. We ought to be seeing to it that they will not be disadvantaged. We are not talking about luxury items here. We are talking about basic essentials that they need. So, again, I emphasize that a good hard analysis of what all of this means, I think, is critically important for all of us.

There is an old advertisement on television that may say it best. That advertisement for a Wall Street firm says, "We make money the old-fash-

ioned way." Well, maybe we ought to reduce the deficit the old-fashioned way. That is, we ought to roll up our sleeves and go to work on it.

I heard a lot of talk here over the last number of weeks about reducing the deficit. This administration over the past 2½ years has achieved through the budget process real reduction in the deficit. That is not my conclusion. That is the conclusion of the Congressional Budget Office and others who have no particular ax to grind. They have concluded that we have achieved 3 consecutive years of deficit reduction, the first time since the Truman administration, to the tune of \$700 billion in deficit relief. That is pretty significant.

We must continue on this path. We must look at current programs, and ask these questions. How can we do a better job? Where can we cut back? We must roll up our sleeves and do the job.

The one thing people are tired of and they expressed it strongly on November 8 is gimmickry. The blue smoke and mirrors, three-card monte, now-you-see-it, now-you-do-not, kind of approach. Dynamic scoring. Threatening to do away with the Bureau of Labor Statistics if they do not come up with the right numbers on inflation. That is not the way we achieve a balanced budget. We must not cook the books and make up the numbers. People want Members to be honest and do the real work.

I would just warn those who are strong advocates for the constitutional approaches, we have gone through more than 200 years of history. We have amended the Constitution, Mr. President, 27 times. I see the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I will watch him carefully because if I am wrong on my numbers he will correct me with a nod; 27 amendments in 200 years, and I believe roughly 11,000 proposals to amend the Constitution of the United States in that same 206-year-period. Some 11,000 ideas. And never once have we decided to inject into the Constitution economic theories that may be terribly wrong.

We have been through a great Civil War. We have been through two world wars, and a Great Depression in this century. For a period of 15 years we have had growing deficit difficulties. The last President to submit a balanced budget was Jimmy Carter. That was the last submission by a President of a balanced budget. In 1969, Lyndon Johnson submitted the last budget with a surplus.

In 1981, the deficit was around \$35 billion with a national debt of under \$1 trillion. After 200 years, we had a national debt of less than \$1 trillion. In the last 15 years, 12 years of the administrations of President Reagan and President Bush, we have quadrupled the national debt, and brought us to annual deficits hovering around \$200, sometimes \$300 billion a year.

We all want to do what we can to balance the budget. But I would strongly urge, Mr. President, that we ought not to take 15 years of troublesome deficit spending and deny 205 years of constitutional history in the process. We should go through the statutory process, come up with whatever ideas we can. But, Mr. President, in my view, we will deeply regret monkeying around with the Constitution of the United States in trying to solve an economic problem that has been created over the last 15 years that is not insolvable. It is solvable.

By writing this into the Constitution and inviting the courts to become involved in deciding these matters we will only complicate the problem, not make it easier. We are told all the time, some 42 States require a balanced budget in their State constitutions. Mr. President I would suggest to Senators that without exception those States have come up with all sorts of ideas to avoid that responsibility.

Everyone knows about bonding. We bond things or create a capital budget on the side so we do not have to meet that obligation. Every imaginable gimmick is used to avoid making the difficult decisions. I can well imagine that future Congress' will employ some new dynamic scoring technique, or some new threat to the Bureau of Labor Statistics that, if they do not come up with an inflation number they like, they will cut off your budget. That is not healthy. That is not the way to be proceeding, not the way to be proceeding at all. It poses serious, serious problems.

So, again, I strongly urge that we endorse unanimously the proposal of the Senator from South Carolina. I think it sends a positive message to people that we are concerned about what happens. I will tell you right now that it is not at all reassuring to hear the majority leader of the House of Representatives say that we cannot tell people out there how we plan to balance the budget because their "knees will buckle." That is not a reassuring quote. I am sure my constituents are going to love to hear that one. We cannot tell you because your knees may buckle. Well, I do not mind a politician's knees buckling, but I do not think my constituents who depend upon Medicare should have to have their knees buckle or some child out there that needs a school lunch or Head Start Program should have to have their knees buckle in the process. Do they not have a right to hear from their elected representatives in advance what we intend to do to them?

Is it a radical notion that somehow our constituents ought to get at least some blueprint of how this is going to work and who is going to be asked to pay? Is it outrageous of them—are they being insolent for demanding of their elected representatives that we give them some idea of how this is going to be achieved? Should we not tell them because they might not like what they

hear? That is what we are saying, in effect, we should not tell them because they might not like what they are going to hear.

This is not a base closure commission we are talking about; we are talking about making major changes to basic programs that people need to survive.

Again, if the pain is going to be shared, let us do it in an equitable fashion. But when you take off Social Security and take out defense and you talk about huge tax cuts—30 percent of which go to people making in excess of \$200,000—are you being fair? I am not opposed to giving people in the upper incomes a tax break. I do not like this class-warfare language. But in the distribution of pain, you have to ask if 30 percent of the tax cuts should come from the people in that income bracket. I do not think so if it is going to be fair and equitable.

The Senator from South Carolina, I think, has proposed a reasonable amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to inform the American public of the important budget decisions this body intends to make in the years ahead.

Mr. President, we are going to have wonderful opportunities, I presume, in the next few weeks, when the constitutional amendment on the balanced budget comes to the floor, to engage in some significant debate about that alone. But before we get there, I think we should lay out the details of how we plan to pay for our trillion dollar plus promises.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Hollings amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I know that we do have those Senators who wish to address this issue. I know that the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee also would like to address this particular amendment that we have before us. I have discussed the following unanimous-consent request that I will be making with the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield? Can we make it 40 minutes? Instead of 30 minutes to a side, 40 minutes to a side?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. All right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 80 minutes for debate prior to a motion to table the pending amendment, to be equally divided in the usual form; that no amendments be in order prior to the motion to table the pending amendment; that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the majority manager, or his designee, be recognized to make a motion to table the pending amendment; and that the vote on the motion to table the pending amendment occur after 4 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Also the yeas and nays. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Idaho, if it is agreed to—and I am perfectly willing to agree to it as he stated it—will also ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. That would be my intent.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, and I do not think that I will, Mr. President, I have an amendment that is similar. It is very much within the same framework, though without reference to date. I do not think it would take me more than 10 or 15 minutes to offer this. I wonder whether I could, as a part of this unanimous-consent agreement, have the opportunity to offer this amendment after this debate since it is exactly within the same framework. I would not take a great deal of time with it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. And I will object because I think there are some Senators who are probably not here this afternoon who may want to discuss this amendment.

Also I note that no other amendments would be in order prior to the motion to table this amendment. I thought we would have a time in which we could offer amendments, possibly get some action on some of them and with the understanding and the request being, which was ordered, that such amendments would have to be offered—

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. By no later than 3 o'clock—

Mr. GLENN. Offered by 3 o'clock tomorrow, no votes until after 4 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. This specific unanimous-consent agreement is that there are to be no other amendments offered to this pending amendment of Senator HOLLINGS.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Reserving the right to object. Knowing that we have to have our amendments offered before 3

o'clock tomorrow, would it be possible that there could be a short window to allow those of us who only wish to offer amendments in order to meet that 3 o'clock deadline to do so and thus be assured that we will not end up inadvertently being precluded from offering our amendment?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I think that would be very appropriate. Also, I will note that we have had other amendments sent to the desk this morning which we have laid aside. In the event, for example, some of those Senators who wish to speak on the pending amendment are not here, I think it would be very much in order to lay it aside so we can continue to facilitate the Senators who wish to lay their amendments down.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I first would like to thank the Senator from West Virginia. I am really intending to make the same request. I think the Senator from Washington has the same interest. I would like the opportunity, now that I think I have clarification on this unanimous-consent agreement, to at least be able to offer the amendment and have it laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's original request?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I object. I would like Senators to have an opportunity to further study this amendment. There may be some of us who wish to speak on this amendment. Not many Senators were going to be around this afternoon because there was an understanding we would have no votes today. This does not keep the Senator from renewing the request on tomorrow or making the motion any time he wishes after the hour of 4 o'clock.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NOS. 183 AND 184, EN BLOC

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments and ask that they be considered as offered under the unanimous-consent agreement of last week and then to be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for purposes of offering the two amendments which I have just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there objection to proposing the amendments en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] proposes amendments numbered 183 and 184, en bloc.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 183

On page 16, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(iii) if funded in whole or in part, a statement of whether and how the committee has created a mechanism to allocate the funding in a manner that is reasonably consistent with the expected direct costs to each State, local, and tribal government.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

(Purpose: To provide a budget point of order if a bill, resolution, or amendment reduces or eliminates funding for duties that are the constitutional responsibility of the Federal Government)

On page 6, strike line 3 and all that follows through line 10, insert the following:

"(i) would reduce or eliminate the amount of authorization of appropriations for—

"(I) Federal financial assistance that would be provided to States, local governments, or tribal governments for the purpose of complying with any such previously imposed duty unless such duty is reduced or eliminated by a corresponding amount; or

"(II) the exercise of powers relating to immigration that are the responsibility or under the authority of the Federal Government and whose reduction or elimination would result in a shifting of the costs of addressing immigration expenses to the States, local governments, and tribal governments; or

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 185

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 185.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"() It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress shall continue its progress at reducing the annual federal deficit and, when the Congress proposes to the States a balanced-budget amendment, must accompany it with financial information on its impact on the budget of each of the States."

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator restate what his request was?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Just asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Is the amendment pending?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes. I just asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I believe we set aside the Hatfield amendment this morning, and would that not have to be disposed of as the pending business before we could move on to another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the unanimous consent agreement this morning was that the Hatfield amendment was set aside for other amendments to be offered.

Mr. GLENN. To be offered. That does not answer my question, I do not believe. Do we have to do anything to deal with the Hatfield amendment before we can bring up other amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Hatfield amendment has been set aside and thus does not need to be disposed of.

Who seeks the floor?

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Yes, there appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 TO AMENDMENT NO. 185

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 186 to amendment No. 185:

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after "() It" and insert the following: "the sense of the Congress that the Congress should continue its progress at reducing the annual federal deficit and, when the Congress proposes to the States a balanced-budget amendment, should accompany

it with financial information on its impact on the budget of each of the States.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be less than 2 or 3 minutes. I know the Senator from Washington would want this amendment set aside, but if I could give the background for just a couple of minutes.

I met with the legislative leadership back in Minnesota several weeks ago, and the legislature passed a resolution. I just want to read one paragraph:

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that it urges the Congress of the United States to continue its progress at reducing the annual Federal deficit, and when the Congress proposes to the States the balanced budget amendment, to accompany it with financial information on its impact on the budget of the State of Minnesota for budget planning purposes.

Mr. President, this resolution was also signed by the Governor on January 20. And, again, this is very much in the spirit of what the Senator from Connecticut was talking about and the Senator from South Carolina. I will, of course, take the opportunity to speak about this amendment at some length but not today.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NOS. 187 AND 188, EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside in order that I can send two amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk two amendments.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes en bloc amendments numbered 187 and 188.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 187

(Purpose: To exclude from the application of the Act agreements with State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector with respect to environmental restoration and waste management activities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

The provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act also shall not apply to any agreement between the Federal Government and a State, local, or tribal government, or the private sector for the purpose of carrying out environmental restoration or waste management activities of the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy.

AMENDMENT NO. 188

(Purpose: To require time limitations for Congressional Budget Office estimates, and for other purposes)

On page 21, insert between lines 13 and 14 the following new paragraph:

“(2) TIME LIMITATIONS FOR STATEMENTS.— (A) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide the statement as required by this section—

“(i) relating to a bill or resolution ordered reported by a committee, no later than one week after the date on which the bill or resolution is ordered reported by the committee; and

(ii) relating to an amendment or conference report, no later than one day after the date on which the amendment is ordered or the conference report is submitted.

“(B) Failure by the Director to meet the time limitations in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall vitiate the provisions of subsection (c)(1)(A) of this section.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me just comment that of the two amendments I sent to the desk, one of them assures that we would not be creating a big, new, powerful bureaucracy at the Congressional Budget Office, and the other one relates to the effect of this bill on nuclear waste cleanup efforts. I am especially concerned about some at the Hanford site in my own State. I will be speaking on these amendments later, but I did want to submit them today under the previous unanimous consent.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the Pastore rule run its course for the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, can I introduce a measure without the Pastore rule applying?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. PELL. Does the Pastore rule still apply or can I talk on another subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Pastore rule has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 180, AS MODIFIED

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to commend and thank the able Senator from North Dakota on modifying his metric conversion amendment. While I opposed the provisions of the amendment that would have imposed a 2-year moratorium, I am comfortable with asking the Commission on Unfunded Mandates, which would be created under this legislation, to look

into the impact on States and localities of using the metric system.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been a longtime proponent of conversion to the metric system. I believe we can't afford not to convert to the metric system. Not converting has already cost this Nation a great deal.

The United States is one of three nations in the world, along with Burma and Liberia, yet to change to metrics. More importantly, the United States is the only industrialized nation in the world that is not a metric country. With a growing global economy, thanks in part to NAFTA and GATT, how can we as a nation expect to sell our products to the rest of the world when those products literally don't measure up with the rest of the world?

The United States stands to gain untold millions of dollars in exports that we are currently losing, because our nonmetric goods are almost excluded from international markets. In fact, the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that U.S. exports could increase by as much as 20 percent by offering metric-sized goods.

Three instances of international trade problems caused by the production of non-metric goods highlight the difficulties caused by our nation's reluctance to go metric.

Saudi Arabia rejected a shipment of General Electric appliances because the power cords were 6 feet long rather than 2 meters as required by Saudi law.

A middle-eastern company was forced to rewire all the electronic equipment it imported from the United States because standard American wire sizes are different from international standards.

Countries around the world have great difficulty locating American lumber mills willing to produce cut lumber in metric sizes.

Mr. President, I agree that the Federal Government should not require States to do that which it is unwilling to do. In that regard, I have and will continue to work to see that all portions of the Federal Government comply with laws already on the books and that it leads the way in converting to the metric system.

I am confident that the more we study the value of the metric system, the more we will find that not joining the rest of the world will only cost us more in the long run.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to take just a very few minutes to address the Hollings amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. It talks about the importance of interest on the national debt as far as being an unfunded mandate. But in part B, it says that prior to adopting, in the first session of the 104th Congress, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget, a sense-of-the-Senate, then

one, that the Congress set forth specific outlay in revenue changes to achieve the balanced Federal budget by the year 2002; two, enforce the congressional budget process, the requirement to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Let me address that briefly. I thought originally maybe that this did not have any place being addressed on the unfunded mandates legislation. This just says that we want to know in advance what the impact is going to be. In other words, it is truth in legislating, as best we can tell that truth, in advance.

I submit that is what this unfunded mandate legislation is all about. We are trying to determine what the impact is in advance, and tell States and local communities just exactly what Federal mandates are going to do to them in advance. And we require the Congressional Budget Office to actually spell out the dollar impacts on them in advance.

That is what Senator HOLLINGS is proposing with this legislation. Why should we not do this? Why should we not, to the best of our ability, say how a balanced budget amendment, if it goes into effect, will be dealt with? That is exactly what we are trying to do with this unfunded mandates legislation as it deals with the States and local communities.

Apropos to this, I think when we come to consideration of a balanced budget amendment, I read some figures over the weekend, I believe in one of the columns, that if we take the things that everyone seems to say are off limits in the House and here also—Social Security, Medicare, interest on the national debt, and defense, those four items—I do not know whether those can all be taken out and made exempt from any consideration when we get into budget cutting or not. If we cannot, if some of those come in, I say to the Social Security recipients that some of your benefits are in danger. The same thing is true with Medicare. We know we have to pay interest on the national debt. We do not want to cut defense. We feel it has been cut enough already.

So if you leave Social Security, Medicare, interest on the national debt, and national defense off budget, or off limits, what does that leave? As was pointed out in the column I read over the weekend, that then would require approximately a little over a 30-percent cut in all the other functions of Government; a 30-percent cut in all the other functions of Government. If you take Social Security, Medicare, interest on the national debt, and national defense off budget, it would be a 30-percent cut in every other program.

If we applied that across the board, this means that next time you climb on an airliner after this, maybe, you will know that 30 percent of FAA funds; 30 percent of National Transportation Safety Board funds; 30 percent of CDC, the Centers for Disease Control

funds, trying to deal with the AIDS problem, an enormous problem; 30 percent of NIH funds, the National Institutes of Health dealing with cancer problems; FDA, trying to see what drugs are safe, are cut. You may say: We will not deal with any of those; we would leave those fully funded. What else gets cut? What else gets cut in that situation?

How about immigration? Do we want additional restrictions on immigration? Do we want to provide the people to firm up the borders? Would that get its 30-percent cut? How about farm subsidies? There is an attractive one. We are going to cut these 30 percent or more to make up for keeping something else from this 30-percent cut. Then there are prisons, and we could go on and on. We are dealing in this unfunded mandate legislation mainly with the impact on the States and local communities.

What do the States get right now? States, right now, under discretionary and entitlement funding, receive about \$230 billion a year, about 70 of that in discretionary funding and about 160 in entitlements. This is broken down into Medicaid, for instance, and \$173 billion goes into Federal and State, total, for Medicaid; 57 percent of that is Federal, and 43 percent is State; that is \$230 billion total.

I use that figure for this reason. If we pass something that says that we are not going to say what we are going to cut, we are just going to do that after we, in effect, threaten ourselves and say, OK, we are going to force ourselves to buy a balanced budget amendment to make these decisions but we are not going to say in advance where the decisions are made, then I submit that the States with what they receive now, what is given to them now for all these various programs, that \$230 billion is going to be a very, very attractive target for budget cutters looking for some way to balance the budget without getting into cuts on Social Security, Medicare, interest on the national debt, or defense.

What Senator HOLLINGS has proposed is a how-to piece of legislation—knowing what we are going to do, giving us an idea of what we are going to do in advance to get to a balanced budget. All of us want to get to a balanced budget. Certainly, I do. I do not think there is anybody here who does not want to get to a balanced budget. What Senator HOLLINGS says is let everybody, the States included, know in advance whether they will be the ones who will be unfairly dealt with in this other area if we pass a balanced budget amendment. Will the efforts to balance the budget then come out of the State's hide of \$230 billion that we send from the Federal Treasury to the States every year?

Surely we would not take the other tack and say on Senator HOLLINGS' amendment that we would adopt in the first session a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitu-

tion requiring a balanced budget, one, the Congress should not set forth specific outlay and revenue changes. Surely we would never add that should not and prohibit anyone from saying exactly how this is going to affect anyone by prohibiting the listing of what the outlay and revenue effects would be. So all he said is that in the Constitution requiring a balanced budget, the Congress set forth specific outlay and revenue changes to achieve a balanced Federal budget by 2002. It seems to me that we are just trying to predict and make forecastable what is happening between the Federal Government and the States with this unfunded mandate legislation.

All Senator HOLLINGS is asking in his proposed amendment, it seems to me, is that we do the same advanced kind of planning in trying to get where the cuts or where the revenues would come from, what the impact would be, the amounts, and trying to determine these things in advance.

So, Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator HOLLINGS' amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, earlier I had offered two of the three amendments which I have reserved for the purposes of having them before the Senate prior to the 3 p.m. deadline tomorrow.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the singular purpose of allowing me to offer the third amendment for consideration at a later date.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 189

(Purpose: To change the effective date)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] proposes an amendment numbered 189.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 33, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply to legislation considered on and after such date.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Iowa will yield.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan without losing my right to the floor.

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

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that amendments 172 to 177, which I sent to the desk last Thursday night, be called up at this time, stated, and then be immediately set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NO. 172 THROUGH 177

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I send a group of amendments to the desk, en bloc, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes amendments numbered 172 through 177, en bloc.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 172

(Purpose: To provide that title II shall apply only after January 1, 1996)

On page 38, after line 25, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect with respect to regulations proposed on or January 1, 1996."

AMENDMENT NO. 173

On page 26, between lines 5 and 6 insert the following:

(e) REQUESTS FROM SENATORS.—At the written request of a Senator, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of the direct cost of a Federal intergovernmental mandate contained in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or motion of such Member.

AMENDMENT NO. 174

(Purpose: To provide that if a committee makes certain determinations, a point of order will not lie, and for other purposes)

On page 17, insert between lines 17 and 18 the following new paragraph:

"(7) COMMITTEE DETERMINATION OF MANDATE DISADVANTAGEOUS TO PRIVATE SECTOR; WAIVER OF POINT OF ORDER.—If a committee of authorization of the Senate or the House of Representatives determines based on the statement required under paragraph (3)(C) that there would be a significant competitive disadvantage to the private sector if a Federal mandate contained in the legislation to which the statement applies were waived for State, local, and tribal governments or the costs of such mandate to the State, local, and tribal governments were paid by the Federal Government, then no point of order under subsection (c)(1)(B) will lie.

AMENDMENT NO. 175

(Purpose: To provide for Senate hearings on title I, and to sunset title I in the year 2002)

On page 33, strike out lines 9 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 107. SENATE JOINT HEARINGS ON UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES.

No later than December 31, 1998, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee and the

Senate Budget Committee shall hold joint hearings on the operations of the amendments made by this title and report to the full Senate on their findings and recommendations.

SEC. 108. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

- (1) take effect on January 1, 1996;
- (2) apply only to legislation considered on or after January 1, 1996; and
- (3) have no force or effect on and after January 1, 2002.

AMENDMENT NO. 176

(Purpose: To clarify the scope of the declaration that a mandate is ineffective)

On page 24, line 18, strike out "mandate to be ineffective" and insert in lieu thereof "mandate to be ineffective as applied to State, local, and tribal governments".

AMENDMENT NO. 177

(Purpose: To clarify use of the term "direct cost")

On page 14, line 19 strike "expected".
On page 22, line 12 strike "estimated".
On page 22, line 22 strike "estimated".
On page 23, line 2 strike "estimated".
On page 23, lines 4 and 5 strike "a specific dollar amount estimate of the full" and insert in lieu thereof "the".
On page 24, line 8 strike "estimated".
On page 24, line 15 strike "estimated".

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the exclusion of Social Security from calculations required under a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, while I know we are not considering it today, there is much discussion going on around this town and the country about our upcoming consideration of the balanced budget amendment. I do not want to delay action on the bill before us, but I believe it is critical that we ease the fears of millions of older Americans who are worried about their security.

I have long supported a balanced budget amendment, and I expect to do so again this year. There have been a number of issues raised concerning the amendment—should there be a supermajority requirement for tax increases; should there be truth in budgeting to require that the cuts necessary to reach a balanced budget by 2002 be specified; should we make provision for times of recession when there are more demands on the Federal Government and tax receipts are down? Each of these questions is very important and should be given the attention they deserve. But, Mr. President, the one issue that is of greatest concern, and the one I think necessary to address immediately by this body, is whether Social Security should be allowed to be cut as part of the balanced budget amendment.

Should Social Security funds be included along with all the receipts and debits in calculating whether we have a balanced budget? I believe we need to

set the record straight about where the Senate stands on this critical point. I hope the Senate could go on record unanimously on this so that we can allay the fears that literally millions of older Americans have.

I have received hundreds of calls, and even more letters, from older Iowans who are scared to death that their Social Security is going to be cut to balance the budget. Almost all of them subsist on little or nothing more than their monthly Social Security check. They live on fixed incomes and are struggling to meet the basics—pay their food, utilities, and medical bills. A cut in Social Security would literally mean for many not enough to eat or enough to pay heating, phone, medical bills, and transportation.

To bring this home, I would like to read excerpts from letters a few Iowans have written me. I have a letter here dated January 2, from Lime Springs, IA:

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: Will you please vote against any more cuts in Medicare and Social Security. I am an 87-year-old widow with Social Security of \$440 a month, and I am trying to stay off welfare. It is almost impossible for old people who depend on Social Security to live anymore. Please help us.

Another letter is dated January 4.

* * * I am a widow, age 78. I have been alone for 29 years and never able to accumulate an estate, bonds, CDs, et cetera. My income is \$650 a month Social Security, and out of that I must pay rent, electric, food, health insurance, medical bills, doctors, prescriptions, et cetera, and I am just barely able to cover the above expenses. There is no money left over for clothes, recreation, et cetera, and I would appreciate it if you would reject any cuts in Social Security and Medicare.

Another letter is dated January 5 from Jefferson, IA. It says:

* * * We are semi-retired farmers facing higher property tax, higher crop expenses and lower prices. If we don't have money, we go without. Because my health has forced my retirement at 62 years of age, I am now receiving a "very generous" \$334 a month Social Security. Now subtract \$46.10 for Medicare, \$56 Blue Cross supplemental, and then try to spread it thin enough to pay for heart, diabetes and arthritis medication at \$3,000 per year.

We have worked hard, still paying on some farmland, knowing that if either of us need to enter a nursing home, it will be gone. Social Security is not welfare.

Well, I have a lot of letters like this and I am sure, Mr. President, you and other Senators are receiving letters like this from your constituents.

Mr. President, the amendment I am about to send to the desk I believe is eminently reasonable and should be quickly passed by this body. It is relatively short and straightforward.

I will not read the whole thing.

It is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is supported by findings that over 42 million Americans receive Social Security benefits, including 3 million children, and 5 million disabled workers; that Social Security is only the pension program for 60 percent of older Americans. Almost 60 percent of the

older beneficiaries depend on Social Security for at least 50 percent of their income; 25 percent of recipients depend on it for 90 percent of their income. Without it, 15 million Americans will be thrown into poverty.

Basically, it is just a sense of the Senate that any joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed by the Senate shall specifically exclude Social Security from the calculations used to determine if the Federal budget is in balance.

Mr. President, when you talk about the average Social Security recipient, you are talking about people of very modest means. The average monthly Social Security payment now is \$679 a month. That is \$8,148 a year, just above the poverty level for a household of one. As I said, for many senior citizens, Social Security represents 90 percent or more of their entire income and it is particularly true of older widows. For the majority of older widows, Social Security represents the bulk of what they have to live on. So I understand them writing me letters saying they are fearful of these cuts.

Mr. President, I should also note that I am not just hearing from the elderly. I am also hearing from middle-age workers who are concerned about the surplus in the Social Security trust funds that will be necessary to pay the benefits when they retire. They are worried because they know it may be just too tempting for politicians to dip into the growing Social Security trust fund surpluses to pay down the deficit. And they have every reason to be worried.

Today, the Social Security surplus stands at about one-half trillion dollars. That is right. The Social Security trust fund has a surplus of one-half trillion dollars,—\$500 billion. By the year 2010, the Social Security surplus is projected to reach \$2.1 trillion. And by 2020, the Social Security trust fund will grow to an astounding \$3 trillion. That surplus, nearly two times the entire Federal budget for this year, will be very tempting to dip into to pay down the deficit.

Some will say a little out will not hurt us. But, in fact, Mr. President, in the coming years, we will need to add to that surplus, not take away from it.

The current projections are that even with a \$3 trillion surplus in the year 2020, the system will go bankrupt by around the year 2030, after paying benefits to the baby boomers who will be retiring. So about 35 years from now—and we have time within that 35 years to make the necessary adjustment. So we need to make adjustments within the next 35 years to further build up the surpluses after 2020 so that those who are working now can be assured that their Social Security will be there when they retire. So we need to add to the surpluses later on, not take away from them.

Mr. President, I am certain that the amendment I am offering will be sup-

ported by an overwhelming majority of Americans. Poll after poll has indicated opposition to the cuts in Social Security benefits by the elderly and by those now working.

So, Mr. President, it is a modest amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I think we ought to express ourselves on this bill. Even though it does not have anything to do, I know, with unfunded mandates, I think we have to express ourselves as soon as possible, especially now in the middle of winter when so many elderly people are concerned about Social Security cuts. And I think, if I am not mistaken, that we will be on the balanced budget amendment right after this bill is disposed of.

So, Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes an amendment numbered 190.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 50, add after line 6 the following new title:

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING
BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) social security is a contributory insurance program supported by deductions from workers' earnings and matching contributions from their employers that are deposited into an independent trust fund;

(2) over 42,000,000 Americans, including over 3,000,000 children and 5,000,000 disabled workers and their families, receive social security benefits;

(3) social security is the only pension program for 60 percent of older Americans;

(4) almost 60 percent of older beneficiaries depend on social security for at least half of their income and 25 percent depend on social security for at least 90 percent of their income;

(5) without social security an additional 15,000,000 Americans, mostly senior citizens, would be thrown into poverty;

(6) 138,000,000 American workers participate in the social security system and are insured in case of retirement, disability, or death;

(7) social security is a contract between workers and the Government;

(8) social security is a self-financed program that is not contributing to the current Federal budget deficit; in fact, the social security trust funds currently have over \$400,000,000,000 in reserves and that surplus will increase during fiscal year 1995 alone by an additional \$70,000,000,000;

(9) this surplus is necessary to pay monthly benefits for current and future beneficiaries;

(10) recognizing that social security is a self-financed program, Congress took social security completely "off-budget" in 1990; however, unless social security is explicitly excluded from a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution, such an amendment would, in effect, put the program

back into the Federal budget by referring to all spending and receipts in calculating whether the budget is in balance;

(11) raiding the social security trust funds to reduce the Federal budget deficit would be devastating to both current and future beneficiaries and would further undermine confidence in the system among younger workers;

(12) the American people in poll after poll have overwhelmingly rejected cutting social security benefits to reduce the Federal deficit and balance the budget; and

(13) social security beneficiaries throughout the nation are gravely concerned that their financial security is in jeopardy because of possible social security cuts and deserve to be reassured that their benefits will not be subject to cuts that would likely be required should social security not be excluded from a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution passed by the Senate shall specifically exclude social security from the calculations used to determine if the Federal budget is in balance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

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

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask the manager, did the Senator intend to proceed with additional amendments now or prefer that we wait?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, in discussing with the Senator from Iowa, we do not have a problem laying aside the pending amendment while we get additional information, and would note that the Senator from Iowa has, I believe, a unanimous-consent request. I believe it would be appropriate to lay the pending amendment aside and proceed with the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent that I set aside the pending amendment and any pending unanimous consent request.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 191

(Purpose: To provide that certain legislation shall always be in order)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 191.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25 the following new section:

“(4) DETERMINATION BY REPORTING COMMITTEE OF APPLICABILITY TO PENDING LEGISLATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, resolution, or conference report if such report includes a determination by the reporting committee that the pending measure is needed to serve a compelling national interest that furthers the public health, safety, or welfare.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the amendment that I have offered today will allow a reporting committee—that is, any of the authorizing committees—to ensure that a measure that committee determines is necessary to serve a compelling national interest be given full consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, last week I raised several issues with my colleagues from Idaho and Ohio regarding Senate bill 1. Specifically, we discussed the fact that under S. 1, it would be out of order to proceed on any legislation that imposes a cost of more than \$50 million on other levels of government unless the Federal Government is willing to pay the full costs incurred by those other levels of government. I realize a point of order would have to be raised by a Senator for the legislation not to be considered. Nevertheless, if the point of order is raised, then consideration of such a bill shall not be in order as I read the unfunded mandates legislation we are considering today.

Mr. President, I believe that we go too far when we say that the Senate should not consider a measure, regardless of its importance, unless the Federal Government can cover all public costs associated with that measure. We can all think of cases of a compelling national interest with which we should proceed even if the Federal Government does not intend to cover all the costs.

Some examples are control of nuclear waste, minimum wage laws, and the control of terrorism. These are clear examples that I think most Senators will agree with. In those cases, it is appropriate to provide a mechanism through which a committee reporting a measure, armed with the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate required by this legislation, can make a determination that it should be in order for the full Senate to consider the matter, and that no point of order should prevent that consideration.

Our Federal system functions best when there is a partnership of effort by local, State, and Federal Government, and tribal government, in some cases. Many of the most successful programs that we have in this country have been

pursued as a result of just such a partnership, constructed by the Federal Government. Examples are the Interstate Highway System, Federal housing assistance, and the unemployment insurance system.

If partnerships involving cost sharing by the different levels of government are to occur, then under our Constitution, the Federal Government is set up as the final arbiter of the terms of those partnerships. It makes no sense for us to abdicate that responsibility entirely. Clearly, in any activity we choose to pursue in partnership with the States, local government, or Indian Tribes, the Federal Government should do its best to cover the costs that relate to the benefits that the country as a whole is to receive. Surely, the Federal Government should do a better job than it has in many cases in being sensitive to other governmental entities about costs they may incur.

But we should not, in my opinion, make it out of order to consider any and all legislation that requires action by other levels of government unless the Federal Government agrees to pay the full cost of that action. Partnerships between the Federal, State, and local governments and Indian tribes will be needed in the future, and it may be appropriate in some cases for some of the costs of those partnerships to be borne by others than the Federal Government.

Under my amendment, the cost estimates would still be done, and no one in the Senate would enter into the debate ignorant of the full costs. Indeed, if the full Senate felt that the cost should be paid for entirely by the Federal Government, an amendment to this effect could be offered. If the funding was not provided for all the costs, an estimate of which would be required under the amendment, the full Senate could vote the measure down after actual debate. A measure that a committee determined to be needed to serve a compelling national interest, however, would be assured a debate on its merits if it reached the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, this seems to be an imminently reasonable adjustment to the procedures outlined in S. 1. I urge the managers to support the amendment. I urge my colleagues to agree to its adoption. I may speak again in reference to this prior to final vote on the issue. I did want to put my colleagues on notice as to the import of this amendment.

I have two other amendments, Mr. President, that I have reserved the right to offer, and I intend to offer those later this afternoon or early tomorrow. I do not have those with me at this moment.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. In response, Mr. President, to the Senator from New Mexico, I think it is necessary to point out that if at any point during this process, there truly is a compelling argument, that the committee, the chairman of that committee, may come to the floor and seek a waiver of this process of S. 1, and need not go through the remaining steps of that process.

But the idea, as I understand the proposed amendment, is to say that the committee itself could exercise the jurisdiction of the full Senate, which I do not think is appropriate and is really a real short circuit of what we are trying to do here with this process.

Earlier today we heard from the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from North Dakota on another issue, but they were saying that with this particular Federal mandate that has been put into place a year or two ago that there may be merit to this unfunded Federal mandate, but it would have been so nice to have known all the implications and the costs before this unfunded Federal mandate was implemented. What they were describing is how nice it would have been to have S. 1 in place before that particular mandate had been imposed.

So, again, I think that S. 1 provides the process and rather than allowing the committee to have that sort of jurisdiction to say that because there is a compelling interest here we need not comply is not the route that we should go. If that is the case, if there truly is a compelling reason, then they can seek that waiver immediately.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, could I just respond to the concern that the Senator from Idaho has raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, by my amendment by its language I am not exempting any piece of legislation from the requirements of cost estimates or reports from the CBO. What I am saying is that once those cost estimates and reports are obtained by the appropriate committee, if that committee determines that there is compelling national interest that needs to be considered here, then it has the right to say that in its report and to have the legislation considered on its merits on the Senate floor. And it does not have to get past any procedural hurdle that this proposed legislation would impose in terms of language that says it is out of order to consider the proposed bill.

In my opinion, it is not wise for us to be writing legislation stating it is out of order to consider any and all Federal legislation where the Federal Government fails to pay the full cost of implementing the legislation. There are too many examples in our Nation's history where it has been appropriate for the

Federal Government to proceed with legislation of that type and where there has been a well-designed partnership between the Federal Government, State government, and local government to accomplish a recognized national purpose.

I am trying to make it clear that where there is such a circumstance in the view of an authorizing committee, then that authorizing committee should have the right to have its legislation, its reported legislation, considered on its merits without having to overcome procedural points of order to do so.

That is the intent of my legislation. It does not exempt any reported legislation from the requirements of reports or cost estimates by the CBO. I do believe those are appropriate, and clearly the failure to have those in some cases has worked a hardship on local governments, on State governments, on Indian tribes.

I wanted to clarify what the import of my legislation is. And with that clarification, I hope that the Senator from Idaho, and all other Senators, can support it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

IN BEHALF OF A CULTURAL CUTTING EDGE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we live in an era of technological miracles—inventions, phenomena, and developments whose inventors and initiators might have been burned at the stake as witches and warlocks in the so-called “Dark Ages” for even suggesting, much less producing or conducting, such things.

Automobiles, jet aircraft, space vehicles, CD records, microwave ovens, telephones, artificial hearts, organ transplants—inventions, opportunities, and creations that some of our ancestors only a century ago might have found unbelievable, if not unimaginable.

But, Mr. President, perhaps the one modern invention that has had, and will have, the greatest impact on human life is television.

Imagine, if you will, the astonishment of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, or even Benjamin Franklin if any one of those men were able to sit down with us today in front of that vast wasteland, as Newton Minow referred to it—a television set.

Imagine being able to tune in with them on a one-on-one conversation across the Atlantic with British Prime

Minister John Major or German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, to discuss Trans-Atlantic alliances or international trade issues, for example.

Or imagine the astonishment of U.S. Grant or Robert E. Lee had they been able in their time to sit before a television set and view the actual progress of the Siege of Vicksburg or the Battle of Gettysburg, as so many millions of everyday Americans viewed the progress of the Gulf War or the shooting down of “Scud” missiles incoming over Tel Aviv or Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Interestingly, perhaps even the Founding Fathers of the television did not foresee the scope of television or grasp the possibilities that this miracle offered in its earliest, fuzziest beginnings.

In those primeval days of television broadcasting—roughly, the late 1930's and pre-World War II 1940's—the biggest star attractions consisted primarily of telecast images of “Felix the Cat” and local station test patterns, which fascinated people even though they offered the crudest of images and practically no motion.

But following the end of the Second World War, several radio programs began “simulcasting”—that is, broadcasting both on infant television networks and on the established radio networks at the same time.

Thus, in time, millions of Americans were enabled both to see and hear “The Voice of Firestone,” “The Bell Telephone Hour,” and “The NBC Orchestra,” conducted by Arturo Toscanini. Increasing numbers of American families were exposed to the music of Beethoven and Schubert, and to the considerable talents of the finest musical figures of the Metropolitan Opera or La Scala.

In time, NBC introduced plays by some of America's leading playwrights on “The Philco/Goodyear Playhouse,” and CBS on “Studio One”—plays many of which went on to be reproduced into classic movies, and plays that introduced some of today's leading actors and actresses to millions upon millions of Americans who had been unable to witness their Broadway and off-Broadway debuts.

For children in those early days of television, “Howdy Doody,” “Romper Room,” “Miss Frances” on “Ding Dong School,” and “Captain Kangaroo” provided often brilliant exposure to experiences and information unavailable to them anywhere else—experiences and information that conveyed values, taught serious while camouflaged knowledge, stretched tiny minds—tiny minds—and imaginations, and helped untold millions of preschool children prepare for the serious business of entering school and beginning their formal educations.

The apparent goal of television executives in those early days seemed to be to reach growing numbers of middle-class and upper-middle-class American consumers whom sponsors wanted to attract to buy their automobiles, bath

soaps, refrigerators, and dish detergents—consumers with high incomes and relatively good educations, and men and women of all income and educational levels who hungered for good music, compelling drama, and intellectually challenging entertainment and diversion.

Likewise in those days, sponsors were eager to have their names and trademarks associated with “quality culture,” in hopes of winning and keeping consumer loyalty and gratitude, both valued intangibles in the supermarkets and department stores when viewers contemplated their purchases.

But as time passed, advertisers more and more craved only higher and higher audience numbers. In the search for those numbers, sensation drove out substance, and action cancelled out content.

In time, in pursuit of ratings, television producers lost their nerve.

If a single “cowboy” show caught the public's fancy, dozens of cowboy shows appeared, crowding out most other programming. If the next season a single detective show garnered high ratings, off the television range fled the cowboys, and detective shows proliferated across the dial. The same held true of variety shows, quiz shows, “sit-coms,” or spy shows.

In the process, children's programs with substance vanished, to be replaced, hour after hour, with crudely composed “action” cartoons, in which scarcely believable and primitively drawn comic book “heroes” exposed children to eternities of violence, mayhem, and pointless fantasy.

Expert television analysts assert that, by the time an American child reaches his or her late teens, commercial television has exposed that child to literally thousands of murders and other acts of violence, an exposure that predictably deadens that child to real-life violence and that overtly and subliminally teaches that violence, in itself, is an effective means of solving problems and getting one's own way in this world.

Should we, then, be surprised that here in the inner-city neighborhoods of Washington, or in Baltimore or New York or other great urban centers—and even in our comfortable suburbs—children are literally murdering other children over the possession of sneakers, team jackets, or over real or imagined slights? After all, again and again without number, these child-murderers have witnessed the effective use of such solutions on commercial television, and a few weeks later, they had seen the same guy who gets shot or stabbed or pushed out the window or strangled with a copper wire on some other show in perfectly good health.

From the beginning of the adulteration of television, thoughtful people have sought alternatives to the trash and vulgarity that have increasingly contaminated the airwaves of this miraculous medium of communication.

And, to the relief of millions of thoughtful Americans, in time, "educational television" laid the foundations for today's public broadcasting stations.

As a result, as the public television network grew, children in our inner cities and in rural States like West Virginia and eastern Kentucky could be reached by television images that stretched their imaginations, taught them stories by great authors, exposed them to initial concepts in science and arithmetic, and challenged them with mainstream values such as telling the truth, respecting other children, obeying their parents, and becoming good citizens.

At the same time, the Public Broadcasting System, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and National Public Radio increasingly filled the voids left by the commercial networks when they turned their backs on people in our society who crave good music, who hunger for good drama, who desire to hear and see good public debates on important questions of our time, who are eager for good documentaries, and who yearn for substance and challenge in their entertainment.

Indeed, the Public Broadcasting System has evolved into a kind of cultural cutting edge—the pioneering network—that carved the frontiers and plowed the first fields that have proved the market that such operations as the Arts and Entertainment network, the Discovery, and Learning Channels, the History Channel, Bravo, and other increasingly culturally oriented systems are now exploiting.

But even in these commendable enterprises, PBS has been the pioneer to which these new cultural channels must look for guidance. As welcome as their entry into the cultural scene is, so much of their offerings were first offered or grubstaked on public television.

The lamentable truth is that, in commercial television, the bottom line is money, and until certain kinds of programming prove themselves, most commercial cable networks are unwilling to take risks on most types of programming—that is, until public television demonstrates the existence of a market for that kind of programming.

Ken Burns' "Civil War" was an enormous gamble on which no one outside public television would have been willing to take a chance, until WETA made a leap of faith and underwrote a classic that will live for decades. Millions upon millions of Americans have seen "The Civil War," and millions upon millions more will see it in coming generations. As a result, countless millions of Americans yet unborn will understand in ways previous impossible the significance and the scale of the greatest conflict in American history—a conflict that still defines us in many ways roughly 130 years later.

Currently, the hunt dogs are baying at the heels of PBS and the public broadcasting network across our country.

We are informed that PBS is too liberal, too radical, too un-American, elitist, left-wing.

Do these critics mean to say that William F. Buckley's "Firing Line" is an example of liberal programming?

William Buckley has been appearing on "Firing Line," a program produced admirably by South Carolina public broadcasting for years. Indeed, to follow William Buckley is to be disarmed by one of the most rational, intellectually charming, and persuasive conservative personalities in American history, a man who has exploited "Firing Line" brilliantly in a committed effort to force millions of Americans to rethink, or to think for the first time, the seminal principles of their own political, economic, and social positions.

Or do the critics mean to include in their criticisms of the liberal and elitist descriptions of PBS the reruns of the "Lawrence Welk Show," reproduced by Oklahoma public television, to the absolute delight of millions upon millions of Middle Aged and Older Americans who await each week the replay of some of the most beautiful music ever composed and performed in America?

Or do they mean "Wall Street Week," presided over by one of the most urbane and persuasive capitalists ever to advocate the free enterprise system anywhere and at any time?

Or do those critics include among left-wing elitists the conservative Ben Wattenberg, whose weekly panels present a wide spectrum of challenging intellects, right and left, in a balanced discussion, in understandable terms, of some of the most arcane issues of our day?

Or are we to assume that "The Collectors," "This Old House," "Cats and Dogs," concerts by the Boston Pops Orchestra, LeVar Burton's "Reading Rainbow," or reruns of such classics as "Casablanca" or Marlene Dietrich's "Blue Angel" are examples of elitist programming?

Or what of "Washington Week in Review" which we see every Friday evening here in Washington, by tuning in at 8 o'clock?

Year after year after year we watched Paul Duke, and we still watch "Washington Week in Review." It provides some of the most perceptive, thoughtful, and penetrating analysis available anywhere.

To be sure, much on public television rankles me, as I am sure it rankles people who do not share my values and philosophy of life.

But to stifle, shut down, starve, emasculate, or cripple our public broadcasting system, by denying it the seed money that guarantees its very survival in some of our most isolated rural communities, would be to kill one of the finest golden-egg-laying geese on the American cultural scene. To speak many truths is to risk making many enemies. Likewise, to speak many truths is to risk making many friends, as well. And because our public

broadcasting system provides such a variety of truths, it can boast mobs of both friends and detractors.

Mr. President, I hope that we will think long and sincerely before we punish, dismantle, or destroy one of the most valuable assets in our national cultural treasury, and risk reducing the Public Broadcasting System, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and National Public Radio to bad and ineffectual imitations of our commercial broadcasting networks, complete with underarm deodorant commercials and paeans to dog food and kitty litter.

I yield the floor.

[Disturbance in the visitors' gallery.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for just a moment.

The gallery must not show approval or disapproval to actions on the floor of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we set aside whatever the pending business is. Is there a pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment 191, The Senator's own amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent my own amendment be set aside temporarily, while I offer another amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 192

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 192.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25, the following new section:

"(4) APPLICATION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE—

Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (c)(1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if such provision relates to a requirement for the treatment or disposal of—

(A) high-level radioactive waste, low-level radioactive waste, or spent nuclear fuel (as such terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101)); or

(B) byproduct material or transuranic waste (as such terms are defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, (42 U.S.C. 2014))."

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering here is an amendment to exempt measures concerning the treatment and disposal of

nuclear waste from S. 1. It is my understanding that the agency primarily responsible for this issue is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It is one of the agencies that is not covered by title II of this legislation.

This amendment I have offered here would have the effect of ensuring that both the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Congress can continue to have authority to take necessary action in this very important policy area. Without this amendment I have offered here, we are leaving the NRC with power to act in an area where it would also be out of order for this Congress itself to consider legislating. If a bill or an amendment is offered to increase the requirements to obtain a license under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that bill would be subject to a point of order. The NRC could do that by regulation without there being any objection raised.

But if the Congress tried by statute to raise the requirements on a licensee under the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that would be subject to a point of order. As the bill now stands, my amendment would correct that. I believe it is important to look at this issue in a historical context.

Research on nuclear energy started without congressional approval and in fact in great secrecy, and only a few select Members of Congress were kept informed about the Manhattan project during World War II, even though a large amount of taxpayer money was being spent to build the facilities needed at Los Alamos in my own home State, in Hanford, and at Oak Ridge.

Moving quickly to assert its control over the nuclear program, Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which created both the Atomic Energy Commission in the executive branch, which was charged with managing the program, and it created a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy within Congress to oversee and direct the program. Moreover, because private ownership was prohibited in the 1946 act, the Federal Government maintained absolute control over nuclear materials and facilities. Consequently, the prospect of the nuclear program being transitional to the civilian sector was very faint, and, therefore, Congress was enforced to enact legislation to develop the civilian nuclear power program in 1954 with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Because that act was extremely vague in its efforts to define safety considerations and in its overall regulatory program, the AEC, the Atomic Energy Commission, was responsible for promulgating safety regulations, and they had broad discretion. In fact, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia noted years later that the 1954 act created—here is a quotation from one of their decisions:

The 1954 act created a regulatory scheme which is virtually unique in the degree to which broad responsibilities should pose in the administrative agency.

And it has a prescription in its charter as to how it shall proceed in achieving the statutory objectives. Mr. President, today that same very broad discretion resides in the regulatory agency.

The initial administrative regulations parallel the 1954 act, and the two were very loose. Nuclear power has proven to be extremely complex and increasingly demanding. Nuclear power plants have grown larger and more sophisticated, and they are requiring capable safety systems and backups.

Very simply stated, the more complex these nuclear power systems have become and plants have become, the more things can go wrong. As a result, nuclear regulation has had to keep pace with industry advances in order to protect the public health and safety. Recent accidents only serve to remind us of the potential of not maintaining close scrutiny of this industry. Chernobyl raised the awareness of Russia and Eastern Europe where dozens of unsafe plants exist that fall way below the Western safety standards that have been promulgated by our own Federal Government.

Under the provisions of the pending unfunded mandates legislation, many of the valuable laws that were created specifically in response to the public health and safety concerns in this area would have been improper for consideration. For instance, the Low Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act could not have been considered by Congress absent the waiver of this unfunded mandates act. The low level waste act, passed in 1980, makes the States responsible for nuclear waste disposal; that is, waste that was generated within that particular State's borders. No Federal funding is provided in this program.

Moreover, I must note that the National Governors Association requested this legislation. Indeed, the National Governors Association provided much input into it. Essentially, the Governors believed that the States were in a better position to select disposal sites within those States. Nonetheless, under S. 1, the low level waste program would come under the definition of a Federal mandate and would be subject to the requirements of title I of the bill.

Additionally, in the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, we authorized the Office of Nuclear Waste Negotiator to find a State or an Indian tribe to host a permanent repository for a monitored, retrievable storage facility for nuclear waste.

This legislation we are considering today could frustrate his efforts if he were successful in identifying a potential host for such a facility. In my home State of New Mexico we are seeing an effort to site a nuclear waste repository facility on tribal land. And I feel strongly that we in the Congress must preserve our ability to legislate and regulate in this area to protect public health and safety.

The reasons for this amendment are self-evident. Although I believe that the Senate should always keep in mind the costs incurred by the private and the public sectors by any of its actions, I believe, as reporting committees apparently do, that in some areas of the law they are simply too important to create points of order against consideration of legislation. I further believe that the treatment and disposal of nuclear waste falls within that category.

Clearly, we have a responsibility to act and exert national leadership in an area that could have a profound impact on the health and safety of the American people, and in the future we may very well be called on to do so. We need to be sure that we will be able to do so and that procedural roadblocks cannot be raised.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to adopt this important amendment. I understand that the managers of the bill are agreeable to a time limit for additional discussion of this bill prior to its being voted on.

I am glad to yield the floor or yield to questions.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I think I understand what the Senator from New Mexico is trying to do, but I am not sure I understand exactly how this would work. I would like to clarify. Let me make a statement. Then I would ask the Senator from New Mexico to respond.

If what the unfunded mandates bill is trying to do, of course, is to say where we are putting a mandate on a State, we will consider the costs up front, we will deal with those costs and either provide for it by passing those costs and saying, States you have to do it, or we would provide the money. That is the purpose of this, so we will not build up these huge bills and put all of these costs on the States occasioned by what we do here with legislation involving the States.

It would appear to me that if we exempt the nuclear industry from this process, you would set up the possibility that, if the proposal, whatever it is, is exempted from the point of order, that you might find the Federal Government is just going back and saying, States do it, with no money or no consideration of money required up front or anything else.

I cannot believe that is what the Senator from New Mexico would intend. Maybe I am wrong. But this would mean someplace like Hanford that has all the problems out there at Hanford in Washington, with all the problems of the so-called semiexplosive silos out there that we have been concerned about for a couple of decades now, and all the other problems from that area as well as some 17 major nuclear sites in the nuclear weapons complex in 11 different States, that we can in effect

say to those States, just take care of it. We put a mandate on you. You take care of it out there. Whether it is Hanford, or in my home State of Ohio, or wherever, we would just say, States, take care of it.

I do not believe that the Senator from New Mexico intends that be the situation. But I would submit, if I understand the amendment correctly, that would be a possibility under this. It would seem to me that the States are better protected by saying we stay under this point of order, if it lies, and then say we have considered the cost up front and here is how we will take care of those costs and help the States comply with Federal law, which is what we do with other environmental concerns, not just nuclear, clean air, clean water, and everything that we provide mandates for around here.

All these environmental mandates so far are the biggest thing under the unfunded mandates. What we set up is a point of order with regard to those where we either work out an arrangement where we share in the costs that we are imposing to accomplish that good end, or we say we are not going to do that up front. But we have to consider the costs up front on what our responsibilities are.

It would seem to me that in the nuclear industry in particular, and particularly the nuclear weapons program, that we are still trying to recover from all those secrecies that went into effect during the cold war that let us build up huge stocks of material that now need to be taken out and disposed of someplace. I would not think that we would want to have that out from under the Government saving in the cost of doing that. Yet, if I read the amendment correctly, that is exactly what it is. Am I wrong in my understanding?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me respond to the question. I do think the Senator is wrong in his understanding.

First of all, let me make clear, my amendment does not exempt anything from the reporting requirements. The reporting requirements in the bill, where you have to estimate the costs and estimate where the costs would fall, remain in place. Those have to be obtained before any legislation comes to the floor, and none of that is changed under my amendment.

What my amendment does say, though, is that in this very important area related to treatment or disposal of nuclear waste, in that very important area, if the Federal Government determines that some action should take place, you cannot raise a point of order that says it is out of order to consider the legislation, absent full funding by the Federal Government. That is all my proposed amendment does.

The Senator was saying this would open up the possibility of the Federal Government saying to the States: Washington State, you are responsible for Hanford.

That possibility exists today. That possibility will exist in the future.

Theoretically, we could do that at any point, just to the same extent we do it today. That is the way the Constitution set up our Federal system. So that possibility is always there for the Federal Government to step in and do that kind of a thing. Clearly, though, that is not consistent with the way this country has viewed responsibility, sharing the responsibility for nuclear power.

Mr. GLENN. If the Senator will yield. I am not sure I understand yet what he is proposing, or if that is his interpretation, because the point of order is supposed to make certain that the Federal Government shares in the mandate they are sending to the State. If we do away with that point of order, and as your amendment says, "notwithstanding any other provision," paragraph 1(b), "it shall always be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, if it relates to the requirement for the treatment or disposal of," and it goes into radioactive waste and so on. That means a point of order would not lie dealing with nuclear waste or disposal. That means the States would have to pick up the bill. That is what we are trying to prevent, as there was too much in the past with clean air, clean water, and all the requirements we have put on the States without providing any Federal funding, if I understand this correctly.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Let me try to respond using another example which I raised, I believe, a week ago to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Idaho both. That is a circumstance we have in my home State, where you have an Indian tribe negotiating now with various utilities to put in a nuclear waste repository, a monitored retrievable storage site. Under the legislation as drafted and as presented here to the Senate, any effort by the Congress to impose requirements on an Indian tribe with regard to the running of a site, the way that a facility such as that would be conducted, if those requirements added up to more than \$50 million, it would be out of order for us to consider the legislation unless we paid for it.

In my view, it should not be out of order for us to consider that legislation. In my view, that is exactly the kind of legislation we ought to be considering.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I respond to my friend that in a situation like that, where it obtains strictly to an Indian tribe that is trying to have some of this activity on their reservation, that should be brought up just like everything else, and the Senate, in considering that then would waive that requirement if it was appropriate in that case.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me clarify that I think maybe the disagreement here is—I have an instinctive reaction against putting language in law that says a point of order can be raised against consideration of any bill which meets the following requirements.

It seems to me that it should not be out of order to consider legislation in an important field such as the treatment and disposal of nuclear waste. That is what the Congress was constituted to do, to consider that kind of legislation. And here we are about to pass legislation, the unfunded mandates act, which says that it is out of order for us to consider it. It strikes me that, at least in this area, where clearly there is a Federal interest, clearly there is a history of responsible Federal action—maybe not as responsible as some would like, but at least the main action that has taken place here has clearly been Federal—I believe it is appropriate for us to say to do the reports, but if you are going to legislate in this area, go ahead and bring that legislation to the floor and let the Senate dispose of it, either pass it or defeat it.

Mr. GLENN. Let me address another concern I have here and that is this: This bill is designed to deal with Federal mandates imposed on other entities—State and local, whatever—to take care of those costs up front or say why we are not going to, and require the States or local communities to address what ever it is the proposal is we are making.

It would seem to me that what you are addressing is something else. Where an Indian tribe on a reservation is initiating a plan on their own, that does not really have anything to do with what we are imposing from the Federal level, is that correct?

Mr. BINGAMAN. No. Mr. President, let me respond that under the act as it now stands, as I understand it, the act does not apply to independent regulatory agencies. They are exempted from the unfunded mandates act.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is such an independent regulatory agency and, therefore, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission can impose obligations on a tribe, on a local government, on a State, by regulation, and the cost of that can exceed \$50 million, or whatever figure it has to exceed.

What we are doing, though, in the legislation as it now stands, is we are saying although the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is vested with authority to impose those kinds of obligations, we are denying ourselves that authority. We in the Congress are denying ourselves that authority, and that strikes me as totally illogical. It strikes me that if we are going to have that authority vested in the Federal Government, clearly Congress should retain its ability to deal with this in a responsible way.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico stated that his amendment would in no way require anything other than the reporting requirements. They would still have to abide by the reporting requirements. The key point is that his

amendment would, again, disavow that a point of order could lie against the legislation.

In this very, very important issue of nuclear storage facilities—for example, spent nuclear fuel rods—we know that we have a number of commercial sites all over the United States. We know that there are certain repositories. We know that there are certain States that may be receiving the spent *naval fuel, as is the case in Idaho. This sort of discussion, as you begin to get a flavor of it here, is exactly the sort of discussion that ought to take place on the floor of the Senate. So, again, this is another exclusion from the presumption that this legislation says we are in favor of State and local governments receiving the funds in order to carry out these Federal mandates. At any point, you can come and seek a waiver. It is a majority vote that would allow that waiver of the point of order at any point during the process.

But I really believe that if we send this sort of a signal, you will find that States are saying: If you are not going to abide by this, if we do not have any likelihood that there will be Federal funds to carry these things out, it will continue to be an unfunded Federal mandate in the area of nuclear storage. For example, I do not think you will see any States that will want to step forward and say they would like to be considered as a possible solution for the long-range storage or disposition of nuclear material. I would not blame them.

So, again, I just say let us not disavow the point of order. Let us allow not only the reporting requirements, the costs associated with that and the impact, but let us also have a discussion so that a point of order could lie and we would have this sort of discussion on the floor of the Senate instead of allowing the committee to have the jurisdiction to say we do not need to allow Congress to consider this any further.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Idaho this: One concern I have had here is under the language of the bill which he is proposing to the Senate, we exempt independent regulatory agencies from the purview of the bill. So we are saying that if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission wishes to impose expensive, onerous requirements on a State, town or tribal government, to ensure safety in the handling of nuclear waste, that is fine. We have no objection. No point of order can be raised. And we are certainly not suggesting one in this bill.

But Congress cannot do that. Congress cannot consider legislation to do that unless it is willing to waive a point of order. So we are essentially denying to the Congress the very powers that we are leaving in the independent regulatory agency at the Federal level.

I have great difficulty understanding the logic of denying Congress the very authority which the Constitution gives it to this area and requiring somebody

who comes to the Senate floor or some committee that reports legislation to the Senate floor requiring them to overcome a procedural hurdle before they can, in fact, have their proposed legislation considered on its merits.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the arguments that were made by the Senator. But drawing the distinction with Congress, he is dealing with legislation. With a regulatory agency, you are dealing with regulations. It may be that that regulatory agency is then, through those regulations, carrying out the will of Congress as established in that legislation.

Also, I know that Senator ROTH, chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, will be holding hearings on regulatory relief to determine if, in fact, there are some areas in which we should be making modifications.

But I do not believe that, by saying what the Senator may be describing as a problem with the regulatory process, we, therefore, should make sure that Congress also follows that same process.

S. 1 is a process to give us accountability. Again, I believe that it will give us the information that we need up front, so that we can have these sort of meanings full discussion and not preclude that sort of discussion by agreeing to the Senator's amendment as proposed.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am beginning to doubt that I am going to persuade the sponsor of the bill of the merits of my amendment.

But let me at least conclude by saying that again my amendment does not in any way take away the requirement that the information be obtained. It says the information must be obtained so that discussion can and should take place on the Senate floor. I just doubt the wisdom of us putting in a Federal statute that it is out of order for us to consider legislation dealing with the treatment and disposal of nuclear waste. It should not be out of order for us to consider that legislation. And a person who wants to consider legislation in that area should not have to come to the floor and overcome a procedural hurdle in order to have his proposed legislation considered on its merits.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, or I am glad to respond if there is further discussion of the amendment.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the Senator from New Mexico, and that is why I take very seriously his suggested amendment.

But I believe, in that last statement, I say to the Senator from New Mexico, maybe there is a semantics problem.

Because when the Senator says that he does not feel we should have some process that makes it out of order for Congress to be discussing potential legislation dealing with the nuclear issue, I agree with the Senator.

But this process does not just automatically say it is out of order. It says, here are the steps you must follow and if you follow those steps as prescribed there is nothing that says you will be out of order. And you will be dealing with that very important issue of nuclear material or storage.

If, however, you find that one of those steps is illogical, onerous, at that point, then you can come and seek a majority vote to say we agree with you. We now waive this point of order, but the Senator's amendment takes that away. It disavows the point of order, and that is my concern.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, just to make it clear, I am focused on the semantics and I think the Senator from Idaho is right. I am focused on line 16 and 17, page 21, where it says, "It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider" and then it goes on and says any bill or joint resolution, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. That to me is not semantics. That is more than semantics to say "It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider."

I think the whole purpose of the Congress in our Federal system is to consider legislation of this type dealing with major national issues. Treating and storage of nuclear waste is just one of those. But I consider that to be an area of concern peculiarly in the purview of the National Government.

So I do think I have a concern when we pass legislation, as we are getting ready to do here, as I understand it, that says, "It shall not be in order for the Senate to consider" various pieces of legislation.

So there is a basic disagreement. I think it is more than semantics. I think it is the language of the statute.

Mr. President, I appreciate the chance to discuss it. I have another amendment. I know there is another Senator ready to offer an amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside for the purposes of offering my amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 193

(Purpose: To provide that any State, local, or tribal government that already complies with a new Federal intergovernmental mandate shall be eligible to receive funds for the costs of the mandate)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and I ask that it be considered as offered for the purposes of the deadline tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] proposes an amendment numbered 193.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following: Nothing in this Act shall preclude a State, local, or tribal government that already complies with all or part of the Federal intergovernmental mandates included in the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report from considerations for Federal funding for the cost of the mandate, including the costs the State, local, or tribal government is currently paying and any additional costs necessary to meet the mandate.

Mr. KOHL. Briefly, Mr. President, this amendment clarifies a possible problem in the bill that we are creating or will be creating a disincentive for States to take action. Some States may well decide to delay action on necessary and important measures in the hope that Congress passes a Federal law to do the same thing that they are considering doing and then provide some money to do it which otherwise would not be available. This amendment will ensure that States are not ineligible to receive funds if they are already meeting a Federal mandate under existing State law.

We are going to be discussing this tomorrow. I am not asking that the amendment be accepted at this time, of course, but I wanted to present it. I think it is important that we not provide clear disincentives to States to do things environmental or with regard to health care or welfare reform or in any way. Should we be giving the States a message that we want them to just sit around and not do anything if they anticipate that down the road a Federal mandate may be passed that would provide the money for them to do it? It seems to me that is not what we are trying to accomplish here with this bill.

My amendment simply indicates that States will not be ineligible to be considered for funding if, in fact, they are acting in a way that is progressive and that, if a mandate then is passed, they will be eligible to be considered for any money that they may have spent in complying with that mandate.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I had some discussion with the Senator from Wisconsin about this, and I understand the intent and I appreciate the intent of this.

It sounds to me like it may be an incentive for States to continue to be progressive and know that there may be ways of doing things in their particular State that do not apply to other States and they ought to proceed.

I would like to have the opportunity later to have a meeting with the Senator from Wisconsin and with the Senator from Ohio and see if we could not work out some language that we could all agree to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, again, I think the intent is very appropriate.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. As the Senator from Idaho and I both know, we have been working together and will continue, I am sure, to work together along with Senator GLENN and Senator ROTH, Senator EXON, to find language that clarifies the purpose and that satisfies all of our needs. I simply want to bring that to the floor. I appreciate your consideration and willingness to work with me on this.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business for a period 5 minutes.

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

CRISIS IN IDAHO

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, last Friday at about this hour I stood on the floor of this Senate to describe a crisis that my State of Idaho and its citizens were at the brink of, a crisis that had resulted from a Federal judge's order to immediately halt all economic activity on nearly 14 million acres of my State.

At the time I spoke, Idaho families and communities stood on the brink of financial ruin, through, frankly, no fault of their own, but because the Federal Government had failed to perform its responsibilities in a framework that was required by the law. Since I spoke on Friday many of my colleagues have asked me about the situation in my State.

I rise this afternoon to give Members a status report to the Senate and, frankly, to the Nation. I say to the Nation, because we will not find this story reported on the front page of any newspaper outside the State of Idaho, probably because nobody would believe the magnitude of the potential catastrophe that was at hand in my State.

This action was taken in the name of saving an important Idaho resource—the salmon, three species of salmon—on the Snake and Columbia River systems of the Pacific Northwest, an anadromous fish that spawns in the headwaters of my State of Idaho and listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

But surely it was not necessary to shut down virtually all activities on six national forests with only 1 day's warning to save these species of fish. This action occurred because a Federal agency, National Marine Fisheries, had not finished its review of another Federal agency's work. The so-called consultation process was being mired down inside the bureaucracy, whether it was because of staff time or inadequate funding or simply they just had not gotten to it. The bottom line was that it had not been done and a Federal judge reacted.

I received from local officials worried about a situation of nearly 2,000 people being put out of work, a population frightened that on Monday morning, this day, they would not have the jobs to go to that they had demanded immediate action. That injunction was to go through on Friday.

Now our problem was to be, what would happen? So on Friday I got in touch with National Marine Fisheries, Rollie Schmitten at his agency and he assured me the work would be completed on January 31—that is a week from now—that it would satisfy National Marine Fisheries concerned about Forest Service activities and that it might well address the consultation process in its conclusion.

What is important to remember is that the court injunction issued over a week ago was not issued because salmon were being endangered by folks at that moment in time. They were not being placed in jeopardy at that moment in time. But a judge reacted with an injunction that could have stopped jobs in the area and would have threatened thousands of families at this moment in time. In other words, the bureaucratic gridlock could have put my State of Idaho out of business and put thousands of people's jobs on the line.

This brings to the forefront, I think, the most recent example of the balancing act we must pursue when saving a species of plant or animal. Unfortunately, I believe it is the Endangered Species Act that is out of balance, not the people of my State of Idaho, and not their actions, inside the law, inside the Federal rules and regulations of the Forest Service of course now being examined by the National Marine Fisheries.

In the coming days and weeks I will be working with Members of the Senate, and the Idaho delegation will be working to try to resolve this issue. Here is what the problem is in the short-term: National Marine Fisheries must expedite that consultation, accepting the decision of the Forest Service on some of these areas. I have asked the Clinton administration to enact emergency regulations to resolve the problems between the two departments, the National Marine Fisheries and the Forest Service. Rollie Schmitten is going to live up to his

deadline of January 31. I trust they will get that done.

Now, of course, in the long term, the legislation of reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act is what is critical and what has to be done.

Well, did anybody lose their job today? The answer is no. In the last hour, the Justice Department asked for us a stay through the Forest Service, and it was granted by the judge. We have 1 week's breathing room.

But the reason I bring this, of course, is just to give you an idea of the kind of crisis, the frustration, the anger, the depression that the citizens of my State went through. Men and women calling my office crying, frightened that their very jobs would be destroyed and taken away from them because of a bureaucratic boondoggle? Absolutely. It is going on in my State of Idaho right now, it has gone on in other States, and it will continue to go on as long as this Congress closes its eyes, turns its back, and walks away from the responsibility of reauthorizing the acts of Congress, the laws of the land, and in that process, reexamining whether they work or do not work, whether they comply or are out of compliance with the intent of Congress and whether, in fact, they truly address the needs of the American people and the wants, and that is to save plants and animals who are endangered. But we in the Senate know today that that is not the way the act is working.

While for the short term, the Idaho congressional delegation has solved an immediate crisis in Idaho, the clock ticks. What happens on Friday or Saturday of this week if these deadlines are not met, if there is no reality to the human compassion that ought to be expressed by these agencies in carrying out the mandate of their laws or their regulations within the law?

I will continue to report to the Senate as the Idaho congressional delegation and I continue to act to try to resolve this immediate crisis. Mr. President, we have a responsibility in the U.S. Senate now to address the Endangered Species Act so that we can say once and for all, "Yes, we're concerned about the protection of or the development of a mitigating plan to save a given species of plant or animal that may be endangered. But while we are doing it, let us not endanger the lives or well-being of thousands of citizens across this country who, through no fault of their own, have fallen on the tracks of a Federal law that is out of control and the train that rides on those tracks now bears down upon them with the risk of destroying them."

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement that we are operating under, I had reserved three amendments to be offered to this bill, and I now ask unanimous consent that we set aside the pending business so that I can offer the third of those three amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 194.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25, the following new section:

"(4) *Application to provisions relating to or administered by independent regulatory agencies.*—

Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (c)(1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if such provision relates to or will be administered by any independent regulatory agency.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will reserve my discussion of this amendment until an appropriate time later in the debate, and I look forward to presenting it at that time.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I might be able to address the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio, it was my desire at this point on the amendment that had previously offered by myself, by Senator HARKIN, and others, on the Federal Reserve Board issue, my understanding is Senator HARKIN has submitted a statement for the RECORD. We are concluded on this side. I would like to get the yeas and nays ordered on that amendment, if that is acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises that it would take unanimous consent to request the yeas and nays at this time.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I make such request. I ask unanimous consent to order the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment, with the unanimous consent then that no further amendments be in order to that particular amendment and that the vote will occur tomorrow. The first vote will be at 4 p.m.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is in order to request them at this time.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table will occur under the previous order.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio, I have one additional amendment which the Senator from Iowa has joined me in offering. It is amendment No. 179, which is at the desk. Inasmuch as the Senator from Iowa is here and ready to speak on the amendment, it may be that we could very quickly dispose of that amendment.

I intend also to ask for a recorded vote on that amendment. That amendment deals with the Consumer Price Index and the calculation of the Consumer Price Index and a mandate required, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of at least one prominent Member of Congress.

We are willing to discuss that, offer it, and seek a recorded vote, and follow the first recorded vote that has already been ordered, if that would satisfy the desire and interests of the two Senators who are managing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I think that would be very advantageous for us to keep moving forward on the progress of this bill. So I welcome that sort of discussion.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, is that satisfactory with the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GLENN. That is satisfactory.

AMENDMENT NO. 179

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding calculation of the Consumer Price Index)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask that amendment No. 179 that I sent to the desk be reported, and I ask unanimous consent to set aside any current amendment that is pending in order to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 179.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . CALCULATION OF THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has maintained that the current Consumer Price Index overstates inflation by as much as 50 percent.

(2) Other expert opinions on the Consumer Price Index range from estimates of a modest overstatement to the possibility of an understatement of the rate of inflation.

(3) Some leaders in the Congress have called for an immediate change in the way in which the Consumer Price Index is calculated.

(4) Changing the Consumer Price Index in the manner recommended by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System would result in both reductions in Social Security benefits and increases in income taxes.

(5) The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which has responsibility for the Consumer Price Index, has been working to identify and correct problems with the way in which the Consumer Price Index is now calculated.

(6) Calculation of the Consumer Price Index should be based on sound economic principles and not on political pressure.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a precipitous change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index that would result in an increase in income taxes and a decrease in Social Security benefits is not the appropriate way to resolve this issue; and

(2) any change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index should result from thoughtful study and analysis and should be a result of a consensus reached by the experts, not pressure exerted by politicians.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator HARKIN, from Iowa, who will speak on this, had to leave the floor for a moment to take a telephone call. Let me make a few comments on this amendment, which I offer on my behalf, on behalf of Senator DODD, and on behalf of Senator HARKIN.

This amendment deals with an issue that is technical but very important. The amendment deals with the Consumer Price Index. We saw about a week ago a story in Washington, DC, in the press, that the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board came to the Congress and he testified on one thing or another. In his testimony, he opined that the Consumer Price Index probably, in his judgment and in the judgment of the Federal Reserve Board, actually overstates the rate of inflation by anywhere from one-half of 1 percent to 1.5 percent.

Shortly after the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board made that statement, some others in Congress began to climb in and say, well, if that is the case, if the Consumer Price Index overstates inflation, then let us force the Bureau of Labor Statistics to get active and do something about it. In

fact, one prominent Member of Congress indicated that we will give them 30 days down at the Bureau of Labor Statistics to either change it or we will zero them out, get rid of them.

Well, Mr. President, here is the consequence of what seems like an innocent sounding recommendation. If someone—the Fed—says we think the Consumer Price Index actually overstates inflation, it does not sound like it means very much, does it. Leave aside for just a moment the question of if that in fact is what the Fed thinks, if in fact that is what they believe, what on Earth has the Federal Reserve Board been doing down there. They have increased interest rates six times because inflation rates were too high. We have low rates of inflation for 4 straight years, and if inflation is overstated by 1.5 percent of the Consumer Price Index, that means the real rate of inflation is only 1.2 percent.

By what justification could these folks down at the Federal Reserve Board be imposing on America a mandate of increased costs by higher interest rates across the board? What justification could they have for that?

Well, I will debate that another time. They have no justification. It is a wrongheaded policy that injures this country, puts the brakes on the economy, and will send this country into a recession. The Fed, unfortunately, does not know what it is doing. What it is doing is the wrong thing for our country. But that is a debate for another day, and a debate I have already had and one I will have again, I am sure.

The proposition is this. If you say that the Consumer Price Index really overstates inflation, what are the consequences of that? Well, the consequences are you are able to reduce the spending on Social Security because you have a smaller COLA adjustment on Social Security recipients' cost-of-living adjustment. So you save money by not giving as much in a cost-of-living adjustment to those folks who live on Social Security.

In fact, the estimates are we are talking around \$27 billion, I believe, on the Social Security issue. If one assumes the Federal Reserve Board's calculations, the decrease to Social Security recipients would be very substantial. And if one assumes the Federal Reserve Board's calculations, it also means that you have other consequences in the Federal budget. And the Federal budget deficit, which the Federal Reserve Board should care about, is increased by this.

So what the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from Iowa and I are concerned about is this discussion about this subject in the context of politics rather than science. The question of what is the Consumer Price Index and how should it be changed, if it should be changed, is a technical question, to be sure.

Most of the discussions about whether the Consumer Price Index is accurate or not come from the Bureau of

Labor Statistics. In fact, most of the information for any studies that exist come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. So someone who sees this on a comment by the Chairman of the Fed to say, "Let's change the Consumer Price Index immediately and if they don't do it, we will in 30 days zero them out," they are saying we are going to impose a mandate, a political mandate on the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I say that is the wrong way to do things. We have developed a resolution, a sense of the Senate, that says a precipitous change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index that would result in both an increase in income taxes—and the reason for that is that the personal exemption has to do with the Consumer Price Index. As the Consumer Price Index goes up, the personal exemption is indexed to it so that goes up. If it is shown not to go up so much, the personal exemption does not go up as much, and therefore one's taxes are increased. So you have two consequences here. One is increased income taxes and second is a lower Social Security payment by changing the calculation of the Consumer Price Index.

But our sense-of-the-Senate resolution says a precipitous change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index that would result in an increase in income taxes and a decrease in Social Security benefits is not the appropriate way to resolve this issue. Any change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index should result from thoughtful, studied analysis and should be a result of consensus reached by experts, not pressure exerted by politicians.

Our point is we have had two major political figures seize on a comment by the Chairman of the Fed to suggest we are going to impose a mandate on the bureaucracy to change the calculation of the Consumer Price Index, and our point is this. This has consequences. Words have consequences and so do actions, and actions to change the Consumer Price Index for political purposes might well reduce the Federal deficit but how is it done? By increasing taxes and by cutting Social Security benefits.

We would never have raised the subject in this context except that some leading figures say this must be done and must be done now and soon and, if not, we will zero out funding for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

There is no evidence that what the Chairman of the Fed has said is correct. Some say the Consumer Price Index overstates inflation. Some say it is about right. And there are some who will allege that it understates inflation through a series of five or six very complicated questions that are debated aggressively among economists.

I am not here today to try to debate that or resolve that. I am only here to say that the final lesson in what the Consumer Price Index ought to be ought to be a lesson that we study from scientists and from those who know

and from economists and others who do a thoughtful analysis, not from pressure brought by politicians.

That is the issue, and that is why I hope we will have a vote on this and the vote will say that the Senate concurs: we do not believe a precipitous change in the Consumer Price Index should result from political pressure. It ought to result from thoughtful analysis by those who know and who study and who give us their expert recommendations.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Iowa is in the Chamber, and I would be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. President, might I make one other unanimous consent request while I am on my feet. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] asked to be included as a cosponsor of the amendment that I offered on the Federal Reserve Board, and I would ask unanimous consent to achieve that.

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

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I congratulate and thank my colleague from North Dakota for offering this amendment, for his thoughtful insight into what some people in the Republican party over on the other side are calling a technical correction in the Consumer Price Index or CPI, our basic measure of the rate of inflation. I think that is what the leaders of the other body called it, a technical correction. Well, you know, some people said ketchup was a vegetable once, too. These technical corrections at some time have very serious consequences.

So while you can call it a technical correction, it is nothing less than two things. It is a stealth tax on the middle class, and it is a cut in Social Security benefits for the elderly, both of which I might add are just the opposite of what my friends in the Republican Party have said they want to do.

So I think this amendment would help my friends on the other side clear up the issue. It would make it clear that we do not in any way want to put pressure on the independent Bureau of Labor Statistics to somehow come up and rush through and make a finding on the basis of political pressure but that, indeed, it ought to be thought through very carefully.

The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely right that this change in the CPI has consequences, big consequences—about \$21 billion in higher taxes annually by the year 2000 and \$27.5 billion cut in Social Security in that same year. And that has to do with the fact that when you pay your income taxes, the personal deduction, the standard deductions that we all get, that middle-income families get are all adjusted by the CPI, and so if you ratchet down that CPI, you may say, well, it is technical, but it is a 1 percent reduction. And what that would mean is that every year the

amount that you could claim for deductions in the standard deduction would be less, so you would pay more in income taxes. And, as I said, after 5 years, the Federal Reserve estimates about \$21 billion in higher taxes. And that would mostly come from moderate and middle-income taxpayers.

Now, I wish to be as fair as I can, Mr. President. On the merits, there may be—and I use the words “may be”—an overestimation of inflation in the CPI statistics. This has been known for many years.

Now, the technical reasons are very complex, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics has and is accurately working on making adjustments. A couple of small adjustments are planned for next month and a key change is scheduled to take effect in 1998.

And funds for part of a 6-year effort to improve the CPI were approved in the fiscal year 1995 Labor-HHS appropriations bill which I chaired and which was supported on both sides of the aisle.

I also want to point out, Mr. President, that in 1987 Congress required the BLS, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to set up an alternative CPI weighted for the elderly. We asked them to do that in 1987 because the elderly pay much more for health care. And that CPI for the elderly now shows a higher level of inflation for the elderly every year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article that outlines the results of the experimental CPI authored by Nathan Amble and Ken Stewart in the May 1995 monthly Labor Review.

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

[From the Labor Review, May 1995]

EXPERIMENTAL PRICE INDEX FOR ELDERLY CONSUMERS

(By Nathan Amble and Ken Stewart)

An experimental consumer price index for older Americans rose somewhat faster than each of two published BLS Consumer Price Indexes; as might be expected, expenditures for medical care accounted almost entirely for this difference.

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics measures the average change in prices over time for a fixed market basket of goods and services for two population groups. The CPI for All Urban Consumer (CPI-U) represents the spending habits of about 80 percent of the population of the United States. The CPI for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) is a subset of the CPI-U and represents about 32 percent of the total U.S. population.

The 1987 amendments to the Older Americans Act of 1965 directed BLS to develop an experimental index for a third population of consumers: those 62 years of age and older. In its 1988 report to Congress, BLS observed that from December 1982 to December 1987, the experimental consumer price index for older Americans rose slightly faster than the CPI-U and CPI-W.¹ (See table 1.)

This article updates the analysis of the behavior of the experimental index for older Americans for the period from December 1987 through December 1993. Over this 6-year pe-

riod, the experimental price index rose 28.7 percent, slightly more than the increases of 26.3 percent for the CPI-U and 25.5 percent for the CPI-W.

METHODOLOGY, DATA, AND LIMITATIONS

Although the study discussed in this article indicates a higher overall inflation rate for older Americans compared with the rates for the official CPI population groups, any conclusions drawn should be used with caution because of the various limitations inherent in the methodology.

Expenditure weights. For each CPI population group, item strata are weighted according to their importance in the spending patterns of the population. The population of older Americans used for the experimental price index was defined to be all urban non-institutionalized consumer units that were either

1. unattached individuals who were at least 62 years of age; or
2. members of families whose reference person (as defined in the Consumer Expenditure Survey) or spouse was at least 62 years of age; or
3. members of groups of unrelated individuals living together who pool their resources to meet their living expenses and whose reference person was at least 62 years of age.

In the 1982-84 Consumer Expenditure Survey, which is used as the source of expenditure weights in the current CPI, 19 percent of the total sample of eligible urban consumer units (3,135 out of 16,500) met this definition. Because the number of consumer units used for determining weights in the experimental index was relatively small, expenditure weights used in the construction of the experimental price index have a higher sampling error than those used for the larger populations.

For each population group, the base expenditure weight of any component represents the actual expenditure on that component in the base period. The relative importance of any component is its expenditure weight (updated for changes in relative prices) and represents the proportion of that weight to total expenditures for the population. The relative importances of selected components for each of the three population groups are shown in table 2 for December 1987, the first month of the study.

Areas and outlets priced. The experimental consumer price index for older consumers is a weighted average of price changes for the same set of item strata collected from the same sample of urban areas as are used in calculating the CPI-U and CPI-W.

Retail outlets are selected for pricing in the CPI based on data reported in a separate survey representing all urban households. The experimental index also uses the same retail outlet sample. Thus, the outlets selected may not be representative of the places where older persons purchase their goods and services.²

Items priced. As with retail outlets, a major limitation of the experimental index is that the categories of items to be priced are selected using expenditure weights calculated from the expenditure surveys for the urban population. As a result, the specific item classes selected for each stratum may not be representative of those classes used by the older population.

Prices collected. A final source of uncertainty about the appropriateness of using the CPI-U prices for the index of the older population concerns the availability of discount prices for older Americans. For example, senior-citizen discount rates are used in the CPI-U in proportion to their use by the urban population as a whole. To the extent that senior-citizen discounts take the form of a percentage discount from the regular

¹Footnotes to appear at end of article.

price, this may not be a problem. If, however, the discount is not a fixed percentage of the price, the scarcity of senior-citizen discount prices in the current CPI could lead to error in the experimental index.

Because of the preceding limitations, any conclusions drawn from the analyses presented in this article should be treated as tentative.

RELATIVE BEHAVIOR OF PRICE INDEXES

Table 3 gives the annual price changes in the all-items CPI-U, CPI-W, and experimental price index during the period 1988–93. Table 4 shows the behavior of these three indexes at the major component levels during the same period.

Over the 6-year period from December 1987 through December 1993, the reweighted experimental price index for older Americans rose 28.7 percent. This compares with increases of 26.3 percent for the CPI-U and 25.5 percent for the CPI-W.

Examining the indexes in more detail, we see that medical care prices during the period rose slightly more than twice as fast as the average for all items in each population group. Because the elderly typically spend more on medical care than does the population as a whole (see table 2), the medical care component accounted for most of the difference between the experimental index and either of CPI-U and CPI-W. In the experimental index, this component increased 59.4 percent during the period 1988–93. By contrast, inflation for the medical care component of the CPI-U was 53.3 percent and that for the CPI-W was 53.3 percent.

The price change for each major expenditure component varied by population because the expenditure weights of the items that comprised the major components varied among the three population groups the indexes served. The expenditure weight that an item had in a particular population reflected the importance of that item as a proportion of the total expenditures of that population. For example, the relatively high expenditure weights of the medical care component of the experimental index may largely be attributed to the differences in the nature of the demand for medical care services by the elderly, compared with the demand for such services by all urban consumers or by urban wage earners and clerical workers. Within the medical care component, the elderly had larger out-of-pocket costs relative to both of the other groups chiefly because those groups had employer-provided health care benefits more readily available to them. An analysis of the relative importance of the various subcomponents making up the medical care component for the elderly and for all urban consumers indicates that older Americans devote a substantially larger share of their medical care budget to physicians' services, followed by hospital room stays and commercial health insurance coverage.

Of the seven major expenditure components, the apparel category registered the smallest price change for all three population groups over the 1988–93 period.

Within the transportation component, public transportation items such as airline fare, intercity bus fare, intercity train fare, and taxi fare had higher relative importance for the elderly than for all urban consumers. These items contributed to the observed overall higher inflation rates in the transportation component of the experimental index.

Like medical care, another expenditure component that rose significantly in all three indexes during the study period was the "other goods and services" category. However, unlike medical care, this component recorded the smallest increase in the

experimental price index (41.8 percent), compared with the CPI-U (47.0 percent) and the CPI-W (46.2 percent). The reason for the lesser rise could be found in differences in the composition of the three populations. For instance, the CPI-U and CPI-W, with their relatively larger concentration of younger people, had a significantly higher relative importance for college tuition, which increased faster than the average of all items in each year of the study. In addition, the populations of all urban consumers and urban wage earners and clerical workers spend proportionately more for tobacco and other smoking products, which have also typically increased faster in price than the "other goods and services" component, of which they are a subcomponent. These items have thus contributed to the faster rise in the "other goods and services" component of the CPI-U and CPI-W relative to the experimental price index for older Americans.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

Adjustments to Social Security Benefits are currently based on the percentage change in the CPI-W, measured from the average of the third quarter of one year to the third quarter of the succeeding year.

While the Senate Special Committee on Aging stipulated that the current study cover persons 62 years of age and older, this population is not likely to be the most appropriate one for defining and developing an index for use in indexing Social Security benefits.

The reason is two-fold. First, many Social Security Beneficiaries are younger than 62 years and receive benefits because they are surviving spouses or minor children of covered workers or because they are disabled. The spending patterns of this younger group are excluded in the weights for the experimental index for older Americans. Second, a substantial number of persons 62 years of age and older—especially those 62 to 64 years—do not receive Social Security benefits at all. Although these older consumers are included in the population covered by the reweighted experimental index, they presumably should be excluded from an index designed to reflect the experience of Social Security pensioners. In short, an index designed specifically to measure price changes for Social Security beneficiaries—that is, one that excludes older persons who do not receive benefits, but includes younger persons who receive survival and disability benefits—might well show price movements that differ significantly from those of the experimental index set out in this article.

TABLE 2.—COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RELATIVE IMPORTANCES OF SELECTED COMPONENTS OF CONSUMER PRICE INDEXES, DECEMBER 1987

Component	CPI-U	CPI-W	Experimental index for older Americans
All items	100.00	100.00	100.00
Food and beverages	7.61	19.45	15.49
Food at home	9.86	11.14	9.79
Food away from home	6.19	6.65	4.57
Alcoholic beverages	1.55	1.66	1.13
Housing	42.48	39.95	48.30
Owners' equivalent rent	19.26	16.84	25.47
Apparel and upkeep	6.34	6.36	4.68
Medical care	5.98	4.95	9.47
Transportation	17.45	19.41	14.43
Motor fuels	3.29	4.03	2.67
Entertainment	4.37	4.04	3.34
Other goods and services	5.93	5.84	4.31
College tuition	1.13	.84	.46
Tobacco and other smoking products	1.29	1.70	1.02

TABLE 3.—PERCENT CHANGE IN ALTERNATIVE CONSUMER PRICE INDEXES, ALL ITEMS, 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER, 1988–93

Year	CPI-U	CPI-W	Experimental index for older Americans
1988	4.4	4.4	4.5
1989	4.6	4.5	5.2
1990	6.1	6.1	6.6
1991	3.1	2.8	3.4
1992	2.9	2.9	3.0
1993	2.7	2.5	3.1
Cumulative change, December 1987–December 1993	26.3	25.5	28.7

TABLE 4.—PERCENT CHANGE IN ALTERNATIVE CONSUMER PRICE INDEXES, BY MAJOR COMPONENTS, DECEMBER 1987–93

Component	CPI-U	CPI-W	Experimental index for older Americans
All items	26.3	25.5	28.7
Food and beverages	24.8	24.8	25.0
Housing	23.1	22.4	25.1
Apparel and upkeep	17.7	16.6	16.6
Transportation	22.8	21.9	25.0
Medical care	54.2	53.3	59.4
Entertainment	25.9	25.0	28.2
Other goods and services	47.0	46.2	41.8

CONCLUSIONS

This article examined changes in three distinct Consumer Price Indexes—the Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W), and experimental index for Americans 62 years of age and older—for the period December 1987 through December 1993. Analysis of the relative behavior of the three indexes at the all-items level reveals that the experimental index rose slightly faster than the two published indexes.

The experimental price index, reweighted to incorporate the spending patterns of older consumers, behaves more like the CPI-U than the CPI-W. This is to be expected, because the CPI-U comprises the expenditures of all urban consumers, including those 62 years of age and over. The CPI-W, on the other hand, is limited to the spending patterns of families of wage earners and of clerical workers and, therefore, specifically excludes the experience of families whose primary source of income is from retirement pensions.

As an estimate of the inflation rate experienced by older Americans, the experimental index has several limitations. One of these is that the samples from which expenditure weights for the index were calculated are substantially smaller than those used in either the CPI-U or the CPI-W. This means that the experimental price index is subject to larger sampling errors than either of the two official indexes.

To produce a more precise CPI for older Americans, sample sizes would need to be strengthened for the Consumer Expenditure Survey to reflect the spending habits of the elderly more accurately. In addition, the point-of-purchase survey and the pricing surveys would need to be improved to reflect which retail outlets and items should be sampled for older Americans. These improvements in the sample design could yield altogether different results from those obtained in the study described in this article. Finally, it should be noted that the medical care component of the CPI has a substantially larger relative weight in the experimental index than in the CPI-U or CPI-W. As a result, this component of the experimental index tends to have a larger impact on the elderly than it does on either all urban consumers or urban wage earners and clerical workers.

FOOTNOTES

¹Charles C. Mason, "An Analysis of the Rates of Inflation Affecting Older Americans Based on an Experimental Reweighted Consumer Price Index," report presented to Congress, June 1988. During the period from December 1982 through December 1987, the CPI-U rose 18.2 percent, the CPI-W increased 16.5 percent, and the experimental index for older Americans grew 19.5 percent. Over the 11-year period from December 1982 through December 1993, the CPI-U rose 49.4 percent, the CPI-W increased 46.2 percent, and the experimental CPI for older Americans grew 53.8 percent.

²The sample size of the current point-of-purchase survey is not adequate to determine whether older Americans typically shop in different types of outlets from those frequented by the general population.

Mr. HARKIN. So, while some say the CPI is overestimating inflation, we now know that for the elderly the CPI underestimates inflation. So if you are now going to arbitrarily cut back the CPI with this sort of technical correction, by 1 or 1.5 percent, without some further study and analysis and finely tuning it, not only will you have the increase in taxes that we talked about, you will have the Social Security cuts. It will hit the elderly the hardest, because they rely most heavily on Social Security for their basic needs. And on top of that their costs for prescription drugs and Medicare and their supplemental insurance and things like that continue to rise much faster than the basic rate of inflation.

I have not addressed myself directly to the issue that Senator DORGAN spoke about, but he is absolutely right. This idea of somehow threatening the Bureau of Labor Statistics to come up with the desired results within 30 days or their funding would be cut off was a threat made by the Speaker of the House. He was quoted widely in newspapers as saying he would cut off their funding if they did not come up with the results in 30 days.

I hope the Speaker will reflect upon his words and come up with a more moderate statement, because efforts to threaten professional staff with budget cuts if they do not come up with the results desired by elected officials I think is very dangerous. We need non-political, objective career professionals producing statistics that Government and the private sector use to develop their policies. I think we have that now. If each party that wins an election puts in people who only give the answers they want regarding economic statistics rather than the best professionally developed figures possible, then I think we are going to be in real big trouble. Fortunately, I hope we are going to back off this so-called dynamic scoring, the justifications that were used to quadruple the public debt in the 1980's. I think they are backing off of that. I am hopeful now my friends on the other side of the aisle will back off from any attempt to improperly pressure the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Again, I congratulate Senator DORGAN for his amendment. I am proud to be a cosponsor. We must maintain the highest professional standards for statistical services in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which produces the CPI and

other statistics on which the Federal Government and our entire economy depend. They must continue to operate without any political interference.

I urge all Senators to support the amendment of Senator DORGAN. Again, first, to send a clear signal we are not going to politically interfere; and, second, that we need to proceed very cautiously on this to get the best information possible for any future adjustments in the CPI; and, third, to state clearly that any adjustments in the CPI, of course, ought not to lead to arbitrary cuts in Social Security or taxes on the middle class.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, if I may, in the midst of this interesting debate, I would like to return the focus of the debate to S. 1 itself; to unfunded mandates, to the impact that those mandates have had on State and on local governments, and to the urgent necessity of seeing to it that this bill is passed and it becomes law.

I have gotten a great deal of correspondence from local governments and the State of Washington on the subject of unfunded mandates. But I would like to start with one the focus of which is a little bit different than many of the particular complaints about unfunded mandates.

The mayor of the city of Kennewick wrote to me and said:

Congress needs to understand the long range impacts of its actions when it passes amendments [to legislation].

I agree. But I am inclined to think that the mayor of Kennewick could have gone considerably further. And I also reflect on why it is that a mayor of a city some 2,500 miles from here should have to say this to us. Of course, the Congress of the United States should have to understand the long-range impacts of the laws that it passes. That is a responsibility we ought to take on ourselves, not one we should have to be reminded of by mayors or Governors or county commissioners. Yet it has been my experience that very frequently we attempt to avoid understanding long-range impacts in passing feel-good legislation, sometimes legislation for valid social purposes but social purposes which we are unwilling to fund.

In my case, I think I would make the statement somewhat stronger than the mayor of Kennewick does. I would revise it to say: "Congress needs to be responsible for the long-range impacts of legislation that it passes."

No group of individuals is likely to be responsible when they can do something that pleases other groups or other individuals without any consequences for the cost of pleasing those individuals or groups. When one separates the authority to make requirements, to pass mandates, to set policy, from the responsibility to pay for the consequences of those actions, one inevitably is led to irresponsibility. And

it is responsibility and accountability that this legislation is all about.

In dealing with this legislation I, in common with many of my colleagues, have asked my local governments to report to me the impact of mandates which we have already imposed on them without understanding the consequences and without taking responsibility for the consequences. I should like to share a few of them with my colleagues and with the record here this afternoon.

The mayor of Colfax, WA, wrote to me that the money spent to comply with Federal mandates—and I am now quoting him—

*** no matter how well intentioned, will inhibit the city's ability to provide a pump station to supply the community hospital, provide wellhead protection for our primary water source, and to repair a critical reservoir. These are only a few of the most important projects that may be delayed or not completed.

It does seem to me to be self-evident that the citizens of Colfax ought to be allowed to determine whether those are higher priorities than priorities imposed upon them by Members of Congress in a general fashion all across the country. And to a very significant degree that is what this debate is all about.

The board of county commissioners of San Juan County wrote to me to say:

The excessive testing and monitoring required by [environmental mandates] puts such a burden on the limited financial capabilities of small water systems that they don't have the money left to maintain their systems! The effect is greater and greater cost with no improvement in service or public safety.

This particular letter, of course, applies to the Safe Drinking Water Act, a subject on which this Senate debated in the last Congress and did, in fact, remove at least a number of unjustified, unfunded mandates.

Unfortunately, the Congress as a whole was not successful in passing amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act, and those mandates remain to this day in full force and effect.

The mayor of Tenino says that the city has been:

forced to shift revenue desperately needed for social services and programs to pay for the costs associated with [mandates]. Although we have not raised taxes to pay for these services, this action will soon become our only recourse.

This is a small rural town, the jobs of many of whose citizens have been affected by grave restrictions on harvests in our national and in our private forests, where unemployment is high or where extra money is hard to come by.

In the city of Langley, the mayor says that compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act alone will cost each water user an additional \$54.

The mayor of South Bend, a very poor community in monetary terms, at least, of less than 2,500 people, wrote in to say that:

Last year our water department was in compliance with every phase of its operation while serving approximately 900 customers. Today, we are considered out of compliance and the costs to bring us back in with the Clean Water Act by 1996 will cost us over a million dollars. How we are going to finance this, God only knows.

The clerk of the town of Fairfield wrote to say:

The effect [of mandates] is, in one word, Disaster! * * * These mandates will do the same thing to small communities as they'll do to small businesses—they will bankrupt them. There is just no way to come up with the dollars these mandates will require. Congress has to come to the realization that the taxpayer's purse is not a bottomless pit.

The chairman of the county commissioners of Asotin County described Federal mandates by saying:

Frustration is the real issue I guess. We do not know with any degree of certainty which way to go. A small county with a limited revenue base, a population of only 18,000 people and a per capita income of nearly \$17,000 has very few alternatives.

Finally, the mayor of a very small town, Washtucna, wrote in to say:

* * * any federal mandate legislation that requires a local government to comply with, but allows no funds to implement these mandates, places small communities in a financial crisis. In fact, many cases could be prohibitive to the point to force some small towns into bankruptcy and unincorporation. Many of the federally mandated regulations have little or no positive consequence to small rural farm communities and therefore are not beneficial to a community that can ill afford the added tax. If it were possible for our small community to afford an additional tax, we would prefer a new water supply tank, new water lines, sidewalks and street improvements.

I am absolutely certain that mayors of small towns and large towns, county commissioners and State governments, have written to each and every Member of this body with similar stories. They come down to one major point: We in our communities want to set our own priorities. We are not necessarily objecting to national priorities or national mandates. But if you Members of Congress and members of the executive wish to impose these mandates on us, please pay for them.

By an overwhelming majority, these men and women who constitute our State and local governments have written to us and called to us to ask us to pass this bill. My only fear with respect to this bill, with all of the admiration I have for the two Senators who are managing it, is that it is likely to be a disappointment to these local officials because, of course, it is not retroactive. We are having enough difficulty with the bill as it is. It would be impossible to pass it if it were retroactive. So it will not solve a single one of the specific problems created by mandates already in existence. Nor will this bill guarantee that there are no further unfunded mandates. It will still be possible, even if this bill becomes law, to impose an unfunded mandate of a considerable nature on our local communities if we simply waive the point of order which is appropriate to present

in the case of a bill carrying with an unfunded mandate, and we will be able to grant that waiver by a mere 51-vote majority here in the U.S. Senate, a simple majority here and in the House of Representatives.

Does this mean that the bill is of little or no meaning? No, Mr. President, I do not think that is the case. I think this is an important piece of legislation because at the very least, that waiver vote will mean that Members who vote for the waiver must be conscious of the fact that they are imposing an unfunded mandate. In most cases, they will have a fiscal note attached to it that will indicate just how much that unfunded mandate is likely to cost. And they therefore will be accountable to the people of our States, our counties, and our local communities for having imposed that unfunded mandate. They will lack the excuse that they did not know what they did. Those mandates will be imposed consciously and deliberately.

As a consequence, Mr. President, I think while unfunded mandates will not end in the Congress, people being what they are, they will probably be somewhat less frequent in the future. If this Congress succeeds in passing some of the priorities which led to this Congress having such a different face as its predecessors and removing at least some of the present unfunded mandate burdens, we will have more of our States and communities able to set their own priorities in the way which has been so important in the development of the United States of America throughout its entire history.

So I know that the sponsors would like an even stronger bill. I believe that they are to be congratulated on doing as much as they have done in connection with this bill. While I find the other debates which are going on in connection with this bill, those on consumer price indexes, on the metric system, and on the Federal Reserve Board to be most interesting, it seems to me at least in the third week of debate upon this bill, on this charter of independence, on this liberation for our States and local governments, that the time is nigh on us that we should deal squarely and directly with the subject matter of this bill, that we should pass it and settle any possible minor differences with the House of Representatives, send it to the President, and liberate our States and local governments from the immense burden of unfunded mandates, at least as far as the future is concerned.

MR. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we turn to amendment No. 190, the amendment that is in the form of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, offered by Senator HARKIN, at this time and lay the amendment now pending aside.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. REID. Mr. President, I will speak briefly on the sense-of-the-Senate reso-

lution offered to this body. I do it because last year I offered an amendment to the balanced budget amendment that would have exempted Social Security. I did not prevail at that time.

There has been, since that time, a significant amount of debate on the balanced budget amendment. And without exception, everyone who has been asked what should happen to Social Security in relation to the balanced budget amendment has said "leave it alone"—Democrats and Republicans, the Democratic leaders, Republican leaders, and even those new leaders, like Speaker GINGRICH, have stated Social Security should not be part of the balanced budget amendment.

I felt it was appropriate that I speak on this legislation offered by the Senator from Iowa, because I have held a press conference earlier on saying that I am a supporter of the balanced budget amendment. But I am going to have everyone stick to what they have said: The balanced budget amendment should exempt Social Security. Why? We have gone to a lot of trouble to make Social Security an independent agency.

They are in the process of now appointing the board of directors, in effect, of that agency, this new Social Security agency. Its funds will no longer be part of the general funds of this country. The program should stand or fall on its own merits. This year, there will be about a \$70 billion surplus in the Social Security fund. By the year 2002, the surplus will reach about \$800 billion.

I had the pleasure of serving with Senators Danforth and KERRY on the entitlement commission. I know—we all know—that Social Security is something we must watch very closely to make sure it is actuarially correct and sound. I repeat that Social Security should rise and fall on its own merits. If we had to pick a contract with America, the original, the most important contract with America, has been the Social Security system.

Mr. President, I will speak more at length about this when the amendment comes up. But as a young boy, one of the first things I remember about Government is that my grandmother could not walk from here to that wall, as she was always infirm, but her only independence was she got what she referred to as her old age pension check. I was a little boy and did not realize that Social Security was a new program at that time. It gave my grandmother, who was born in England, independence and some security.

I want to make sure that my children and my children's children have the ability to enjoy the benefits of Social Security. I do not know whether this sense-of-the-Senate resolution will pass or not. We all know that sense-of-the-Senate resolutions, in the overall scheme of legislative activities, are not the most important things. But they do send a message. I think we should send a message to the American people

that we are going to try to save Social Security, and this is a prelude to the amendment that will be offered by this Senator, Senators CONRAD, DORGAN, HARKIN, and FEINSTEIN, at the time the balanced budget amendment is brought up.

The Social Security program we have in America is a simple, binding contract. Individuals collect Social Security payments after paying into a trust fund with their employer over a period of years. I want to make sure, Mr. President, that the Social Security trust fund is a trust fund and not a slush fund. We should not be able to use the moneys out of Social Security to pay for highways in New Hampshire or highways in Nevada. We should not be able to use the Social Security trust fund to pay for subsidies for farmers in Iowa or in Missouri. Those moneys that we collect into this trust fund should be used only for Social Security recipients, and that is all.

When I practiced law, I had a trust fund that I set up. I had to do that; we were required by the rules of the bar association. If I had a check that came for settling a case, as an example, the money went into the trust fund and I had to be very careful what I did with those moneys. It was different than moneys that were in my general account that I could use to pay rent and salaries of my employees. I could not use that trust fund money to pay anything other than what was allowed by law. If I did anything else, I violated that trust that was established, and then I could be disbarred or even criminally prosecuted. So the Social Security trust fund, I believe, Mr. President, should be treated the same way.

Congress has an obligation to uphold its end of the contract. So this unique, binding contract upon which millions depend should be protected, and it should not be a giveaway or an entitlement, even though it is not and even though people lump it into the entitlement category.

I congratulate my friend, the junior Senator from Iowa, for offering this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I hope that all Senators will give this very serious consideration, as I know they will. We understand that this is a prelude to the real debate that will take place, which will be substantive law, and that is to exempt Social Security from the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

APPOINTMENT OF A NEW CIA DIRECTOR

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition this afternoon to speak briefly about the pending appointment of a new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and how we ought to structure a new term to really strengthen that position and, in

effect, professionalize the position of Director of Central Intelligence.

I have talked to a number of my colleagues about the idea of legislation which would create a 10-year term for the Director of Central Intelligence, just as the Director of the FBI has a 10-year term. That legislation for the FBI was enacted relatively recently to strengthen the hand of the Director and to give independence and strength to that position.

It is my view, based on the experience that I have had on the Intelligence Committee—and I now serve as chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee—that there is a real need for additional strength in the position of the Director, as we have seen what has happened to the CIA with the Aldrich Ames case, and as we take a look at the role of the Central Intelligence Agency and the national security interests of the United States into the foreseeable future.

The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, I believe, has to come to that position in the Central Intelligence Agency, in that unique culture there, and say to the establishment: Look, I am going to be here longer than anybody else who was here, and it is my responsibility to do what is necessary to correct the problems of the agency and to do what is necessary to reorder the priorities and set the agency on a course which will protect the security interests of the United States.

We had the threat assessment hearings the week before last where the Director, James Woolsey, testified about the threats to the United States and responded, to some extent, about the Aldrich Ames case. There is no doubt that the unique culture of the CIA—I prefer to call it their “unique culture,” rather than the slang expression the “old boy’s network”—was at work in allowing Aldrich Ames to stay in a position where he could abuse the trust of the CIA and really do great damage to the United States’ national security interest, even though there were many signs which should have led to his ouster. He failed a lie detector test, he was living beyond his means, he was drunk on duty, he had classified documents, he visited foreign agencies and foreign embassies without any justifiable reason. Many of the CIA contacts were killed as a result of what he had done. Many were placed in jeopardy. And that should have been corrected long before it finally came to light.

I believe that if we had a Director who had tenure, 10 years, in effect, being able to say, “I am going to be here longer than the people I am confronting with,” that kind of strength would do a great deal to enhance our national security.

We are facing some very perilous times. People ask, is there a real role for the Central Intelligence Agency? Based on the experience I have had on the Intelligence Oversight Committee, and now as chairman of that committee, I say, absolutely “yes.”

We are looking at some very critical intelligence operations in assessing, for example, what is happening with North Korea with their development of nuclear weapons. I, frankly, have grave reservations about the agreement which exempts the North Koreans from inspection on the fuel rods for some 5 years, which is the best way to tell what they are doing with nuclear weapons. And as the hearing the week before last with Director Woolsey showed, the North Koreans now have the capacity to hit Alaska. The North Koreans are working with Iran on ballistic missile tests. When asked what is the potential for reaching the continental United States, nobody could give assurances that that is not an imminent problem.

When you take a look at the dismantling of nuclear weapons in the old Soviet Union, there are real problems to see to it that organized crime in Russia does not take over and place those weapons at the disposal of rogue nations. When you take a look at the role of CIA in terrorism or drugs or economy issue, where many intelligence agencies of government help the trade deficit, there is a vital role in the intelligence agency.

There has to be reform, first, of not having a repeat of the Aldrich Ames case and doing the job of the future.

I intended to introduce this legislation and to comment on it this afternoon and not to unduly interrupt the flow of this legislation.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

(Purpose: To propose a substitute amendment)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending being amendments will be set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 195.

Mr. GLENN. 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.”)

(Mr. INHOFE assumed the chair.)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, this amendment—and I do not want to scare anybody who may be watching and listening to this and I will give my reasons for submitting this amendment—this amendment is the old S. 993 that we brought out last year. I wanted

it to be on file and be available to be considered if we reach a point where that might be necessary. But I hasten to add immediately that, at least the way we are going right now, I do not think that will be necessary.

The situation we had gotten into here on the floor last week was such—and I will not go through all of what led up to it, but it was at a point where the majority leader filed cloture and did not have the votes to invoke cloture. There were some 117 amendments that had been put in from both sides of the aisle—mainly, about two to one, from the Democratic side, but from both sides of the aisle—and we found ourselves in a situation where it looked as though there might not be any move out of that parliamentary situation that we were in.

What would we do in that situation? What had happened was that S. 993 that came out last year with approval by the big seven, and we were happy to get it to the floor, but the situation that developed was we could not get it through last year.

Over the holidays, with the changed political climate, it was determined that what the House was liable to do and the movement that we would have to make toward what the House might do to enable a Senate bill to have a chance at passage meant that S. 993 should be amended or changed and somewhat toughened up. Now that was done with S. 1, using S. 993 as the basic structure from which to start.

The situation we found ourselves in, though, last week, the parliamentary situation, was that I could see the possibility that maybe nothing was going to move. S. 1 had generated some opposition for various reasons. Cloture, which was filed, could not be invoked. We had the vote on that. And there we sat in basically a stalemate.

I am committed to getting through unfunded mandate legislation. I do not want anyone to think that I am not.

But I would rather, if we got ourselves into another quagmire like that, I just want S. 993 refiled as a potential amendment—and I say potential; I am not planning to bring it up—but I want it filed so that if we reach another situation like that—and I hope we do not—that we would have that as a fallback position which would be better than getting nothing through; certainly much better, because we all viewed S. 993 last year as being fine legislation.

I understand where the Governors and the County Commissioners, mayors, and so on are coming from now in support of S. 1. It is tougher from their standpoint. But it also has some opposition.

Now, what would I foresee as a situation that might develop where we might want to drop back? Obviously, there are a number of different things that could happen on that. If we wound up with a filibuster on S. 1, which I do not anticipate we will, but if there were some provisions voted in here on the Senate floor that may be

unpalatable, then we might have something like that required.

The amendment that I am putting in or will put in today and another one after this one and probably a couple more tomorrow morning address very substantive changes in the bill, procedures in the bill that I think should be corrected. They were things we were not able to bring up in the committee because of the rush to get it to the floor, which was another situation we talked about earlier today for a little while.

But you have several other concerns that do address specifically how this bill would operate, and I think those are important things to be considered. Those are not show stoppers, as I see it. Failure to put those things in are not basically things that would require us to go back to S. 993.

But let me just bring up some of the amendments that have been put in or proposed, some from the other side, as a matter of fact, some Republican-proposed amendments, such as judicial review.

Now, I think if judicial review was lodged against this where anyone who felt that the estimate on a particular proposal was not adequate and they would have the right in that case to file a case in Federal court and in effect stop legislation in its tracks, if judicial review was put in and passed, to me would be a way of stopping almost all legislation or a very high percentage of legislation that comes before the Senate. So I think if judicial review came in, was voted in here, this would result in such concern that I think—I am the last one that is going to threaten a filibuster—but I think that would cause a great, great deal of concern.

Now, another one that is coming up that would be very controversial, and I understand is going to be called up, were amendments that were proposed dealing with motor-voter, as it is called. There is a lot of passion involved with motor-voter, as we know from the very extended debate that took place on the Senate floor when motor-voter was put in last year. That would draw serious opposition.

Another one, a supermajority point of order requiring a 60-vote point of order. In other words, 60 votes would be required to grant a waiver to proceed with a bill. Now that sounds great, because it says, well, you are getting a supermajority of the Senate. But it does something else. It puts a great deal of power in the minority if you can garner 41 votes.

I do not want to see us get into a situation where we would have, in effect, a tyranny of the minority.

We had another one that would be a very, very important amendment, if brought up and if possibly passed, one that we would have to really take very, very seriously, and that is an amendment that I understand may be proposed which would extend the application of the act to past mandates as well as current mandates. If we did that, I

do not know whether we would be getting into trillion dollar estimates and funding requirements if we passed that with no sorts of other restrictions on it than those I am aware of at this time. That is another one that would be a real threat to passage of this bill.

Now, I am not saying any one of these by itself would be a complete show stopper and block to passage of the bill. The reason I put S. 993 back in is to cover a combination of possibilities. Say that some of the corrections we wanted to put in committee are voted down here, and say that some of these amendments that I understand are going to be put in—I do not believe they have been put in yet—amendments on the Republican side that deal with the things that I just mentioned such as 60-vote point of order and the motor-voter and judicial review and the retroactivity. Say that several of these things passed. I think in that situation the view of S. 1 would change rather dramatically, and I might add, probably on the Republican side as well as on the Democratic side.

I wanted to point out the possibilities just to point out the reason why I am putting S. 993 back in, as a possible substitute amendment. It would be a fallback in case we have some of the dire things I have talked about happen, and got into a situation here we could not get out of, which we thought we were in last week when I mentioned the possibility of this. I am putting it back in, but do not plan to bring it up at this time.

I think we are in a whole different situation than we were in last week because last week we were faced with a situation where cloture could not be invoked. The votes were not there. There were great concerns about S. 1. There were some 117 amendments that were filed in advance of the cloture vote, because if cloture would happen to be invoked then amendments cannot be put in. Cloture was defeated. The number of provisions we debated last week have been stripped back. We have now under the new agreement, some 60 slots, I believe, 58 or 60 slots, available for amendments that have to be filed by Tuesday afternoon at 3:00. Votes, then, will start not later than 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

This is much more manageable now. People have been coming to the floor and offering their amendments. We will have votes on them. We are in a whole different situation. I am not putting S. 993 back in as any scare tactic but there are possibilities that loom out here that this would be a last-gasp stopgap measure we could put in if really necessary. I want to stress that. I know there was a considerable amount of discontent in some quarters last week when I even brought this up. I wanted to make sure it was not misunderstood now.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 179

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on the Dorgan amendment numbered 179.

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

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 178 AND 179

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to either the Dorgan amendment numbered 178 or 179, and that the vote occur on the motion to table amendment numbered 178 at 4 o'clock p.m. tomorrow, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Dorgan amendment numbered 179.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 191 AND 192

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to make a motion to table both Bingaman amendments numbered 191 and 192, and I be able to ask for the yeas and nays, and it be done with one show of seconds.

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

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I move to table amendments 191 and 192 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to either Bingaman amendments prior to the vote on the motion to table and that the two Bingaman votes occur in sequence following the vote with respect to the second Dorgan amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments to the Hollings amendment numbered 182 be in order prior to the vote on the motion to available that amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 196 TO AMENDMENT NO. 190

(Purpose: To modify the sense-of-the-Senate provision)

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume consideration of amendment numbered 190, and I send an amendment to the desk to the Har-kin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] proposes amendment numbered 196 to amendment numbered 190.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the word "that" and insert the following:

(1) social security is supported by taxes deducted from workers' earnings and matching deductions from their employers that are deposited into independent trust funds;

(2) over 42,000,000 Americans, including over 3,000,000 children and 5,000,000 disabled workers and their families, receive social security benefits;

(3) social security is the only pension program for 60 percent of older Americans;

(4) almost 60 percent of older beneficiaries depend on social security for at least half of their income and 25 percent depend on social security for at least 90 percent of their income;

(5) 138,000,000 American workers pay taxes into the social security system;

(6) social security is currently a self-financed program that is not contributing to the Federal budget deficit; in fact, the social security trust funds now have over \$400,000,000,000 in reserves and that surplus will increase during fiscal year 1995 alone by an additional \$70,000,000,000;

(7) these current reserves will be necessary to pay monthly benefits for current and future beneficiaries when the annual surpluses turn to deficits after 2018;

(8) recognizing that social security is currently a self-financed program, Congress in 1990 established a "firewall" to prevent a raid on the social security trust funds;

(9) raiding the social security trust funds would further undermine confidence in the system among younger workers;

(10) the American people overwhelmingly reject arbitrary cuts in social security benefits; and

(11) social security beneficiaries throughout the nation deserve to be reassured that their benefits will not be subject to cuts and their social security payroll taxes will not be increased as a result of legislation to implement a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any legislation required to implement a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution shall specifically prevent social security benefits from being reduced or social security taxes from being increased to meet the balanced budget requirement.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 197

(Purpose: To have the point of order lie at only two stages: (1) against the bill or joint resolution, as amended, just before final passage, and (2) against the bill or joint resolution as recommended by conference, if different from the bill or joint resolution as passed by the Senate)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous amendment be set aside, and that I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 197.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike beginning with line 16 through line 4 on page 22 and insert the following:

"(I) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) STATEMENT REQUIRED FOR REPORTED BILL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate, after third reading or at any other time when no further amendments are in order, to consider any bill or joint resolution that is reported by a committee unless the committee has published a statement of the Director on the direct costs of Federal mandates in accordance with subsection (a)(6) before such consideration.

"(B) LEGISLATION OR THRESHOLD.—(i) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report—

"(I) after third reading or at any other time when no further amendments are in order, if the enactment of such bill or resolution as amended; or

"(II) if such bill or resolution in the form recommended by such conference report differs from the bill or resolution as passed by the Senate, and if the enactment of such bill or resolution in the form recommended in such conference report, would increase the direct costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates by an amount that causes the thresholds specified in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) to be exceeded, unless the conditions specified in clause (ii) as satisfied.

"(ii) The conditions referred to in clause (i) shall be satisfied if—

Redesignate the clauses following accordingly."

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, this takes care of what I think is a difficulty in the bill. It would correct what I think is something we probably should have dealt with earlier on. That is this: The bill deals with points of order and when they will lie against legislation coming to the floor, to have the overall expense or the cost to the States and local communities considered in advance of considering the legislation and whether Congress will fund those costs.

As now crafted, as now structured, the bill would permit a point of order when the bill with Federal intergovernmental mandates first comes to the floor. Then there would be no more points of order that would lie against the bill but there could be points of

order invoked any amendment that may or may not contain an intergovernmental mandate. If we think about how a bill normally works its way through the Senate, a number of amendments can be brought up here on the Senate floor. They may well change completely the nature of the bill by the amendments and the cost of amendments that are incurred during the amending process here on the floor.

Now, I think it would be more appropriate the bill be subject to a point of order after we know what all the amending process has done to it. To have the point of order apply to possibly every amendment all the way through creates a situation that could be used if a Senator really wanted to filibuster something. He or she could put in a dozen different amendments containing Federal intergovernmental mandates, each maybe over \$50 million, that might not even apply and might not be germane or relevant to the bill being considered and would then go through all the process of point of order on everything that was brought up in each of the amendments. I could see this as a possibility of a means of really creating a lot of delay.

What we are really interested in, it seems to me, is the final bill as amended on the floor before we vote on it. And at that point, we either say yes, we go ahead with these unfunded mandates because it is important for everybody in the whole country for whatever reason and therefore we waive the point of order. Or we say no, all these total of amendments here plus what the cost of the original bill should be subject to the points of order requiring cost estimates and funding.

It seems to me that is a more appropriate way to go than having the point of order lie on all amendments.

Mr. President, my amendment would apply the points of order in two places, not at the start of consideration on the floor as S. 1 requires, but it would apply at the end of consideration of legislation on the floor—just prior to third reading—and, at a second point, when it comes back from conference, because when it comes back from conference, sometimes it might be a completely changed bill from what went to conference with the approval of the Senate.

So my amendment would apply points of order at those two places. As I said, my concern in applying the point of order requirements for CBO cost estimates and State and local funding of floor amendments, as S. 1 currently does, is that it may unnecessarily bog down the legislative process, particularly for the first year or two when this act goes into effect. It is possible someone might raise points of order, as I said, on almost every amendment that is offered to any one bill.

I understand points of order can currently be raised under the Budget Act on amendments that affect Federal direct spending but have not been scored

by CBO. However, the Budget Act scoring process has been in place for some time and the procedures in S. 1, on the other hand, are brand new. So we should not overload the Senate with these new procedural requirements on floor amendments, as I see it.

As I said, the amendment would see that the points of order lie in two places: First, just prior to final passage and then on the conference report. That way, only amendments that have been adopted would have to be scored by CBO, rather than having them score all amendments prior to their being offered, as would have to be done under S. 1. So the burden on CBO might be reduced. Only amendments adopted would be required to be scored, not amendments offered. Of course, Members bringing an amendment to the floor may wish to have a CBO cost estimate in order to know precisely what the effect of the amendment will be. My amendment will ensure conference reports will also still be scored, as is the case under S. 1.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate resume consideration of amendment No. 182, the Hollings amendment; that there be 30 minutes for debate prior to a motion to table, to be equally divided between Senators HOLLINGS and DOMENICI; that following that debate, it be in order for the majority manager, or his designee, to move to table the Hollings amendment; and that the vote occur on the motion to table immediately following the disposition of the Bingaman amendment No. 192.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not, where is the Bingaman amendment in the hierarchy now? Is that No. 4 that we have on our list?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, that is correct. This will be No. 5.

Mr. GLENN. I will not object.

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

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I yield the floor. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 198

(Purpose: To modify the exemption for matter within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Appropriations)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside so that I may send an amendment to the desk and ask it be considered as offered as required under the unanimous consent agreement under which the Senate is currently operating.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 198.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, strike lines 7 through 10, and insert the following:

(3) Committee on Appropriations.—Paragraph (1)—

(A) shall not apply to any bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives; but

(B) shall apply to—

(i) Any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any bill or resolution reported by such Committee;

(ii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any amendment offered to a bill or resolution reported by such Committee;

(iii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal intergovernmental mandate in a conference report accompanying a bill or resolution reported by such Committee; and

(iv) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal intergovernmental mandate contained in any amendments in disagreement between the two Houses to any bill or resolution reported by such Committee.

(C) Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any provision listed in Paragraph (3)(B), and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, such specific provision shall be deemed stricken from the bill, resolution, amendment, amendment in disagreement, or conference report and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment is very basic. It would extend a provision of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act to cover appropriations bills. As reported by the Governmental Affairs Committee, appropriations legislation was exempted from S. 1. I wish to repeat, appropriations legislation was exempted from this legislation.

This amendment would establish that any legislative provisions contained in an appropriations bill or conference report that create an unfunded mandate would also be subject to the point of order called for by this bill.

Clearly, Mr. President, this important legislation sponsored by Senator KEMPTHORNE is a proposal that warrants swift passage. Over the last year,

every Member of Congress has likely heard pleas for assistance from State and local officials in their home States for relief from the steadily increasing burdens of unfunded Federal mandates, and understandably so.

As the Governmental Affairs Committee noted in a report on this issue, State and local officials from across the country sent a powerful and unified message to Washington that:

* * * unfunded Federal mandates imposed unreasonable fiscal burdens on their budgets; limited their flexibility to address more pressing local problems; forced local tax increases and service cutbacks; discouraged innovation at a local level; and hampered their ability to effectively govern.

The burdens which have been placed on the shoulders of States, cities, and counties in America have become intolerable. The CBO estimated the cumulative costs of Federal regulatory mandates on States over a 7-year period are as high as \$12 billion.

A study released by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1990 estimated that the total annual costs of environmental mandates to State and local governments would rise a total of 67 percent by the year 2000.

The mayor of one of America's largest cities said that:

When you pass a mandate down to us and we have to pay for it, the police force goes down, the firefighting force goes down. Recreation departments are in disrepair * * * because our capital budget is being sopped up by * * * the need to pay for federal mandates.

I strongly sympathize with these views and those that I have heard from so many city and town officials in my State of Arizona. The cumulative weight of the involuntary spending requirements that the Congress has been foisting upon State and local governments has finally reached the breaking point, and it is important that we pass this legislation to address the problem early in the 104th Congress.

There is, however, a significant omission in the bill we have before us. S. 1 applies only to legislation emanating from authorizing committees, and exempts appropriations bills. This is a big loophole, Mr. President, and given the tendencies of many Members of Congress, I fear it is a loophole that will be taken advantage of in short order.

If we exempt appropriations bills from the point of order procedure of this unfunded mandates bill, we will be tacitly allowing a process where Members will be tempted or pressured into using appropriations bills as vehicles to levy mandates upon State and local governments. Such an exemption would undermine the important objectives of what S. 1 is so admirably trying to achieve. This amendment to subject any legislative language in spending bills to a majority point of order regarding unfunded mandates will help ensure that doesn't happen.

The intent and impact of this amendment is simple, straightforward, and entirely reasonable, Mr. President. If a

bill reported out of the Environment and Public Works Committee or the Labor Committee which creates a new mandate on State or local governments, those committees are required to authorize funding to pay for it. A point of order would lie against the bill if it were not properly funded. Surely we should establish this same procedural hurdle for appropriations bills if they contain new unfunded mandates.

I fully recognize, Mr. President, that existing Senate rules already bar appropriations bills from being used as vehicles for authorizations. If this restriction was uniformly adhered to, appropriations bills would only factor into concerns about unfunded mandates to the degree that they were adequately delivering Federal funds to State and local governments.

As all of my colleagues well know, however, this is often not the case. Appropriations bills can and have been used by the Senate for legislative purposes. This fact necessitates the amendment I am proposing here today.

It is surely not an unwarranted leap of faith, Mr. President, to anticipate that Members and staff in the Congress might be tempted to utilize appropriations bills as a vehicle for unfunded mandates in the future. Minds far sharper and more creative than my own could craft language into an appropriations bill that in effect would impose a new unfunded mandate on a State, local, or tribal government.

Indeed, Mr. President, if past experience on legislative language being inserted in appropriations bills is a guide, we should expect this to happen. I am concerned that exempting appropriations measures from S. 1 will be akin to locking the barn door while leaving a ground-floor window wide open. This exemption is a loophole that will surely prove too tempting for enterprising Members of Congress to leave untested, and we should act to close it before they do.

Furthermore, for my colleagues who may question whether this amendment is necessary, I would like to note the dilemma we already face in the case of appropriations legislation passed by the House of Representatives. According to Senate precedent, appropriations bills containing legislative language sent over from the House is deemed germane, and is not subject to a point of order.

We already experience problems with exceptions being made to the Senate rule that prohibits legislative language on an appropriations bill, so I hope we will not exacerbate this situation by creating a special new exemption for appropriations bills regarding unfunded mandates. Let us not miss this historic opportunity to stem the tide of oppressive Federal mandates by allowing them to be imposed by way of appropriations bills or conference reports.

Mr. President, if the basic rules of the Senate are followed and appropriations measures contain no new unfunded mandates, then this amendment

would not affect them in any way. We should improve this important bill to curb the Congress's penchant for passing on millions of dollars of mandatory spending requirements onto States and local governments by adopting this amendment. To leave appropriations legislation exempted from the provisions of S. 1 is to leave a sizable loophole in the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to remedy it.

I again thank my friend from Idaho who has probably had enough praise over the last week to last him for a long period of time, but he deserves every bit of it. I must say he has done a magnificent job. But I also point out to my friend from Idaho and remind him that when I asked him why were appropriations bills exempted from this bill language, his response was, "Well, we could not get the bill passed."

Then my question is, to him and to the other sponsors of this bill: Why is it, then, if we are not concerned about legislation being enacted on an appropriations bill and it not being subject to a point of order, then why should there be any objection whatsoever to this amendment? It seems to me by the very act of exempting appropriations bill from this point of order procedure we are tacitly saying we do not want to tangle with the Appropriations Committee and we do not want to make sure that there is not a loophole in this legislation by allowing legislation on appropriations bills.

I also say to the sponsors of this bill, if you do not think we have legislated on appropriations bills then I have a lot of legislation to show you. We have. It has happened time and time again where appropriations bills have been the vehicles for authorizing legislation which are stuffed into bills, many times in the dead of night, or in a conference committee, a conference between the two Houses so the rest of us who are not Members of that conference are unable to know about it.

This is a very serious issue. And I have to say after my 9th year, if I have grown a little bit cynical it is because I think I have reason to be so. We cannot allow authorization on appropriations bills. If we do not allow it then this amendment should cause no problem for anyone. The only reason you can assume why this bill exempted appropriations bills is because of the possibility in the future of authorizing legislation on appropriations bills.

I think I have made my point. There may be a desire to engage in extended debate on this issue. I do not intend to leave a loophole of this size in this unfunded mandates bill, which is a very critical bill, and then go back to the people I represent and say everything is fine. Because it is not going to be fine if we allow people to authorize on an appropriations bill and not be subject to the same point of order that there is on the authorizing legislation.

I again thank Senator KEMPTHORNE for his outstanding work on this very important and critical piece of legislation. If I could just tell him, I met with the mayors of my State a couple of months ago, I met with the county supervisors of my State, and there was one issue and one issue only they wanted to talk about and that was Senator KEMPTHORNE's legislation. So he is even famous in the State of Arizona as well as the State of Idaho.

So I thank my friend from Idaho and I yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I just wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for his kind remarks and also to acknowledge his strong and enthusiastic support to curb these unfunded Federal mandates. He is one of the stalwarts in this effort. So I thank him.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to use my leader time, if I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

MRS. ROSE FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to my friend and colleague, Senator TED KENNEDY on the death of his mother.

Mrs. Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy lived a life that saw more than its share of public tragedy and private sorrow. Her courage and her profound faith in her church and her God gave her the strength to be the support of her children and an inspiration to all Americans.

Mrs. Kennedy's passing is a loss to our Nation. No one old enough to remember will ever forget the fortitude with which she bore the assassination of two beloved sons, President John F. Kennedy and Senator Robert Kennedy.

Her public strength helped the Nation endure, as her private strength has always been, in the words of her son John, "the glue that held the Kennedy family together."

The tragedies she suffered did not diminish her sense of service. Into an age where no one would have questioned a desire to retire from public life, she traveled tirelessly, promoting the work of the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation, to aid the mentally retarded.

Her spirit and work earned her the admiration of the entire world and made Americans very proud.

So today I know that I express the sentiment of all of our colleagues in saying that our prayers are with her son, our colleague, TED, and her other children and grandchildren on this occasion.

I yield the floor.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield to the Senator from New Jersey, by the way, whose birthday it is today, and this is not in lieu of a birthday present I say to the Senator from New Jersey, I would ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield to the Senator from New Jersey for the purpose of his offering an amendment without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senators and friends who are on the floor to wish me well on my birthday. It is one of those things, a time we would like to pass without notice, but, on the other hand, being here to recall it is something of value as well.

AMENDMENT NO. 199

(Purpose: To exclude from the application of the Act, provisions limiting known human (Group A) carcinogens defined by the Environmental Protection Agency)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily set aside so that I may offer an amendment to meet the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] proposes an amendment numbered 199.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 13, line 5, strike out "or".

On page 13, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and "or".

On page 13, insert between lines 8 and 9 the following new paragraph:

(7) limits exposure to known human (Group A) carcinogens, as defined in the Environmental Protection Agency's Risk Assessment Guidelines of 1986.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last week we began a colloquy with the managers of the bill on some of the uncertain provisions and ambiguous provisions in the bill. I thought we could pick that colloquy up this evening. I have a number of amendments that have been offered. There are two additional amendments to be offered that have been listed for me. I think the number of the issues which have been raised, even though amendments both are filed and to be filed, could be clarified if I could discuss with the managers of the bill some of the provisions which I consider to be ambiguous. In order to do that, I thought I would again use the same hypothetical. If I could get copies of this

to the two managers of the bill, this hypothetical Senate bill is the one I used last week. We went into the first ambiguity and then after about 3 hours of debate clarified it with an amendment.

This bill, hypothetical, to be offered after the effective date of this law mandates reductions of dangerous levels of mercury from incinerator emissions after October 1, 2005. Under this hypothetical bill the EPA is designated to determine what constitutes a mercury level dangerous to human health. The first question is when is this bill effective? That is not a theoretical question. That is a very critical question because there must be an estimate of the cost of an intergovernmental mandate the first year that it is effective. When a bill or amendment is effective becomes a critical issue and could mean the life or death of the bill or amendment because if the estimate of the mandate is more than \$50 million in any year starting the first year it is effective, for 5 years, then certain things are triggered. Very significant things are triggered. Estimates, authorizations, language relative to appropriations, all must be in the bill. Agencies have to be designated to pull back from or to relieve the local governments of the mandate. That estimate and its effective date are absolutely central to this new version of the bill.

Last year we had a bill which had broad cosponsorship, including myself, where there was an estimate required but there was less hanging on it, on its specificity, on its certainty, on its length, and as to when it is first effective, when the mandate was first effective. A lot less was hanging on that because you did not have this mechanism, this new point-of-order mechanism, relative to the appropriation of funds. That is one of the things which is new this year. Unless we do it right it is going to complicate this process beyond anyone's wildest dream or nightmare. So that is the area that I want to discuss with my friends.

Last week I asked the Senator from Ohio what is the effective date of this mandate in my hypothetical bill. He basically said, well, it would have to be sometime before October 1, 2005. So I thought to clarify the situation I would give an actual or a hypothetical CBO estimated direct cost of the local government in my hypothetical so we can get some clarification and some legislative history as to what is intended by the mandate.

The chart that I have up gives the following CBO estimated direct costs for these 87,000 State, local, and tribal governments. In this hypothetical in fiscal year 1996, the estimated direct cost is \$6 million. In fiscal year 1997, the estimated direct cost is \$8 million; in 1998, \$10 million; 1999, \$15 million;

2000, \$20 million; 2001, \$25 million; 2002, \$30 million; 2003, \$50 million; 2004, \$100 million; 2005, \$200 million. Let us assume that is the way the estimate comes back.

How they can make this estimate is a different question. Last week the Senate decided that if it was impossible to make the estimate that we would allow them to say it is impossible. That took an awful lot of debate on this floor and had been rejected in committee on a party-line vote. But we ought to be grateful for progress. We made some progress on that narrow issue. The CBO can be honest. The way the bill was originally written they were allowed to be honest relative to the private sector, but they were not allowed to admit it was impossible to estimate the direct cost of a mandate relative to the intergovernmental sector if it was. The amendment that was adopted last week permits them to make an honest statement if it is impossible to make an estimate in either or both sectors.

OK. You make an estimate. It comes back the way this is laid out on this chart.

Now my question to the managers of the bill, and last week again the Senator from Ohio saw the dilemma that we are all in, and said well, it has to be earlier than October 1, 2005, because if that is the effective date of the mandate within the meaning of the bill there will never be any cost because it sounds like October 1 is the effective date of 2005. The way I read it sure sounds like it because under my hypothetical bill it says it mandates reductions of dangerous levels of mercury from incinerator emissions after October 1, 2005. That sounds like the effective date is October 1, 2005. Most of us, and I think most ordinary readers of that language would say the effective date is October 1, 2005. But if it is 2005, if that is the first effective date, there will not be any costs. Nothing would ever be triggered because all the money would have been spent before that in order to make sure it complies by that date.

The Senator from Ohio said that would be troubling and he said there would be some years prior to that that the CBO would have to make some estimate. I do not know how. But somehow or other, it would have to make an estimate. An awful lot is hanging on this. The life or death of a bill or amendment can be hanging on this because you must have the estimate in order to get by the point of order. In order to pursue this issue and to get the thinking of the managers who are the prime sponsors of this bill, I thought I would give them this hypothetical estimated direct cost.

My question to both Senators would be, in this chart what would be the first fiscal year that this mandate would have a direct cost? What is the fiscal year to trigger that 5-year issue? If I could go through the Chair to ask the managers if they would be able to engage me in a colloquy on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, in response to that—and again, this is the first time that I have seen this scenario—one of the things that I would caution everyone, including myself, is that it can be difficult in a debate situation to take a hypothetical or a scenario and then try to answer all of the questions here.

My initial view of this is that when we look at the bill, it clearly states that we will consult with our State and local elected officials. I do not know that we can answer that question based upon what the Senator has in front of us.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield. This is the CBO estimated cost. They have now consulted. By the way, that raises a whole other series of issues which we will get to later. This assumes that all that consultation has taken place, and this is the document that comes back to us, the estimated direct cost. This is the piece of paper which CBO hands to us.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Then I believe, again, based upon input from the State and local officials, that input, in addition to this document, if it is—

Mr. LEVIN. This is the document created, if I may say so, following all of the input. The CBO has done its work and has consulted with State and local officials. After consultation, it then tells us that this is their best estimate. This is what is going to determine now all the points of order. They come back to us saying we have consulted and we have talked to the 87,000 State and local governments in the last week, and this is our best estimate.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. The CBO is to make a 5-year estimate. Based upon the input from State and local officials, I would think the committee would then ask either CBO, or based upon the input from those State and local officials: What is the effective date? Again, I do not know that we can derive that from this document.

Mr. LEVIN. If I may say so, we are introducing a tremendous ambiguity, because we are saying in the bill that the first fiscal year after the effective date, and each 4 fiscal years thereafter, we will determine a critical estimate. I am giving the managers and the sponsors of the bill what the CBO tells us. I am laying it out. I cannot be clearer than that. The CBO comes back and says these are the 10 years prior to that effective date of October 1, 2002. We just cannot simply say, well, they will determine the effective date. The sponsors of the bill would have an intent, I hope, as to what is the effective date for the purposes of this bill.

I think it is going to be absolutely essential that we get an answer to that question because there is an awful lot that is going to hinge on when the effective date is. The way I wrote the hypothetical, it said: You must reduce dangerous levels of mercury from in-

cinerator emissions after October 1, 2005. That is the way the bill hypothetical states it. When I asked the Senator from Ohio last week when is the effective date, the Senator said—and I happen to agree with him, since much of the costs are going to be before 2005, probably all of the costs, because they want to be in compliance by the October 1, 2005, date. So over the weekend, I decided we would come up with an actual CBO estimated direct cost. Here it is.

The sponsors of the bill, it seems to me, should say what the intent of the bill is. We know there are costs in each of the 10 years. The first year that there are direct costs is 1996. That is what the CBO tells us. That is the first year. The second year is 1997. If we are to take this legislation on its face, it says the first year that it has a direct cost will be the first year it is effective. The next 4 years thereafter, if any of those 5 years are above the \$50 million threshold, it triggers certain very critical things. This sounds technical and dry, and it may, indeed, be almost impossible for people studying the legislative process to know what it is that is going to happen. But surely we have an obligation to clarify, to the extent we can, what is the intent of this bill.

I have laid it out. So now I am asking the managers as to whether or not it is the intent of this bill that 1996 be the first year, since there is a direct cost, according to the CBO estimate, in that year. That is my question. Is that the first fiscal year, since there is a direct cost in that year?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, in response to that, again, I do not know that we can answer that just based on this. Again, I have to go back to what S. 1 is all about. It is a process. Is the requirement to remove mercury a current mandate? That would be a question. Is the requirement to remove mercury a current mandate?

Mr. LEVIN. Current before the hypothetical laws if this is adopted?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. The point is that you are asking the CBO to make an estimate. I am telling you what their conclusion is. I am telling the Senator what the conclusion of the CBO is so we can have a discussion. It makes no difference in my hypothetical whether there is a current mandate or not. The only thing that is important is this CBO estimate. I am giving the Senator the estimate and now asking the Senator if that is their estimate.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I am trying to determine what went into coming up with this CBO list and the analysis. But, again, is the requirement to remove mercury a current mandate in your hypothetical?

Mr. LEVIN. It would make it a relevant hypothetical because CBO is mandated in the bill to come up with the direct cost. In order to have a discussion of when the first fiscal year is

triggered, I am saying this is the CBO conclusion.

Assume for the moment that you do not disagree with the conclusion. Assume for the moment that there is no basis to disagree with the CBO. Assume for the moment that everybody accepts it. This is the given I want to debate. This is the conclusion of the CBO. And I add further that every single Member of the U.S. Congress says: That sure looks good to us; they have really done their work, and they have consulted with every 1 of the 87,000 local governments in the last 2 weeks. They have taken into consideration all of the factors that could be taken into consideration. Is there a current mandate or is there not? They have done everything perfectly right, and this is their conclusion.

My question is: What is the first fiscal year? I can understand if the Senator says, well, maybe the CBO is wrong. But that is a different issue. My assumption is that the CBO is correct, that they have done their homework and everybody concludes that is a very good, solid estimate. They have done their work and they have read the bill correctly. So much hangs on when is the first fiscal year that this mandate is effective, and we better understand going in that we are going to have points of order on this floor. We are going to ask that poor Parliamentarian up there to rule. Do we want the Parliamentarian to rule as to when the first fiscal year is that the mandate is effective? Do we want the Parliamentarian to rule whether there is a mandate? I guess so. But in order to have some clarity of congressional purpose here, I am simply giving the CBO estimate, and I want you to assume, if you will, that it is correct and that we all concede that this is the correct CBO estimated direct cost. We must know when that first fiscal year starts. When does that clock start running? If we do not know it now when we are passing the legislation, we are never going to be able to figure it out later.

This is where folks will come back for guidance. What was the legislative intent? This is it. This is where we are trying to create legislative intent, to the extent it is relevant these days—and it still is relevant—this is the moment where we have to lay out what our intentions are.

The reason this is different from last year's bill, in last year's bill there had to be an estimate. That was fine. If there was not, it was subject to a point of order. That was fine.

And, by the way, last year's bill had the support of the Governors and the support of local officials. And, as far as I am concerned, that was fine, too.

But in this year's bill, we have a new point of order. And in this year's bill, an awful lot is going to hinge on that estimate, including some critical appropriations language that did not exist last year.

And I will repeat, the life and death of an amendment or a bill can be deter-

mined by the answer to this question. And it is a straightforward question.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. In the report of the Committee on the Budget with regard to S. 1, when you look at this, you have the CBO estimate, and that is what we are talking about here. And, Mr. President, as you can see, you have all of the information, the steps that CBO would go through in order to get this, which may look similar to what the Senator's large chart looks like.

But, again, in this hypothetical, the Senator is not allowing us to go through this process. The Senator has simply gone to the conclusion of numbers by year. But, again, I do not think you can conclude this based on that because you are not allowing us to go through what a CBO process would go through.

Mr. LEVIN. If my good friend will yield again, the only way we are going to clarify congressional intent is if we state, as I have stated, that after you go through the CBO process, after the CBO goes through all of their process, after they have consulted with 87,000 local governments, after they have considered whether there is a current mandate or not a current mandate, they have done everything right, and everyone in the Senate concludes CBO is right and this is their conclusion.

Now, if that is their conclusion, my question is, when is the first fiscal year that that mandate is effective?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, again I would be interested in this and we would have to reconstruct this whole scenario. We would have to continue with more hypothetical points. What does CBO recommend? Does CBO recommend what the effective date would be?

Mr. LEVIN. Is that the intent of the sponsors, that the CBO recommends? We do not give them any guidance? That the sponsors of the bill just throw it off to the CBO?

We are writing a bill here. What are we urging the CBO to do?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, the legislation would identify the effective date, but it would be based, again, upon input from a whole variety of resources and sources. Again, with all due respect, I do not think you could simply take one chart, numbers, and say, "Now, go back and reconstruct this whole scenario and tell me what it all concludes."

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I think there is a serious ambiguity here and, to some extent, an abdication if we let this go without clarification. The abdication is that we must, as a Senate and a House, later on know what the legislation intended. It is central to the bill that the first fiscal year in which a mandate is effective is a critical date in the bill. A

new point of order is created based upon it.

Last week, I asked the question whether or not the language in my hypothetical meant that the mandate was effective October 1, 2005. And I am going to read that again, because one sentence says yes, it is 2005. In the hypothetical, the Senate mandates reductions of dangerous levels of mercury from incinerator emissions after October 1, 2005.

Now, the average reader, the average person reading that bill, would say that is the effective date of the mandate. If it is, again, and I think my friend would agree with me, as the Senator from Ohio agreed with me last week, if the effective date of the mandate is October 1, 2005, when all emissions must comply, then it will never be triggered because all the money is going to be spent before October 1, 2005.

But I do not think we can have it both ways. We cannot say "Well, it is not the date in the statute, October 1, 2005, because all the money is going to be spent before that date, in order to have the emissions be in compliance." And that is correct. I think that is a logical response. If it is going to have any effect at all and any meaning, you cannot say that the date in the statute, October 1, 2005, is the effective date for the purpose of the point of order. You have to find the effective date prior to that.

And, according to this bill—and I am just reading the bill—the first fiscal year that there are direct costs to local and State governments is year 1. That is year 1. And you go 5 years. And if, in any of those 5 years, this mandate costs more than \$50 million, certain very, very significant things happen. And if they do not happen, very serious points of order lie.

I do not think we can have if both ways. We cannot say the effective date that is in the bill is not the one that governs because it has to be before that date and, on the other hand, we are not going to give any guidance down the road as to what the first fiscal year is.

I think that we cannot have it both ways; that we are leaving a massive ambiguity in the law. It is an example of where the new bill, because it places so much importance on the mandate, goes too far.

Unlike last year's bill, which had more balance to it and which did not link the appropriations of that estimate together, this year's bill makes an estimate in the year 1995 that is going to have an impact 10 years down the road or 20 years down the road. And I believe there is a lot of uncertainty and ambiguity, and that means legislative mischief, because there is no clarity on just this one point.

This is just one point.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I believe what the Senator has described—and I must give him a great deal of credit, because

he has been very thorough and meticulous on this legislation. For that, I think we have already made some perfecting language that has been helpful.

But, really, he is providing us one piece of a puzzle and then he is saying, "Well, because with this one piece of the puzzle you can't tell us the whole picture, then the picture does not exist."

This scenario, for example, I think lacks the actual legislative language. It lacks information from State and local governments and the Federal agency on the impact of the legislation. It lacks the text of the CBO letter indicating the basis of the estimate, including CBO's assumption on the effective date based on the legislation when a regulation is written.

We could continue to construct this scenario and somehow try to back into it. But I would add that, through this process, it is on an individual basis. These will be devised by the authorizing committee based upon not strictly one piece of paper, but based upon much of what I just went through in the list. And again, it resides with the authorizing committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, my understanding, if the Senator would yield, that the Congressional Budget Office is the one that makes the estimate. Is that correct? Is that the intent of the statute, that the Congressional Budget Office makes the estimate?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. For the legislation, yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, now, under my hypothetical the Congressional Budget Office has made an estimate. It has taken into consideration each of the items that have been mentioned in the authorizing bill. I could not agree more with the Senator from Idaho that there are many items in the authorizing bill that affect these direct costs. There could be hundreds of them. The CBO is mandated by this bill to make an estimate. I would not only hope but it is the assumption of this chart that the CBO has taken all of the authorizing bill's factors into account. After taking them all into account, which it is required to do, and after consulting with the State, local and tribal governments, it has reached this conclusion that I set forth on this chart.

I do not think it is accurate to say there is a puzzle here of which this is a part. This chart is the conclusion of the CBO after putting together the puzzle. They have taken each piece of the puzzle and put the puzzle together and that puzzle leads them to this conclusion. The CBO under my hypothetical has each piece of that puzzle together and reached the conclusion that has been set forth on this chart. It is true that there are many pieces. It is the CBO that has to consider those pieces and then give an estimate. Unless we can tell them now, in a hypothetical such as this, when is the first fiscal year in which that estimate is effective, we are closing our eyes to a major

ambiguity and we are going on to the next ambiguity. We are throwing up our hands. We are not defining the first fiscal year in which a mandate is effective.

I do not think that that is a way to legislate that will give guidance to folks who will be bedeviled by the points of order unless they understand what the legislation means and what the intent is of the folks that wrote it.

Now, again, I emphasize, there was a requirement in last year's bill for the CBO to make an estimate. I support that. But last year's bill was very different from this year's bill in that it did not contain this additional requirement relative to the appropriations of funds. Much more hangs on the accuracy of this mandate in this year's bill than in last year's bill. In last year's bill there had to be an estimate, there had to be an authorization for an appropriation to meet the estimate.

What last year's bill did not have and what this year's bill does have, is a point of order which makes it improper to consider a bill that does not have additional language in it which directs that if an Appropriations Committee after the mandate is effective does not appropriate money at least equal to the estimate that then a bill must direct an agency to cut back on that mandate or eliminate it or be subject to a point of order. That is one of the places where this year's bill goes too far. The fact that there is no answer to this question on this chart is evidence of the fact that this bill goes too far in that respect.

Now, I will press forward because I know that there are folks that are trying to end this session at a reasonable hour tonight. Again, I raise these hypotheticals as somebody who has had local government experience, and frankly had the same frustration with the Federal mandates that I think just about everyone has, whether they had local experience or not. My good friend from Idaho had greater local experience than I did. I was a mere council president but I was frustrated, deeply frustrated by mandates that the Federal Government imposed.

I want to act but act in a way which is practical, which works, which will reduce the number of mandates, which will force the Senate to consider mandates, but which will avoid plunging the legislative process into this pit of ambiguity.

Next question, and I welcome any guidance from the other manager of the bill on this issue. We spoke last week. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I will be very brief because I do not have a ready answer, as the Senator knows from our previous conversations on this.

I think the things he brings up here as to the implementation of this bill are very, very good. And I do not want to rub salt into old wounds. We have talked about it enough. These are the

kind of things that normally we should have worked out in committee. That is where it is normally worked out. I do not have a ready answer for this.

Ordinarily if we are lumping a program or putting some program on to Federal, State, or local governments, we would look at what the total impact of this would be. Now, that is one way to look at it. The other way to look at it is 10 years out, nobody can make an estimate that far out. There may be some new technical development that enables us to take away mercury in a new way that is cheaper; or an intractable problem that winds up more expensive. A nuclear cleanup at the 17 different major sites all around the country in 11 different States in our nuclear weapons complex, the original estimate of cleanup as I recall in committee, we would take care of the whole thing for \$8 to \$12 billion. That was in 1985, I believe. Here we are in 1995 and 10 years later it has gone up to \$300 billion and it may go higher than that. That is how indefinite some of these estimates are.

So, while I would like to say that a CBO estimate of costs, whatever the total cost of the project is, that would trigger the point of order. Then we come up with the uncertainty of 10 years and we may be knocking a lot of things out that should be considered.

So, here we are on the floor working out things like this and trying to make acceptable language where we should have been able to do this in committee. I will not belabor that because we have already talked about it some today. I think we should take whatever time is necessary on the floor to work these things out because they are very, very real.

Now, on the other hand, too, let me make another caveat. That is this: This bill was never intended, nor was S. 993, the predecessor, intended to take care of absolutely every possible permutation, every possible what if that we could dream up. They were meant to, in most legislation where there were estimates and we knew what the estimates were within some factor of confidence, that in those which are probably 90 percent of the bills that go through here, we would have a process set up for CBO estimates and points of order to lie.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan who has gone into this legislation in, really, a lot more detail, I think, than almost any other Senator, I think is to be commended for bringing this up. And where possible we should work things like this out. I would come back to the original intent of unfunded mandates legislation, and that was to get our best estimates and if there were problems like this we bring them to the floor.

If a point of order lay because the total cost to this was \$200 million and we had to have a point of order, fine, we would do that and get on with the

conclusion of the bill in the best judgment of the Senate as to what should happen.

I do not know that we will be able to answer every what-if type problem on this. Certainly not now. And I only say one more time I wish we had more time to work this out in committee. That is where details like this are normally worked out rather than here on the floor taking up the time of the Senate.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio raises another issue. I want to discuss with him this question, and that is the outyears. As I understand this legislation, the Congressional Budget Office must estimate the direct cost of the mandate in all years in which the mandates are effective, once the threshold has been exceeded of \$50 million in any of the first 5 years after its effective date. I am wondering if the Senator from Ohio would agree with me on that.

Mr. GLENN. I agree with that statement. I think that is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. If we can imagine a mandate which does not have a sunset provision or is not a 10-year authorization or not a 5-year authorization, it is just a permanent authorization, somehow or the other the CBO has to estimate the cost forever—forever—of that mandate on local government.

I want to ask the Senator from Ohio, who has perhaps had a better view of infinity than anyone in this body, whether he can conceive of forever, and how would the Congressional Budget Office possibly estimate the direct cost of a mandate, assuming that the threshold has been met, on local government for an indefinite period of time?

Mr. GLENN. Obviously, the answer is that nobody, not the Congressional Budget Office or anyone else, can go to infinity on their estimates. Normally around here, we do it for 5 years, and we rely on those estimates. Under the Budget Act, you have a number of points of order lie there. The 5-year estimates are what would normally be made here or whatever the mandate was, the length of time.

As far as how much it is going to cost out in the indefinite future, there is no way the Budget Office or anyone else can estimate that because of inflation, changes in technology, and a whole host of things.

Mr. LEVIN. My question then of the Senator from Ohio is, since this is not an estimate of the 5-year costs, once that threshold has been reached—strike the five. I want to change my 5-year time. I do not want to get two 5-year periods in here. It would just be confusing.

There is a 5-year threshold. If, in any of the first 5 years after the mandate is effective, there is a \$50 million cost to State and local governments, at that point an estimate is triggered. The estimate, though, is not just for the 5 years.

Under the bill—and I think the Senator from Ohio just concurred with me

on this—under the bill, the estimate is for all of the years that the mandate is in effect, and that is on page 23, lines 6 and 7: You must identify a specific dollar estimate of the full direct cost of the mandate for each year or other period during which the mandate shall be in effect under the bill.

There is no 5-year limit, there is no 10-year limit, there is no 20-year limit, there is no 50-year limit. If the authorization bill has no limit, then somehow or another the CBO is supposed to estimate the direct cost to local government for every year during which the mandate shall be in effect under the bill.

My question of the managers is, would they consider changing or amending this bill so that there would be some finite limit on that estimate, even if the authorization bill itself is not limited? I am wondering if either of the managers might comment on that question.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I am one who would advocate that Congress should not just establish some mandate in infinity.

Mr. LEVIN. Or without a limit of years.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I think Congress ought to revisit these issues a little more often than simply saying now that we impose this mandate, it is here for infinity.

Mr. LEVIN. I am wondering if the Senator is going to cosponsor my 10-year sunset on this bill.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. No, but that is an interesting point. You make the point as to why we should not sunset S. 1, because we need to keep this process in place to deal with these issues. It is an interesting point. Again, I would be willing to sit down with you and pencil out what perhaps you are suggesting and see if there is some way to craft this.

Mr. LEVIN. I agree with my friend from Idaho, by the way, that authorization bills should have limits. But there is no saying that Senators cannot offer a bill that does not have a limit on the length of the authorization. They do it all the time. And if they do, under this bill, the Congressional Budget Office is required to make an estimate. The managers may not like those bills, I may not like those bills, but everyone has a right to introduce those bills, and if they introduce those bills, presumably they have a right to get an estimate.

My question is, how can the CBO make an estimate for each year during which the mandate shall be in effect if there is no 5-year or 10-year limit in the bill on the mandate? That is the question that I have of the managers. I am wondering if the Senator from Ohio might also be willing to entertain some kind of a limit on how far out the CBO has to estimate a mandate if there is no limit in the bill on the length of time that the authorization will be in effect.

Mr. GLENN. I say to my friend from Michigan, I do not have any answer to

it right now. I think what you are bringing up is a very good point. Let us say, for instance, that we are not going to repeal the Clean Air Act, we are not going to say it only applies for a certain length of time and then take it off.

As the States get into implementation of the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, or whatever, their costs may be completely different from what was originally estimated. If so, they come back to us again and the appropriate committee should be cognizant of that and take action to make sure that is corrected so the States are not unfairly dealt with.

I tend to think that in most cases, on most legislation we would deal with, a 5-year estimate would be OK. You can bring up something else, though. What if we got into a situation like we were in about a decade ago—a little over a decade ago, about 15 years ago—where we had an inflation rate that ran 17 percent for a while? What if we got into a situation like that and the value of \$50 million changes? We might have to come back with additional legislation to change that.

Right now, you are talking about, looking at your 10-year chart on the mercury problem and taking it over a 10-year period, as that \$50 million threshold now becomes in actual current dollars worth \$25 million, or something like that. I do not believe that has been addressed here either. I do not want to argue against our own bill.

There are problems like that, too, we do need to address in committee or either make corrections in this legislation that is on the floor or provide something that takes care of those variables for the future also.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio raises a very important question. I may offer an amendment to basically have an inflation factor built in so that we would reestimate every few years what that \$50 million or \$100 million or \$200 million is to the nearest \$10 million.

I have reserved a number of amendments, and one of those amendments will probably be that feature of factoring in the inflation factor, if needed, so we do not 10 years out from now have the same number.

The next question has to do with the range, the issue of range.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. Sure, I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I would be happy to sit down and see what perhaps we could design here because if in fact what the Senator is suggesting is that rather than trying to have CBO give an estimate that is many, many years down there, that there can be updated reestimates by CBO so that we are being realistic in the funds that we are providing to the State and local governments to carry out that mandate. If

that is what the Senator is suggesting, then I think we are headed in the right direction.

Mr. LEVIN. That is actually a related but somewhat different idea. If I have enough space on my amendments list, I intend to offer an amendment on this matter.

The Senator from Ohio raised the same question, and this is what it is. Let us assume the estimate is that it is going to be \$50 million in each of the 5 critical fiscal years, and therefore the threshold has been met. Therefore, the language must be in the bill or it is subject to a point of order. That could be 10 years away, that period that is being estimated. And let us assume that 10 years down the road there is new technology, as my friend from Ohio said. Instead of it costing \$50 million to address the mercury problem in these incinerators, there has been a whole new technology designed and now all of a sudden it is \$5 million.

By the way, a lot of the previous estimates of costs to State and local governments have been overestimates. This is not new, totally new what is going on here. We have already required by law that there be estimates of costs to State and local governments, and there have been hundreds of them, approximately 800 of them, in the last 12 years. A lot of those estimates have been overestimates.

Now I wish to get back to the topic because I am going to try to draft an amendment which would address this issue.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator yield just for a correction?

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GLENN. I said a moment ago it raised questions about its inflation impact.

That is provided for in this legislation. The \$50 million goes up with a correction for inflation each year.

Mr. LEVIN. I am wondering whether or not the \$200 million figure also goes up as well?

It does. All right. That is fine if there is an inflation factor already built in. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Now, getting back to this question, let us assume that there is an estimate that the first affected year, the first fiscal year in which the mandate is in effect, let us say it is the year 2001. That is what CBO says. We have no better information. It is a guesstimate probably at best, the way a lot of these are going to be. But that is it. And so the threshold is now triggered.

At that point we have to put the critical language in the bill that, unless the Appropriations Committee in the year 2001 puts in \$50 million to fund this particular mandate, an agency 5 years from now must reduce the level of this mandate or, if no money is appropriated, must take the local and State governments off the hook totally. That language must be in the authorization bill that is passed now for 10 years from now.

OK, now the CBO scores it, and they decide it is going to cost \$50 million in

the year 2001. That is their estimate—\$50 million. Now, the fiscal year 2001 comes. The Appropriations Committee says: Wait a minute. There has been new technology for the last couple of years on the question of mercury. That will cost one-tenth of what they thought 5 years ago it was going to cost. There is brand new technology. And they ask the CBO in the year 2001 to rescure it. CBO says absolutely this thing is not going to cost \$50 million; this thing is going to cost \$5 million.

Under this bill, the agency is still required to reduce the mandate. Now, that is wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. I do not think we ought to be appropriating \$50 million to anybody if \$5 million will do the job. We are trying here presumably to create incentives to reduce costs to Government. In everything we do, we are trying to drive down costs to Government.

This language says unless we address it in some way that the Appropriations Committee has to appropriate \$50 million in that year way down the road even though the CBO in that same year down the road tells us it only costs \$5 million now because of new technology.

I ask my friends whether they will work with me on language which would allow the Appropriations Committee down the road to appropriate less if they have a CBO estimate down the road which says that circumstances have changed and it will not cost as much as was thought way back then when the estimate was originally made. I am wondering if the managers would work with me on such language.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. Mr. President, if we were to work out the language, would the Senator then support the bill and vote for it?

Mr. LEVIN. If we could work out enough of these amendments, I would like to vote for this bill. I can assure my friend from Idaho that I supported the bill last year because I wanted to do something about these mandates. But we have to do it in a way which is effective, which does not waste taxpayers' dollars, because that is the last thing my friend from Idaho wants us to do, and in a way which allows us to function effectively as a legislative body.

So my answer is if we can work out enough changes in the bill that we have discussed, I would like to be able to support this bill.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. Mr. President, as the Senator described it, if it is a situation where we are in essence providing more funds than are necessary to carry out the mandate, then, yes, we need to have a mechanism because that is taxpayers' precious money, and we do not want to abuse that by having it somehow go to purposes for which it is not intended.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend for that, and I will be submitting language to the managers along this line.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. One other point, if I may. There is a process there which is the rescission process by the agen-

cies. The agency that has been duly noted by the authorizing committee would deal with that issue.

Mr. LEVIN. The rescission process is a complicated process, but there is that possibility.

The next question relates to range. Is the CBO allowed to estimate a range of cost?

Mr. KEMP THORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. No; the intent is for the CBO to give us a specific on that number on that.

Mr. LEVIN. The reason I asked that question is because the Budget Committee on page 11 says that the committee—this is near the top of page 11 of the committee report.

The committee is concerned about and recognizes the difficulty of making outyear estimates, particularly beyond the 5-year window. The committee notes that the new enforcement procedures are based on thresholds being exceeded. However, if a range of estimates is made and that range of estimates is less than to greater than the threshold, the committee believes the enforcement procedure should apply.

Which means that at least one of the two committees thinks that apparently a range is going to be made at times and is going to be provided instead of a specific dollar.

Mr. KEMP THORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMP THORNE. I know it was the Governmental Affairs Committee, and there seemed to be a concurrence and certainly a statement that you would take the higher number. So, again, you are not going to be dealing with a range but you take the higher number. That is why I think in this scenario they are saying if you have a threshold and someone is suggesting numbers that are less than or greater than the threshold, it is the larger number that you deal with. That would be the number that we would take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, that is what this one committee report says. But last year, that was not agreed to in the Governmental Affairs Committee, may I say. That was the subject of great discussion in Governmental Affairs. There never was a resolution of that issue.

But there are two issues. First, is a range allowed and, if so, what is the number? And if we are saying if a range is given by CBO that, No. 1, it is going to be allowed, then we have to figure out what the number is and the bill should be explicit on that question. My understanding is that a specific amount is required in this bill. That is the language in the bill. Yet, we got a committee report that talks about the possibility of a range. So I think we

have an inconsistency between the bill and the committee report.

But if a range is going to be permitted, then it seems to me the bill must be explicit as to what will be that magic, specific amount upon which a point of order is going to either lie or not lie. I must say, I do not see any logic in saying that if the range is from \$10 to \$60 million, we are going to assume for purposes of the point of order it is \$60 million. Why not take the midpoint of the range?

I do not think there is any logic in saying the high point will govern any more than there is in saying the low point will govern. It seems to me the best approach will be to say the middle will govern. But it seems to me in any event this bill is not clear on the question of whether or not a range is going to be permitted, and that it is important that we do so. Otherwise, we could have wild ranges where the CBO—in some of these cases, believe me, it is not beyond the realm of imagination that the CBO is going to say this is somewhere between \$10 million and \$100 million.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I will be happy to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. In that hypothetical where you say it is between \$10 million and \$60 million, that you take the midrange, the reason that I would be an advocate that you take the larger range is because S. 1 is based upon the presumption we are going to provide the funds to State and local government, and therefore in order to protect them, you would take the larger range. Otherwise, we have a real possibility that we are underfunding.

Mr. LEVIN. The other possibility, if I may ask the Senator to yield, is that we are overfunding. We do not want to be appropriating more money or requiring the appropriation of more money than is needed to do the job. They are both unacceptable, either to appropriate less money, if it is our determination to fund the mandate, or to appropriate more money than required.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. If the Senator will yield, then we do have a rescission procedure that is in place.

Mr. LEVIN. We also have subsequent appropriations which are possible, as well. We are trying to legislate now on the basis of an estimate. There is no logic in an estimate to say we are going to go with the high point of a range anymore than there is to say the low point of a range. But the important point is that the legislation be clear, and it is not.

If I can say to my friend from Idaho, if we want to allow a range, we should say so. If a range is going to be allowed, we should say what it is our intent that the estimate will be. That is simply my point. This bill is not clear on a very critical issue, which has been the subject of great debate.

Finally, on this issue, in last year's Governmental Affairs Committee, the committee agreed that the range issue

would need to be resolved on the Senate floor when S. 993 was brought up for consideration. I urge the managers to clarify the range issue.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. If the Senator will yield? I have been advised that CBO, with regard to the Budget Act, rarely uses ranges. And also, I remind all of us, with this process you do have the waiver. If there is something that comes up that you feel, therefore, you should bring to the floor to convince a majority of Senators that there is a reason to waive this point of order and those steps involved, you may do so. There is flexibility in this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, contrary to S. 993, I think this piece of legislation on which we had a debate last year—and I recall the Senator from Michigan was going to have a debate that dealt with some of this, this legislation—I believe what we provide here is that CBO will make an estimate. If they cannot make an estimate, they say they cannot make an estimate and that is it. And we do not provide for a range here, specifically. I think that is the way it should be.

If the range is of such order that CBO cannot estimate whether it is going to be above \$50 million or not, then tell us that and that is part of the information we need, that it is that uncertain. So I think to try to force them into making an estimate of ranges, I would not favor that. I think it would be better this way, in this bill, where we provide for an estimate. If they cannot make an estimate that they say is within some range of being probable, then they tell us that and say they cannot make an estimate and that is part of our fact pattern here on the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Is it then the intent of the Senator from Ohio that if the range estimate is made by the CBO, that that would be the same as no estimate?

Mr. GLENN. I think it would be very infrequent they would run into that type of situation where it would spread over our threshold. That is the question you are talking about. We are not talking about whether on a \$50 million threshold the estimate is \$75 or \$100 million.

Mr. LEVIN. There are two questions.

Mr. GLENN. In either case. As long as CBO can tell us in their best judgment it is going to exceed the threshold, that is what we need to know, and have some estimate of that and give a figure. I think when we get into these ranges and you say what if the range is \$10 million to \$1 billion, for instance—just to pick numbers—then it is they could not possibly do that and it would be of no use to us here on the floor, anyway. So I think we are on solid ground saying either pick an estimate and that is the figure we hopefully rely on, or if they do not have any confidence in that figure, tell us that and they just cannot make an estimate.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the Senator from Idaho

would agree we should prohibit ranges in this legislation? What the Senator from Ohio is saying is we do not provide for ranges in this legislation. It was a much-discussed issue.

I know a lot of time has been taken this evening on this issue, probably 15 or 20 minutes already. More time was taken in committee and it was unresolved on last year's bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. The bill now is silent on this thing of ranges. It says CBO will make an estimate. That means to me they will make an estimate.

Mr. LEVIN. No range.

Mr. GLENN. No range, is the way I interpreted that myself. If they cannot do that, then they just tell us that and we take that into consideration.

Mr. LEVIN. I am wondering whether the manager of the bill and chief sponsor agrees with the interpretation of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, again we are not plowing new ground here. We are following the procedures of the Budget Act. Again, I have been advised that rarely do they come up with a range.

If you have a range that is a wide range, from CBO, then I think perhaps the authorizing committee has not provided enough information so they can zero in on what that actual figure should be.

Mr. LEVIN. I am wondering whether the Senator from Idaho agrees with the Senator from Ohio that in effect a range is not permitted or authorized under this bill? And that if they cannot give a specific amount, that they must then say it is impossible to give a specific amount?

That is what the Senator from Ohio said. I am wondering whether the Senator from Idaho agrees with that interpretation of the manager on this side?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Again, right now, I do not think this legislation states what a range is—it is silent on that question.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator from Ohio said in his judgment a range is not permitted under this bill and that if they cannot give a specific amount and can only give a range, that the CBO must tell us it is impossible to give a specific amount. That is what I understood the Senator from Ohio to be saying.

I am wondering whether or not the Senator from Idaho agrees with that interpretation?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. No, I—again, I do not know if that is encouraging some vagueness. I think the authorizing committee would say narrow that range. If CBO comes back and says this is the figure or the figures, then that is their estimate. It does not create the presumption that they have not been able to provide an estimate.

Mr. LEVIN. One last question on the range. I think the sponsor of the bill is basically saying the bill is silent. The

cosponsor of the bill, the Democratic manager, is saying in his view the bill would not allow for it. And I do not think that is the right way for us to legislate. I think this is the time to clarify that issue. It is an important issue, I can assure my colleague. It has been brought up in committee at some length.

In the event, I ask my friend from Idaho, there were a range given by the CBO, and that range were \$100 million to \$500 million, what then would be the specific amount that would have to be authorized in the bill in order for a point of order to be avoided?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, again, I would be more than happy to defer to a Senator who is on the Budget Committee to respond to this because again this is simply following that. So while this legislation is silent, CBO continually has been providing specific numbers. So I do not know to what extent this is going to really create that unusual problem and how many times. But in that event, again that number, or the CBO's estimate, comes back to the authorizing committee where they can deal with that and determine if they want to provide more information so CBO can then narrow it.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend.

This is a very different process, may I say. The CBO would never have to determine whether or not there was a mandate that applied to local government, what year it is effective, and it was never required to create with the specificity that is going to be needed here to avoid a point of order, and involving appropriations what the estimate is of the cost to 87,000 jurisdictions.

Sure, the CBO has made estimates before. I mean we know they have made estimates for the cost to the Federal Government. But in this case there are 87,000 jurisdictions. They may have to do this in a matter of hours.

OK. Let me just plow on here.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I would be happy to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, the way this is set up now is we are supposed to get our estimate from the CBO. They give that estimate then to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee then has authority, as a range as I understand it—staff can correct me, if I am wrong on this—if the Budget Committee wished to, if the Budget Committee wanted to pick a figure in their wisdom, then that would be up to them to do that and recommend it to the Senate. I think that is the way it is provided for in the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield on that, when we are in committee before we get to the floor, all we have is the CBO's estimate.

Mr. GLENN. That is correct. But if the CBO has difficulty making an esti-

mate or giving us a figure to go on, then it would be up to the Budget Committee to decide whether to give us the exact figure or to say there can be no figure. I think that is the way the bill is structured right now.

Mr. LEVIN. Then the bill would have to be amended to provide that the Budget Committee would get involved prior to the markup of the bill in committee. Because as I understand it, it is CBO that makes the estimate and the Budget Committee does not become involved until the bill gets to the floor.

Mr. GLENN. If the Senator will yield, I think he is correct. I think the way it would work is in the committee, when you are considering the bill, the Budget Committee would not be involved at that point. You would have a CBO estimate. There would be a range on that, and I would say the figure would apply. It is when you come to the floor. Then the Budget Committee is required to put their judgment, their imprimatur, their approval on what the CBO has given to the Budget Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Unless the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is adopted that says that the point of order is at the end of the process instead of the beginning—in other words, the way the bill is currently, it would be out of order even to bring the bill to the floor with a range. There is not a specific amount in the bill.

Let me just keep going to the next ambiguity. Let us assume that the CBO has made an estimate. Somehow or other they make an estimate that a bill in each of the five fiscal years is going to cost \$40 million. That is what the CBO estimates before the markup of the bill in committee, \$40 million, in each of the five fiscal years. Nothing is triggered as I understand it. Is that correct?

A Senator now wants to offer an amendment in my hypothetical that says the following: This amendment that is in front of each of the managers says that because of a health emergency no new incinerator may be built within 300 yards of a school or hospital after October 1, 2005. That is an amendment to the bill. Again, the bill has to do with the levels of mercury.

Question No. 1. Can a Senator even get an estimate under this bill? Do we have a right as individual Senators to get CBO's estimate as to what that amendment could cost? And would the managers of the bill support language which would indicate that individual Senators have a right to get estimates since our amendments can live or die depending on whether we can get an estimate? If you cannot get an estimate, your amendment is out of order. You do not even get to the point of the amount of the estimate. If you cannot get an estimate, your amendment is out of order.

So will the Senator's support language which will allow an individual Senator or Member of the House to get an estimate so that his or her amendment can be in order?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, yes. I would agree to that.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend. That language is being worked on as we speak.

The next question is this: That amendment, let us say, is to be offered. I am an individual Senator. I get the CBO to give me the estimate, and, by gosh, it comes back that that amendment is going to cost \$20 million per year in each of the fiscal years. Here is the situation we are now in. The bill says that mercury emissions change is going to be done by a certain year. CBO has scored it at \$40 million a year. It is not above the threshold, and nothing is triggered. I come along now and offer this amendment on the setback. That is going to add \$20 million in each year, and if adopted in committee by the committee. Now it comes to the floor.

My question is: Is the bill coming to the floor subject to a point of order for being above the threshold? CBO has scored the mercury emissions change at \$40 million. The amendment adopted in committee would add \$20 million. The question is, Is it in order for the Senate to consider that bill?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, it would be my opinion that once you exceed that threshold, that is a cost to the State that exceeds our Federal mandate for the threshold that is set and the point of order should apply, would be my opinion. I have not gone back to the fine print. But that would be what I think would be right because it would finally be going over the threshold of the State. That is what was set as our limit.

One other comment on the Senator's hypothetical. I would think the health emergency that he mentions here, bona fide emergencies, are exempted from consideration of a point of order under this. If this was let us say a Presidentially-declared emergency, that we have learned something new about mercury and whatever, and the distance from a school or whatever, if it was a Presidentially-declared kind of an emergency, then I think it would all be exempted from any requirements.

Mr. LEVIN. I would like to get to that issue of the emergency in a moment.

I am wondering if the Senator from Idaho would agree that that \$20 million committee amendment would push this above the threshold so it would not be in order to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate, if a point of order was raised, without raising that point of order.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Yes, I would agree with that.

Mr. LEVIN. That raises two questions. One is, this is just a committee amendment, it has not been adopted by the Senate yet.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Would the Senator repeat that?

Mr. LEVIN. The committee has adopted the amendment that costs \$20 million, but the Senate has not. Why

would it be out of order to bring the bill to the Senate floor?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Yes, perhaps I can clarify. I do not believe it would be out of order to bring the bill up. A point of order could lie against the amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, the amendment is \$20 million, and \$20 million is under the \$50 million threshold.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. But it is the mechanism that causes the threshold to be exceeded.

Mr. LEVIN. Is the answer, then, if the amendment is adopted, then the bill would be subject to a point of order, or the amendment itself would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. It is my understanding that the amendment itself would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVIN. Would the Senator from Ohio be willing to comment on that?

Mr. GLENN. State your question again, please.

Mr. LEVIN. The bill that comes out of the committee has a \$40 million annual price tag in each of the 5 key years. There is a committee amendment which would add \$20 million to each of the 5 fiscal years, if that amendment were adopted by the Senate, but it has not yet been adopted. The committee amendment is now offered in the Senate. Is that amendment subject to a point of order?

Mr. GLENN. No, it would not be. What my proposed amendment I put in earlier today would say is that we would have a point of order lie at the end of all consideration of the bill before a final vote. If there is a cumulative effect of exceeding the \$50 million, then that would be voted on as a point of order at the end of the process.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, there seems to be two different opinions on this issue. I think that it is important that the language of the bill be clear as to whether or not a point of order would lie against a bill coming out of the Committee, which does not violate the threshold, before a committee amendment is considered.

Second, is the amendment of the committee subject to a point of order before it is even adopted? There are two different opinions on that issue from the managers, and I think that ought to be clarified. May I say that, in any event, it would be another reason why the amendment of the Senator from Ohio putting the point of order at the end is, I think, a wise approach to this.

Mr. President, on the emergency issue—and I see that the majority leader is on the floor, and I have a hunch that means he would like to see this colloquy come to an end. I think the managers may join him in that feeling because it has been a long day for them.

I will just ask this last question and we will pick this up tomorrow. If a bill says that there is an emergency situation, for instance, on the setback issue on the school, how would a President

declare an emergency? In other words, if the bill itself says that there is an emergency and the President signs the bill, does that meet the test of this emergency requirement? The language on page 13 says "that the President designates as emergency legislation." I do not know of any mechanism for that to happen. "And the Congress so designates in a statute."

My question is: If the statute states that this is emergency legislation, would not the signature of the President to it satisfy subsection 6 on page 13? That is my question. If the answer is no, would the sponsors tell me how does a President designate legislation as emergency legislation? Does that mean we could not induce the legislation, that we would have to wait for some kind of a designation from the White House?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, again, following the Budget Act, Senate bill No. 1 goes under the Budget Act. The current process is that the President would send a letter to Congress stating that there is an emergency. The Congress would then include in the legislation the statement that an emergency exists.

So it is a two-pronged approach. First, a letter from the President, and then the legislation which would include the acknowledgement of an emergency.

Mr. LEVIN. Then my understanding of the answer of the distinguished manager is that in order for this subsection to be invoked, and an exception to the point of order requirement or language be applicable, the President must initiate by letter legislation and designate it as emergency legislation, and we as individual Senators, or Members of the House, could not introduce legislation with that designation and avoid the point of order in the absence of that prior letter; is that correct?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, that is the current procedure with the Budget Act. But I state to the second part of that, could not Congress initiate something—again, you could seek a waiver of the point of order. That may be your justification.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there have been a number of statements on the floor which are going to help me shape amendments. I think what I would like to do—again, I see the distinguished majority leader on the floor. I would at this point thank the managers of the bill for engaging in these colloquies. I think they are absolutely critical to clarify legislation which is going to affect just about every amendment and bill that comes to the floor, and new points of order are being created. We should think these through and make sure they are clear. Some of the amendments which I think now can be offered—some of which I believe will now have the support of the managers—perhaps will clarify that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I know the distinguished majority leader

wants the floor shortly. But let me comment briefly here. I think Senator LEVIN has brought up a number of very good points. They are excellent points and things we should have worked out before we go ahead with this landmark legislation. It is landmark legislation. We are reversing a trend here of some 60 years, and we better do it right and make sure it is going to work.

When we talk about this on the floor—and I will not go through all of the arguments at this hour of the evening, but I doubt very much if we are going to be able to answer all of the very good questions with amendments by 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I do not see how that is possible. We may want to think about this overnight and perhaps address this tomorrow. I am not saying this is an effort to delay this. These have been honest-to-goodness questions on how this would operate. There have been 5 or 6 points made to things we do not have the answers to, and we should try to get answers for as many things as possible.

I do not think we can take every possible "what if" and make sure everything is covered perfectly, because this bill was designed to be a general guidance-type bill. On the other hand, where specifics are brought up that indicate there would be a problem, I think it is incumbent upon us to address these things when we can. I am not proposing that we extend the time tomorrow for proposals that would deal with what the Senator from Michigan has brought up this evening. But I wanted to raise this as a possibility, because I do not think we are going to be able to put this all together by 3 o'clock tomorrow morning. Maybe the staffs can get together and we can talk about this tomorrow and see how we can work it out. I do not know whether the majority leader has been listening in his office or working on other things. I think he would have to agree that there are real questions that should be worked out before we lock this up for final passage. I open that up as a possibility for tomorrow that we want to consider some time tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Ohio. We will work hard overnight as well to try to cast language for the additional amendments to address some of these issues and do our very best to meet the timetable.

Mr. DOLE. And, of course, if the amendments are offered, we can have a discussion after 3. I guess the question would be whether there are some amendments that did not get offered. But if it is some critical amendment, then I think, under the order, the two leaders could agree to make an exception to the 3 o'clock cutoff, which, if it

is a legitimate amendment, I think that is what we should do.

AMENDMENT NO. 178

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota raises some worthwhile points.

The formulation of monetary policy ought to be of interest to all of us, and he is right to raise questions.

I, too, have questions about the Fed's operation of monetary policy. I've been concerned for a long time that the Fed, despite its independence, was forced to meet more policy goals than it is capable of meeting.

In fact, Chairman Greenspan has told me in a public hearing that the Humphrey Hawkins Act forces the Fed to act in such a way that he believes is not in the long-term best interest of American jobs and the economy.

For this and other reasons, I plan to hold hearings in both the Joint Economic Committee and the Banking Committee to examine amendments to Humphrey Hawkins. The Senator from North Dakota will, I'm sure, be very interested in changing Humphrey Hawkins because such changes should keep interest rates much lower than we have been used to.

We ought to save this debate for a few more weeks and not delay passing the unfunded mandates bill. I can assure the Senator from North Dakota that the issue of monetary policy will be aired fully.

The Dorgan amendment should be tabled, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, State and local governments have been paying billions of dollars to comply with unfunded Federal mandates since the 1970's. As the Federal budget gets tighter it becomes more tempting to pass legislation telling State and local governments how they must spend more and more of their resources. According to the Congressional Budget Office roughly 10 to 20 bills that are reported out of committees every year contain unfunded Federal mandates of over \$200 million each. This seemingly endless stream of legislation imposing greater burdens on our cities and States is what prompted me to introduce legislation in the 102d Congress similar to what is being considered today.

The time is long overdue to focus attention not only on the benefits bestowed by legislation we pass, but also on the burdens imposed by the legislation. Some of this legislation, while noble and well-intended, has had the effect of thrusting Federal policymakers into the limelight as champions of a cause, while leaving the price tag for implementation with the State and local governments. Unfunded mandates place an unbearable strain on local budgets that are already burdened by local demand and, in effect, force backdoor tax increases to cover mandated costs.

State and local resources don't automatically rise whenever the Federal

Government requires new spending. As a result, State and local priorities get subordinated. For example, suppose the top priority for the city of Tallahassee is combating drugs and crime, or they need to replace wornout firefighting equipment. When the Federal Government mandates that Tallahassee spend x dollars on housing and asbestos removal, or face heavy fines for non-compliance, they effectively scuttle the city's top priority. The dollars used to build housing or remove asbestos are not available for addressing drugs and crime or fighting fires.

Some local governments have responded to the crush of mandates by raising revenue through imposing greater fee for building permits, water and sewer hookups, and subdivision approvals. Localities have also imposed development impact fees that total thousands of dollars. The National Association of Home Builders estimates that the impact fees in the State of Florida total \$5,000 per home.

In a State like Florida, the issue of unfunded Federal mandates is even more serious given the tendency by the Federal Government to ignore Florida's growth when determining the State's share of Federal funds.

This legislation will help us focus on a problem that has been growing for decades. In the future we will not pass legislation without knowing what it costs and who is going to pay for it. It is simply unfair to force State and local governments to choose between complying with Federal mandates and their more immediate local needs. I urge the swift passage of this important bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for morning business not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

POLAND'S OUTREACH TO THE EAST

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had the pleasure of meeting with Mr. Michal Strak, the chief of the Office of the Polish Council of Ministers. Mr. Strak brought to my attention Poland's activities with regard to Poles living in the former Soviet Union, and I would like to share some of that information with my colleagues today.

With the end of the cold war, Poland has been able to reestablish links with ethnic Poles throughout the former Soviet Union. The Polish community in the New Independent States is comprised of descendants of Poles who were exiled there during the 1930's. Poles suffered great losses during World War II, due in part to the mass deportation of Polish citizens. Many were pressed into forced labor and others died of hunger and disease. Those who survived became victims of the Soviet sys-

tem, isolated from their homeland. Until recently, their descendants have had few opportunities to learn the Polish language or culture.

Poland, which itself is undergoing major reform, maintains an active outreach program to the Polish community in the former Soviet Union—particularly Kazakhstan where more than 100,000 people of Polish origin reside. Many of these activities focus on language training, with Polish nongovernmental organizations providing Polish language teachers and textbooks, and the Polish Government offering scholarships for ethnic Poles to study in Poland. The Polish Government is also seeking to encourage and support business links between the Polish community in countries such as Kazakhstan and Poland.

These activities play an important role in helping the people of the New Independent States establish ties with the West. The Government of Poland is to be commended for its efforts to assist the Polish communities in their democratization and economic reform efforts.

TRIBUTE TO GERALD F. HAMRA

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to a good friend and a favorite son of my home State of Arkansas. I am referring to Gerald "Jerry" Hamra, a man known as much for his charity and his devotion to family as he is for his success in the competitive world of fast-food franchising.

Jerry Hamra grew up as the son of a clothing salesman in Steele, MO. He likes to joke about his upbringing and his Lebanese heritage by referring to himself as "the rag merchant's son." Today, as chairman of the board and CEO of Wendy's of Little Rock, Inc., Jerry owns 33 Wendy's hamburger franchises in Arkansas—not bad for a rag merchant's son.

I once asked Jerry what led him to get into the hamburger business. He told me "I didn't have any choice—I had just gone belly up in a swimming pool franchise business and I needed the work." That statement belies the savvy and business acumen that we in Arkansas have come to equate with Jerry Hamra.

Jerry first came into Little Rock in 1974 and opened his first Arkansas-based Wendy's in 1975. It was the beginning of a remarkable success story. He has been recognized time and again by Wendy's International for his commitment to excellence. In 1990, he received the business' highest honor when he became the first franchisee to be inducted into the Wendy's Hall of Fame.

Those of us who have known him for so long also know that the success of Jerry Hamra, the businessman, is directly linked to the life of Jerry Hamra, the human being. Jerry once told me that his priorities are "God,

family, and then business—and business is way down on the list.” His concern for people dictates his outlook on business. He is a big believer in hard work, and his pet peeves are a wrong order and an unclean facility. But on the opposite side, his favorite way of dealing with employees is to find a way to compliment them.

Jerry is also known for his love of children—other people’s as well as his own. Locally, he is what you might call the pied piper of hamburgers. He always carries coupons for free burgers in his back pocket and passes them out to children wherever he sees them. But he has also shown that generosity and compassion for children on a much larger scale. In 1987, Jerry donated and dedicated the therapeutic pool at Arkansas Children’s Hospital, the only one of its kind in Arkansas. In 1992 he was named Citizen of the Year by the Arkansas chapter of the March of Dimes.

Jerry Hamra is truly known in Arkansas as much for his benevolence and his many kindnesses to other people as he is for anything he has accomplished in the business world. He once told me he was so charitable because, as he put it, “Arkansas has given me so much, I can never fully pay it back.” Well, on behalf of all Arkansans, I want to tell Jerry how grateful we are that, 20 years ago, he chose Arkansas as his home. Jerry is currently battling cancer, and I want him to know that he and his fine family are very much in the thoughts of the Pryor family and of countless people across the State of Arkansas. I know my colleagues join me in wishing Jerry a speedy recovery and continued success.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CAVALIERS SOCCER TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, approximately 1 year ago, on February 23, 1994, Senator WARNER remarked for this RECORD that the University of Virginia soccer team had reached an athletic pinnacle never before achieved: three successive NCAA national championships. I joined Senator WARNER and Senator ROBB in recognizing this team’s achievement with special ceremonies in the U.S. Capitol and with President Clinton and Vice President GORE at the White House.

I mention this as a prelude to the Cavaliers’ most recent achievement. On December 11, the Virginia Cavaliers soccer team defeated the Indiana Hoosiers by a score of 1-0 to claim an unprecedented fourth consecutive National College Athletic Association title.

The Washington Post reported that:

The Cavaliers (22-3-1) certainly had a lot to overcome. Top ranked Indiana University (23-3) was considered to have the best chance at knocking off fifth-ranked Virginia, which some felt wasn’t as strong as previous years. Midfielder Claudio Reyna, the nation’s top player the previous two seasons, had left a year early to play for the 1994 U.S. World

Cup team and then professionally in Germany.

Indiana, on the other hand, had eight seniors who were hungry for a title after falling short of expectations in previous years. Its midfield also was rated as the nation’s best [with two All Americans]. But none of that seemed to matter once the game started.

I was fortunate to attend the NCAA championship played at Davidson University in North Carolina. I can report without equivocation that the UVA Cavaliers showed grit, determination, and heart as they successfully defended their NCAA championship. Each team member displayed courage time and again in a season marked with obstacles and during a championship game described as “more like a rugby match than a soccer game.”

The significance of this team’s triumph was best summed up by head coach Bruce Arena, who commented that the team “accomplished something that may never be accomplished in Division I men’s athletics again. We knew that things were a little tough going in, but great teams rise to the occasion, and that’s what happened here.”

Coach Bruce Arena and his fine staff—assistant coach George Gelnovatch graduate assistant coach Bob Willen, trainer Sue Foreman, and managers Elizabeth Williams and Brighid O’Donnell—are to be commended for their dedication and hard work.

Special recognition and attention must, Mr. President, be focused on the team’s seniors. Each senior—a winner of four national titles—will long be remembered as the finest. A.J. Wood and Nate Friends as strikers were the best combination of speed, power, and finesse in the Nation. Clint Peay overcame injuries and a changed position to remain a star. Tain Nix played steady, stellar soccer all year.

The fine young men who make up the team are true role models for our youth, and they also deserve recognition and commendation. The names of all members of this great soccer team are to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where they will become a permanent part of our Nation’s history:

Tom Baker, defender, Plymouth, MI.
Ryan Borst, midfielder/defender, Ridgefield, CT.

Diallo Bryan, forward/midfielder, Silver Spring, MD.

Sean Feary, midfielder/defender, Fairfax Station, VA.

Mike Fisher, midfielder, Doylestown, PA.

David Fitzmaurice, midfielder, Arlington, VA.

Sam Franklin, midfielder, Arlington, VA.

Nate Friends, forward, Great Falls, VA.

Scott Hodge, goalkeeper, Oakton, VA.

Adam Jacoby, goalkeeper, Clifton, VA.

Stephen Johnson, forward/defender, Lexington, KY.

Matt Laughlin, midfielder, Fairfax Station, VA.

Matt Leanard, forward, Fairfax Station, VA.

Christian Nix, midfielder, Fairfax, VA.

Clint Peay, defender, Columbia, MD.

Mark Peters, goalkeeper, Winchester, VA.

Brandon Pollard, defender, Richmond, VA.

Key Reid, midfielder, Searchlight, NV.

Yuri Sagatov, goalkeeper, Fairfax, VA.

Andriy Shapowal, midfielder, Chagrin Falls, OH.

Damian Silvera, midfielder, Huntington, NY.

Joaquin Targhetta, midfielder, Reston, VA.

Billy Walsh, midfielder, Chatham Township, NY.

A.J. Wood, forward, Rockville, MD.

REGARDING PUBLIC TELEVISION FUNDING

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the statements made by Bell Atlantic and others concerning the so-called privatization of public broadcasting. In my view, the so-called privatization of public broadcasting could bring an end to the system of public broadcasting as we know it. While this may be the goal of certain legislators, this is not what the American people want. Three recent polls have concluded that the overwhelming majority of Americans support continued funding for public broadcasting.

I have always supported efforts to make public broadcasting more efficient and less costly. In the last Congress, I introduced a bill calling for a freeze in the authorized levels of funding for public broadcasting. Placing public broadcasting in the hands of private, corporate entities, however, would simply turn public broadcasting into more of the same advertising-driven, profit-motivated commercial broadcasting that we have today. Americans already receive too much violence and profanity on the commercial broadcast stations. What America needs is more educational programming, more children’s programming, more family-oriented programming. This is what public broadcasting provides.

There is no substitute for the programming provided by public broadcasting today. Cable television is received by only 60 percent of Americans, while public broadcasting reaches 98 percent of the American public. Almost twice as many children watch public television than watch similar programs on cable.

Congress spends only \$1 per American per year on public broadcasting. This is a small price to pay for the education of our Nation’s children and adults.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF DISASTER ASSISTANCE TO JAPAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 2

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have directed the Secretary of Defense to provide appropriate disaster assistance to the Government of Japan in response to the devastating earthquake of January 17, 1995. As required by section 404 of title 10, United States Code, I am notifying the Congress that the United States commence disaster relief operations on January 18, 1995, at 11:06 p.m., eastern standard time. To date, the U.S. military has provided 37,000 blankets. In addition, the following information is provided:

1. Disaster relief assistance is being provided in response to an earthquake affecting Kobe and Osaka, Japan.

2. Reports indicate at least 3,100 people have died, nearly 900 are missing, over 16,000 are injured, and an estimated 240,000 are homeless. The destruction of basic physical infrastructure poses a threat to the lives of the survivors.

3. Currently, U.S. military involvement has been limited to 15 U.S. Air Force C-130 Hercules sorties. Further requests for U.S. military assistance in the form of transportation, supplies, services, and equipment are unknown at this time.

4. Switzerland is providing search and rescue dog teams. Assistance by other countries is unknown.

5. Anticipated duration of disaster assistance activities is unknown.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1995.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution resolving that the two Houses of Congress as-

semble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 24, 1995, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-183. A communication from the Secretary of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-184. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-185. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-186. A communication from the President of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-187. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-188. A communication from the Executive Director of the Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-189. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-190. A communication from the Chairman of the National Science Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-191. A communication from the Chairman of the National Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-192. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-193. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-194. A communication from the HUD Secretary's Designee to the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-195. A communication from the Deputy and Acting CEO of the Resolution Trust Corporation and the Chairman of the Thrift Depositor Oversight Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-196. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to unvouchered expenditures potentially subject to audit by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-197. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-198. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-199. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-200. A communication from the Director of the United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-201. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-202. A communication from the Office of the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-203. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-204. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-205. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-206. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1

through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-207. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-208. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-209. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-210. A communication from the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-211. A communication from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-212. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-213. A communication from the Chairman of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-214. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Commission For the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-215. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-216. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-217. A communication from the Chairman and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-218. A communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-219. A communication from the Executive Director of the State Justice Institute, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector

General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-220. A communication from the Chair of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-221. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-222. A communication from the Chairman of the Corporation For Public Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-223. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-224. A communication from the Executive Director of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-225. A communication from the President of the National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-226. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-227. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-228. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-229. A communication from the Chairperson of the Appraisal Subcommittee, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-230. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-231. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-232. A communication from the President of the U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report

of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-233. A communication from the Chairperson of the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-234. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-235. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-236. A communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-237. A communication from the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-238. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-239. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-240. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-241. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-242. A communication from the President of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-243. A communication from the Chairperson of the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 1. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. REID, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. EXON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KYL, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards to protect taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 259. A bill for the relief of the Persis Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 260. A bill to provide for the protection of books and materials from the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 261. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit the use and occupancy of certain lands within the jurisdiction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for recreational and public uses; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. REID, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. EXON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KYL, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards to protect taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

THE TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS II

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am very sorry my colleagues and chief cosponsor of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, has been detained. He is at the White House. I think later in the day he will speak on this subject matter.

Mr. President, over the past several years, there has been extensive debate over ways to achieve tax fairness for middle-income Americans. Proposals are most often costly, and very, very partisan. But there is one legislative package helping taxpayers, Mr. President, that transcends political boundaries and costs very little—we call it the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II.

So, as the debate once again heats up on ways to achieve tax fairness for middle-income Americans, I want to

draw attention to this legislation which will help bolster taxpayer confidence in dealing with the Government by ensuring taxpayers are treated fairly by the tax collector—the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, many of my colleagues in the Senate today were not here in 1988 when Congress passed, and President Reagan signed into law, the first Taxpayer Bill of Rights. That bill was the first ever comprehensive piece of legislation enumerating the rights of taxpayers. For example:

The right of the taxpayer to be informed of their rights;

The right of the taxpayer to rely on written advice of the IRS;

The right of the taxpayer to representation; and

The right of the taxpayer to recover civil damages and attorneys fees from the IRS.

I might note that this particular legislation, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights, which was signed into law in 1988, was the very first piece of legislation throughout recorded American history that gave the taxpayers of America their due rights.

Mr. President, these basic, commonsense provisions were codified by the first Taxpayer Bill of Rights. The battle waged by a strongly bipartisan coalition for their codification was hard fought and their ultimate enactment was a giant first step for the American taxpayer. But the time is overdue to more fully develop and expand these rights.

Mr. President, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II is the next natural step which builds on the first effort in 1988.

In 1992, I first introduced the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II with a considerable bipartisan backing of 52 of my colleagues. The bill passed Congress twice that year but was ultimately vetoed because it was included as part of two large tax bills with which President Bush did not agree.

Since these two bills were vetoed, the Senate has not had the opportunity to consider the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II. However, Mr. President, I believe the time is now to enact this legislation, and I am committed to work along side my friend and colleague Senator GRASSLEY to push taxpayer rights forward and in the coming months to look for additional ways to ensure the IRS treats taxpayers with respect.

Today, Senator GRASSLEY and I come to the floor, once again, with a strong bipartisan contingent in support of this bill—20 cosponsors—12 Democrats and 8 Republicans—a bill which builds on the foundation laid by the original Taxpayer Bill of Rights and is the next natural step in requiring the IRS to achieve higher standards of accuracy, timeliness, and fair play in providing taxpayer service.

The Taxpayer Bill of Rights II achieves these new standards through 27 provisions, including:

First, expanding the authority of the taxpayer advocate to prevent hardships on taxpayers.

Second, create the right in small taxpayers to an installment agreement, and further, rights when installment agreements are denied or terminated.

Third, require the IRS to abate interest when it has made an unreasonable error or delay, and enable the courts the power to review the interest abatement determination.

Fourth, increase the rights of taxpayers to recover civil damages against the IRS when it has acted negligently or recklessly.

Fifth, strengthen the code so a taxpayer may recover out-of-pocket costs incurred in a case in which the IRS position was not substantially justified.

Sixth, and, prohibit the IRS from issuing retroactive proposed regulations unless the Congress provides otherwise.

These are some of the examples of the 27 provisions that Senator GRASSLEY and our 20 cosponsors in the Senate in a bipartisan effort will bring to this body for action later in this session.

Mr. President, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights II contains many more commonsense provisions designed to safeguard the rights of taxpayers, and I believe, will work to instill some confidence into our system of taxation.

Mr. President, joining me later in the day, as I have mentioned, is my friend and colleague, Senator GRASSLEY. We worked very hard on these provisions in the past, and we look forward to our work in the future.

Let me name one other individual who has worked very, very hard in this field and that, of course, is Senator HARRY REID of Nevada.

Senator REID came from the House of Representatives to the Senate. Mr. President, one day I was presiding in the chair when the Democrats had control of the Senate. I noticed over to my far extreme right that Senator REID of Nevada was making his very first maiden speech in the Senate. And it was about taxpayers' rights. I, too, had been interested in this issue. I called for a page to come up, and I handed the page a note. I said, "HARRY REID, I want to work with you on this provision that you are so concerned about." Ultimately, Senator REID, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator LEVIN, and many of us worked through the course of that year in developing the Taxpayer Bill of Rights I, which was in fact signed into law.

So it has been a great pleasure and honor to have worked with these fine Members of the Senate, I must say in a very bipartisan way. As the Finance Committee continues its march of progress, let us say during the next several months, I look forward to the development now of Taxpayer Bill of Rights II and working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I think there are other Senators who seek recognition.

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to once again sing on as a cosponsor to the bill introduced by Senator PRYOR, the taxpayer bill of rights II. I was a cosponsor of this important legislation in both the 102d and 103d Congress.

Over the years, many have cited abused by the IRS during tax audits and collection. Aware of these types of problems, Congress passed the taxpayer bill of rights in 1988. While the original bill was in many ways successful, it is clear that further action is necessary.

The taxpayer bill of rights II builds on the success of the original bill, and provides taxpayers with expanded protections against improper collection techniques. This legislation expands protection for taxpayers by requiring the IRS to pay legal fees when it loses in court, increases from \$100,000 to \$1 million the cap on damages a taxpayer can collect from the IRS, and revokes the agencies authority to issue retroactive regulations.

The bill also establishes a better taxpayer advocate within the IRS who will have the authority to intervene and help taxpayers cases, and increases taxpayers' ability to get a fair hearing in disputes with the IRS.

It is unfortunate that this bill is necessary; however, in such a monumental task as collecting taxes it is inevitable that there will be mistakes made. This bill will help to ensure that taxpayers are not forced to pay for the mistakes for which they had no control over.

I have heard too many times from anguished constituents in Nevada regarding their dealings with the IRS. While dealing with discrepancies with the IRS is never an enjoyable experience, once this bill becomes law taxpayers will finally have their rights protected.

In past sessions of Congress, this bill has received overwhelming bipartisan support. I am hopeful that we can again join together, pass this bill and give taxpayers the rights that they deserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD. •

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

TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS II (T2)

A.—TAXPAYER ADVOCATE

Section 101. Establishment of Position of Taxpayer Advocate within Internal Revenue Service. The Office of the Taxpayer Ombudsman was statutorily created in 1987 in the Omnibus Taxpayer Bill of Rights. The Ombudsman is presently hired by and reports directly to the IRS Commissioner.

T2 will replace the Ombudsman with the new Office of Taxpayer Advocate which will have expanded authority as provided in A.2 below. The Taxpayer Advocate will continue to be hired by and report to the IRS Commissioner.

Presently, the Office of the Taxpayer Ombudsman carries out its duties and responsibilities in the local field offices through the Problem Resolution Office (PRO). However, PROs are hired, supervised, reviewed, and promoted by the local IRS District Director, not the Ombudsman. T2 will provide

that the PRO will report directly to the Office of Taxpayer Advocate.

T2 will require the Taxpayer Advocate to provide the Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate two annual reports. The first report is on the activities of the Taxpayer Advocate during the previous fiscal year. The report must identify the initiatives the Taxpayer Advocate has taken to improve taxpayer services and IRS responsiveness, contain recommendations received from individuals who have the authority to issue a TAO, contain a summary of at least 20 of the most serious problems which taxpayers have in dealing with the IRS, describe in detail the progress made in implementing these recommendations, include recommendations for such administrative and legislative action as may be appropriate to resolve such problems, and to include other such information as the Taxpayer Advocate may deem advisable. The Commissioner is required to establish procedures that will ensure a formal IRS response to all recommendations submitted by the Taxpayer Advocate. The first report is due not later than December 31 for each fiscal year after September 30, 1995.

In the second report, the Taxpayer Advocate must furnish to the tax writing committees its annual objectives, not later than December 31 of each calendar year after 1994.

All reports should contain full and substantive analysis, in addition to statistical information.

Effective Date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment except for the specified due dates of the above reports.

Section 102. Expansion of Authority of the Taxpayer to Issue Taxpayer Assistance Orders. Under current law, section 7811(a) authorizes the Taxpayer Ombudsman to issue a Taxpayer Assistance Order (TAO) if, in the determination of the Ombudsman, the taxpayer is suffering or about to suffer a "significant hardship" as a result of the manner in which the tax laws are being administered by the Secretary.

T2 eliminates the qualifier of "significant" hardship from section 7811 to allow PROs to assist taxpayers in avoiding hardship before it occurs since the standard of "significant" hardship presupposes that a taxpayer must be some degree of hardship before any relief can be afforded.

Currently under section 7811(b), a TAO allows a PRO to "cease any [IRS] action" with respect to a taxpayer. However, section 7811(b) does not allow the terms of a TAO to authorize affirmative steps to help a taxpayer.

T2 will authorize the terms of a TAO to "cease any action, take any action" with respect to a taxpayer, and therefore, allow a TAO to both stop IRS action and to take affirmative steps with respect to a taxpayer. For example, the Taxpayer Advocate's new scope of power will specifically include, but not be limited to, the authority to (1) abate assessments, (2) grant refund requests, and (3) stay collection activity. Further, a TAO may specify a period of time within which the TAO must be followed. The Taxpayer Advocate will have the power to grant authority to his or her designees (i.e., the Problems Resolution Officers).

Current law provides that a TAO may be modified or rescinded by the Ombudsman, a district director, a service center director, a compliance center director, a regional director of appeals, or any superior of such person.

T2 provides that a TAO may be modified or rescinded only by the Taxpayer Advocate and/or the IRS Commissioner.

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

B.—MODIFICATIONS TO INSTALLMENT AGREEMENT PROVISIONS

Section 201. Taxpayer's Right to Installment Agreement. T2 amends section 6159 to provide that, upon request, an individual taxpayer has an automatic right to an installment agreement if the taxpayer has not been delinquent in the previous 3 years and the liability is under \$10,000.

Effective date.—The provision is effective for installment agreements entered after the date of enactment.

Section 202. Running of Failure to Pay Penalty Suspended During Period Section 111 Installment Agreement in Effect. Under present law, a taxpayer is subject to "failure to pay" penalties even though he or she has agreed to pay his or her tax liability with interest by entering into an installment agreement.

T2 will amend current law to prevent the IRS from imposing the "failure to pay" on installment agreements, under section 111 above, where the taxpayer requests an agreement on or before the due date of the tax return.

Effective date.—The provision is effective for installment agreements entered after the date of enactment.

Section 203. Notification of Reasons for Termination of Installment Agreements. Section 6159(b)(3) presently requires the IRS to give the taxpayer a 30-day notice before terminating an installment agreement, if it is determined that the financial condition of the taxpayer has significantly changed. However, no notice is required if the taxpayer defaults for any other reason. In these cases, the IRS may unilaterally terminate the installment agreement with no notice to the taxpayer.

T2 will require the IRS to provide a taxpayer with a 30-day notice before terminating an installment agreement for any reason except when the collection of the tax is determined to be in jeopardy. In addition, T2 will require the notice to include the reason(s) why the IRS considers the installment agreement to be in default.

Effective date.—The provision is effective six months after the date of enactment.

Section 204. Administrative Review of Termination or Denial of Request for Installment Agreement. Under present law, a taxpayer has no right to an independent review of a termination or denial of his request for an installment agreement.

T2 will require the IRS to establish procedures for an independent administrative review of a termination of or denial of a request, for an installment agreement. T2 will also require the IRS to provide a written response to a taxpayer who requested an installment agreement. The written response must state the decision of the IRS and the basis for such decision. Finally, T2 will require the IRS to include in the instructions for filing Federal income tax returns the rules and procedures for requesting installment agreements.

Effective date.—The provision is effective January 1, 1996.

C.—INTEREST

Section 301. Expansion of Authority to Abate Interest. Section 6404(e)(1) (Assessment of interest attributable to errors and delays by the IRS) provides "the Secretary may abate" interest on "any deficiency in whole or in part to [due to] any error or delay by an officer or employee of the IRS (acting in his official capacity) in performing a ministerial act".

The ministerial act requirement too narrowly limits the possibility of relief to the taxpayer with the result that the IRS does not abate interest even if it is the IRS' fault. Further, IRS rejection of a taxpayer request

to abate interest cannot be reviewed because section 6404(e)(1) provides no authorization for courts to review an IRS rejection and no appropriate standard of review. The resulting interest assessment may be especially onerous on small taxpayers who do not have cash on hand to invest in anticipation of paying future tax assessments.

T2 will provide that for qualified small taxpayers, as defined in section 7430(c)(4)(A)(iii), the Secretary must abate or refund interest when the IRS has made an unreasonable error or delay. This will allow courts to review the IRS determination on the abatement of interest issue for small taxpayers. For nonqualified "larger" taxpayers, courts will still not be allowed to review the IRS determination on the interest abatement issue, however, the new standard of review will allow the IRS more flexibility in providing relief.

Section 302. Extension of Interest-Free Period for Payment of Tax After Notice and Demand. When the IRS sends a first notice requesting payment to a taxpayer, section 6601(e) provides a 10-day interest-free period from the date of the notice. The 10-day requirement is virtually impossible to meet given delivery time to and from the taxpayer attempting to timely remit payment.

T2 will extend taxpayers' interest-free period for payment of the tax liability reflected in the first notice from 10 days to 21 days, when the total tax liability on the notice of deficiency is less than \$100,000.

Effective date.—The provision applies in the case of any notice and demand given six months after the date of enactment.

D.—JOINT RETURNS

Section 401. Disclosure of Collection Activities. Present law does not allow the IRS to inform either spouse as to the efforts of the IRS to collect the tax liability from the other spouse.

T2 will permit that, if either spouse or former spouse makes a written request, the IRS is required to disclose in writing whether the IRS has attempted to collect the deficiency from his or her spouse or former spouse, the general nature of such collection activities, and the amount collected. The IRS may refuse such request in cases where disclosure of such information may result in the threat of physical danger or harassment to a taxpayer.

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

Section 402. Joint Return May Be Made After Separate Returns Without Full Payment of Tax. Under section 6013(b)(2), taxpayers, who file separate returns and subsequently determine that their tax liability would have been less if they had filed a joint return, may not reduce their tax liability by filing jointly unless they are able to pay the entire amount of the joint return liability before the expiration of the 3-year period for making the election.

T2 will repeal the provision requiring full payment of the tax liability as a precondition to taxpayers switching from married filing separately to married filing jointly status.

Effective date.—The provision applies to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment.

E.—COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

Section 501. Modifications to Lien and Levy Provisions. A Notice of tax lien provides public notice that a taxpayer owes the government money. Section 6326(b) requires the IRS to issue a Certificate of Release for such notices for erroneous liens only. This extremely narrow language prevents the IRS from issuing the Release on premature or incorrectly filed liens.

T2 will give discretion to the IRS to remove such liens without prejudice when (1)

the filing of the notice was premature or not in accordance with administration procedures of the IRS; (2) the taxpayer has entered into an installment agreement for the payment of the tax liability with respect to the tax on which the lien is imposed; (3) the withdrawal of the lien will facilitate the collection of the tax liability; or (4) the withdrawal of the lien would be in the best interest of the taxpayer and the United States (with the best interests of the taxpayer to be determined by the Taxpayer Advocate).

T2 will require that, upon written request by the taxpayer in the 4 cases cited above, the IRS shall make prompt efforts to notify the credit reporting agencies specified that the notice has been withdrawn. T2 will also require the IRS to return levied-upon property to the taxpayer in the 4 above cited cases.

T2 will raise the levy exemption amounts of \$1500 for personal property and of \$1100 for equipment and property for a trade, business, or profession, which were set in 1990, to the present indexed amounts of \$1750 and \$1250, respectively.

Effective date.—The provisions are effective on the date of enactment.

Section 502. Offers-in-Compromise. Section 7122 provides that the IRS may settle a tax debt pursuant to an offer-in-compromise. Amounts over \$500 can be accepted only if the reasons for the acceptance are documented in detail and supported by an opinion of the IRS Chief Counsel. Further, section 6103(k) requires public disclosure of the names of taxpayers whose tax debts are compromised, as well as the amount owed and the amount accepted by the Government. These burdensome requirements result in the IRS not pursuing the offer-in-compromise route in settling even small tax disputes.

T2 will provide that, in cases where the unpaid tax assessment is less than \$50,000, the opinion of the IRS Chief Counsel is not required. However, the IRS shall subject these offers-in-compromise to an IRS quality review. Further, T2 will amend 6103(k) to provide that in cases where the unpaid tax assessment is less than \$50,000, the offer-in-compromise will not be subject to public disclosure.

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

Section 503. Notification of Examination. Presently, in many cases, the IRS is approaching taxpayers, requesting books and records, but not notifying taxpayers of examination. If the taxpayer is contacted and the agent requests to review the taxpayer's books and records, a written notice, followed by an examination report, should be required.

T2 will amend section 7605 to require that the IRS give the taxpayer written notice that the taxpayer is under examination. The notice will be required for examinations under all sub-titles of the Code. Such notice will include an explanation of the process as described in section 7521 (explanation of examination process, right to be represented by an attorney, etc.).

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

Section 504. Increase in Limit on Recovery of Civil Damage. Section 7433 caps civil damage awards for unauthorized collections actions against the IRS at \$100,000. Section 7433 also limits recovery to reckless and intentional actions of the IRS.

T2 will increase the \$100,000 cap for "reckless and intentional actions" to \$1 million, and in addition, T2 will include recovery for "negligent" actions of the IRS capped at \$100,000.

Effective date.—The provision applies to actions by IRS employees that occur after the date of enactment.

Section 505. Designated Summons. T2 requires that issuance of any designated summons with respect to a corporation's tax return be preceded by review of such issuance by the Regional Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel to the IRS, for the Region in which the examination of the corporation's return is being conducted.

In addition, T2 requires that the corporation whose return is in issue be promptly notified in writing in any case where the Secretary issues a designated summons (or another summons, the litigation over which suspends the running of the assessment period under the designated summons procedure) to a third party. It is expected that the IRS generally will meet this requirement by issuing such notice on the same day that it issues such summons, and by transmitting such notice to the corporation in a manner reasonably designed to bring it to the prompt attention of an agent of the corporation responsible for communicating with the IRS in connection with the examination.

Effective date.—This provision applies to summonses issued after date of enactment.

F.—INFORMATION RETURNS

Section 601. Phone Number of Person Providing Payee Statements Required to be Shown on Such Statement. Taxpayers frequently need to contact payors issuing information returns in order to resolve disputes. Presently, information returns (e.g. W-2s, 1099s, etc.) require only the name and address of the payor.

T2 will require the payor to also provide the phone number of the payor's information contact. Payors may have the option of providing the name of its customer service department, if appropriate, an Form 1099.

Effective date.—The provision applies to statements required to be furnished after December 31, 1993 (determined without regard to any extension).

Section 602. Civil Damages for Fraudulent Filing of Information Returns. Some taxpayers have suffered significant personal loss and inconvenience as the result of the IRS receiving fraudulent information returns. These false returns have been filed by payors whose intent is to defraud the IRS or to harass taxpayers.

T2 will provide that, if any person files a false or fraudulent information return with respect to payments made to another person, with the intent of either defrauding the IRS or harassing another person, the other person may bring a civil action for damages against the person filing such return. Further, T2 will provide that damage awards in such cases be at least \$5000, and that the plaintiff must bring action within 6 years from the time the fraudulent return was filed with the IRS.

Effective date.—The provision applies to false or fraudulent information returns filed after the date of enactment.

Section 603. Requirement to Conduct a Reasonable Investigation of Information Returns. Section 6212(a) authorizes the IRS to determine tax deficiencies. The term "determine" is not defined in the Code, and until recently, courts have declined to inquire whether or not, and how, the IRS made its determination. Further, courts have begun to chip away at the long-standing presumption of correctness afforded deficiency notices.

T2 will amend section 6212(a) to provide that a "determination" must be "a thoughtful and considered determination that the United States is entitled to an amount not yet paid." *Portillo v. Commissioner*, 832 F. 2d 1128 (5th Circuit 1991). If the IRS fails to

make a thoughtful and considered determination, then the notice of deficiency will be invalid.

T2 will provide that where the taxpayer asserts a reasonable dispute with respect to any item of income reported to the IRS on an information return, the IRS, not the taxpayer, will bear the burden of proof in any deficiency or refund proceeding absent a showing that the IRS conducted a reasonable investigation of the facts surrounding the taxpayer's return.

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

G.—MODIFICATIONS TO PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO COLLECT AND PAY OVER TAX

Section 701. Preliminary Notice Requirement. Section 6672 imposes personal liability on those persons who are required to collect employment taxes ("responsible officers") and who willfully fail to pay over these taxes to the IRS. The Code additionally provides for a 100% penalty on responsible officers failing to pay over such taxes. Taxpayers who may be responsible persons are assessed the taxes owed and the penalty without the right to an administrative review.

T2 will require the IRS to issue a preliminary notice which will give the taxpayer the right to an administrative appeals hearing.

Effective date.—The provisions applies to failures occurring after the date of enactment.

Section 702. Disclosure of Certain Information Where More Than One Person Subject to Penalty. The IRS may recover more than the amount owed under section 6672 (since each responsible person is jointly and severally liable). There is no procedure to ensure that the IRS does not collect more than 100% of what is owed.

T2 will require that a person liable for a section 6672 penalty may request, in writing, that the IRS disclose any other person who is liable for such penalty along with general nature of the IRS' collection activities.

Effective date.—The provision is effective on the date of enactment.

Section 703. Penalties Under Section 6672. Under current law, unpaid, volunteers, who serve on boards of tax-exempt organizations, may be held liable for the 100% penalty depending on the duties and roles of the individual involved.

T2 provides that the 100% penalty will not be imposed on unpaid, volunteer members of any board of trustees or directors of a tax exempt organization.

T2 will also require the IRS to develop materials to better inform employees and volunteers of their responsibilities under the law.

H.—AWARDING OF COSTS AND CERTAIN FEES

Section 801. Motion for Disclosure of Information. Once a taxpayer has substantially prevailed in his case with the IRS, he may file a petition for an order requiring the disclosure of all information and copies of relevant records in the possession of the IRS with respect to the taxpayer's case and the substantial justification for the position taken by the IRS.

Effective date.—The provision is effective for notices made and proceedings commenced after the date of enactment.

Section 802. Increased Limit on Attorney Fees. T2 will amend section 7430 to provide that reasonable fees incurred for the services of qualified taxpayer representatives shall not be indexed for inflation occurring since 1981, currently \$110 per hour, and this amount shall be indexed to inflation in the future.

Effective date.—The provision applies to notices made and proceedings commenced after the date of enactment.

Section 803. Failure to Agree to Extension not taken into Account. Section 7430 re-

quires the taxpayer to exhaust all administrative remedies before costs may be awarded. T2 provides that a taxpayer's failure to agree to an extension of time shall not be taken into account in determining whether a taxpayer has exhausted his or her administrative remedies.

Section 804. Authority for Court to Award Reasonable Administrative Costs. Section 7430 provides for the recovery of administrative costs incurred on or after the earlier of the receipt of the final decision of IRS Appeals or the statutory notice of deficiency. Because, generally, no administrative costs are incurred after this period, the provision is ineffective.

T2 remedies the statute by deleting the time limitations on the recovery of costs and by providing that the court may in its discretion determine the commencement date of the running of administrative costs on a case by case basis.

I.—OTHER PROVISIONS

Section 901. Required Content of Notices. Section 7522 (Content of tax due, deficiency, and other notices.) requires the IRS to clarify certain notices by identifying and describing the basis for any tax due, as well as any interest and penalties assessed. However, the IRS is not required to separately set forth, in the notice, the components and explanation for each adjustment.

T2 will amend section 7522 to require that the IRS set forth the components and explanation for each specific adjustment which is the basis for the total tax deficiency.

Section 902. Relief from Retroactive Application of Treasury Department Regulations. T2 will generally require that temporary and proposed regulations issued by the Treasury Department are to effective prospectively from the date of filing with the Federal Register except: (1) temporary or proposed regulations may take effect from the date any notice which substantially describes the regulation is issued to the public, (2) Congress may explicitly authorize Treasury to prescribe the effective date, (3) Treasury may issue retroactive temporary or proposed regulations to prevent abuse of the statute, (4) Treasury may issue retroactive temporary, proposed, or final regulations to correct a procedural defect in the issuance of a regulation, (5) Treasury may provide that taxpayers may elect to apply a temporary or proposed regulation retroactively.

Effective date.—The provision applies with respect to any temporary or proposed regulation published on or after January 5, 1993, and any temporary or proposed regulation published before January 5, 1993, and published as a final regulation after that date.

Section 903. Required Notice of Certain Payments. T2 will provide that, if the IRS receives a payment from a taxpayer and cannot associate that payment with any outstanding tax liability, then the IRS must make reasonable efforts to notify the taxpayer of such inability within 60 days after receipt of such payment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as many taxpayers are struggling in the midst of the current tax filing season, the issue of taxpayer's rights takes on a special importance. Although most IRS employees provide valuable and responsible service, taxpayer abuse by the Government is an ongoing problem. With this in mind, I am very happy to be joining Senator PRYOR and others in reintroducing the taxpayer bill of rights II. This is very necessary legislation that builds upon the original taxpayer bill of rights that we passed into law in 1988.

I was unable to be here earlier today when the bill was introduced because I was taking part in the President's signing ceremony of the Congressional Accountability Act, of which I am the lead Senate sponsor. But, I'm glad to be here now to offer my strong support to this ongoing effort.

Mr. President, for me, the long process of trying to ensure taxpayer protections began in the early 1980's, when I was a member and then chairman of the Finance Subcommittee on IRS Oversight. We made progress, but it was only the beginning.

Senator PRYOR continued the cause when he succeeded me as chairman in 1987. At that time, he took the initiative and asked me to work with him in pushing for a taxpayer bill of rights by expanding legislation I and others had introduced. It took nearly 2 years, but we ultimately succeeded in achieving this goal.

We now have a 6-year record of implementation regarding the taxpayer bill of rights. Great strides toward taxpayer protection were achieved through this legislation. However, the taxpayer bill of rights of 1988 was never expected to be the final chapter of the book on taxpayer protection. It was a major step in the continuing process of stamping out taxpayer abuse. And that process continues today, as we look into ways to improve the current law.

In reviewing the record, it's clear that much more needs to be done. There's no question that breakdowns in implementing the law have occurred, and there are gaps in the law that need to be filled. For instance, we believe the current ombudsman position is too limited and too beholden to IRS insiders. Our legislation will turn the ombudsman into a more independent office of taxpayer advocate that will have expanded powers to help taxpayers.

We were successful in passing a very similar proposal through the Congress in 1992. However, the underlying legislation that the proposal was attached to was vetoed by President Bush. So, we're back again in this new Congress.

Since 1987, Senator PRYOR and I have worked in a cooperative, bipartisan effort to further taxpayer rights. As our roles change somewhat in this new Republican-controlled Congress, I hope to continue our successful teamwork.

Beyond the introduction of this bill today, Senator PRYOR and I will be working on further improvements and even more protaxpayer provisions that will be offered at a later date.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort to help make the IRS more responsible and more accountable to the taxpayers of this country.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 260. A bill to provide for the protection of books and materials from the Library of Congress, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BOOK PROTECTION ACT

• Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I introduce legislation to help protect the valuable resources of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress Protection Act will help the Library of Congress stop abuses of its free book loan program by authorizing the Library to impose fines for books that are long overdue.

I am reintroducing this legislation to empower Library of Congress officials to crack down on individuals who seriously abuse their Library privileges, by keeping books too long or failing to return them. Library of Congress officials should not have to tolerate the fact that many individuals are apparently unconcerned about returning the books that taxpayers provide for them. Congress should not prevent the Library from instituting strengthened policies to hold severely delinquent borrowers responsible for their tardiness.

This legislation will enable the Library of Congress to implement a reasonable overdue book charge policy similar to those of most public libraries across America. By doing so, the many Members of Congress, congressional staffers, and executive branch employees who benefit from this magnificent institution will have an added incentive to comply with the generous loan policies of the Library of Congress.

This proposal is very basic, but it will afford Library officials the leverage and flexibility they need to address this problem. This bill will help Library of Congress officials keep better track of their resources, and will spur many delinquent borrowers to return the books that taxpayers provide for them completely free of charge.

The Library of Congress Book Protection Act would direct the Library to implement an overdue book charge policy for books improperly held over 70 days. These individuals or offices will have their privileges suspended until their fines are paid in full. Library of Congress officials will, however, be able to waive such penalties when appropriate. The Library would also be authorized to retain the funds received from late book fines, as well. Finally, the offices of severely delinquent borrowers and the fines they owe will be published in the annual report submitted by the Library to its oversight committees.

Figures published by the Library during the 103d Congress showed that out of the 20,000 books that were out on loan, over one-third were listed as overdue. One half of the 4,200 books on loan to congressional staff and the media were listed as overdue, and one in five books out on loan to Members, committees, and congressional support agencies had been overdue for more than 2 months. Library of Congress officials state that over 300,000 books are

missing from their collections dating back to 1978, and the estimated cost of these thefts is \$12 million.

I am concerned about the fact that it is all too easy for individuals to disregard their responsibility to return books to the Library of Congress in a timely manner. This negligence is not only unfair to the other users of the Library, but it also drains the Library's resources in chasing down overdue or missing books.

In addition to Members of Congress and congressional staff, the Library of Congress also makes loans to executive branch departments and agencies, the judiciary and diplomatic corps, the press, and other institutions. As I have mentioned, Mr. President, the Library of Congress is barred from charging late fees for overdue books in contrast to virtually every other publicly funded library in America. Furthermore, the Library cannot retain any funds that might be collected due to the loss or damage of loaned books. It's clearly time to change these unwise restrictions and strengthen the Library's ability to protect its resources, and I hope Members of the Senate will support this legislation to do so.

Surely it's not asking too much of the individuals and offices fortunate enough to use the Library of Congress to do so in a responsible manner. Even under the new borrowing guidelines that would be instituted by this legislation, there really is no reason for any well-intentioned borrower ever to have to pay late fines or have their privileges suspended. I'm optimistic that the mere specter of having to pay overdue book fines will coax delinquent borrowers into responsibility renewing their book loans or returning the books.

I hope that the Senate will adopt this legislation to implement prudent new guidelines in the book loan policies of the Library of Congress. •

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to award grants to States to promote the development of alternative dispute resolution systems for medical malpractice claims, to generate knowledge about such systems through expert data gathering and assessment activities, to promote uniformity and to curb excesses in State liability systems through federally-mandated liability reforms, and for other purposes.

S. 45

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Helium Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to sell Federal real and personal property held in connection with activities carried out under the Helium Act, and for other purposes.

S. 108

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 108, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the energy investment credit for solar energy and geothermal property against the entire regular tax and the alternative minimum tax.

S. 121

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 121, a bill to guarantee individuals and families continued choice and control over their doctors and hospitals, to ensure that health coverage is permanent and portable, to provide equal tax treatment for all health insurance consumers, to control medical cost inflation through medical savings accounts, to reform medical liability litigation, to reduce paperwork, and for other purposes.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 172, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation for the vessel L. R. Beattie.

S. 190

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 190, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees who perform certain court reporting duties from the compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 205

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 205, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to revise and expand the prohibition on accrual of pay and allowances by members of the Armed Forces who are confined pending dishonorable discharge.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require certain Federal agencies to protect the right of private property owners, and for other purposes.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the payment of tuition for higher education and interest on student loans.

S. 249

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr.

GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to establish a 2-digit fingerprint matching identification system in order to prevent multiple enrollments by an individual for benefits under such Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that expenditures for a fiscal year shall neither exceed revenues for such fiscal year nor 19 per centum of the Nation's gross national product for the last calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], and the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 16, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant the President line-item veto authority.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

At the request of Mr. KEMPThORNE, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 17, a joint resolution naming the CVN-76 aircraft carrier as the U.S.S. *Ronald Reagan*.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting congressional terms.

AMENDMENT NO. 178

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 178 proposed to S. 1, a bill to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations; and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

HATFIELD AMENDMENT NO. 181

Mr. HATFIELD proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE V—

LOCAL EMPOWERMENT AND FLEXIBILITY

SECTION 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act of 1995".

SEC. 502. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) historically, Federal programs have addressed the Nation's problems by providing categorical financial assistance with detailed requirements relating to the use of funds;

(2) while the assistance described in paragraph (1) has been directed at critical problems, some program requirements may inadvertently impede the effective delivery of services;

(3) the Nation's local governments and private, nonprofit organizations are dealing with increasingly complex problems which require the delivery of many kinds of services;

(4) the Nation's communities are diverse, and different needs are present in different communities;

(5) it is more important than ever to provide programs that—

(A) promote more effective and efficient local delivery of services to meet the full range of needs of individuals, families, and society;

(B) respond flexibly to the diverse needs of the Nation's communities;

(C) reduce the barriers between programs that impede local governments' ability to effectively deliver services; and

(D) empower local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to be innovative in creating programs that meet the unique needs of their communities while continuing to address national policy goals; and

(6) many communities have innovative planning and community involvement strategies for providing services, but Federal, State, and local regulations often hamper full implementation of local plans.

SEC. 503. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to—

(1) enable more efficient use of Federal, State, and local resources;

(2) place less emphasis in Federal service programs on measuring resources and procedures and more emphasis on achieving Federal, State, and local policy goals;

(3) enable local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to adapt programs of Federal financial assistance to the particular needs of their communities, by—

(A) drawing upon appropriations available from more than one Federal program; and

(B) integrating programs and program funds across existing Federal financial assistance categories; and

(4) enable local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to work together and build stronger cooperative partnerships to address critical service problems.

SEC. 504. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term "approved local flexibility plan" means a local flexibility plan that combines funds from Federal, State, local government or private sources to address the service needs of a community (or any part of such a plan) that is approved by the Flexibility Council under section 505;

(2) the term "community advisory committee" means such a committee established by a local government under section 509;

(3) the term "Flexibility Council" means the council composed of the—

(A) Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy;

(B) Assistant to the President for Economic Policy;

(C) Secretary of the Treasury;

(D) Attorney General;

(E) Secretary of the Interior;

(F) Secretary of Agriculture;

(G) Secretary of Commerce;

(H) Secretary of Labor;

(I) Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(J) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(K) Secretary of Transportation;

(L) Secretary of Education;

(M) Secretary of Energy;

(N) Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

(O) Secretary of Defense;

(P) Director of Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(Q) Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(R) Director of National Drug Control Policy;

(S) Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(T) Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(U) Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(4) the term "covered Federal financial assistance program" means an eligible Federal financial assistance program that is included in a local flexibility plan of a local government;

(5) the term "eligible Federal financial assistance program"—

(A) means a Federal program under which financial assistance is available, directly or indirectly, to a local government or a qualified organization to carry out the specified program; and

(B) does not include a Federal program under which financial assistance is provided by the Federal Government directly to a beneficiary of that financial assistance or to a State as a direct payment to an individual;

(6) the term "eligible local government" means a local government that is eligible to receive financial assistance under 1 or more covered Federal programs;

(7) the term "local flexibility plan" means a comprehensive plan for the integration and administration by a local government of financial assistance provided by the Federal Government under 2 or more eligible Federal financial assistance programs;

(8) the term "local government" means a subdivision of a State that is a unit of general local government (as defined under section 6501 of title 31, United States Code);

(9) the term "priority funding" means giving higher priority (including by the assignment of extra points, if applicable) to applications for Federal financial assistance submitted by a local government having an approved local flexibility program, by—

(A) a person located in the jurisdiction of such a government; or

(B) a qualified organization eligible for assistance under a covered Federal financial assistance program included in such a plan;

(10) the term "qualified organization" means a private, nonprofit organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(11) the term "State" means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 505. PROVISION OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROVED LOCAL FLEXIBILITY PLAN.

(a) **PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts available to a local government or a qualified organization under a covered Federal financial assistance program included in an approved local flexibility plan shall be provided to and used by the local government or organization in accordance with the approved local flexibility plan.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.**—An individual or family that is eligible for benefits or services under a covered Federal financial assistance program included in an approved local flexibility plan may receive those benefits only in accordance with the approved local flexibility plan.

SEC. 506. APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A local government may submit to the Flexibility Council in accordance with this section an application for approval of a local flexibility plan.

(b) **CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.**—An application submitted under this section shall include—

(1)(A) a proposed local flexibility plan that complies with subsection (c); or

(B) a strategic plan submitted in application for designation as an enterprise community or an empowerment zone under section 1391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) certification by the chief executive of the local government, and such additional assurances as may be required by the Flexibility Council, that—

(A) the local government has the ability and authority to implement the proposed plan, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, throughout the geographic area in which the proposed plan is intended to apply; and

(B) amounts are available from non-Federal sources to pay the non-Federal share of all covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the proposed plan; and

(3) any comments on the proposed plan submitted under subsection (d) by the Governor of the State in which the local government is located;

(4) public comments on the plan including the transcript of at least 1 public hearing and comments of the appropriate community advisory committee established under section 509; and

(5) other relevant information the Flexibility Council may require to approve the proposed plan.

(c) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—A local flexibility plan submitted by a local government under this section shall include—

(1) the geographic area to which the plan applies and the rationale for defining the area;

(2) the particular groups of individuals, by service needs, economic circumstances, or other defining factors, who shall receive services and benefits under the plan;

(3)(A) specific goals and measurable performance criteria, a description of how the plan is expected to attain those goals and criteria;

(B) a description of how performance shall be measured; and

(C) a system for the comprehensive evaluation of the impact of the plan on participants, the community, and program costs;

(4) the eligible Federal financial assistance programs to be included in the plan as covered Federal financial assistance programs and the specific benefits that shall be provided under the plan under such programs, including—

(A) criteria for determining eligibility for benefits under the plan;

(B) the services available;

(C) the amounts and form (such as cash, in-kind contributions, or financial instruments) of nonservice benefits; and

(D) any other descriptive information the Flexibility Council considers necessary to approve the plan;

(5) except for the requirements under section 508(b)(3), any Federal statutory or regulatory requirement applicable under a covered Federal financial assistance program included in the plan, the waiver of which is necessary to implement the plan;

(6) fiscal control and related accountability procedures applicable under the plan;

(7) a description of the sources of all non-Federal funds that are required to carry out covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the plan;

(8) written consent from each qualified organization for which consent is required under section 506(b)(2); and

(9) other relevant information the Flexibility Council may require to approve the plan.

(d) **PROCEDURE FOR APPLYING.**—(1) To apply for approval of a local flexibility plan, a local government shall submit an application in accordance with this section to the Governor of the State in which the local government is located.

(2) A Governor who receives an application from a local government under paragraph (1) may, by no later than 30 days after the date of that receipt—

(A) prepare comments on the proposed local flexibility plan included in the application;

(B) describe any State laws which are necessary to waive for successful implementation of a local plan; and

(C) submit the application and comments to the Flexibility Council.

(3) If a Governor fails to act within 30 days after receiving an application under paragraph (2), the applicable local government may submit the application to the Flexibility Council.

SEC. 507. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY PLANS.

(a) **REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.**—Upon receipt of an application for approval of a local flexibility plan under this title, the Flexibility Council shall—

(1) approve or disapprove all or part of the plan within 45 days after receipt of the application;

(2) notify the applicant in writing of that approval or disapproval by not later than 15 days after the date of that approval or disapproval; and

(3) in the case of any disapproval of a plan, include a written justification of the reasons for disapproval in the notice of disapproval sent to the applicant.

(b) **APPROVAL.**—(1) The Flexibility Council may approve a local flexibility plan for which an application is submitted under this

title, or any part of such a plan, if a majority of members of the Council determines that—

(A) the plan or part shall improve the effectiveness and efficiency of providing benefits under covered Federal programs included in the plan by reducing administrative inflexibility, duplication, and unnecessary expenditures;

(B) the applicant local government has adequately considered, and the plan or part of the plan appropriately addresses, any effect that administration of each covered Federal program under the plan or part of the plan shall have on administration of the other covered Federal programs under that plan or part of the plan;

(C) the applicant local government has or is developing data bases, planning, and evaluation processes that are adequate for implementing the plan or part of the plan;

(D) the plan shall more effectively achieve Federal financial assistance goals at the local level and shall better meet the needs of local citizens;

(E) implementation of the plan or part of the plan shall adequately achieve the purposes of this title and of each covered Federal financial assistance program under the plan or part of the plan;

(F) the plan and the application for approval of the plan comply with the requirements of this title;

(G) the plan or part of the plan is adequate to ensure that individuals and families that receive benefits under covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the plan or part shall continue to receive benefits that meet the needs intended to be met under the program; and

(H) the local government has—

(i) waived the corresponding local laws necessary for implementation of the plan; and

(ii) sought any necessary waivers from the State.

(2) The Flexibility Council may not approve any part of a local flexibility plan if—

(A) implementation of that part would result in any increase in the total amount of obligations or outlays of discretionary appropriations or direct spending under covered Federal financial assistance programs included in that part, over the amounts of such obligations and outlays that would occur under those programs without implementation of the part; or

(B) in the case of a plan or part that applies to assistance to a qualified organization under an eligible Federal financial assistance program, the qualified organization does not consent in writing to the receipt of that assistance in accordance with the plan.

(3) The Flexibility Council shall disapprove a part of a local flexibility plan if a majority of the Council disapproves that part of the plan based on a failure of the part to comply with paragraph (1).

(4) In approving any part of a local flexibility plan, the Flexibility Council shall specify the period during which the part is effective. An approved local flexibility plan shall not be effective after the date of the termination of effectiveness of this title under section 513.

(5) Disapproval by the Flexibility Council of any part of a local flexibility plan submitted by a local government under this title shall not affect the eligibility of a local government, a qualified organization, or any individual for benefits under any Federal program.

(c) **MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.**—(1) The Flexibility Council may not approve a part of a local flexibility plan unless each

local government and each qualified organization that would receive financial assistance under the plan enters into a memorandum of understanding under this subsection with the Flexibility Council.

(2) A memorandum of understanding under this subsection shall specify all understandings that have been reached by the Flexibility Council, the local government, and each qualified organization that is subject to a local flexibility plan, regarding the approval and implementation of all parts of a local flexibility plan that are the subject of the memorandum, including understandings with respect to—

(A) all requirements under covered Federal financial assistance programs that are to be waived by the Flexibility Council under section 508(b);

(B)(i) the total amount of Federal funds that shall be provided as benefits under or used to administer covered Federal financial assistance programs included in those parts; or

(ii) a mechanism for determining that amount, including specification of the total amount of Federal funds that shall be provided or used under each covered Federal financial assistance program included in those parts;

(C) the sources of all non-Federal funds that shall be provided as benefits under or used to administer those parts;

(D) measurable performance criteria that shall be used during the term of those parts to determine the extent to which the goals and performance levels of the parts are achieved; and

(E) the data to be collected to make that determination.

(d) **LIMITATION ON CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.**—The Flexibility Council may not, as a condition of approval of any part of a local flexibility plan or with respect to the implementation of any part of an approved local flexibility plan, establish any confidentiality requirement that would—

(1) impede the exchange of information needed for the design or provision of benefits under the parts; or

(2) conflict with law.

SEC. 508. IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED LOCAL FLEXIBILITY PLANS; WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **PAYMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLAN.**—Notwithstanding any other law, any benefit that is provided under a covered Federal financial assistance program included in an approved local flexibility plan shall be paid and administered in the manner specified in the approved local flexibility plan.

(b) **WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.**—(1) Notwithstanding any other law and subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Flexibility Council may waive any requirement applicable under Federal law to the administration of, or provision of benefits under, any covered Federal assistance program included in an approved local flexibility plan, if that waiver is—

(A) reasonably necessary for the implementation of the plan; and

(B) approved by a majority of members of the Flexibility Council.

(2) The Flexibility Council may not waive a requirement under this subsection unless the Council finds that waiver of the requirement shall not result in a qualitative reduction in services or benefits for any individual or family that is eligible for benefits under a covered Federal financial assistance program.

(3) The Flexibility Council may not waive any requirement under this subsection—

(A) that enforces any constitutional or statutory right of an individual, including any right under—

(i) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(ii) section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.);

(iii) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373 et seq.);

(iv) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.); or

(v) the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

(B) for payment of a non-Federal share of funding of an activity under a covered Federal financial assistance program; or

(C) for grants received on a maintenance of effort basis.

(c) **SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.**—To the extent permitted by law, the head of each Federal agency shall seek to provide special assistance to a local government or qualified organization to support implementation of an approved local flexibility plan, including expedited processing, priority funding, and technical assistance.

(d) **EVALUATION AND TERMINATION.**—(1) A local government, in accordance with regulations issued by the Flexibility Council, shall—

(A) submit such reports on and cooperate in such audits of the implementation of its approved local flexibility plan; and

(B) periodically evaluate the effect implementation of the plan has had on—

(i) individuals who receive benefits under the plan;

(ii) communities in which those individuals live; and

(iii) costs of administering covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the plan.

(2) No later than 90 days after the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the approval by the Flexibility Council of an approved local flexibility plan of a local government, and annually thereafter, the local government shall submit to the Flexibility Council a report on the principal activities and achievements under the plan during the period covered by the report, comparing those achievements to the goals and performance criteria included in the plan under section 506(c)(3).

(3)(A) The Flexibility Council may terminate the effectiveness of an approved local flexibility plan, if the Flexibility Council, after consultation with the head of each Federal agency responsible for administering a covered Federal financial assistance program included in such, determines—

(i) that the goals and performance criteria included in the plan under section 506(c)(3) have not been met; and

(ii) after considering any experiences gained in implementation of the plan, that those goals and criteria are sound.

(B) In terminating the effectiveness of an approved local flexibility plan under this paragraph, the Flexibility Council shall allow a reasonable period of time for appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and qualified organizations to resume administration of Federal programs that are covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the plan.

(e) **FINAL REPORT; EXTENSION OF PLANS.**—

(1) No later than 45 days after the end of the effective period of an approved local flexibility plan of a local government, or at any time that the local government determines that the plan has demonstrated its worth, the local government shall submit to the Flexibility Council a final report on its implementation of the plan, including a full evaluation of the successes and shortcomings of the plan and the effects of that implementation on individuals who receive benefits under those programs.

(2) The Flexibility Council may extend the effective period of an approved local flexi-

bility plan for such period as may be appropriate, based on the report of a local government under paragraph (1).

SEC. 509. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—A local government that applies for approval of a local flexibility plan under this title shall establish a community advisory committee in accordance with this section.

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—A community advisory committee shall advise a local government in the development and implementation of its local flexibility plan, including advice with respect to—

(1) conducting public hearings; and

(2) reviewing and commenting on all community policies, programs, and actions under the plan which affect low income individuals and families, with the purpose of ensuring maximum coordination and responsiveness of the plan in providing benefits under the plan to those individuals and families.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of a community advisory committee shall—

(1) consist of—

(A) persons with leadership experience in the private and voluntary sectors;

(B) local elected officials;

(C) representatives of participating qualified organizations; and

(D) the general public; and

(2) include individuals and representatives of community organizations who shall help to enhance the leadership role of the local government in developing a local flexibility plan.

(d) **OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT BY COMMITTEE.**—Before submitting an application for approval of a final proposed local flexibility plan, a local government shall submit the final proposed plan for review and comment by a community advisory committee established by the local government.

(e) **COMMITTEE REVIEW OF REPORTS.**—Before submitting annual or final reports on an approved Federal assistance plan, a local government or private nonprofit organization shall submit the report for review and comment to the community advisory committee.

SEC. 510. TECHNICAL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—(1) The Flexibility Council may provide, or direct that the head of a Federal agency provide, technical assistance to a local government or qualified organization in developing information necessary for the design or implementation of a local flexibility plan.

(2) Assistance may be provided under this subsection if a local government makes a request that includes, in accordance with requirements established by the Flexibility Council—

(A) a description of the local flexibility plan the local government proposes to develop;

(B) a description of the groups of individuals to whom benefits shall be provided under covered Federal assistance programs included in the plan; and

(C) such assurances as the Flexibility Council may require that—

(i) in the development of the application to be submitted under this title for approval of the plan, the local government shall provide adequate opportunities to participate to—

(I) individuals and families that shall receive benefits under covered Federal financial assistance programs included in the plan; and

(II) governmental agencies that administer those programs; and

(ii) the plan shall be developed after considering fully—

(I) needs expressed by those individuals and families;

(II) community priorities; and

(III) available governmental resources in the geographic area to which the plan shall apply.

(b) **DETAILS TO COUNCIL.**—At the request of the Flexibility Council and with the approval of an agency head who is a member of the Council, agency staff may be detailed to the Flexibility Council on a nonreimbursable basis.

SEC. 511. FLEXIBILITY COUNCIL.

(a) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Flexibility Council shall—

(1) receive, review, and approve or disapprove local flexibility plans for which approval is sought under this title;

(2) upon request from an applicant for such approval, direct the head of an agency that administers a covered Federal financial assistance program under which substantial Federal financial assistance would be provided under the plan to provide technical assistance to the applicant;

(3) monitor the progress of development and implementation of local flexibility plans;

(4) perform such other functions as are assigned to the Flexibility Council by this title; and

(5) issue regulations to implement this title within 180 days after the date of its enactment.

(b) **REPORTS.**—No less than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Flexibility Council shall submit a report on the 5 Federal regulations that are most frequently waived by the Flexibility Council for local governments with approved local flexibility plans to the President and the Congress. The President shall review the report and determine whether to amend or terminate such Federal regulations.

SEC. 512. REPORT.

No later than 54 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress, a report that—

(1) describes the extent to which local governments have established and implemented approved local flexibility plans;

(2) evaluates the effectiveness of covered Federal assistance programs included in approved local flexibility plans; and

(3) includes recommendations with respect to local flexibility.

SEC. 513. CONDITIONAL TERMINATION.

This title is repealed on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless extended by the Congress through the enactment of the resolution described under section 514.

SEC. 515. JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION.**—A resolution referred to under section 513 is a joint resolution the matter after the resolving clause is as follows: "That Congress approves the application of local flexibility plans to all local governments in the United States in accordance with the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act of 1995, and that—

"(1) if the provisions of such Act have not been repealed under section 513 of such Act, such provisions shall remain in effect; and

"(2) if the repeal under section 513 of such Act has taken effect, the provisions of such Act shall be effective as though such provisions had not been repealed."

(b) **INTRODUCTION.**—No later than 30 days after the transmittal by the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress of the report required in section 512, a resolution as described under subsection (a) shall be introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, or by a Member or Members of the Senate

designated by such chairman, and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives by the Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, or by a Member or Members of the House of Representatives designated by such chairman.

(c) **REFERRAL.**—A resolution as described under subsection (a) shall be referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives. The committee shall make its recommendations to the Senate or House of Representatives within 30 calendar days of the date of such resolution's introduction.

(d) **DISCHARGE FROM COMMITTEE.**—If the committee to which a resolution is referred has not reported such resolution at the end of 30 calendar days after its introduction, that committee shall be deemed to be discharged from further consideration of such resolution and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(e) **VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.**—When the committee has reported or has been deemed to be discharged from further consideration of a resolution described under subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

(f) **RULES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE.**—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in subsection (a), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

HOLLINGS AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. HOLLINGS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, *supra*; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT OF A BALANCED BUDGET

It is the sense of the Senate—

(A) that the Congress should move to eliminate the biggest unfunded mandate—interest on the national debt, which drives the increasing federal burden on state and local governments, and

(B) that prior to adopting in the first session of the 104th Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget—

(1) the Congress set forth specific outlay and revenue changes to achieve a balanced federal budget by the year 2002; and

(2) enforce through the Congressional budget process the requirement to achieve a balanced federal budget by the year 2002.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 183

Mr. GRAHAM proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, *supra*; as follows:

On page 16, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(iii) if funded in whole or in part, a statement of whether and how the committee has created a mechanism to allocate the funding in a manner that is reasonably consistent with the expected direct costs to each State, local, and tribal government."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a technical, yet extremely important, amendment to S. 1. My amendment would require committees that choose to pay for their public sector legislative mandates to report as to "how the committee has created a mechanism to allocate the funding in a manner that is reasonably consistent with the expected direct costs to each State, local, and tribal government."

If the Congress chooses to pay for its mandates, and I believe the strong presumption should be that it do so, certainly the intent of this bill would be to have the funding reach those State, local, and tribal governments that will be impacted by the mandate rather than allocate funding State, local, and tribal governments through a random or arbitrary process.

For example, if a mandate is imposed on local school districts, it would make more sense to ensure the money reaches local school districts rather than to State education agencies. If a mandate were to have an impact on State and local government in rural areas, it would make little sense to allocate the funding to our Nation's cities.

On the other hand, if a mandate were to specifically impact the cities of our country such as Philadelphia, Seattle, Louisville, Baltimore, Houston, and New York City, why would funding be allocated to the State capitals of Harrisburg, Olympia, Frankfort, Annapolis, Austin, or Albany? To do the latter would undermine the entire purpose of this bill. While Governors Ridge, Lowry, Jones, Glendening, Bush, and Pataki might love to receive such a windfall to their State budgets, the cities could very well receive the mandate but none or very little of the funding. In fact, to pay for the mandate, the committee may very well have eliminated a Federal aid program in which cities are largely the recipient. As a result, the cities could have Federal funding cut and also receive an unfunded mandate.

In such a case, Congress may have had great intentions in funding the mandate but fail miserably in actually achieving such a worthy goal. Mayors, Governors, or whomever receives the hard mandate but phantom funds will be far angrier at the Congress than they ever were before we passed this legislation. Certainly such circumstances would undermine both this bill and our Nation's system of intergovernmental relations.

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of this legislation and fully intend to vote in favor of its passage. Some may argue that asking the committee to review and report how and whether its allocations are made in a reasonably consistent manner with the expected costs is unnecessary. They might argue that the various committees will do the right thing and accurately distribute funding.

Based on the Congress' track record of both unfunded mandates and outdated formula allocations, more attention needs to be placed on both areas by Congress. While we have heard over the last week about problems with unfunded mandates, no attention has occurred or been placed on how the Federal Government will go about compensating State, local, and tribal governments. However, as noted before, such attention is critical and fundamental to the success of this legislation.

To give you just one example, what if last year's crime bill had a requirement that all States must implement mandatory drug testing and treatment of all its imprisoned felons?

If the committee or the Congressional Budget Office were to anticipate increased numbers of imprisoned felons over a period of time and therefore increased costs over a period of years, would the funding allocation reflect the anticipated growth in the individual States? If not, what would be the impact on the budgets and policy implications for States that actively attempt to put and keep violent criminals behind bars and off the streets of this Nation? The law of unintended consequences would arise. In an attempt to get people off of drugs and squelch their propensity to commit crimes by mandating drug testing and treatment, the funding formula could effectively have the contrary effect for unfairly impacted States.

And finally and most importantly, what if the funding formulas are arbitrary or fail to allocate funding in a manner reasonably consistent with expected costs? I offer this specific example because, in last year's crime bill, the allocation formula for "Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for Prisoners" effectively allocated to some States substantially more dollars per inmate than to other States. Without compelling evidence that the former States prison inmates are more drug addicted or expensive to treat, such a formula makes no sense.

If this were to happen in a circumstance of funding a mandate rather than a block grant, the impact could be devastating. To have a partially funded mandate imposed on some States while others receive several times the funding in comparison to the cost of its mandate would undermine the intent of this legislation. While funding formulas for block grants are important and should always strive to be as fair as possible, it is imperative they be consistent with the intergovernmental location and scale when funding mandates, if we are at all concerned with achieving the stated intent of this legislation.

As a result, while my amendment would not require "fair" formulas to be established, it would require the committee to consider and explain the allocation formulas established to pay for the public sector unfunded mandates in their committee reports. Due to the importance of such allocations and

need for thorough consideration by both the committees and Congress, I urge this amendment's adoption.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 184

Mr. GRAHAM proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, *supra*; as follows:

On page 6, strike line 3 and all that follows through line 10, and insert the following:

"(ii) would reduce or eliminate the amount of authorization of appropriations for—

"(I) Federal financial assistance that would be provided to States, local governments, or tribal governments for the purpose of complying with any such previously imposed duty unless such duty is reduced or eliminated by a corresponding amount; or

"(II) the exercise of powers relating to immigration that are the responsibility or under the authority of the Federal Government and whose reduction or elimination would result in a shifting of the costs of addressing immigration expenses to the States, local governments, and tribal governments; or

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to first reaffirm my support for the objectives to S. 1 and look forward to voting for it on final passage. Many of my colleagues have discussed at length the financial impact that mandates have on their individual States or localities. I would add that mandates tie the hands of or effectively displace the priorities of political leaders in State and local government. As Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin wrote in her book entitled "Reviving the American Dream,"

The Federal Government's own weakness has not made it any less eager to tell States and localities what to do. Indeed, when its ability to make grants declined, the Federal Government turned increasingly to mandates as a way of controlling state and local activity without having to pay the bill.

Furthermore, unfunded mandates create a situation whereby voters cannot accurately ascertain where responsibility lies for certain Government actions. As Rivlin adds,

Mandates add to citizen confusion about who is in charge. When the Federal Government makes rules for State and local officials to carry out, whether or not they have the resources to do so, it is not clear to voters who should be blamed, either when the regulations are laxly enforced or when the cost of compliance is high.

As a result, I strongly support this legislation and offer the following amendment with Senators MACK, BRYAN, and BOXER to close an important loophole in the bill with respect to immigration and its impact on State and local government.

My amendment would require Congress to recognize and address the cost shift to State and local governments for any action on the floor that would delete or preempt the authorization of any Federal reimbursement program for immigration costs, such as in the Criminal Aliens Federal Responsibility Act. The amendment does not address funding levels for such programs in appropriations bills or address past immigration-related costs absorbed by State and local governments.

However, the amendment would place immigration reimbursement programs

in the same circumstance as Medicaid, the social services block grant, the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program, child nutrition, and three other Federal programs. In this bill, if any of these programs are financially capped or the Federal Government's responsibility to provide funding to State and local government is reduced and State and local government lack the authority to amend their financial or programmatic responsibilities, then such an action would trigger the definition of an unfunded mandate in the bill.

These are precisely the circumstances relating to immigration reimbursement programs such as the Criminal Aliens Federal Responsibility Act. As you will recall, the Criminal Aliens Federal Responsibility Act was successfully included in the crime bill last session by a bipartisan group of Senators in an effort to have the Federal Government address its responsibility for immigration and the costs imposed on States and localities of incarcerating criminal aliens.

According to a recent report by the Urban Institute, more than 21,000 criminal illegal immigrants are incarcerated in U.S. prisons at an annual cost of \$471 million. Educating undocumented immigrants is even more costly. More than 640,000 undocumented children are enrolled in primary and secondary schools in the United States at a cost of \$3.1 billion a year.

In a policy brief from the Governor's office this week on the impact of unfunded mandates to the State of Florida, it is estimated that State costs relating to illegal aliens including education, emergency health care, prosecution and incarceration of criminal aliens and public infrastructure. In fiscal year 1993 this unfunded mandate cost the State of Florida \$884 million.

An elimination of the authorization of such program would clearly reduce the Federal Government's responsibility to provide funding to State and local governments, while those entities have virtually no authority or ability to amend their financial or programmatic responsibilities.

In a letter to the Congress last year, the National Governors' Association wrote,

The Nation's governors have been in strong agreement that immigration policy must be based on Federal responsibility and fairness to State and local governments. As you well know, immigration policy is solely a Federal concern. Yet Federal law mandates the States to provide emergency health care and education to undocumented immigrants who reside in our States. State governments also are forced to pay for the costs of incarcerating undocumented alien criminals.

Immigration is clearly much more like mandatory or entitlement programs such as Medicaid than other discretionary programs such as transportation and housing. State and local governments do not have the discretion

to amend or restrict their financial obligations for mandatory or entitlement programs.

In fact, I would argue that the status of unreimbursed Federal immigration-related costs as an unfunded mandate is actually stronger than that of programs such as Medicaid because the Federal Government's plenary role and responsibility for immigration and border control is unchallenged. In *Traus versus Raich*, the Supreme Court ruled in 1915 that "[t]he authority to control immigration—to admit or exclude aliens—is vested solely in the Federal Government." States cannot make treaties, hire border patrol, establish naturalization policy or even set much in the way of policy with respect to providing services to illegal immigrants. Border protection and immigration are clearly Federal obligations.

The implications of my amendment would be to allow Members of Congress to raise a point or order against legislation that would reduce or eliminate the authorization of Federal immigration reimbursement programs.

For example, if legislation were introduced that imposes a Federal mandate that the Congressional Budget Office estimates to cost State and local governments \$350 million, the author of the bill could attempt to offset such costs by eliminating the authorization for the Criminal Aliens Federal Responsibility Act. Such an action would effectively pay for a federally imposed Federal mandate by shifting the full costs and responsibility for incarcerating criminal aliens to State and local governments. Such a circumstance would certainly run counter to the intent of S. 1. My amendment would clarify this loophole and allow a point of order to be raised for creating yet another unfunded mandate.

As a result, I urge the amendment's adoption.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, it has consistently been my position that the Federal Government must assume greater responsibility for the costs associated with immigration, both legal and illegal. My colleague from Florida has offered an amendment which recognizes the problem of immigration costs as an unfunded mandate, and I believe this amendment is a positive addition to the bill. Absent this amendment, S. 1 categorizes only a select few immigration costs as unfunded mandates and ignores the myriad other expenses which accrue to the States, such as education and incarceration costs. These expenses and many others would not be borne by the States. Only because the Federal Government has failed to fulfill their duty to enforce our immigration laws is this amendment necessary. I urge the adoption of the Graham amendment as an essential step in recognizing the burdens which the Federal Government's policy of abdication and default has placed upon the backs of the States.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 185

Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: () it is the sense of the Congress that the Congress shall continue its progress at reducing the annual federal deficit and, when the Congress proposes to the States a balance-budget amendment, must accompany it with financial information on its impact on the budget of each of the States.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 186

Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to amendment No. 186 proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

Strike all after "() It" and insert the following: "the sense of the Congress that the Congress should continue its progress at reducing the annual federal deficit and, when the Congress proposes to the States a balance-budget amendment, should accompany it with financial information on its impact on the budget of each of the States."

MURRAY AMENDMENTS NOS. 187–188

Mrs. MURRAY proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 187

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following: The provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act also shall not apply to any agreement between the Federal Government and a State, local, or tribal government, or the private sector for the purpose of carrying out environmental restoration or waste management activities of the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy.

AMENDMENT NO. 188

On page 21, insert between lines 13 and 14 the following new paragraph:

"(2) TIME LIMITATIONS FOR STATEMENTS.—(A) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide the statement as required by this section—

"(i) relating to a bill or resolution ordered reported by a committee, no later than one week after the date on which the bill or resolution is ordered reported by the committee; and

"(ii) relating to an amendment or conference report, no later than one day after the date on which the amendment is offered or the conference report is submitted.

"(B) Failure by the Director to meet the time limitations in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall vitiate the provisions of subsection (c)(1)(A) of this section.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 189

Mr. GRAHAM proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 33, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply to legislation considered on and after such date.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 190

Mr. HARKIN proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 50, add after line 6 the following new title:

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING
BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) social security is a contributory insurance program supported by deductions from workers' earnings and matching contributions from their employers that are deposited into an independent trust fund;

(2) over 42,000,000 Americans, including over 3,000,000 children and 5,000,000 disabled workers and their families, receive social security benefits;

(3) social security is the only pension program for 60 percent of older Americans;

(4) almost 60 percent of older beneficiaries depend on social security for at least half of their income and 25 percent depend on social security for at least 90 percent of their income;

(5) without social security an additional 15,000,000 Americans, mostly senior citizens, would be thrown into poverty;

(6) 138,000,000 American workers participate in the social security system and are insured in case of retirement, disability, or death;

(7) social security is a contract between workers and the Government;

(8) social security is a self-financed program that is not contributing to the current Federal budget deficit; in fact, the social security trust funds currently have over \$400,000,000,000 in reserves and that surplus will increase during fiscal year 1995 alone by an additional \$70,000,000,000;

(9) this surplus is necessary to pay monthly benefits for current and future beneficiaries;

(10) recognizing that social security is a self-financed program, Congress took social security completely "off-budget" in 1990; however, unless social security is explicitly excluded from a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution, such an amendment would, in effect, put the program back into the Federal budget by referring to all spending and receipts in calculating whether the budget is in balance;

(11) raiding the social security trust funds to reduce the Federal budget deficit would be devastating to both current and future beneficiaries and would further undermine confidence in the system among younger workers;

(12) the American people in poll after poll have overwhelmingly rejected cutting social security benefits to reduce the Federal deficit and balance the budget; and

(13) social security beneficiaries throughout the nation are gravely concerned that their financial security is in jeopardy because of possible social security cuts and deserve to be reassured that their benefits will not be subject to cuts that would likely be required should social security not be excluded from a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is a sense of the Senate that any joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution passed by the Senate shall specifically exclude social security from the calculations used to determine if the Federal budget is in balance.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 191

Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25 the following new section:

"(4) DETERMINATION BY REPORTING COMMITTEE OF APPLICABILITY TO PENDING LEGISLATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, resolution, or conference

report if such report includes a determination by the reporting committee that the pending measure is needed to serve a compelling national interest that furthers the public health, safety, or welfare.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 192

Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25, the following new section:

(4) APPLICATION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (c)(1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if such provision relates to a requirement for the treatment or disposal of—

(A) high-level radioactive waste, low-level radioactive waste, or spent nuclear fuel (as such terms are defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101)); or

(B) byproduct material or transuranic waste (as such terms are defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, (42 U.S.C. 2014)).

KOHL AMENDMENT NO. 193

Mr. KOHL proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:
Nothing in this Act, shall preclude a State, local, or tribal government that already complies with all or part of the Federal intergovernmental mandates included in the bill, joint resolution amendment, motion, or conference report from consideration for Federal funding for the cost of the mandate, including the costs the State local or tribal government is currently paying and any additional costs necessary to meet the mandate.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 25, add after line 25, the following new section:

(4) APPLICATION TO PROVISIONS RELATING TO OR ADMINISTERED BY INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCIES.—

Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (c)(1)(B), it shall always be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if such provision relates to or will be administered by any independent regulatory agency.

GLENN AMENDMENT NO. 195

Mr. GLENN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Mandate Accountability and Reform Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and States, local governments, and tribal governments;

(2) to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on States, local governments, and tribal governments without adequate Federal funding, in a manner that may displace other essential State, local, and tribal governmental priorities;

(3) to assist Congress in its consideration of proposed legislation establishing or revis-

ing Federal programs containing Federal mandates affecting States, local governments, tribal governments, and the private sector by—

(A) providing for the development of information about the nature and size of mandates in proposed legislation; and

(B) establishing a mechanism to bring such information to the attention of the Senate before the Senate votes on proposed legislation;

(4) to promote informed and deliberate decisions by Congress on the appropriateness of Federal mandates in any particular instances;

(5) to establish a point-of-order vote on the consideration in the Senate of legislation containing significant Federal mandates; and

(6) to assist Federal agencies in their consideration of proposed regulations affecting States, local governments, and tribal governments, by—

(A) requiring that Federal agencies develop a process to enable the elected and other officials of States, local governments, and tribal governments to provide input when Federal agencies are developing regulations; and

(B) requiring that Federal agencies prepare and consider better estimates of the budgetary impact of regulations containing Federal mandates upon States, local governments, and tribal governments before adopting such regulations, and ensuring that small governments are given special consideration in that process.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) FEDERAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATE.—The term "Federal intergovernmental mandate" means—

(A) any provision in a bill or joint resolution before Congress or in a proposed or final Federal regulation that—

(i) would impose a duty upon States, local governments, or tribal governments that is enforceable by administrative, civil, or criminal penalty or by injunction (other than a condition of Federal assistance or a duty arising from participation in a voluntary Federal program, except as provided in subparagraph (B)); or

(ii) would reduce or eliminate the amount of authorization of appropriations for Federal financial assistance that would be provided to States, local governments, or tribal governments for the purpose of complying with any such previously imposed duty; or

(B) any provision in a bill or joint resolution before Congress or in a proposed or final Federal regulation that relates to a then-existing Federal program under which \$500,000,000 or more is provided annually to States, local governments, and tribal governments under entitlement authority (as defined in section 3(9) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(9))), if—

(i) the bill or joint resolution or regulation would increase the stringency of conditions of assistance to States, local governments, or tribal governments under the program; or

(ii) would place caps upon, or otherwise decrease, the Federal Government's responsibility to provide funding to States, local governments, or tribal governments under the program; and

(i) the States, local governments, or tribal governments that participate in the Federal program lack authority under that program to amend their financial or programmatic responsibilities to continue providing required services that are affected by the bill or joint resolution or regulation.

(2) FEDERAL PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATE.—The term "Federal private sector mandate"

means any provision in a bill or joint resolution before Congress that—

(A) would impose a duty upon the private sector that is enforceable by administrative, civil, or criminal penalty or by injunction (other than a condition of Federal assistance or a duty arising from participation in a voluntary Federal program); or

(B) would reduce or eliminate the amount of authorization of appropriations for Federal financial assistance that will be provided to the private sector for the purpose of complying with any such duty.

(3) FEDERAL MANDATE.—The term "Federal mandate" means a Federal intergovernmental mandate or a Federal private sector mandate, as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) DIRECT COSTS.—

(A) FOR A FEDERAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATE.—In the case of a Federal intergovernmental mandate, the term "direct costs" means the aggregate estimated amounts that all States, local governments, and tribal governments would be required to spend in order to comply with the Federal intergovernmental mandate, or, in the case of a bill or joint resolution referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), the amount of Federal financial assistance eliminated or reduced.

(B) FOR A FEDERAL PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATE.—In the case of a Federal private sector mandate, the term "direct costs" means the aggregate amounts that the private sector will be required to spend in order to comply with the Federal private sector mandate.

(C) NOT INCLUDED.—The term "direct costs" does not include—

(i) estimated amounts that the States, local governments, and tribal governments (in the case of a Federal intergovernmental mandate), or the private sector (in the case of a Federal private sector mandate), would spend—

(I) to comply with or carry out all applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal laws and regulations adopted before the adoption of the Federal mandate; or

(II) to continue to carry out State, local governmental, and tribal governmental programs, or private-sector business or other activities established at the time of adoption of the Federal mandate; or

(ii) expenditures to the extent that they will be offset by any direct savings to be enjoyed by the States, local governments, and tribal governments, or by the private sector, as a result of—

(I) their compliance with the Federal mandate; or

(II) other changes in Federal law or regulation that are enacted or adopted in the same bill or joint resolution or proposed or final Federal regulation and that govern the same activity as is affected by the Federal mandate.

(D) ASSUMPTION.—Direct costs shall be determined on the assumption that States, local governments, tribal governments, and the private sector will take all reasonable steps necessary to mitigate the costs resulting from the Federal mandate, and will comply with applicable standards of practice and conduct established by recognized professional or trade associations.

(5) AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The term "amount" with respect to an authorization of appropriations for Federal financial assistance means—

(A) the amount of budget authority (as defined in section 3(2)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(2)(A))) of any Federal grant assistance; and

(B) the subsidy amount (as defined as "cost" in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)(a))) of

any Federal program providing loan guarantees or direct loans.

(6) **PRIVATE SECTOR.**—The term “private sector” means individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, business trusts, or legal representatives, organized groups of individuals, and educational and other non-profit institutions.

(7) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—

(A) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning stated in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code, but does not include independent regulatory agencies, as defined by section 3502(10) of title 44, United States Code.

(B) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(C) **LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “local government” has the same meaning as in section 6501(6) of title 31, United States Code.

(D) **REGULATION OR RULE.**—The term “regulation” or “rule” has the meaning of “rule” as defined in section 601(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(E) **SMALL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “small government” means any small governmental jurisdiction as defined in section 601(5) of title 5, United States Code, and any tribal government.

(F) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the same meaning as in section 6501(9) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. EXCLUSIONS.

This Act shall not apply to any provision in a bill or joint resolution before Congress and any provision in a proposed or final Federal regulation that—

(1) enforces constitutional rights of individuals;

(2) establishes or enforces any statutory rights that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, religion, gender, national origin, or handicapped or disability status;

(3) requires compliance with accounting and auditing procedures with respect to grants or other money or property provided by the United States Government;

(4) provides for emergency assistance or relief at the request of any State, local government, or tribal government or any official of any of them;

(5) is necessary for the national security or the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations; or

(6) the President designates as emergency legislation and that the Congress so designates in statute.

SEC. 5. AGENCY ASSISTANCE.

Each agency shall provide to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office such information and assistance as he may reasonably request to assist him in performing his responsibilities under this Act.

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REFORM

SEC. 101. DUTIES OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

(a) **COMMITTEE REPORT.**—

(1) **REGARDING FEDERAL MANDATES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—When a committee of authorization of the House of Representatives or the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution of public character that includes any Federal mandate, the committee shall issue a report to accompany the bill or joint resolution containing the information required by subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(B) **REPORTS ON FEDERAL MANDATES.**—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall contain—

(i) an identification and description, prepared in consultation with the Director, of any Federal mandates in the bill or joint resolution, including the expected direct costs to States, local governments, and tribal governments, and to the private sector, required to comply with the Federal mandates; and

(ii) a qualitative, and if possible, a quantitative assessment of costs and benefits anticipated from the Federal mandates (including the enhancement of health and safety and the protection of the natural environment).

(C) **INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATES.**—If any of the Federal mandates in the bill or joint resolution are Federal intergovernmental mandates, the report required by subparagraph (A) shall also contain—

(i)(I) a statement of the amount, if any, of increase in authorization of appropriations under existing Federal financial assistance programs, or of authorization of appropriations for new Federal financial assistance, provided by the bill or joint resolution and usable for activities of States, local governments, or tribal governments subject to the Federal intergovernmental mandates; and

(II) a statement of whether the committee intends that the Federal intergovernmental mandates be partly or entirely unfunded, and if so, the reasons for that intention;

(ii) any existing sources of Federal assistance in addition to those identified in clause (i) that may assist States, local governments, and tribal governments in meeting the direct costs of the Federal intergovernmental mandates; and

(iii) an identification of one or more of the following: reductions in authorization of existing appropriations, a reduction in direct spending, or an increase in receipts (consistent with the amount identified in clause (i)(I)).

(2) **PREEMPTION CLARIFICATION AND INFORMATION.**—When a committee of authorization of the House of Representatives or the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution of public character, the committee report accompanying the bill or joint resolution shall contain, if relevant to the bill or joint resolution, an explicit statement on the extent to which the bill or joint resolution preempts any State, local, or tribal law, and, if so, an explanation of the reasons for such preemption.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF BILLS TO THE DIRECTOR.**—When a committee of authorization of the House of Representatives or the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution of a public character, the committee shall promptly provide the bill or joint resolution to the Director and shall identify to the Director any Federal mandates contained in the bill or resolution.

(c) **PUBLICATION OF STATEMENT FROM THE DIRECTOR.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receiving a statement (including any supplemental statement) from the Director pursuant to section 102(c), a committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate shall publish the statement in the committee report accompanying the bill or joint resolution to which the statement relates if the statement is available soon enough to be included in the printed report.

(2) **IF NOT INCLUDED.**—If the statement is not published in the report, or if the bill or joint resolution to which the statement relates is expected to be considered by the House of Representatives or the Senate before the report is published, the committee shall cause the statement, or a summary thereof, to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration of the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 102. DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR.

(a) **STUDIES.**—

(1) **PROPOSED LEGISLATION.**—As early as practicable in each new Congress, any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate which anticipates that the committee will consider any proposed legislation establishing, amending, or reauthorizing any

Federal program likely to have a significant budgetary impact on States, local governments, or tribal governments, or likely to have a significant financial impact on the private sector, including any legislative proposal submitted by the executive branch likely to have such a budgetary or financial impact, shall request that the Director initiate a study of the proposed legislation in order to develop information that may be useful in analyzing the costs of any Federal mandates that may be included in the proposed legislation.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

(A) solicit and consider information or comments from elected officials (including their designated representatives) of States, local governments, tribal governments, designated representatives of the private sector, and such other persons as may provide helpful information or comments;

(B) consider establishing advisory panels of elected officials (including their designated representatives) of States, local governments, tribal governments, designated representatives of the private sector, and other persons if the Director determines, in the Director's discretion, that such advisory panels would be helpful in performing the Director's responsibilities under this section; and

(C) consult with the relevant committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The Director shall, at the request of any committee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, consult with and assist such committee in analyzing the budgetary or financial impact of any proposed legislation that may have—

(1) a significant budgetary impact on State, local, or tribal governments; or

(2) a significant financial impact on the private sector.

(c) **STATEMENTS ON NONAPPROPRIATIONS BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.**—

(1) **FEDERAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATES IN REPORTED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.**—For each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of authorization of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, the Director shall prepare and submit to the committee a statement as follows:

(A) **DIRECT COSTS AT OR BELOW THRESHOLD.**—If the Director estimates that the direct costs of all Federal intergovernmental mandates in the bill or joint resolution will not equal or exceed \$50,000,000 (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) in the fiscal year in which any Federal intergovernmental mandate in the bill or joint resolution (or in any necessary implementing regulation) would first be effective or in any of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, the Director shall so state and shall briefly explain the basis of the estimate.

(B) **DIRECT COSTS ABOVE THRESHOLD.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Director estimates that the direct costs of all Federal intergovernmental mandates in the bill or joint resolution will equal or exceed \$50,000,000 (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) in the fiscal year in which any Federal intergovernmental mandate in the bill or joint resolution (or in any necessary implementing regulation) would first be effective or in any of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, the Director shall so state, specify the estimate, and briefly explain the basis of the estimate.

(ii) **ESTIMATES.**—The estimate required by clause (i) shall include—

(I) estimates (and brief explanations of the basis of the estimates) of—

(aa) the total amount of direct costs of complying with the Federal intergovernmental mandates in the bill or joint resolution; and

(bb) the amount, if any, of increase in authorization of appropriations under existing Federal financial assistance programs, or of authorization of appropriations for new Federal financial assistance, provided by the bill or joint resolution and usable by States, local governments, or tribal governments for activities subject to the Federal intergovernmental mandates;

(II) estimates, if and to the extent that the Director determines that accurate estimates are reasonably feasible, of—

(aa) future direct costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates to the extent that they significantly differ from or extend beyond the 5-year time period referred to in clause (i); and

(bb) any disproportionate budgetary effects of Federal intergovernmental mandates and of any Federal financial assistance in the bill or joint resolution upon any particular regions of the country or particular States, local governments, tribal governments, or urban or rural or other types of communities; and

(III) any amounts appropriated in the prior fiscal year to fund the activities subject to the Federal intergovernmental mandate.

(2) **FEDERAL PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATES IN REPORTED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.**—For each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of authorization of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, the Director shall prepare and submit to the committee a statement as follows:

(A) **DIRECT COSTS AT OR BELOW THRESHOLD.**—If the Director estimates that the direct costs of all Federal private sector mandates in the bill or joint resolution will not equal or exceed \$200,000,000 (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) in the fiscal year in which any Federal private sector mandate in the bill or joint resolution (or in any necessary implementing regulation) would first be effective or in any of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, the Director shall so state and shall briefly explain the basis of the estimate.

(B) **DIRECT COSTS ABOVE THRESHOLD.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Director estimates that the direct costs of all Federal private sector mandates in the bill or joint resolution will equal or exceed \$200,000,000 (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) any Federal private sector mandate in the bill or joint resolution (or in any necessary implementing regulation) would first be effective or in any of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, the Director shall so state and shall briefly explain the basis of the estimate.

(ii) **ESTIMATES.**—Estimates required by this subparagraph shall include—

(I) estimates (and a brief explanation of the basis of the estimates) of—

(aa) the total amount of direct costs of complying with the Federal private sector mandates in the bill or joint resolution; and

(bb) the amount, if any, of increase in authorization of appropriations under existing Federal financial assistance programs, or of authorization of appropriations for new Federal financial assistance, provided by the bill or joint resolution and usable by the private sector for activities subject to the Federal private sector mandates;

(II) estimates, if and to the extent that the Director determines that such estimates are reasonably feasible, of—

(aa) future costs of Federal private sector mandates to the extent that they differ sig-

nificantly from or extend beyond the 5-year time period referred to in clause (i);

(bb) any disproportionate financial effects of Federal private sector mandates and of any Federal financial assistance in the bill or joint resolution upon particular industries or sectors of the economy, States, regions, and urban or rural or other types of communities; and

(cc) the effect of Federal private sector mandates in the bill or joint resolution on the national economy, including on productivity, economic growth, full employment, creation of productive jobs, and international competitiveness of American goods and services; and

(III) any amounts appropriated in the prior fiscal year to fund activities subject to the Federal private sector mandate.

(C) **FAILURE TO MAKE ESTIMATE.**—If the Director determines that it is not reasonably feasible for him to make a reasonable estimate that would be required by subparagraphs (A) and (B) with respect to Federal private sector mandates, the Director shall not make the estimate, but shall report in his statement that the reasonable estimate cannot be reasonably made and shall include the reasons for that determination in the statement.

(3) **AMENDED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS; CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—If the Director has prepared a statement that includes the determination described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) for a bill or joint resolution, and if that bill or joint resolution is passed in an amended form (including if passed by one House as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the language of a bill or joint resolution from the other House) or is reported by a committee of conference in an amended form, the committee of conference shall ensure, to the greatest extent practicable, that the Director prepare a supplemental statement for the bill or joint resolution. The requirements of section 103 shall not apply to the publication of any supplemental statement prepared under this subsection.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Congressional Budget Office to carry out the provisions of this Act \$6,000,000, for each of the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

(e) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

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

(2) by striking “(a)”;

(3) by striking subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 103. POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution that is reported by any committee of authorization of the Senate unless, based upon a ruling of the presiding Officer—

(1) the committee has published a statement of the Director in accordance with section 101(c) prior to such consideration; and

(2) in the case of a bill or joint resolution containing Federal intergovernmental mandates, either—

(A) the direct costs of all Federal intergovernmental mandates in the bill or joint resolution are estimated not to equal or exceed \$50,000,000 (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) in the fiscal year in which any Federal intergovernmental mandate in the bill or joint resolution (or in any necessary implementing regulation) would first be effective or in any of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, or

(B)(i) the amount of the increase in authorization of appropriations under existing Federal financial assistance programs, or of authorization of appropriations for new Federal financial assistance, provided by the bill or joint resolution and usable by States, local governments, or tribal governments for activities subject to the Federal intergovernmental mandates is at least equal to the estimated amount of direct costs of the Federal intergovernmental mandates; and

(ii) the committee of jurisdiction has identified in the bill or joint resolution one or more of the following: a reduction in authorization of existing appropriations, a reduction in direct spending, or an increase in receipts (consistent with the amount identified in clause (i)).

(b) **WAIVER.**—The point of order under subsection (a) may be waived in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting (provided that a quorum is present) or by the unanimous consent of the Senate.

(c) **AMENDMENT TO RAISE AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.**—Notwithstanding the terms of subsection (a), it shall not be out of order pursuant to this section to consider a bill or joint resolution to which an amendment is proposed and agreed to that would raise the amount of authorization of appropriations to a level sufficient to satisfy the requirements of subsection (a)(2)(B)(i) and that would amend an identification referred to in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii) to satisfy the requirements of that subsection, nor shall it be out of order to consider such an amendment.

SEC. 104. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The provisions of sections 101, 102, 103, and 105 are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of such House, respectively, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of each House.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to bills and joint resolutions reported by committee on or after October 1, 1996.

TITLE II—REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY AND REFORM

SEC. 201. REGULATORY PROCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each agency shall, to the extent permitted in law, assess the effects of Federal regulations on States, local governments, and tribal governments (other than to the extent that such regulations incorporate requirements specifically set forth in legislation), including specifically the availability of resources to carry out any Federal intergovernmental mandates in those regulations, and seek to minimize those burdens that uniquely or significantly affect such governmental entities, consistent with achieving statutory and regulatory objectives.

(b) **STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENT INPUT.**—Each agency shall, to the extent permitted in law, develop an effective process to permit elected officials (including their designated representatives) and other representatives of States, local governments, and tribal governments to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant Federal intergovernmental mandates. Such a process shall be consistent with all applicable laws.

(c) **AGENCY PLAN.**—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before establishing any regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments, agencies shall have developed a plan under which the agency shall—

(A) provide notice of the contemplated requirements to potentially affected small governments, if any;

(B) enable officials of affected small governments to provide input pursuant to subsection (b); and

(C) inform, educate, and advise small governments on compliance with the requirements.

(2) AUTHORIZATION.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each agency to carry out the provisions of this section, and for no other purpose, such sums as are necessary.

SEC. 202. STATEMENTS TO ACCOMPANY SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before promulgating any final rule that includes any Federal intergovernmental mandates that may result in the expenditure by States, local governments, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, of \$100,000,000 or more (adjusted annually for inflation by the Consumer Price Index) in any 1 year, and before promulgating any general notice of proposed rulemaking that is likely to result in promulgation of any such rule, the agency shall prepare a written statement containing—

(1) estimates by the agency, including the underlying analysis, of the anticipated costs to States, local governments, and tribal governments of complying with the Federal intergovernmental mandates, and of the extent to which such costs may be paid with funds provided by the Federal Government or otherwise paid through Federal financial assistance;

(2) estimates by the agency, if and to the extent that the agency determines that accurate estimates are reasonably feasible, of—

(A) the future costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates; and

(B) any disproportionate budgetary effects of the Federal intergovernmental mandates upon any particular regions of the country or particular States, local governments, tribal governments, urban or rural or other types of communities;

(3) a qualitative, and if possible, a quantitative assessment of costs and benefits anticipated from the Federal intergovernmental mandates (such as the enhancement of health and safety and the protection of the natural environment); and

(4)(A) a description of the extent of any input to the agency from elected representatives (including their designated representatives) of the affected States, local governments, and tribal governments and of other affected parties;

(B) a summary of the comments and concerns that were presented by States, local governments, or tribal governments either orally or in writing to the agency;

(C) a summary of the agency's evaluation of those comments and concerns; and

(D) the agency's position supporting the need to issue the regulation containing the Federal intergovernmental mandates (considering, among other things, the extent to which costs may or may not be paid with funds provided by the Federal Government).

(b) PROMULGATION.—In promulgating a general notice of proposed rulemaking or a final rule for which a statement under subsection (a) is required, the agency shall include in the promulgation a summary of the information contained in the statement.

(c) PREPARATION IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER STATEMENT.—Any agency may prepare any statement required by subsection (a) in conjunction with or as a part of any

other statement or analysis, provided that the statement or analysis satisfies the provisions of subsection (a).

SEC. 203. ASSISTANCE TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall collect from agencies the statements prepared under section 202 and periodically forward copies of them to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on a reasonably timely basis after promulgation of the general notice of proposed rulemaking or of the final rule for which the statement was prepared.

SEC. 204. PILOT PROGRAM ON SMALL GOVERNMENT FLEXIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with Federal agencies, shall establish pilot programs in at least 2 agencies to test innovative, and more flexible regulatory approaches that—

(1) reduce reporting and compliance burdens on small governments; and

(2) meet overall statutory goals and objectives.

(b) PROGRAM FOCUS.—The pilot programs shall focus on rules in effect or proposed rules, or a combination thereof.

TITLE III—BASELINE STUDY

SEC. 301. BASELINE STUDY OF COSTS AND BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of the Census, in consultation with the Director, shall begin a study to examine the measurement and definition issues involved in calculating the total costs and benefits to States, local governments, and tribal governments of compliance with Federal law.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study required by this section shall consider—

(1) the feasibility of measuring indirect costs and benefits as well as direct costs and benefits of the Federal, State, local, and tribal relationship; and

(2) how to measure both the direct and indirect benefits of Federal financial assistance and tax benefits to States, local governments and tribal governments.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of the Census to carry out the purposes of this title, and for no other purpose, \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

TITLE IV—JUDICIAL REVIEW; SUNSET

SEC. 401. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Any statement or report prepared under this Act, and any compliance or noncompliance with the provisions of this Act, and any determination concerning the applicability of the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to judicial review. The provisions of this Act shall not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person in any administrative or judicial action. No ruling or determination under this Act shall be considered by any court in determining the intent of Congress or for any other purpose.

SEC. 402. SUNSET.

This Act shall expire December 31, 1998.

KEMPTHORNE AMENDMENT NO. 196

Mr. KEMPTHORNE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, supra; as follows:

Strike all after the word "That" and insert the following:

(1) social security is supported by taxes deducted from workers' earnings and matching deductions from their employers that are deposited into independent trust funds;

(2) over 42,000,000 Americans, including over 3,000,000 children and 5,000,000 disabled

workers and their families, receive social security benefits;

(3) social security is the only pension program for 60 percent of older Americans;

(4) almost 60 percent of older beneficiaries depend on social security for at least half of their income and 25 percent depend on social security for at least 90 percent of their income;

(5) 138,000,000 American workers pay taxes into the social security system;

(6) social security is currently a self-financed program that is not contributing to the Federal budget deficit; in fact, the social security trust funds now have over \$400,000,000,000 in reserves and that surplus will increase during fiscal year 1995 alone by an additional \$70,000,000,000;

(7) these current reserves will be necessary to pay monthly benefits for current and future beneficiaries when the annual surpluses turn to deficits after 2018;

(8) recognizing that social security is currently a self-financed program, Congress in 1990 established a "firewall" to prevent a raid on the social security trust funds;

(9) raiding the social security trust funds would further undermine confidence in the system among younger workers;

(10) the American people overwhelmingly reject arbitrary cuts in social security benefits; and

(11) social security beneficiaries throughout the nation deserve to be reassured that their benefits will not be subject to cuts and their social security payroll taxes will not be increased as a result of legislation to implement a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any legislation required to implement a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution shall specifically prevent social security benefits from being reduced or social security taxes from being increased to meet the balanced budget requirement.

GLENN AMENDMENT NO. 197

Mr. GLENN proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 21, strike beginning with line 16 through line 4 on page 22 and insert the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) STATEMENT REQUIRED FOR REPORTED BILL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate, after third reading or at any other time when no further amendments are in order, to consider any bill or joint resolution that is reported by a committee unless the committee has published a statement of the Director on the direct costs of Federal mandates in accordance with subsection (a)(6) before such consideration.

"(B) LEGISLATION OR THRESHOLD.—(i) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report—

"(I) after third reading or at any other time when no further amendments are in order, if the enactment of such bill or resolution as amended; or

"(II) if such bill or resolution in the form recommended by such conference report differs from the bill or resolution as passed by the Senate, and if the enactment of such bill or resolution in the form recommended in such conference report,

would increase the direct costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates by an amount that causes the thresholds specified in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) to be exceeded, unless the conditions specified in clause (ii) are satisfied.

“(ii) The conditions referred to in clause (i) shall be satisfied if—

Redesignate the clause following accordingly.

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 198

Mr. MCCAIN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1, *supra*; as follows:

On page 25, strike lines 7 through 10, and insert the following:

“(3) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall not apply to any bill or resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives; but

(B) shall apply to—

(i) Any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal inter-governmental mandate contained in any bill or resolution reported by such Committee;

(ii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal inter-governmental mandate contained in any amendment offered to a bill or resolution reported by such Committee;

(iii) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal inter-governmental mandate in a conference report accompanying a bill or resolution reported by such Committee; and

(iv) any legislative provision increasing direct costs of a federal inter-governmental mandate contained in any amendments in disagreement between the two Houses to any bill or resolution reported by such Committee.

(C) Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any provision listed in Paragraph (3)(B), and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, such specific provision shall be deemed stricken from the bill, resolution, amendment, amendment in disagreement, or conference report and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 199

Mr. LAUTENBERG proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1, *supra*; as follows:

On page 13, line 5, strike out “or”.

On page 13, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and “or”.

On page 13, insert between lines 8 and 9 the following new paragraph:

(7) limits exposure to known human (Group A) carcinogens, as defined in the Environmental Protection Agency's Risk Assessment Guidelines of 1986.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a markup session on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission reauthorization (S. 178). The markup will be held on Wednesday, February 1, 1995, at 9:30 in SR-332.

For further information, please contact Chuck Coner at 224-0005.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to House Concurrent Resolution 16, just received from the House, regarding the State of the Union Address; that the concurrent resolution be deemed agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 16) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that all these requests have been approved by the Democratic leadership.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-2

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Treaty with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Mutual Legal Assistance on Criminal Matters, treaty document No. 104-2, transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and ask the treaty be considered as having been read the first time, that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on January 6, 1994, with a related exchange of notes signed the same date. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including members of drug cartels, “white-collar criminals,” and terrorists. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: (1) the taking of testimony or statements of witnesses; (2) the provision of documents, records,

and evidence; (3) the service of legal documents; (4) the location or identification of persons; (5) the execution of requests for searches and seizures; and (6) the provision of assistance in proceedings relating to the forfeiture of the proceeds of crime and the collection of fines imposed as a sentence in a criminal prosecution.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty, and related exchange of notes, and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1995.

AUTHORITY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee have until 8 p.m. on Tuesday, January 24, 1995, to file a report to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Constitutional balanced budget amendment.

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

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States to the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on January 24, 1995.

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

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 24, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each, with the following Senators to speak for up to the designated times: Senator GRASSLEY, 5 minutes; Senator ROTH, 5 minutes; and Senator CAMPBELL, 10 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 1, the unfunded mandates bill, and that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party luncheons to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me just explain to my colleagues that there will be five consecutive rollcall votes, beginning at 4 p.m. tomorrow, on or in relation to amendments to S. 1, the unfunded mandates bill. Additional votes are expected after this series of votes. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered last week, Senators have until 3 p.m. Tuesday to offer their amendments.

As a reminder, Senators should assemble tomorrow in the Senate Chamber at 8:30 p.m. so we may proceed as a body at 8:35 p.m. to the Hall of the House of Representatives in order to hear an address by the President on the state of the Union.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate and no other Senator is seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:24 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, January, 24, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1995:

THE JUDICIARY

JANET BOND ARTERTON, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, VICE JOSE A. CABRANES, ELEVATED.

WILLIS B. HUNT, JR., OF GEORGIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE HORACE T. WARD, RETIRED.

SUSAN Y. ILLSTON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BARBARA A. CAULFIELD, RESIGNED.

CHARLES B. KORNMANN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, VICE JOHN B. JONES, RETIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JOHN L. BRYANT, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 1997, VICE HELMUTH J. NAUMER, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DALE W. THOMPSON, JR., 000-00-0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JERRY R. RUTHERFORD, 000-00-0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN A. LOCKARD, 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRALS (LOWER HALF) OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE LINE AND STAFF CORPS, AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISION OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

U.S. NAVAL RESERVE

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH LEROY FISHER, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN HENRY MCKINLEY, JR., 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN FRANCIS PADDOCK, JR., 000-00-0000

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ROGER GEORGE GILBERTSON, 000-00-0000

DENTAL CORPS OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES CONLEY YEARGIN, 000-00-0000

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT CAMERON CRATES, 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRALS (LOWER HALF) IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFORE AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

U.S. NAVY

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES STEVENSON ABBOT, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL LEE BOWMAN, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK MATTHEW DIRREN, JR., 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) MARSHA JOHNSON EVANS, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) HENRY COLLINS GIFFIN III., 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) LEE FREDERIC GUNN, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL DONALD HASKINS, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) HENRY FRANCIS HERRERA, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANCIS WILLIAM LACROIX, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS FLETCHER MARFIAK, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD WILLARD MIES, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT JOSEPH NATTER, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT MICHAEL NUTWELL, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES GREGORY PROUT III, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES REYNOLDS STARK, 000-00-0000

REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT SUTTON, 000-00-0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAY BRADFORD YAKELEY III, 000-00-0000

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL MATTHEW ROBINSON, 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAPTAINS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF) IN THE LINE AND STAFF CORPS, AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISION OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

U.S. NAVAL RESERVE

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH PETER BARAUSKY, 000-00-0000

CAPT. MARTIN EDWARD JANCZAK, 000-00-0000

CAPT. PIERCE JARVIS JOHNSON, 000-00-0000

CAPT. MICHAEL ROBERT SCOTT, 000-00-0000

INTELLIGENCE OFFICER

To be real admiral (lower half)

CAPT. LARRY LAFAYETTE POE, 000-00-0000

PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RICHARD HARRY WELLS, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICER

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN BERT COTTON, 000-00-0000

CAPT. JOHN CONANT WEED, JR., 000-00-0000

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. FRED JOSEPH SCHUBER III, 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PETER HESS BECKWITH, 000-00-0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATE OR RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALAN L. CHRISTENSEN, 000-00-0000

JAMES L. RODGERS, 000-00-0000

To be major

DEAN F. CONNORS, 000-00-0000

EDWARD A. WOLFF III, 000-00-0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

GARDNER G. BASSETT, 000-00-0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTIONS 12203 AND 3385:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

HOSIG, RODGER T., 000-00-0000

OLIVA, JOSEPH R., 000-00-0000

PALAZZO, FRANK J., 000-00-0000

SIKES, JAMES M., 000-00-0000

SPAIN, EDWIN E. III, 000-00-0000

STEWART, THOMAS E., 000-00-0000

STOUT, EDWARD L. IV, 000-00-0000

UMBARGER, ROY M., 000-00-0000

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be colonel

DECATO, ROGER P., 000-00-0000

REISDORFF, STEVEN J., 000-00-0000

SCHNEIDER, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000

SKELTON, JOSEPH R., 000-00-0000

SMITH, JAMES P., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

GELB, DONALD M., 000-00-0000

HANCOCK, THOMAS J., 000-00-0000

HILL, PURVIS W. JR., 000-00-0000

ROGERS, LEO F., 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be colonel

BROUSSARD, ANDRE R., JR., 000-00-0000

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

MARTINE, PETER A., 000-00-0000

MCADORY, CLARENCE M., JR., 000-00-0000

NELAN, DANIEL J., 000-00-0000

NELSON, JOHN R., 000-00-0000

NESBIT, WILLIE A., 000-00-0000

RUSSELL, MICHAEL H., 000-00-0000

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LAMPTON, DUNNICA O., 000-00-0000

PUGLISI, RICHARD L., 000-00-0000

SPEARS, RONALD D., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALLELY, ERIC B., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LOWE, SARA M., 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR A RESERVE OF THE ARMY APPOINTMENT, WITH CONCURRENT ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203, 12204, AND 12320:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

FREDERICK B. BROWN, 000-00-0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

JAMES P. SCREEN III, 000-00-0000

ELISSA J. SMITH, 000-00-0000

JASON R. J. TESTA, 000-00-0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE APPROPRIATE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AND THOSE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN INDICATED.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

BADER, BARRETT W., 000-00-0000

BOLGER, WALTON L., 000-00-0000

CORNELIUS, CLIFFORD W., 000-00-0000

CUMMINGS, DONALD E., 000-00-0000

EDWARDS, RICHARD C., 000-00-0000
 ENG, RONALD W., 000-00-0000
 FANCHER, JAMES P., 000-00-0000
 GREENE, PAUL D., JR., 000-00-0000
 HILTON, THOMAS J., 000-00-0000
 NAYLOR, WILLIAM P., 000-00-0000
 NELSON, CRAIG L., 000-00-0000
 OSBORNE, PAUL B., 000-00-0000
 PALMER, DAVID S., 000-00-0000
 PEMBLE, CHARLES W., III, 000-00-0000
 SHAEFER, JEFFREY R., 000-00-0000
 SHANNON, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000
 SHULMAN, ELLIOT R., 000-00-0000
 WESTERHOLM, HAROLD S., II, 000-00-0000
 WYMAN, BARRY M., 000-00-0000
 ZOLLARS, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

ABERNATHY, SUSAN P., 000-00-0000
 ARROYO, LUIS C., 000-00-0000
 BAGGERLY, GREGORY C., 000-00-0000
 BARBERA, RAYMOND T., 000-00-0000
 BEECHIE, CARLA A., 000-00-0000
 BERG, JACK L., 000-00-0000
 BISSON, ROGER U., 000-00-0000
 BLACK, JERROLD G., 000-00-0000
 BOHANON, KATHLEEN S., 000-00-0000
 BUNTINGBLAKE, GERALD F., 000-00-0000
 CHASTAIN, DAVID O., 000-00-0000
 CHRISTENSEN, ALAN W., 000-00-0000
 CLARK, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000
 COVASMALDONADO, IVAN, 000-00-0000
 DREHNER, DENNIS M., 000-00-0000
 DURNING, JAMES P., 000-00-0000
 EXSTRUM, TERRY D., 000-00-0000
 GILLIAM, PAUL E., JR., 000-00-0000
 GLIFORT, KENNETH F., 000-00-0000
 GOODWIN, DEBORAH V., 000-00-0000
 HAGAN, LARRY L., 000-00-0000
 HEMPHILL, VIRGIL E., JR., 000-00-0000
 JOHNSON, THOMAS G., 000-00-0000
 KING, THOMAS H., 000-00-0000
 LEE, BRADFORD H., 000-00-0000
 LEVITT, MORTON H., 000-00-0000
 LOPEZVALENTIN, PEDRO H., 000-00-0000
 MARRERO, GREGORIA, 000-00-0000
 MARSHALL, JOHN A., II, 000-00-0000
 MCCARTHY, DAVID A., 000-00-0000
 MCCAULEY, KATHLEEN M., 000-00-0000
 MEINHARDT, MILTON A., 000-00-0000
 MESSINGHAM, MARK L., 000-00-0000
 MONROE, SCOTT W., 000-00-0000
 MORK, MICHAEL R., 000-00-0000
 MORRIS, FRANCIS M., 000-00-0000
 MORTON, PAUL E., 000-00-0000
 PIETRZAK, MICHAEL P., 000-00-0000
 RAM, PRATHIBA, 000-00-0000
 RAMLER, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
 REEVES, JAMES D., 000-00-0000
 SABOE, GERALD W., 000-00-0000
 SAMMONS, JAMES H., JR., 000-00-0000
 SANDERS, GEORGE L., 000-00-0000
 SAYERS, ROBERT E., 000-00-0000
 SCOTT, THOMAS E., 000-00-0000
 SNYDER, RUSSELL R., 000-00-0000
 STOCK, DONALD H., 000-00-0000
 SUTTERFIELD, THOMAS C., 000-00-0000
 TRUSS, HUBERT N., 000-00-0000
 UCHMAN, STANLEY F., 000-00-0000
 WHITE, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
 WOLF, EARL G., JR., 000-00-0000
 YANCEY, FORREST C., JR., 000-00-0000
 YASUHARA, THOMAS T., 000-00-0000
 YOUNG, WILLIAM W.C., 000-00-0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALEXANDER, JOEL B., III, 000-00-0000
 ANDERSON, DENNIS M., 000-00-0000
 ATWOOD, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
 BATES, CHRISTOPHER F., 000-00-0000
 BEESON, THOMAS J., 000-00-0000
 BRENDLINGER, ERIC J., 000-00-0000
 BROWN, CRAIG D., 000-00-0000
 BURNETT, ROBERT R., 000-00-0000
 DEVINE, SARA M., 000-00-0000
 ESQUIVEL, CARLOS, 000-00-0000
 FLORES, SALVADOR, JR., 000-00-0000
 GOHRING, WILLIAM J., 000-00-0000
 GONZALES, DAVID A., 000-00-0000
 GRACE, THOMAS W., JR., 000-00-0000
 GULBRANSON, STEVEN D., 000-00-0000
 HETT, JAMES M., 000-00-0000
 IMBERY, TERENCE A., 000-00-0000
 JAMES, WALTER J., 000-00-0000
 KELLY, DENNIS W., JR., 000-00-0000
 KOCH, MICHAEL A., 000-00-0000
 LEIST, JOHN C., III, 000-00-0000
 LINDEMUTH, JAMES S., 000-00-0000
 LINEHAN, ALLAN D., 000-00-0000
 MACPHERSON, JEFF R., 000-00-0000
 MEDLEY, CHRISTOPHER C., 000-00-0000
 MERRILL, STEPHEN W., 000-00-0000
 MIKOTOWICZ, JOHN J., 000-00-0000
 NOALL, KEVIN M., 000-00-0000
 RAWLEY, DANIEL J., 000-00-0000
 ROGERS, PAUL M., 000-00-0000
 SEBERRY, DONALD C., 000-00-0000
 TABATCHNICK, LARRY, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS, WALTER L., 000-00-0000
 TOWNSEND, JULIA H., 000-00-0000
 VANDEWALLE, CRAIG S., 000-00-0000
 VILLA, RICHARD H., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALLEN, ROBERT C., 000-00-0000
 BEHESHTI, MICHAEL V., 000-00-0000
 BELENY, CHARLES G., 000-00-0000
 BERRO, EVA T., 000-00-0000
 BIEDIGER, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000
 BLOOD, ROBERT L., 000-00-0000
 BROCKWAY, LEAH W., 000-00-0000
 CHAMBERLAIN, DONALD H., 000-00-0000
 CHAPMAN, STEVEN F., 000-00-0000
 CHESHIRE, BRIAN D., 000-00-0000
 CHONG, CHRISTOPHER L., 000-00-0000
 CHOU, TIMOTHY Y., 000-00-0000
 CLEMS, JAY A., 000-00-0000
 CORCORAN, TIMOTHY S., 000-00-0000
 COX, KENNETH L., 000-00-0000
 DEFRANCIS, DOMINIC A., 000-00-0000
 DICKEY, KIMBERLY J., 000-00-0000
 DONIGAN, ARAM M., 000-00-0000
 DOUGHERTY, RAYMOND S., 000-00-0000
 DUNN, CORY D., 000-00-0000
 DYE, JOSEPH D., 000-00-0000
 DYKES, THOMAS M., 000-00-0000
 EGICHT, RUSSELL W., 000-00-0000
 FACINOLI, JOHN F., 000-00-0000
 FOX, KAREN A., 000-00-0000
 FRIDES, MELISSA H., 000-00-0000
 GELORMINI, RUSSELL G., 000-00-0000
 GILLIS, JOHN F., 000-00-0000
 GINGRICH, MARI J., 000-00-0000
 GOODWIN, DAVID A., 000-00-0000
 GORDON, TRACY A., 000-00-0000
 GRAY, THOMAS E., 000-00-0000
 HANKINS, THOMAS C., 000-00-0000
 HARRIS, SHARON G., 000-00-0000
 HENRY, BRYAN L., 000-00-0000
 HEPBURN, BYRON C., 000-00-0000
 HERMAN, NORMAN L., 000-00-0000
 HOCOTT, WILLIAM B., 000-00-0000
 HOUGAS, JAMES E., JR., 000-00-0000
 HUFFMAN, JOHN W., 000-00-0000
 HURLEY, LEO D., 000-00-0000
 JOHNSON, ROBERT, 000-00-0000
 KIM, JEROME HAHN, 000-00-0000
 KING, JAMES A., 000-00-0000
 KLINK, BRIAN K., 000-00-0000
 KNOWLES, JAMES R., 000-00-0000
 KUWILA, THOMAS E., 000-00-0000
 LASHLEYALDER, PHYLLIS J., 000-00-0000
 LENOACH, PHILIP M., 000-00-0000
 LITTLEFIELD, WILLIAM G., 000-00-0000
 LOCKIE, SHIRLEY, R., 000-00-0000
 LONG, JAMES, M., 000-00-0000
 LONGUSSO, FERNAK, J., 000-00-0000
 LOVICH, STEPHEN, F., 000-00-0000
 MACISAAC, KATHLEEN, A., 000-00-0000
 MAKI, LANCE, A., 000-00-0000
 MANUSOV, ERON, G., 000-00-0000
 MASON, JAMES, S., 000-00-0000
 MCLAUGHLIN, THOMAS, J., 000-00-0000
 MENDEZ, EVELYN, 000-00-0000
 MITCHELL, THEODORE A., JR., 000-00-0000
 MITCHELL, JOHN, F., 000-00-0000
 MONTANY, PAUL, F., 000-00-0000
 MOORE, VERGA, A., 000-00-0000
 MORALES, CARLOS, F., 000-00-0000
 MURPHY, KEMET, F., 000-00-0000
 MURPHY, KENT, R., 000-00-0000
 MURPHY, SEAN, L., 000-00-0000
 MUSKAT, PETER, C., 000-00-0000
 NELSON, ANTONIO, 000-00-0000
 NEVILLE, JAMES, S., 000-00-0000
 NOLTE, JOHN, M., 000-00-0000
 ODEGARD, KEITH, J., 000-00-0000
 OHSIEK, CATHERINE, C., 000-00-0000
 O'NEAL, JONATHAN, F., 000-00-5856
 PANDS, REED, G., 000-00-0000
 PARSIA, BRIAN, B., 000-00-0000
 PAUL, DAVID, L., 000-00-0000
 PELLON, JEFFREY, J., 000-00-0000
 PEREZBECERRA, JOSE, L., 000-00-0000
 PETERS, KURT, R.L., 000-00-0000
 PHILBRICK, KEMUEL, L., 000-00-0000
 PHILLIPS, PAUL, A., 000-00-0000
 PLAGA, BRADLEY, R., 000-00-0000
 PORTALATTIN, MANUEL, B., 000-00-0000
 PRESTIDGE, BRADLEY, R., 000-00-0000
 RAMIREZ, HECTOR, A., 000-00-0000
 ROBB, DOUGLAS, J., 000-00-0000
 SANDERS, TIMOTHY, G., 000-00-0000
 SCHAFFRINNA, MICHAEL, G., 000-00-0000
 SCHULTZ, CURTIS, D., 000-00-0000
 SHEA, KEVIN, S., 000-00-0000
 SHIAU, DAVID, W., 000-00-0000
 SLAWINSKI, KIMBERLY, A., 000-00-0000
 SMART, RANDALL, W., 000-00-0000
 SORRA, ENDEL, A., 000-00-0000
 STANCOMBE, BRADLEY, B., 000-00-0000
 TAPPEL, JOHN, J., 000-00-0000
 TASHIRO, KEN, M., 000-00-0000
 TAYLOR, CYNTHIA, N., 000-00-0000
 TIDABACK, DALE R., 000-00-0000
 TIPTON, DAVID J., 000-00-0000
 TONG, ANDREW, 000-00-0000
 TRACY, JAMES M., 000-00-0000
 TUBB, RICHARD J., 000-00-0000*
 TURNER, RUSSELL, A., 000-00-0000
 VANVALKENBURG, SCOTT W., 000-00-0000
 VERAZIN, GARY THOMAS, 000-00-0000
 VOGT, ROBERT P., 000-00-0000
 WALLACE, DAVID F., 000-00-0000
 WALSH, PETER T., 000-00-0000
 WALZ, JON H., JR., 000-00-0000

WARREN, DOUGLAS C., 000-00-0000
 WATSON, JOHN W., 000-00-0000
 WEBB, HAROLD J., 000-00-0000
 WEMPE, JOSEPH M., 000-00-0000
 WOODWARD, KELLY H., 000-00-0000
 WOOTEN, JOHN D. III, 000-00-0000
 WRIGHT, GARTH B., 000-00-0000
 WYMAN, DANIEL O., 000-00-0000*

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

BENDER, DAVID M., 000-00-0000
 BERGERON, BRIAN E., 000-00-0000
 BOESTER, RUSSELL G., 000-00-0000
 BRANDYS, ROBERT F., 000-00-0000
 BROTHERTON, LEN D., 000-00-0000
 BRUNSON, DAVID Z., 000-00-0000
 CHILDRESS, ROGER W., 000-00-0000
 CRISP, CHARLES B., 000-00-0000
 DELUNA, JEFFREY F., 000-00-0000
 DRAPER, SCOTT A., 000-00-0000
 EVANS, DARRELL J., 000-00-0000
 FORD, DOUGLAS E., 000-00-0000
 FULSAAS, LEE A., 000-00-0000
 GREENING, SCOTT R., 000-00-0000
 HANIGAN, JAMES B., 000-00-0000
 HARRELL, CHARLES J., JR., 000-00-0000
 HELM, STEVEN H., 000-00-0000
 JENKINS, DENVER D., JR., 000-00-0000
 KIRKPATRICK, TIMOTHY C., 000-00-0000
 KLYN, STEVEN L., 000-00-0000
 LACKLER, KARL P., 000-00-0000
 LEVEY, JONATHAN A., 000-00-0000
 MARCK, ANDREW J., 000-00-0000
 MAY, VALENCIA D., 000-00-0000
 MEIER, ALLEN W., 000-00-0000
 NILI, MARK D., 000-00-0000
 NOVY, CHARLES K., 000-00-0000
 PARKE, ALLAN S., 000-00-0000
 POTH, MICHAEL E., 000-00-0000
 POWERS, DAVID B., 000-00-0000
 RECTOR, TIMOTHY M., 000-00-0000
 REINHART, ROBERT V., JR., 000-00-0000
 RICE, WILLIAM E., 000-00-0000
 SCHUH, TIMOTHY J., 000-00-0000
 STANIFER, KENNETH C., 000-00-0000
 TERRY, GLENN L., 000-00-0000
 THEKEN, JAMES E., JR., 000-00-0000
 TIGCHELAAR, DONALD C., 000-00-0000
 UYEHARA, MARK Y., 000-00-0000
 VANSURKSUM, RODERICK D., 000-00-0000
 VASTAFALLDORF, FRANCESCA, 000-00-0000
 WIMSATT, JAMES A., III, 000-00-0000
 WONG, LOLO, 000-00-0000
 YACCINO, JOHN M., 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

ADAMS, STEPHEN R., 000-00-0000
 AGNER, DALE R., 000-00-0000
 AHADIAN, FARSHAD M., 000-00-0000
 AKAKA, GERARD K., 000-00-0000
 ALMY, CYNTHIA C., 000-00-0000
 ANDERSON, JOSEPH B., 000-00-0000
 ANDERSONROJAS, ELIZABETH R., 000-00-0000
 ANDO, KERRY J., 000-00-0000
 ANDREWS, TODD L., 000-00-0000
 ANDRUSS, ROBERT J., 000-00-0000
 ANG, DAVID F., 000-00-0000
 ARNESS, MARK K., 000-00-0000
 ARNOLD, JEFFREY L., 000-00-0000
 ASHBURN, ELIZABETH L., 000-00-0000
 AULTMAN, CHAD J., 000-00-0000
 BAILEY, JODI L., 000-00-0000
 BAISEN, BETH A., 000-00-0000
 BALSAN, SCOTT A., 000-00-0000
 BAMBER, JOHN JOSEPH, 000-00-0000
 BARAD, JAMES F., 000-00-0000
 BARADZIEJ, MARK E., 000-00-0000
 BAYLOR, KATHY E., 000-00-0000
 BEDNAR, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
 BENEDETTI, GARY E., 000-00-0000
 BENKE, THEODORE T., 000-00-0000
 BENNION, JAMES R., 000-00-0000
 BENSON, MICHAEL K., 000-00-0000
 BENTS, ROBERT T., 000-00-0000
 BERKHEIMER, WALTER R., 000-00-0000
 BERTAGNOLI, MARK W., 000-00-0000
 BEST, DARRYL B., 000-00-0000
 BEST, HENRY J., IV, 000-00-0000
 BIANCO, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
 BIAS, JOHN G., 000-00-0000
 BLOUNT, JAMES J., III, 000-00-0000
 BOMALASKI, JOHN, J., 000-00-0000
 BONAR, JAMES P., 000-00-0000
 BOONE, MELCHOR M., JR., 000-00-0000
 BORER, JOSEPH M., 000-00-0000
 BORKOWSKI, MICHAEL A., 000-00-0000
 BOUFFARD, JOHN P., 000-00-0000
 BRADLEY, DEBORAH K., 000-00-0000
 BRECH, KILIAN H., II, 000-00-0000
 BRETZKE, CECIL B., 000-00-0000
 BRINGHURST, DIRK C., 000-00-0000
 BRINKMAN, MARK J., 000-00-0000
 BROWN, SCOTT D., 000-00-0000
 BROWNBRATSCHE, JANELLE E., 000-00-0000
 BROOOWNE, LINDA J., 000-00-0000
 BRUNSELL, SUSAN G., 000-00-0000
 BUENAVENTURA, RICARDO M., 000-00-0000
 BUERDIE, DAVID D., 000-00-0000
 BUTCHER, ROBERT F., 000-00-0000
 CALDERWOOD, CAROL A., 000-00-0000
 CARDENAS, DIEGO G., 000-00-0000
 CARROLL, CHARLES L., II, 000-00-0000
 CARROLL, KEVIN W., 000-00-0000

CARTER, BRUCE M., 000-00-0000
CASEBOLT, MARK A., 000-00-0000
CHAMBERLAIN, DAVID G., 000-00-0000
CHARLES, WILBERT E., 000-00-0000
CHEESEMAN, MELISSA M., 000-00-0000
CHENEVERT, LISA S., 000-00-0000
CHESNUTT, JAMES C., 000-00-0000
CHINEA, CARLOS E., 000-00-0000
CHING, ANGELA, 000-00-0000
CHLEBOWSKI, JAMES E., 000-00-0000
CHOZINSKI, JOSEPH P., 000-00-0000
CHRISTENSEN, KENNETH E., 000-00-0000
CLARKSON, THOMAS A., 000-00-0000
CLAYTON, ANNA S., 000-00-0000
COHEN, AARON H., 000-00-0000
COLLAER, REBECCA A., 000-00-0000
COOKE, SHANNON E., 000-00-0000
COPELIN, CLAUDIA R., 000-00-0000
CORDES, DAVID J., 000-00-0000
COUDREAUT, MICHAEL F., 000-00-0000
CRAIG, DONNA J., 000-00-0000
CROUSE, BRENT A., 000-00-0000
CROWLEY, MICHAEL A., 000-00-0000
CURRISTON, MICHAEL P., 000-00-0000
CURRY, CHARLES E., JR., 000-00-0000
CUSICK, JEFFREY M., 000-00-0000
CZUBA, KAREN M., 000-00-0000
DAGOSTINO, MARK A., 000-00-0000
DAHLHAUSER, KEITH F., 000-00-0000
DAIDONE, MARA J., 000-00-0000
DALEY, JOSEPH C., III, 000-00-0000
DAMOUR, PAUL L., II, 000-00-0000
DANZEISEN, DAVID J., 000-00-0000
DASSOW, PAUL L., 000-00-0000
DAVIDSON, BRADLEY K., 000-00-0000
DAVILA, JEFFREY N., 000-00-0000
DEGUIDE, JOHN J., 000-00-0000
DEMBSKI, DAVID M., 000-00-0000
DIAMOND, KENNETH C., 000-00-0000
DIDIER, MARK E., 000-00-0000
DINENBERG, ARTHUR S., 000-00-0000
DOLISTER, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
DOOLITTLE, DANIEL S., 000-00-0000
DOOLITTLE, THOMAS S., 000-00-0000
DOSMANN, MARK A., 000-00-0000
DOWSE, ROBERT K., 000-00-0000
EASON, WILLIAM A., 000-00-0000
EBENROTH, ERIC S., 000-00-0000
EHRNSTROM, PETER G., 000-00-0000
ELTON, THOMAS J., 000-00-0000
EMIG, MIAMI, 000-00-0000
ENSGN, BRUCE G., 000-00-0000
EWENS, JOSEPH D., 000-00-0000
EYRE, JOHN C., 000-00-0000
FAUSEL, EDWARD D., 000-00-0000
FEDRIZZI, RUDOLPH P., 000-00-0000
FIRNHABER, JONATHAN M., 000-00-0000
FISHER, JOHN H., JR., 000-00-0000
FLESHER, MARK D., 000-00-0000
FLETCHER, REX A., 000-00-0000
FORSLUND, DARREL R., JR., 000-00-0000
FRANKLIN, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000
FRECKLETON, MICHAEL W., 000-00-0000
FREEL, PAUL D., 000-00-0000
FREESTONE, DAVID J., 000-00-0000
FRIEDRICHS, PAUL A., 000-00-0000
FULLERTON, BRIAN D., 000-00-0000
FUSCO, MARK A., 000-00-0000
GAGLIAND, NICHOLAS C., 000-00-0000
GALKE, CURTIS L., 000-00-0000
CANONG, KEVIN D., 000-00-0000
CANZI, LOIS L., 000-00-0000
CEANON, JOHN D., 000-00-0000
CEE, MATTHEW R., 000-00-0000
GIANNINI, JACQUELINE K., 000-00-0000
GIBBONS, MARION L., 000-00-0000
GLASS, TODD F., 000-00-0000
GLOVER, RICHARD A., 000-00-0000
GOLDBERG, KENNETH W., 000-00-0000
GOLDSTEIN, BRIAN S., 000-00-0000
GOOD, ROBERT B., 000-00-0000
GOODRICH, DEBRA A., 000-00-0000
GOODRICH, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000
GOODWIN, JANET T., 000-00-0000
GOODWIN, MARK D., 000-00-0000
GOOTOS, PETER J., 000-00-0000
GOULD, PETER J., 000-00-0000
GRANT, WALTER K., III, 000-00-0000
GREEN, JEFFREY S., 000-00-0000
GREENWOOD, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
GRIDER, DOUGLAS J., 000-00-0000
GRINAGE, BRADLEY D., 000-00-0000
CRINKMEYER, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000
GUERRA, HORACIO P., IV, 000-00-0000
HALL, BRIAN H., 000-00-0000
HALL, CURTIS R., 000-00-0000
HALLOW, KEVIN D., 000-00-0000
HARKER, DAVID L., 000-00-0000
HARMON, CHRISTOPHER B., 000-00-0000
HART, CAROL ANN, 000-00-0000
HARTER, STEVEN B., 000-00-0000
HARVEY, TODD J., 000-00-0000
HARVICH, JANA R., 000-00-0000
HASKE, TERRY L., 000-00-0000
HAUSER, STEPHEN H., 000-00-0000
HAYES, BRIAN F., 000-00-0000
HAYES, PATRICK R. L., 000-00-0000
HEIDENREICH, ERIC J., 000-00-0000
HELMS, JEFFREY R., 000-00-0000
HEMMELGARN, LORI M., 000-00-0000
HERD, EDWIN P., 000-00-0000
HICKMAN, TIMOTHY N., 000-00-0000
HO, ALBERT F., 000-00-0000
HOFFMAN, KRISTINA M., 000-00-0000
HOLDER, CURTIS H., 000-00-0000
HOLDER, KATHRYN K., 000-00-0000
HOLE, DONALD J., 000-00-0000

HOLLAND, SWEND, 000-00-0000
HOLTHOUSE, MARK E., 000-00-0000
HORN, JAMES K., 000-00-0000
HOWARD, DONALD S., 000-00-0000
HURWITZ, GARY LEE, 000-00-0000
JABLON JEFFREY H., 000-00-0000
JACOBS, JOSHUA S., 000-00-0000
JAMES, MICHAEL W., 000-00-0000
JOHNSON, CHRISTOPHER C., 000-00-0000
JOHNSON, STEPHANIE J., 000-00-0000
JOHNSON, TROY E., 000-00-0000
JONES, ROBERT C., 000-00-0000
JONES, WOODSON S., 000-00-0000
JORDAN, LEANNE E., 000-00-0000
JOSEPH, FREDERIC B., 000-00-0000
JOYNER, KRISTIN M., 000-00-0000
KAAN, DARYL J., 000-00-0000
KALMAR, STEPHEN R., 000-00-0000
KAMMERER, WILLIAM F., 000-00-0000
KARTCHNER, KEVIN E., 000-00-0000
KARTCHNER, WADE E., 000-00-0000
KEARNEY, PATRICIA A., 000-00-0000
KEARNEY, PATRICK J., 000-00-0000
KEENE, MATTHEW S., 000-00-0000
KELLEHER, INEZ M., 000-00-0000
KENDALL, BRIAN S., 000-00-0000
KENNEDY, KAREN D., 000-00-0000
KING, BRYAN C., 000-00-0000
KLINE, ROBERTA L., 000-00-0000
KNIGHT, KENNETH K., 000-00-0000
KOOIMA, RICK A., 000-00-0000
KUNTZ, CARIN CAIN, 000-00-0000
KURIAN, LEONARD S., 000-00-0000
LANE, ALEXIS G., 000-00-0000
LARSEN, DENNIS E., 000-00-0000
LAW, GEORGE S., 000-00-0000
LAWRENCE, BILL B., 000-00-0000
LEGAN, JOSEPH J., 000-00-0000
LEVASSEUR, JOHN G., 000-00-0000
LEVI, MARC L., 000-00-0000
LIEVENS, MICHAEL W., 000-00-0000
LISKE, MICHAEL R., 000-00-0000
LIU, JOSEPH C., 000-00-0000
LOCASTRO, DAVID P., 000-00-0000
LOESCHEN, STEVE K., 000-00-0000
LORBER, RICHARD O., 000-00-0000
LUNDAHL, ROBERT E., 000-00-0000
LUNT, CHAD C., 000-00-0000
MAGDON, MICHAEL R., 000-00-0000
MAHLER, DAVID S., 000-00-0000
MAILLET, MATT W., 000-00-0000
MANN, MICHAEL D., 000-00-0000
MANSFIELD, JOHN T., 000-00-0000
MARSHALL, DEANNA L., 000-00-0000
MARTIN, WILLIAM R., 000-00-0000
MASRI, ADDAM, 000-00-0000
MATSUMOTO, MAVIS N., 000-00-0000
MATSUNO, STANFORD K., 000-00-0000
MCALPINE, BRIAN H., 000-00-0000
MCCAIN, STEFANIE B., 000-00-0000
MCCOY, KEITH E., 000-00-0000
MCCRARY, JAMES E., 000-00-0000
MCDONALD, LYNN A., 000-00-0000
MCQUIRE, DAURA A., 000-00-0000
MCKENNA, DAVID S., 000-00-0000
MEARS, DIANA L., 000-00-0000
MEURER, KAREN J., 000-00-0000
MILLER, FRANK R., IV, 000-00-0000
MITCHELL, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
MOKULIS, ELIZABETH C., 000-00-0000
MONATH, JAMES R., 000-00-0000
MOORE, NICOLE N., 000-00-0000
MORAN, ANDREW M., 000-00-0000
MOREHOUSE, JOSEPH D., 000-00-0000
MORGAN, MARY J., 000-00-0000
MORRISON, PETER A., 000-00-0000
MURPHY, BELINDA A., 000-00-0000
MUSE, ROGER K., 000-00-0000
NAGY, ANNAMARIA, 000-00-0000
NEAL, RANDALL H., 000-00-0000
NEELD, JOHN B., 000-00-0000
NELSON, RONALD A., 000-00-0000
NGUYEN, DUKE, 000-00-0000
NISHIOKA, LUCAS J., 000-00-0000
NORRIS, SCOTT B., 000-00-0000
NORTH, HEATHER H., 000-00-0000
OLIVER, MALCOLM B., 000-00-0000
ONELL, MARY M., 000-00-0000
ORMANOSKI, MARGARET H., 000-00-0000
OROURKE, TERENCE L., JR., 000-00-0000
OUWELEEN, JENNIFER A., 000-00-0000
PAGAN, RAFAEL A., 000-00-0000
PARKER, DAVID K., 000-00-0000
PECKHAM, ROBYN H., 000-00-0000
PERRY, WILLIAM B., 000-00-0000
PETER, THOMAS C., 000-00-0000
PHILLIPS, SCOTT E., 000-00-0000
PO, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000
POLLARD, THOMAS W., 000-00-0000
RADACK, MATTHEW C., 000-00-0000
RANALLI, MARK A., 000-00-0000
RAPHAEL, HOWARD J., 000-00-0000
RAYBON, KELVIN B., 000-00-0000
RAYMOND, JULIE T., 000-00-0000
REED, JOHN B., 000-00-0000
REHAK, CHRISTOPHER S., 000-00-0000
REIMER, ALEXIS B., 000-00-0000
RICHARDSON, KENNETH J., 000-00-0000
RIEGEL, RICHARD L., 000-00-0000
RIZZO, ANNE G., 000-00-0000
ROANE, DOUGLAS W., 000-00-0000
ROBINETTE, TIMOTHY D., 000-00-0000
ROCK, DOUGLAS B., 000-00-0000
RODRIGUEZ, LORA B., 000-00-0000
ROLLO, VINCENT J., 000-00-0000
RUDEK, CRAIG R., 000-00-0000
RUFF, THEODORE A., 000-00-0000

RUSSELL, TOD S., 000-00-0000
RUSSO, MAGNO PATRICIA M., 000-00-0000
RYDEN, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
SAKURADA, CRAIG H., 000-00-0000
SALATA, MICHAEL P., 000-00-0000
SANCHEZ, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
SANDOVAL, WILLIAM, 000-00-0000
SANTERINI, KRISTINE, R., 000-00-0000
SARKISIAN, EDWARD C., JR., 000-00-0000
SATTERLY, MARY F., 000-00-0000
SAWAY, WILLIAM C., 000-00-0000
SCHEFFER, MARK M., 000-00-0000
SCHILLING, RUSSELL A., 000-00-0000
SCHMITZ, ROBERT A., 000-00-0000
SCHOENBERGER, JOSEPH A., 000-00-0000
SELLMAN, DANIEL C., 000-00-0000
SHERWOOD, LORAN D., 000-00-0000
SHULER, KURT J., 000-00-0000
SHUTTER, LORI A., 000-00-0000
SKIDMORE, BRETT D., 000-00-0000
SKYE, ERIC P., 000-00-0000
SLOAN, RANDY M., 000-00-0000
SMIDT, WESLEY R., 000-00-0000
SMITH, DEANE L., II, 000-00-0000
SMITH, STEVEN L., 000-00-0000
SNOW, STEVEN P., 000-00-0000
SODD, ANTHONY N., 000-00-0000
SOEHNER, DAVID F., 000-00-0000
SOTO, CECILIA, 000-00-0000
ST CLAIR, DOUGLAS A., 000-00-0000
START, ROBERT J., 000-00-0000
STEELE, ANDREW C., 000-00-0000
STEEPY, KATHLEEN A., 000-00-0000
STEPHAN, KEVIN T., 000-00-0000
STOKES, GARY N., 000-00-0000
STONE, ALAN B., 000-00-0000
STORROW, ALAN B., 000-00-0000
SUMRALL, RICHARD W., 000-00-0000
SUTHERLIN, RALPH M., 000-00-0000
SWAN, MICHAEL C., 000-00-0000
SWAN, REBECCA R., 000-00-0000
TAKATA, JAY A., 000-00-0000
TAYLOR, JANINE D., 000-00-0000
TAYLOR, LISA J., 000-00-0000
TEDDER, CHARLES S., 000-00-0000
TEMOFEEV, RICHARD K., 000-00-0000
THELEN, GREGORY L., 000-00-0000
THOMASON, RONALD W., 000-00-0000
THOME, JUDENE M., 000-00-0000
THOMPSON, WILLIAM C., 000-00-0000
TOWNE, LAURA E., 000-00-0000
TREBIAN, KATHLEEN M., 000-00-0000
TRICK, WILLIAM E., 000-00-0000
TUCHER, JOHN J., 000-00-0000
TURNER, LISA CAROLE, 000-00-0000
VALLETTE, ERIKA R., 000-00-0000
VANASSCHE, SIDNEY T., 000-00-0000
VANDIVORT, DANIEL L., 000-00-0000
VARGAS, CHERYL P., 000-00-0000
VETTEL, KENNETH L., 000-00-0000
WAGENHORST, BRETT B., 000-00-0000
WAGNON, DONALD W., 000-00-0000
WASEL, DAVID B., 000-00-0000
WARREN, LEO C., 000-00-0000
WATSKY, JAY G., 000-00-0000
WEAVER, DANIEL C., 000-00-0000
WEBER, PAUL W., 000-00-0000
WEHRLY, SCOTT R., 000-00-0000
WEIGAND, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
WELLER, DONALD A., 000-00-0000
WELTON, RANDON S., 000-00-0000
WEST, ANDREW J., 000-00-0000
WESTERHEIDE, CHRISTOPHER J., 000-00-0000
WESTFALL, LORNA A., 000-00-0000
WETZEL, ROBERT J., 000-00-0000
WHITE, THOMAS C., 000-00-0000
WHITNEY, CHARLES C., 000-00-0000
WIERSMA, DONALD S., 000-00-0000
WIEST, GERALD V., 000-00-0000
WILCOX, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000
WILKINSON, JANET L., 000-00-0000
WILLARD, KIRK E., 000-00-0000
WILSON, SCOTT W., 000-00-0000
WIPRUD, JOHN M., 000-00-0000
WITKOWSKI, EDMUND, 000-00-0000
WIXOM, WILLIAM L., 000-00-0000
WOLF, KATHLEEN M., 000-00-0000
WONG, CEDRIC L., 000-00-0000
WOODS, DANA P., 000-00-0000
WOODYARD, THOMAS C., 000-00-0000
YANG, LINDA, 000-00-0000
YOUNG, ERIC T., 000-00-0000
YU, LARRY M., 000-00-0000
ZEMIS, JOSEPH N., 000-00-0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 307, TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, AND SECTIONS 8363 AND 12203, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

JONATHAN E. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
JAMES W. APPLE, JR., 000-00-0000
THOMAS W. BATTERMAN, 000-00-0000
EUGENE T. BEASLEY, 000-00-0000
JOHN W. CARLSON, 000-00-0000
HARRISON S. CARTER, 000-00-0000
SAMUEL A. COLEMAN, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. COLWELL, 000-00-0000
CHARLES G. CORNELIUS, 000-00-0000
LLOYD T. CRUMRINE, 000-00-0000
ROSS C. DETWILER, 000-00-0000

LAWRENCE M. DICUS, 000-00-0000
 MYRON N. DOBASHI, 000-00-0000
 HENRY B. FOSTER, III, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY GARDNER, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD A. GROBEN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN B. HANDY, 000-00-0000
 DARRELL E. HART, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM E. HAYMES, JR, 000-00-0000
 SHUFORD HAZEL, 000-00-0000
 ALAN R. HEERS, 000-00-0000
 MELVIN K. HONDA, 000-00-0000
 CLIFFORD W. LANDES, 000-00-0000
 GARY W. LOGAN, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS G. LUCAS, 000-00-0000
 LESTER S. MARRINER, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. MCCARVEL, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG R. MCKINLEY, 000-00-0000
 LOUIS A. MEIER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID B. MOREMEN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN C. MOSBEY, 000-00-0000
 RANDALL F. MOY, 000-00-0000
 JAY D. NIELSEN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT E. PARISH, 000-00-0000
 VERNON V. PATE, JR, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH J. POLITO, 000-00-0000
 JERRY W. RAGSDALE, 000-00-0000
 HAROLD E. REED, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES D. RESTIVO, 000-00-0000
 LYNN V. RITCHIE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD G. ROSE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT A. ROSE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD L. ROTH, JR, 000-00-0000
 GARY L. SAYLER, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT O. SEIFERT, 000-00-0000
 DAVID E. B. STROHM, 000-00-0000
 MARVIN L. TOOMAN, 000-00-0000
 JAY W. VANPELT, 000-00-0000
 TOMMY L. WEEMS, 000-00-0000
 RANDAU F. WIMMER, 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be colonel

JOHN B. ELLINGTON, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL N. LEININGER, 000-00-0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE

To be colonel

REESE L. HARRISON, JR, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

JOHN T. DIEGEL, 000-00-0000
 WILBURN E. GEORGE, JR, 000-00-0000
 HARRY J. HECK, II, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN D. KNIGHT, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH M. ZOMPA, 000-00-0000

NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

JUDITH L. CUMMINGS, 000-00-0000
 SHARON G. FREIER, 000-00-0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE AIR FORCE RESERVE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203, 8362 AND 8371, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

TIMOTHY L. ANDERSON, 000-00-0000
 DOYLE W. ARGO, 000-00-0000
 JAY M. AUGUSTENBORG, 000-00-0000
 KIRK A. BAKER, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH W. BARNES, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM J. BARNES, 000-00-0000
 KIRK D. BENTSON, 000-00-0000
 GERALD O. BOLME, 000-00-0000
 DIANE M. BOULWARE, 000-00-0000
 NICK F. BOWMAN, 000-00-0000
 SHARON L. BOYNTON, 000-00-0000
 GERALD J. A. BOYUM, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT L. BROWN, 000-00-0000
 DREW W. BROWNING, 000-00-0000
 LEE J. BRUNDAGE, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL J. CAREY, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM J. CLEARY, JR, 000-00-0000
 PATRICK A. COLLINS, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD C. COLLINS, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES R. CONEWAY, JR, 000-00-0000
 WAYNE F. CONROY, 000-00-0000
 WARNEY L. CROSBY, JR, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. CURRY, 000-00-0000
 LOUIS C. CUSIMANO, 000-00-0000
 ELIZABETH A. DENNARD, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM H. DOBSON, JR, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT F. DODSON, 000-00-0000
 JOHN B. DOOLITTLE, 000-00-0000
 PETER J. DOWNES, JR, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. DUNN, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS A. DYCHES, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM T. EVES, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE A. FISHER, 000-00-0000
 RONALD E. FISHER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID G. FRY, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT L. GARDNER, 000-00-0000
 GENE E. GARTON, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE W. GERING, III, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS M. GISLER, JR, 000-00-0000
 RODNEY C. GLOVER, 000-00-0000
 BRENDAN B. GODFREY, 000-00-0000

JUNIOR R. GOLDEN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT A. GUALTIERI, 000-00-0000
 HAROLD A. GUNN, JR, 000-00-0000
 RONALD B. HALL, 000-00-0000
 JOHN S. HARLAN, JR, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN L. HEAD, 000-00-0000
 ROY W. HEADRICK, 000-00-0000
 FREDDIE M. HEGLER, 000-00-0000
 CALVIN W. HICKEY, 000-00-0000
 SYDNEY G. HILL, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTOPHER B. HITCHCOCK, 000-00-0000
 WERNER E. HOLT, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT B. HUNTER, 000-00-0000
 PHILIP E. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
 LARRY E. JUDAY, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM P. KANE, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD KELLY, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT D. KIM, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY F. KLINE, 000-00-0000
 HOWARD J. KNAGGS, JR, 000-00-0000
 ROSALIND P. KRAWIEC, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD M. LAVIN, JR, 000-00-0000
 OLIS L. LEWIS, JR, 000-00-0000
 CATHERINE F. LICK, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL J. LIERLEY, 000-00-0000
 GILES A. LIGHT, JR, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT P. LINDSETH, 000-00-0000
 DONALD T. LOPEZ, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS E. MAPLE, 000-00-0000
 GARY P. MARTINDELL, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM V. MASLYK, 000-00-0000
 PAUL W. MCDONALD, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG A. MCELROY, 000-00-0000
 GARY M. MCKENZIE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD W. MCLELLON, 000-00-0000
 MARTIN J. MCNAMARA, 000-00-0000
 BRIAN P. MEENAN, 000-00-0000
 BETTY L. MULLIS, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT J. NEE, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES W. NEELEY, 000-00-0000
 GARY L. NEWHOUSE, 000-00-0000
 FRED S. PETER, JR, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. PFEIL, 000-00-0000
 MARK A. PILLAR, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH R. PLAKE, 000-00-0000
 PHILIP D. POLAND, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. PRICE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES C. QUICK, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT F. RAUB, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT J. RAUK, 000-00-0000
 DONALD J. RHEINSTEIN, 000-00-0000
 JON J. RHYNARD, 000-00-0000
 JASON J. RIVET, 000-00-0000
 DAVID A. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 ALFRED J. RONDINA, JR, 000-00-0000
 TERRY F. ROYLANCE, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM E. SCARBORO, JR, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. SCHILDMAYER, 000-00-0000
 KENT SCHLUSSEL, 000-00-0000
 JAMES W. SCHULTZ, JR, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES O. SCHULZ, 000-00-0000
 RUDOLPH C. SCHWARTZ, JR, 000-00-0000
 DEAN W. SEDLACEK, 000-00-0000
 HARVEY T. SEKIMOTO, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH L. SHAEFER, 000-00-0000
 TIMOTHY E. SHARPE, 000-00-0000
 GARY L. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL L. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT E. SMITH, JR, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS E. STEPHENS, 000-00-0000
 GARY G. STERZINGER, 000-00-0000
 MILES H. STRALY, 000-00-0000
 JACK R. SUGGS, 000-00-0000
 HARRY A. TALBOT, 000-00-0000
 JOHN R. THOMAS, 000-00-0000
 FREDERICK M. THURMAN, 000-00-0000
 PAUL G. TUCKER, 000-00-0000
 GERALD C. VONBERGE, 000-00-0000
 NICKI J. WATTS, 000-00-0000
 JOHN H. WEED, 000-00-0000
 RONALD L. WEIGHT, 000-00-0000
 LLOYD C. WELKEN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT D. WELSH, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS J. WESLOH, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD C. WHALEN, JR, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS H. WOLFF, 000-00-0000
 CARMEN R. YURIS, 000-00-0000
 KEETON D. ZACHARY, 000-00-0000
 KARL J. ZAUNER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN D. ZUBER, 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be colonel

LAWRENCE J. DOYLE, 000-00-0000
 LELAN D. MCREYNOLDS, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT D. PARLOTZ, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM G. RUPRACHT, 000-00-0000

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

FRANK J. FOREMAN, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL N. KLEIN, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD M. WISE, 000-00-0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE

To be colonel

RONALD A. BARRETT, 000-00-0000
 ROCKNE J. BURAGLIO, 000-00-0000
 MALCOLM L. BURDINE, 000-00-0000
 JON H. BURROWS, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM F. CLORAN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. FREEDMAN, 000-00-0000
 DON R. GORDON, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT T. LEE, 000-00-0000

TIMOTHY J. MURPHY, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY J. PERFILIO, 000-00-0000
 NICHOLAS E. PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 MARK C. RAMSEY, 000-00-0000
 JOHN W. RANBY, 000-00-0000
 ANDREW F. REISH, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN H. ROVAK, 000-00-0000
 SCOTT W. STUCKY, 000-00-0000
 GORDON O. TANNER, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH A. WILHELM, III, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

LARRY M. ALLEN, 000-00-0000
 PETER T. BEAUDETTE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID W. BECKER, JR, 000-00-0000
 JOHN E. CARROLL, JR, 000-00-0000
 PAYTON NANCY J. COPELAND, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE P. COSTANZO, 000-00-0000
 NENITA B. DAQUIPA, 000-00-0000
 SHAMMAA NABIL A. EL, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT E. HARVEY, 000-00-0000
 HWA ING KANG, 000-00-0000
 IQBAL M. KHAN, 000-00-0000
 BERTRAM G. KWASMAN, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM A. MCDUGALL, 000-00-0000
 JAMES L. NELSON, 000-00-0000
 JAMES E. OSTRANDER, 000-00-0000
 MUNI S. POLSKY, 000-00-0000
 JEHANGIR R. SETHNA, 000-00-0000
 LEWIS WETSTEIN, 000-00-0000

NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

ANNIE P. ANDERSON, 000-00-0000
 JANET S. BARBER, 000-00-0000
 KATHRYN A. BOOM, 000-00-0000
 LINDA JEAN CARSKADON, 000-00-0000
 JEAN Y. DIEBOLT, 000-00-0000
 JULIA T. GORDON, 000-00-0000
 BONITA J. HEFFNER, 000-00-0000
 LINDA S. HEMMINGER, 000-00-0000
 PATRICIA A. HONG, 000-00-0000
 MARTHA A. MISKER, 000-00-0000
 BRENDA L. REITER, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT A. REYNOLDS, JR, 000-00-0000
 RITA B. RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 PATRICIA A. RIESBRONZO, 000-00-0000
 MARY C. ROSS, 000-00-0000
 GWENDOLYN L. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 MARY C. SMOLENSKI, 000-00-0000
 MARGARET A. WOODS, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

BARTON L. ASPLING, 000-00-0000
 ALAN I. BASKIN, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL F. HUBBELL, 000-00-0000

BIOMEDICAL SERVICE

To be colonel

WILBUR W. ALBERTSON, 000-00-0000
 NEIL G. ANDERTON, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD B. FORD, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL L. HORTON, 000-00-0000
 RODNEY L. LINK, 000-00-0000
 MARILEE A. NELSON, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND E. RATAJIK, JR, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL A. MCDOWELL, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL D. MCKINNON, 000-00-0000
 LEON N. MCLIN, JR, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES P. MENDEZ, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN C. PUTBRESE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES A. QUATTLEBAUM, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. RIDDLE, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL J. RUSDEN, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS M. SCHOLL, 000-00-0000
 JOHN F. SEIBERT, 000-00-0000
 ELIZABETH A. SHERLOCK, 000-00-0000
 CARI A. SHERRIS, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD G. SIMMONS, JR, 000-00-0000
 BERYL A. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 ERIC I. SPIEGEL, 000-00-0000
 PHILIP G. STEGMAIER, 000-00-0000
 GERALD W. TALCOTT, 000-00-0000
 BRENDA D. THOMPSON, 000-00-0000
 JAY A. WENIG, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL W. WHITE, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS W. WILDES, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. WILLIAMSON, 000-00-0000
 DORIS WONG, 000-00-0000
 ALAN L. ZOHNER, 000-00-0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3365:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

RONNIE ABNER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. ABPLANALP, 000-00-0000
 SAM K. ACRE, 000-00-0000
 BLAKE B. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS L. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE F. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 HUBERT E. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 JOHN A. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN A. ADAMS, 000-00-0000
 DEBRA J. ALBERT, 000-00-0000

BOYD L. ALEXANDER, 000-00-0000
DONALD A. ALF, 000-00-0000
IVA ALFONSOMORALES, 000-00-0000
DAVID F. ALLEN, 000-00-0000
SERAFFIN P. ALORRO, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM A. AMBROSE, 000-00-0000
RONALD D. ANDERSON, 000-00-0000
RONALD L. ANDERSON, 000-00-0000
STEVEN D. ANDERSON, 000-00-0000
FRANK D. ANDREWS, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM L. ANDREWS, 000-00-0000
WANDA A. ARCENEAUX, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. ATKINS, 000-00-0000
ALMA T. AUGUSTUS, 000-00-0000
MERRILL D. AUSTIN, 000-00-0000
MILTON G. AVERY, 000-00-0000
JUAN B. AVILES, 000-00-0000
MILTON R. AYALA, 000-00-0000
PATRICIA F. AZLIN, 000-00-0000
DARRELL D. BACKHAUS, 000-00-0000
GREGORY P. BAILEY, 000-00-0000
BRUCE H. BAKER, 000-00-0000
KENNETH J. BAKER, 000-00-0000
PANDU BALARAM, 000-00-0000
THEODORE BALTES, JR., 000-00-0000
ROBERT W. BANKS, 000-00-0000
PAUL BARABANI, 000-00-0000
JOSHUAH L. BARBER, 000-00-0000
METTRO E. BARBER, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL J. BARBIERI, 000-00-0000
KENNETH P. BARDEN, 000-00-0000
NEWTON R. BARDWELL, 000-00-0000
RAYMOND J. BARNARD, 000-00-0000
LEWIS BARNES, JR., 000-00-0000
STEPHEN E. BARNES, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM E. BARNETT, 000-00-0000
OWEN M. BARNHILL, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL BARNHOUSE, 000-00-0000
MARY C. BARNSTEAD, 000-00-0000
WAYNE C. BARR, 000-00-0000
ROBERT D. BARTA, 000-00-0000
PERRY E. BARTH, 000-00-0000
LARRY S. BASSETT, 000-00-0000
WINFRED W. BATCHE, 000-00-0000
PETER J. BAUM, 000-00-0000
EDWARD G. BEACH, 000-00-0000
HERBERT W. BEAM, 000-00-0000
RICHARD C. BEAN, 000-00-0000
FLOYD A. BEARDEN, 000-00-0000
VERNON BEARDEN, 000-00-0000
THOMAS K. BEATY, 000-00-0000
RAYMOND A. BEAZLEY, 000-00-0000
JAMES K. BECKER, 000-00-0000
CARL B. BECKMANN, JR., 000-00-0000
RONALD C. BEGAY, 000-00-0000
STEVEN E. BEHOUNEK, 000-00-0000
PAUL J. BEHRENS, 000-00-0000
RICHARD R. BELANGER, 000-00-0000
MARVIN L. BELL, 000-00-0000
ROY C. BENNETT, 000-00-0000
STEVEN J. BERG, 000-00-0000
GEORGE C. BERGERON, 000-00-0000
WILBERT BERRIOS, 000-00-0000
LEONARD E. BERRY, 000-00-0000
BRUCE R. BETHERS, 000-00-0000
LLOYD C. BEVER, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN C. BEVILL, 000-00-0000
PETER A. BIANCHI, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM G. BICKEL, 000-00-0000
JAMES C. BICKFORD, 000-00-0000
LETTIE J. BIEN, 000-00-0000
FREDERICK BIESTEK, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN A. BILLINGS, 000-00-0000
DONALD J. BILLONI, 000-00-0000
LAWRENCE BINKOSKI, 000-00-0000
EDWARD J. BINSEEL, 000-00-0000
JOHN A. BIRZNIKES, 000-00-0000
BRANT L. BISHOP, 000-00-0000
GARY B. BISHOP, 000-00-0000
ALAN C. BITTING, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM C. BLACK, 000-00-0000
GARY W. BLACKLEDGE, 000-00-0000
VERNON C. BLAND, 000-00-0000
RONALD BLANKENSHIP, 000-00-0000
ROBIN P. BLOCH, 000-00-0000
FRANCIS A. BLOOM, 000-00-0000
JUSTIN F. BLUM, 000-00-0000
WOODROW M. BOHANNAN, 000-00-0000
DAVID C. BOHL, 000-00-0000
PHILIP C. BOHLEN, 000-00-0000
JOALLYN BOHN, 000-00-0000
THOMAS C. BOLTON, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY N. BOLIYARD, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM M. BOND, 000-00-0000
EUGENE L. BONOS, 000-00-0000
JOHN P. BOOS, JR., 000-00-0000
BLAKE A. BORGESON, 000-00-0000
RENE C. BOUCHER, 000-00-0000
CHRIS A. BOYD, 000-00-0000
GEORGE M. BOYD, 000-00-0000
JAMES L. BOYD, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL L. BOYD, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, 000-00-0000
CHARLES L. BRADFORD, 000-00-0000
DANIEL P. BRADY, 000-00-0000
GEORGE R. BRADY, 000-00-0000
PAUL M. BRADY, 000-00-0000
PHILIP C. BRAGG, 000-00-0000
JAMES E. BRAMAN, 000-00-0000
JAMES A. BRATTAIN, 000-00-0000
JOHN L. BRENNEMAN, 000-00-0000
DANIEL R. BREWER, 000-00-0000
JOHN J. BRIAN, 000-00-0000
DENNIS K. BRIGGS, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. BRIGHTMAN, 000-00-0000
ROBERT K. BRINSON, 000-00-0000
WILLIE L. BRITT, 000-00-0000

DANIEL L. BROOKS, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY J. BROOKS, 000-00-0000
JOHN L. BROSNAN, 000-00-0000
JAMES G. BROWDER, 000-00-0000
ALAN L. BROWN, 000-00-0000
DOUGLAS M. BROWN, 000-00-0000
GENE F. BROWN, 000-00-0000
HAROLD E. BROWN, 000-00-0000
JAMES M. BROWN, 000-00-0000
JOHN W. BROWN III, 000-00-0000
STEVEN R. BROWN, 000-00-0000
THOMAS J. BROWN, 000-00-0000
KENNETH R. BROWNING, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM BRUNKHORST, 000-00-0000
EUGENE A. BRUNOZZI, 000-00-0000
ROBERT O. BRUNSON, 000-00-0000
MARK H. BRYANT, 000-00-0000
RICHARD BRZUCHALSKI, 000-00-0000
NANCY L. BUCK, 000-00-0000
RICHARD L. BUCK, 000-00-0000
LINWOOD D. BUCKALEW, 000-00-0000
DAVID W. BUCKLEY, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH M. BUCKNER, 000-00-0000
ROMAN A. BUETTNER, 000-00-0000
PAUL W. BUGGE, 000-00-0000
HAROLD G. BUNCH, 000-00-0000
THOMAS BURGESS, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH P. BURKE, 000-00-0000
JOHN A. BURKETT, 000-00-0000
RONALD W. BURKETT, 000-00-0000
FRED W. BURT, 000-00-0000
WALTER J. BURT, 000-00-0000
FRANCIS M. BUSBEE, 000-00-0000
LARRY D. BUSBY, 000-00-0000
MARSHALL L. BUSH, 000-00-0000
MILTON L. BUSHMAN, 000-00-0000
EVERETT W. BUSSELL, 000-00-0000
HAROLD G. BUTCHART, 000-00-0000
DONALD J. BUTLER, 000-00-0000
STEVEN E. BUTLER, 000-00-0000
THOMAS D. BUTLER, 000-00-0000
GEORGE G. BUXTON, 000-00-0000
DENNIS R. BYRNES, 000-00-0000
MATTHEW CACCIATORE, 000-00-0000
GLEN CADLE, JR., 000-00-0000
RICKY G. CADLE, 000-00-0000
JEROME F. CADY, 000-00-0000
ROGER D. CAGLE, 000-00-0000
JOHNNIE L. CAHOON, 000-00-0000
JAMES H. CAIN, 000-00-0000
JOHN B. CALDWELL, 000-00-0000
LARRY J. CALDWELL, 000-00-0000
GEORGE T. CALLAHAN, 000-00-0000
PAUL F. CALTABIANO, 000-00-0000
ALDO R. CALVI, 000-00-0000
LARRY D. CAMPBELL, 000-00-0000
ISMAEL R. CAMPOS, 000-00-0000
HAROLD M. CANADEO, 000-00-0000
CRAIG A. CANELORE, 000-00-0000
LOING M. CANEY, 000-00-0000
CARL A. CANNON, 000-00-0000
DOUGLAS F. CANNON, 000-00-0000
NELSON J. CANNON, 000-00-0000
CARL J. CANNON, 000-00-0000
CLIFTON W. CANOY, 000-00-0000
RALPH D. CANTRELL, 000-00-0000
EMUND R. CAPAS, 000-00-0000
LES M. CAPLAN, 000-00-0000
CONNIE L. CAREY, 000-00-0000
RODNEY D. CARIKER, 000-00-0000
GEORGE M. CARNEY, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL J. CARNEY, 000-00-0000
MELVIN J. CARR, 000-00-0000
WILBERT M. CARR, 000-00-0000
STUART A. CARRILL, 000-00-0000
LEE A. CASAS, 000-00-0000
JOHN R. CASON, 000-00-0000
CLYDE CASSELBERRY, 000-00-0000
THOMAS CASTONGUAY, 000-00-0000
KENNETH CATHCART, 000-00-0000
WAYNE E. CAUGHMAN, 000-00-0000
HECTOR E. CAVAZOS, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM S. CEPHUS, 000-00-0000
JOSE L. CERDA, 000-00-0000
CHARLES R. CHADWICK, 000-00-0000
WALLACE E. CHAILLOU, 000-00-0000
GARY W. CHANDLER, 000-00-0000
MARK R. CHAPLIN, 000-00-0000
KENNETH CHAPPELLE, 000-00-0000
MITCHELL CHASTAIN, 000-00-0000
ANGELO J. CHAVES, 000-00-0000
ELIZABETH CHECCHIA, 000-00-0000
HARLEY CHEGWIDDEN, 000-00-0000
HERMAN A. CHESLEY, 000-00-0000
GERMY A. CHESSOR, 000-00-0000
JAMES Y. CHILTON, 000-00-0000
WAYNE A. CHRISTIAN, 000-00-0000
JOHN CHRISTIANSEN, 000-00-0000
FAY A. CHU, 000-00-0000
JOHN A. CHUBB, 000-00-0000
CAROLYN J. CIPRIANI, 000-00-0000
HARVEY S. CLAPP IV, 000-00-0000
JOHN L. CLARK, 000-00-0000
TERRY P. CLARK, 000-00-0000
STEVEN L. CLAYBORN, 000-00-0000
ROBERT P. CLINEBELL, 000-00-0000
RONALD W. COBER, 000-00-0000
GERALD W. COCHRANE, 000-00-0000
CHARLES F. COFFIN, 000-00-0000
ROLON F. COGLEY, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL D. COLA, 000-00-0000
BARRY M. COLEMAN, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. COLEMAN, 000-00-0000
THOMAS W. COLEMAN, 000-00-0000
ROBERT D. COLETTA, 000-00-0000
THOMAS P. COLLINS, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM B. COLLINS, 000-00-0000

PETER M. COLLOTON, 000-00-0000
WILFREDO COLON, 000-00-0000
IRIS D. COLONRIVERA, 000-00-0000
JOHN D. COMBS, 000-00-0000
DENISE P. CONTENTO, 000-00-0000
BRENDAN C. CONWAY, 000-00-0000
DENNIS L. CONWAY, 000-00-0000
EDWIN S. COOK, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM C. COOK, 000-00-0000
DAVID A. COOMBS, 000-00-0000
THOMAS E. COONEY, 000-00-0000
ALFRED B. COOPER, 000-00-0000
KENNETH C. COPE, 000-00-0000
ROBERT E. COPUS, 000-00-0000
ROY E. CORY, 000-00-0000
GAYLORD COSTON, 000-00-0000
CALVIN E. COUFAL, 000-00-0000
ROBERT N. COULTER, 000-00-0000
DUANE P. COVINO, 000-00-0000
FLOYD L. COX, 000-00-0000
HOMER T. COX III, 000-00-0000
MARK E. CRAIG, 000-00-0000
JOHN V. CRANDALL, 000-00-0000
REX H. CRAY, 000-00-0000
WARREN G. CRECY, 000-00-0000
JOHN H. CRECH, 000-00-0000
COX R. CRIDER, 000-00-0000
REED R. CRITCHFIELD, 000-00-0000
KEVIN CROSTHWAITE, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM CRUTCHFIELD, 000-00-0000
JUAN CRUZ, 000-00-0000
RITA K. CUCCHIARA, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM CULBERTSON, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL C. CULLEN, 000-00-0000
JAMES W. CULP, 000-00-0000
ALLEN D. CUNNINGHAM, 000-00-0000
ROBERT J. CURTIS, 000-00-0000
DAVID B. DABLING, 000-00-0000
RICHARD A. DAISLEY, 000-00-0000
KIM R. DANIEL, 000-00-0000
RICHARD R. DABRAM, 000-00-0000
AUGUST W. DAUEL, 000-00-0000
GLORIA E. DAVIS, 000-00-0000
JACK L. DAVIS, 000-00-0000
JAMES C. DAVIS, 000-00-0000
LARRY D. DAVIS, 000-00-0000
REBECCA S. DAVIS, 000-00-0000
JOHN W. DAVISON, 000-00-0000
DAVID I. DAWLEY, 000-00-0000
ROLAND R. DEAN, 000-00-0000
CLIFFORD T. DEANE, 000-00-0000
PHILIP J. DECARA, 000-00-0000
FAY M. DEFORD, 000-00-0000
PAUL M. DEKANDEL, 000-00-0000
JAMES T. DELISI, 000-00-0000
SANTIAGO DEL VALLE, 000-00-0000
STUART K. DEMARS, 000-00-0000
RONALL J. DENNISON, 000-00-0000
RONALD J. DENOYA, 000-00-0000
DAVID T. DENTON, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH G. DEPAUL, 000-00-0000
GEORGE J. DESIDERIO, 000-00-0000
GRANT R. DEWEY, 000-00-0000
ELIZABETH B. DIAL, 000-00-0000
NEIL DIAL, 000-00-0000
ROBERT A. DICKERSON, 000-00-0000
KEITH D. DICKSON, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. DILL, 000-00-0000
KEITH L. DILL, 000-00-0000
RICHARD R. DILLON, 000-00-0000
JAMES J. DISANZA, 000-00-0000
JAMES M. DOBBINS, 000-00-0000
ANTHONY DODSON, 000-00-0000
RICKY L. DODSON, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY J. DONNELLY, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL P. DONOVAN, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY D. DONOVAN, 000-00-0000
JEFFREY E. DORNEY, 000-00-0000
DAVID T. DORRROUGH, 000-00-0000
JOHN L. DORSEY, 000-00-0000
JOHN N. DOW, 000-00-0000
RALPH R. DOWNEY, 000-00-0000
RAYMOND S. DOYLE, 000-00-0000
ALBERT A. DREWKE, 000-00-0000
WAYNE K. DREYER, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH E. DRIESSEL, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM W. DUCHARME, 000-00-0000
CHARLES J. DUET, 000-00-0000
MARK T. DUNAISKI, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH E. DUNLEAVY, 000-00-0000
DONALD C. DURANT, 000-00-0000
PETER W. DUSEL, 000-00-0000
RICHARD C. DYKE, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM T. EGAN, 000-00-0000
GERALD F. EHRLICH, 000-00-0000
THOMAS EICHENBERG, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL EICHINGER, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM D. ELLIOTT, 000-00-0000
THLARN H. ELLIS, JR., 000-00-0000
EDWIN J. ELMORE, 000-00-0000
WOODROW A. ELMORE, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL P. ELMERINE, 000-00-0000
ROBERT L. EMMONS, 000-00-0000
PATRICK J. ENDERLIN, 000-00-0000
GARY R. ENGEL, 000-00-0000
THOMAS R. ENGEL, 000-00-0000
CONSTANCE ENRIGHT, 000-00-0000
LARRY J. ERICKSON, 000-00-0000
BEVERLY J. ERTMAN, 000-00-0000
BETTY J. ERVIN, 000-00-0000
GEORGE C. ESCHER, 000-00-0000
ARTHUR D. EVANS, 000-00-0000
GERRY L. EVANS, 000-00-0000
HENRY S. EVANS, 000-00-0000
KARY B. EVANS, 000-00-0000
STANLEY E. EVERETT, 000-00-0000
BOYDE J. FAGAN, 000-00-0000

KAREN A. FAGGIOLI, 000-00-0000
DONALD C. FAIRBANKS, 000-00-0000
JAMES L. FAIRCHILD, 000-00-0000
ALLEN C. FAIRCLOTH, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM C. FALKNER, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. FARENISH, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM H. FARR, 000-00-0000
EMILE J. FARRIS, 000-00-0000
DAN W. FAUST, 000-00-0000
ROLLAND E. FEARNOW, 000-00-0000
FRANK R. FERGUSON, 000-00-0000
DANIEL J. FERRARI, 000-00-0000
EMILIO FERRERSOTO, 000-00-0000
JOHN E. FIEG, 000-00-0000
DESMOND C. FIELDING, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN M. FIELDING, 000-00-0000
MIGUEL D. FIGUEROA, 000-00-0000
LELAND A. FINCHAM, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL P. FINN, 000-00-0000
JEFFERY V. FISCHER, 000-00-0000
GERARD E. FIX, 000-00-0000
DAVID R. FLEMING, 000-00-0000
JESSE E. FLEMING, 000-00-0000
JOHN P. FLEMMING, 000-00-0000
JANICE L. FLETCHER, 000-00-0000
ROBERT F. FLETCHER, 000-00-0000
NADINE M. FLYNN, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM J. FLYNN, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM J. FOGT, 000-00-0000
ROBERT J. FOLEY, 000-00-0000
DOUGLAS J. FONTENOT, 000-00-0000
JOYCE A. FORD, 000-00-0000
ROBERT G. FORD, 000-00-0000
PAUL D. FOREHAND, 000-00-0000
BRIAN A. FORZANI, 000-00-0000
GORDON O. FOSS, 000-00-0000
DAVID FOTHERINGHAM, 000-00-0000
JUDY A. FRAGO, 000-00-0000
GEORGE T. FRAZE, 000-00-0000
JAMES R. FRAZIER, JR., 000-00-0000
LLOYD J. FRENKLETON, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM M. FREMAM, 000-00-0000
JAMES P. FREITAG, 000-00-0000
DALE E. FRENCH, 000-00-0000
DONALD D. FRESIE, 000-00-0000
STEVEN W. FRODL, 000-00-0000
CHERIE A. FUCHS, 000-00-0000
WESLEY FUDGER, 000-00-0000
JIM E. FULBROOK, 000-00-0000
RICHARD R. GAARD, 000-00-0000
RALPH J. GABRIEL, 000-00-0000
BRUCE J. GABRYS, 000-00-0000
SUSAN L. GAHAGAN, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL GALLAGHER, 000-00-0000
HAROLD L. GALLMAN, 000-00-0000
PAUL V. GAMBINO, 000-00-0000
JOHN H. GAMSBY, 000-00-0000
RAYMON GARAYRIVERA, 000-00-0000
ROQUE GARCIA, JR., 000-00-0000
DAVID W. GARLAND, 000-00-0000
JOHN B. GARVER, 000-00-0000
JERRY T. GASKIN, 000-00-0000
BRUCE H. GATAROSKA, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM P. GATES, 000-00-0000
DARRELL C. GEE, 000-00-0000
PAUL C. GENEREUX, 000-00-0000
NORMAN P. GENTIEU, 000-00-0000
JAMES H. GERBERMAN, 000-00-0000
KENNETH J. GERCHMAN, 000-00-0000
ROBERT L. GIACUMI, 000-00-0000
SALVATOR GIANGREGO, 000-00-0000
HENRY L. GIBBS, 000-00-0000
CHARLES GIETZ, 000-00-0000
DAVID K. GILBERT, 000-00-0000
ROBERT C. GILBERT, 000-00-0000
ROBERT T. GILBERT, 000-00-0000
RICHARD D. GILLIAM, 000-00-0000
ROBERT D. GIRTEN, 000-00-0000
KEITH GLICKENHAUS, 000-00-0000
SAMUEL B. GLOVER, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL L. GLYMPH, 000-00-0000
KELLY P. GOAD, 000-00-0000
RICHARD E. GODFROY, 000-00-0000
RONALD C. GOHN, 000-00-0000
PAUL D. GOLDEN, 000-00-0000
DAVID A. GOMEZ, 000-00-0000
ROBERT A. GONOS, 000-00-0000
SAMUEL GOOD, JR., 000-00-0000
NANCY J. GORDON, 000-00-0000
THOMAS E. GORDON, 000-00-0000
MARTIN L. GRABER, 000-00-0000
ALLAN F. GRACHAN, 000-00-0000
CLIFFORD D. GRAHAM, 000-00-0000
MELVIN J. GRAVES, 000-00-0000
PHILIP A. GRAY, 000-00-0000
JAMES M. GRECO, 000-00-0000
JAMES F. GREEN, 000-00-0000
LINDA D. GREEN, 000-00-0000
OSCAR C. GREENLEAF, 000-00-0000
GEORGE T. GREENLEE, 000-00-0000
STANLEY B. GRELA, 000-00-0000
ROY D. GRIFFIN, 000-00-0000
GROVER K. GRIFFITH, 000-00-0000
KENNETH E. GRISSOM, 000-00-0000
EDWARD V. GRONNET, 000-00-0000
ELLEN M. GRUCHALLA, 000-00-0000
RAUL A. GRUMBERG, 000-00-0000
URS R. GSTEIGER, 000-00-0000
NELSON GUADALUPE, 000-00-0000
LINDSAY H. GUDRIDGE, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH R. GUILLORY, 000-00-0000
FRANK L. GUNN, 000-00-0000
RICKIE C. GURR, 000-00-0000
BRUCE J. GUSTAFSON, 000-00-0000
JOHN B. HABERMAN, 000-00-0000
GRADY R. HADDOX, 000-00-0000
RICHARD D. HAGGERTY, 000-00-0000

WILLIAM B. HAGOOD, 000-00-0000
HAL P. HAILEY, 000-00-0000
JIMMY A. HALL, 000-00-0000
STERLING W. HALL, 000-00-0000
JOHN J. HALLORAN, 000-00-0000
DANIEL R. HAMILTON, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL J. HAMILTON, 000-00-0000
CHRISTOPHER HAMLIN, 000-00-0000
PAUL G. HAMMER, 000-00-0000
MARK W. HAMPTON, 000-00-0000
JOHN C. HANCOCK, 000-00-0000
RALPH B. HANES, 000-00-0000
PHILIP L. HANRAHAN, 000-00-0000
DAVID R. HARBARGER, 000-00-0000
ALLAN D. HARCASLE, 000-00-0000
RUSSELL S. HARGIS, 000-00-0000
ROBERT HARGREAVES, 000-00-0000
DANIEL J. HARLAN, 000-00-0000
STEVEN M. HARNES, 000-00-0000
JOHN S. HARREL, 000-00-0000
ANDREW W. HARRELL, 000-00-0000
THOMAS HARRINGTON, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. HARRIS, 000-00-0000
JAMES H. HARRIS, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL P. HARRIS, 000-00-0000
ROBERT G. HARRIS, 000-00-0000
RODGER M. HARRISON, 000-00-0000
SAMMIE L. HARRISON, 000-00-0000
STEVEN R. HARRISON, 000-00-0000
EUGENE HARVEY III, 000-00-0000
ARTHUR J. HASS, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL R. HASTINGS, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN J. HATCH, 000-00-0000
STEVE C. HATZIS, 000-00-0000
GARY L. HAUSKEN, 000-00-0000
DANIEL E. HAWKIN, 000-00-0000
PETER R. HAWKINS, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN C. HAYDUK, 000-00-0000
ROBERT W. HAYES, 000-00-0000
PHILLIP R. HAYS, 000-00-0000
VICTORIA A. HAZZARD, 000-00-0000
JAMES D. HEAD, 000-00-0000
DAVID P. HEASLEY, 000-00-0000
DENNIS HELDENBRAND, 000-00-0000
PAUL L. HENDERSON, 000-00-0000
PRENTISS HENDRICKS, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM HENDRICKSON, 000-00-0000
KATHY L. HENNES, 000-00-0000
DONALD R. HENNINGER, 000-00-0000
DOUGLAS M. HENRY, 000-00-0000
JOHN R. HENSTRAND, 000-00-0000
BARBARA J. HEPWORTH, 000-00-0000
ROBERT G. HERBERT, 000-00-0000
WALTER C. HERBERT, 000-00-0000
FERNANDO HERNADEZ, 000-00-0000
CHERYLE F. HESS, 000-00-0000
FREDRICK S. HESSLER, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY J. HIGBEE, 000-00-0000
JOHN E. HIGGINS, 000-00-0000
KATHIE J. HIGHTOWER, 000-00-0000
EDGAR V. HILL, 000-00-0000
HOWARD E. HILL, 000-00-0000
ROBERT S. HILL, 000-00-0000
RODERICK A. HILL, 000-00-0000
LYNN D. HINTZE, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL D. HLADY, 000-00-0000
THOMAS R. HLAVAC, 000-00-0000
RUBY L. HOBBS, 000-00-0000
GARRY W. HOBSON, 000-00-0000
BARRY A. HOFFMAN, 000-00-0000
MARY J. HOGAN, 000-00-0000
THOMAS D. HOGGATT, 000-00-0000
THOMAS H. HOLCOMB, 000-00-0000
RICHARD G. HOLCOMBE, 000-00-0000
FRANK E. HOLLAND II, 000-00-0000
JAMES L. HOLLAND, 000-00-0000
CHAR HOLLANDSWORTH, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM J. HOLLEIN, 000-00-0000
JUDITH A. HOLLOWAY, 000-00-0000
PATRICK P. HOLMES, 000-00-0000
RICHARD F. HOLMES, 000-00-0000
REX M. HOLMLIN, 000-00-0000
HENRY V. HOLT, 000-00-0000
JAMES D. HOLT, 000-00-0000
JOHN S. HOOGLASIAN, 000-00-0000
CRAIG G. HOON, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY N. HOON, 000-00-0000
NORMAN M. HOOVER, 000-00-0000
CARL V. HOPPER, 000-00-0000
HOWARD C. HORACE, 000-00-0000
GARY W. HORNBACK, 000-00-0000
KENNETH A. HORNE, 000-00-0000
CHARLES P. HORTON, 000-00-0000
GEORGE W. HOUSE, 000-00-0000
JOHNNY D. HOUSER, 000-00-0000
THOMAS C. HOUSTON, 000-00-0000
BRUCE B. HOVERMALE, 000-00-0000
GARY C. HOWARD, 000-00-0000
JOSEPH S. HOWARD II, 000-00-0000
MELVIN A. HOWRY, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. HUDOCK, 000-00-0000
GEORGE T. HUDSON, 000-00-0000
MAURICE HUDSON, 000-00-0000
MACK HUGHES, 000-00-0000
PETER G. HUNKER, 000-00-0000
LINDELL R. HURST, 000-00-0000
HENRY J. IARRUSSO, 000-00-0000
JAMES ILKU, 000-00-0000
JERRY D. INGRAM, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL C. INGRAM, 000-00-0000
JAMES G. IVEY, 000-00-0000
JAMES J. JABLONSKI, 000-00-0000
KEVIN F. JACKSON, 000-00-0000
KEVIN M. JACKSON, 000-00-0000
ROY S. JACKSON, 000-00-0000
RONALD A. JACOBS, 000-00-0000
JOHN T. JANECZEK, 000-00-0000

LARRY D. JAYNE, 000-00-0000
THOMAS G. JENKINS, 000-00-0000
HOPE C. JENSEN, 000-00-0000
RANDY G. JENSEN, 000-00-0000
DENNIS L. JOHNS, 000-00-0000
ALBERT S. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
BRYAN W. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
DAVID W. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
FREDERICK JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
GREGORY D. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
JAMES H. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
JOY A. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL E. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
NORMAN A. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
RICKY L. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN J. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
WALTER G. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM E. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
ZACKARY R. JOHNSON, 000-00-0000
MARTIN A. JOHNSTON, 000-00-0000
STEVEN E. JOHNSTON, 000-00-0000
JERRY O. JONES, 000-00-0000
PAUL L. JONES, 000-00-0000
KENNETH D. JORDAN, 000-00-0000
PAUL E. JORDAN, 000-00-0000
MELISSA C. JOST, 000-00-0000
DARRICK H. JURDEN, 000-00-0000
CHARLES A. JUSTICE, 000-00-0000
CHARLES C. JUSTICE, 000-00-0000
LEONARD A. KAAANTA, 000-00-0000
JOHN P. KACSAN, 000-00-0000
ANNA M. KACZMARSKI, 000-00-0000
CAROLYN E. KADLEC, 000-00-0000
LANSING K. KAKAZU, 000-00-0000
EDWARD T. KAMARAD, 000-00-0000
DONALD L. KANE, 000-00-0000
JAMES M. KANE, 000-00-0000
STEPHEN R. KANE, 000-00-0000
JOHN C. KANISS, 000-00-0000
ELDON P. KAOPUA, 000-00-0000
GARY G. KASPER, 000-00-0000
MELVIN L. KAUFMAN, 000-00-0000
WALTER G. KEALEY, 000-00-0000
JOHN T. KELLY, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL A. KELLY, 000-00-0000
BARRETT M. KEMP, 000-00-0000
NEAL W. KEMP, 000-00-0000
BILLY G. KENNEDY, 000-00-0000
JEFFERY J. KENNEDY, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM H. KERN, 000-00-0000
JEAN N. KERNS, 000-00-0000
CAROL N. KERR, 000-00-0000
SAED A. KHAWAJA, 000-00-0000
EMMETT A. KIMBROUGH, 000-00-0000
LAWRENCE W. KIMMEL, 000-00-0000
DAVID KING, 000-00-0000
GEORGE A. KING, 000-00-0000
CLIFTON KIRKSEY, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL M. KITTTS, 000-00-0000
GEORGE A. KLINE, 000-00-0000
GARY M. KLUKA, 000-00-0000
CRAIG P. KNAPP, 000-00-0000
DARCE K. KNIGHT, 000-00-0000
FRED A. KNIGHT, 000-00-0000
FREDERICK KNUDSEN, 000-00-0000
CHESTER A. KOJRO, 000-00-0000
JAN E. KOLAKOWSKI, 000-00-0000
NICHOLAS KORMANIK, 000-00-0000
WELLS B. KORMANN, 000-00-0000
GERY W. KOSEL, 000-00-0000
DANIEL T. KOWACKI, 000-00-0000
MAREK A. KOZIARSKI, 000-00-0000
BRUCE E. KRAMME, 000-00-0000
FRANK M. KREIS, 000-00-0000
JOHN R. KREYE, 000-00-0000
KIRK M. KRIST, 000-00-0000
LARRY S. KROGRUD, 000-00-0000
DORIS J. KUBIK, 000-00-0000
KEITH J. KUDLA, 000-00-0000
REINHARD T. KUFALK, 000-00-0000
EMBE E. KUGLER, 000-00-0000
CHARLES KUKLENSKI, 000-00-0000
HAROLD C. KULBERG, 000-00-0000
THOMAS KURASIEWICZ, 000-00-0000
SHEILA A. KUSCHKE, 000-00-0000
SUSAN E. KUWANA, 000-00-0000
POLYDEF KYPIANDES, 000-00-0000
NORMAN M. LABUTTI, 000-00-0000
DAWN M. LAKE, 000-00-0000
RANDALL LAMBRECHT, 000-00-0000
DUNNICA O. LAMPTON, 000-00-0000
THOMAS B. LANE, 000-00-0000
JAMES P. LANG, 000-00-0000
JAMES F. LARSEN, 000-00-0000
LAWRENCE M. LARSEN, 000-00-0000
ALICIA C. LASHBROOK, 000-00-0000
RANDOLPH A. LATALL, 000-00-0000
STANLEY R. LAWSON, 000-00-0000
JOHN T. LEADEATER, 000-00-0000
JAMES P. LEAHY, 000-00-0000
LELAND W. LEARNED, 000-00-0000
DONALD E. LEFKISHER, 000-00-0000
THOMAS LEBOVIC, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM D. LECHER, 000-00-0000
JERRY G. LEDOUX, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. LEE, 000-00-0000
JOHN C. LEE, 000-00-0000
DONALD D. LEETH, 000-00-0000
LAWRENCE T. LEPAK, 000-00-0000
GARY D. LERCH, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. LESCH, 000-00-0000
LEO S. LESKO, 000-00-0000
GLENN J. LESNIAK, 000-00-0000
PAUL L. LEVERETTE, 000-00-0000
MORRIS H. LEW, 000-00-0000
DONALD L. LEWIS, 000-00-0000
HERMAN P. LEWIS, 000-00-0000

MICHAEL LEWIS, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD D. LEWIS, 000-00-0000
 SALVATORE J. LICARI, 000-00-0000
 MARK P. LINTZ, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD L. LITTLE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID A. LIVELY, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN M. LLOYD, 000-00-0000
 DAVID B. LOBB, 000-00-0000
 JOHN W. LOCKHART, 000-00-0000
 BRAD G. LOEWEN, 000-00-0000
 WALTER C. LOHMAN, 000-00-0000
 RAMSEY LONGBOOTHAM, 000-00-0000
 WALTER E. LORCHEIM, 000-00-0000
 JONATHAN D. LORD, 000-00-0000
 ORLANDO C. LOVELL, 000-00-0000
 RHETT M. LOWERY, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT L. LOWERY, JR., 000-00-0000
 VERNON L. LOWREY, 000-00-0000
 GILBERT LOZANO, JR., 000-00-0000
 JAMES C. LUBS, 000-00-0000
 JOHN M. LUCACOS, 000-00-0000
 GABRIEL S. LUM, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM J. LUPTON, 000-00-0000
 JOHN D. LYBRAND, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN L. LYNCH, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN L. LYNE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. MAAS, 000-00-0000
 KARL L. MACE, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL E. MACK, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. MACKENZIE, 000-00-0000
 BRADLEY A. MACOMBER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN V. MADDEN, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. MADSEN, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG R. MAEFS, 000-00-0000
 JEFFREY S. MAGERS, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL H. MAGGARD, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD P. MAHONEY, 000-00-0000
 PAULINE J. MALLORY, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS O. MANCOSKE, 000-00-0000
 BRIAN C. MANDEVILLE, 000-00-0000
 JEANNIE M. MANGIONE, 000-00-0000
 NOEL R. MANN, 000-00-0000
 WINSTON E. MANN, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY R. MARKET, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS M. MARKLEY, 000-00-0000
 WAYNE D. MARLETT, 000-00-0000
 CHESTER M. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES C. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN R. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH D. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 MARTYN A. MARTIN, 000-00-0000
 PETER A. MARTINE, 000-00-0000
 PABLO MARTINEZ, 000-00-0000
 HECTOR M. MARTIR, 000-00-0000
 ERIC D. MARTZ, 000-00-0000
 MATTHEW G. MASNIK, 000-00-0000
 PAUL E. MASTERS, 000-00-0000
 TOM O. MATCHIN, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH A. MATCZAK, 000-00-0000
 ROGER L. MAXWELL, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN R. MAXWELL, 000-00-0000
 ALBERT E. MAYNARD, 000-00-0000
 FRANKLIN E. MAYO, 000-00-0000
 CLARENCE M. MCADORY, 000-00-0000
 BILLY J. MCALISTER, 000-00-0000
 ROYETTA A. MCBAIN, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL MCCALISTER, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY N. MCCALLON, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS F. MCCANN, 000-00-0000
 TIMOTHY G. MCCARTHY, 000-00-0000
 CECIL L. MCCLELLAN, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN MCCONNELL, 000-00-0000
 WALTER D. MCCORMICK, 000-00-0000
 JOHN W. MCCOY, 000-00-0000
 MATTHEW A. MCCOY, 000-00-0000
 DANNY MCDANIEL, 000-00-0000
 JOHN E. MCDONALD, 000-00-0000
 WILLIE G. MCGAHA, JR., 000-00-0000
 DENNIS J. MCGLOTHLIN, 000-00-0000
 COURTIS U. MCGUIRE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT P. MCKEEVER, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD A. MCKENNEY, 000-00-0000
 GARY A. MCKOWN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN R. MCLAUGHLIN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. MCLEOD, 000-00-0000
 JEFFERY A. MCNARY, 000-00-0000
 JAMES C. MCNAUGHTON, 000-00-0000
 TIMOTHY R. MCNEESE, 000-00-0000
 JERRY L. MCNINCH, 000-00-0000
 ALDEN W. MCPIKE, 000-00-0000
 TERESA L. MCSWAIN, 000-00-0000
 GLEN A. MEADE, 000-00-0000
 HARRY E. MEADE, 000-00-0000
 NOLAN R. MEADOWS, 000-00-0000
 GILBERT MEDINA, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT J. MEIER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID H. MELASKY, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE W. MELLELEU, 000-00-0000
 TERRY L. MELTON, 000-00-0000
 EDWIN MENDEZ, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT A. MIENTE, 000-00-0000
 VIVIAN R. MENYHART, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD L. MENZEL, 000-00-0000
 MARK E. MERCER, 000-00-0000
 TERRENCE J. MERKEL, 000-00-0000
 RONALD W. MERKH, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN C. METZ, 000-00-0000
 GERALD L. MEYER, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. MIER, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL P. MIGUES, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES A. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 EVAN G. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY L. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN E. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 KURT D. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 MUREL C. MILLER, 000-00-0000

SCOTT D. MILLER, 000-00-0000
 EDDIE D. MILLS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. MITAS, 000-00-0000
 JOHN P. MITCHAM, 000-00-0000
 JAN E. MITCHELL, 000-00-0000
 DAVID W. MITCHEM, 000-00-0000
 HOMER B. MOFFITT, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT A. MOGOR, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM MONK III, 000-00-0000
 XAVIER A. MONTALVO, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES E. MOORE, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY A. MOORE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES W. MOORE, 000-00-0000
 RANDALL C. MOORE, 000-00-0000
 ALFRED MORALESOLAN, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL E. MORAN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN B. MORGAN, 000-00-0000
 JUAN E. MORGAN, 000-00-0000
 JILL MORGENTHAUER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN J. MORIARTY, 000-00-0000
 DOMINIQUE J. MORIN, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND J. MORRELL, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND E. MORREN, 000-00-0000
 DAVID A. MORRIS, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. MORRIS, 000-00-0000
 WILLARD D. MORTON, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH MOSCARIELLO, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY J. MOSKAL, 000-00-0000
 FRANCIS V. MOULTER, 000-00-0000
 SPENCER T. MUKAI, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL J. MULLEN, 000-00-0000
 LAWRENCE W. MUNCIE, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD R. MURDOUGH, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH A. MURPHY, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT E. MURPHY, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS R. MURPHY, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD J. MURRELL, 000-00-0000
 RUSSELL L. MUSE, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL J. MUSEL, 000-00-0000
 JORGE L. MUSKUS, 000-00-0000
 ALAN R. MYERS, 000-00-0000
 GARY R. MYERS, 000-00-0000
 MARGARET E. MYERS, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT S. MYERS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS H. MYLAN, 000-00-0000
 WALTER H. NAGEL, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH S. NAVARRA, 000-00-0000
 WAYNE M. NEAL, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND A. NEGRON, 000-00-0000
 LINN G. NEIDENGARD, 000-00-0000
 JOHN R. NELSON, 000-00-0000
 KURT A. NELSON, 000-00-0000
 PATRICK G. NELSON, 000-00-0000
 JERRY A. NEPODAL, 000-00-0000
 DONALD R. NEWMAN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT NEWMAN, 000-00-0000
 HOMER I. NEWTON, 000-00-0000
 DONALD R. NICHOLS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES H. NICHOLS, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN D. NICHOLS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. NICHOLS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. NITZSCHE, 000-00-0000
 GORDON D. NIVA, 000-00-0000
 JESSE L. NOLES, 000-00-0000
 MICHELLE H. NOEL, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH F. NOFERI, 000-00-0000
 RONALD NORMANDEAU, 000-00-0000
 BARRY D. NORON, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES M. NORTON, 000-00-0000
 STANLEY J. NOVAK, 000-00-0000
 VINCENT OVERHOFER, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG F. ODELL, 000-00-0000
 JOE P. ODUL, 000-00-0000
 RIC B. OLSEN, 000-00-0000
 DOLAN E. OLSON, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. OLSON, 000-00-0000
 STEWART A. OLSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM H. ORANGE, 000-00-0000
 FERNANDO ORNELAS, 000-00-0000
 ANG ORTIZRODRIGUEZ, 000-00-0000
 BRETT W. OSBORN, 000-00-0000
 MARTI OSHAUGHNESSY, 000-00-0000
 HENRY J. OSTERMANN, 000-00-0000
 THEODORE G. OSUNIGA, 000-00-0000
 JEFFREY D. OUS, 000-00-0000
 JEFFAMIN F. OVERBEY, 000-00-0000
 DARREN G. OWENS, 000-00-0000
 MARTY D. OWENS, 000-00-0000
 DUANE L. PACE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES A. PAHDOCO, 000-00-0000
 ERNEST S. PALASSIS, 000-00-0000
 JAN G. PAPRA, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH E. PAQUIN, 000-00-0000
 KEVIN J. PARDUS, 000-00-0000
 PETER F. PARIS, 000-00-0000
 COLLEEN P. PARKER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID M. PARQUETTE, 000-00-0000
 GARLAND W. PARRISH, 000-00-0000
 LYNN M. PARROTT, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT PASCOCELLO, 000-00-0000
 JAMES L. PATRICK, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD PATTERSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM PATTERSON, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN L. PAULL, 000-00-0000
 JAMES K. PAYNE, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTIAN PEARSON, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE J. PECHARKA, 000-00-0000
 PAUL A. PEDERSEN, 000-00-0000
 WALTER S. PEDIGO, 000-00-0000
 VINCENT P. PEDULLA, 000-00-0000
 JOHN E. PEMBERTON, 000-00-0000
 JOHN L. PENSINGTON, 000-00-0000
 DAVID C. PERKINS, 000-00-0000
 LAWRENCE M. PERNA, 000-00-0000
 ARTHUR E. PETERSEN, 000-00-0000
 KARL F. PETERSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. PETERSON, 000-00-0000

FRANCIS P. PETRELL, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN C. PFAFF, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL D. PHELAN, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY W. PHELPS, 000-00-0000
 JERRY L. PHILLABAUM, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES C. PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 FREDERICK PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH C. PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 SHELDON H. PHILLIPS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES V. PIANELLI, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH A. PIASTA, 000-00-0000
 MARK H. PIEKLIN, 000-00-0000
 LEWIS E. PINSON, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND P. PLAGGE, 000-00-0000
 STANLEY C. PLUMMER, 000-00-0000
 PATRICK P. PNACEK, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE W. POGGE, 000-00-0000
 URSULA S. POLK, 000-00-0000
 JAMES M. POLLOCK, 000-00-0000
 PAMELA J. POLMATEER, 000-00-0000
 WALTER R. POSEY, 000-00-0000
 KAREN POSPISIL, 000-00-0000
 BRICCA PRESTRIDGE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT M. PREVETTE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD J. PREVOST, 000-00-0000
 LESTER K. PRICE, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM C. PRICE, 000-00-0000
 RICKY L. PRUETT, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD L. PUGLISI, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL M. PURCELL, 000-00-0000
 CORTEZ M. PURYEAR, 000-00-0000
 JAMES I. PYLANT, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY H. QUAN, 000-00-0000
 WESLEY R. QUERNS, 000-00-0000
 GRANDVIAL H. QUICK, 000-00-0000
 ALLEN E. QUILLIN, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY A. QUIRIN, 000-00-0000
 WAYNE P. RAKETT, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN R. RANKIN, 000-00-0000
 LARRY F. RATLIP, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL RAWSTHORNE, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH M. REA, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD J. RECKE, 000-00-0000
 CAROLYN RECKOWENS, 000-00-0000
 LARRY D. REESE, 000-00-0000
 ELDON P. REGUA, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD REID, 000-00-0000
 WILLIE V. REID, JR., 000-00-0000
 DENNIS E. REILAND, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD F. RENNIE, 000-00-0000
 BRUCE C. RESSNER, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL M. REYNA, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD RHEINHEIMER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN C. RICE, 000-00-0000
 JACKIE L. RICHARDS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES L. RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 JEROME RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 MARK A. RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 RAJ L. RICHARDSON, 000-00-0000
 MARK C. RICKETTS, 000-00-0000
 DREW S. RICKS, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM F. RIDLON, 000-00-0000
 DARRELL RIEKENBERG, 000-00-0000
 JOHN S. RILEY, 000-00-0000
 JOYCE S. RILEY, 000-00-0000
 TOD H. RINGENBERG, 000-00-0000
 LINFORD E. RINIKER, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE W. RIPPEE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID RITTENHOUSE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES H. RITTER, 000-00-0000
 JOSE RIVERANAZARIO, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT F. ROACH, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL K. ROBEL, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. ROBERTS, 000-00-0000
 DANNY L. ROBERTSON, 000-00-0000
 MONROE I. ROBERTSON, 000-00-0000
 CARTER J. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES J. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES M. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 DAVID P. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. ROBINSON, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES P. ROCCO, 000-00-0000
 LARRY L. ROCHAT, 000-00-0000
 JOHN L. RODDY, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT G. RODRIGUEZ, 000-00-0000
 GUY A. ROGERS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES E. ROGERS, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH L. ROGERS, 000-00-0000
 LARRY E. ROGERS, 000-00-0000
 KEITH C. ROGERSON, 000-00-0000
 RANDY C. ROLAND, 000-00-0000
 ALLYN D. ROLLEY, 000-00-0000
 DEBRA A. ROSEBROCK, 000-00-0000
 DANNY R. ROSS, 000-00-0000
 JOHN L. ROSS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS W. ROUND, 000-00-0000
 REX C. RUDY, 000-00-0000
 FRANKLIN J. RUPL, 000-00-0000
 SALVATORE J. RUSSO, 000-00-0000
 LARRY D. RUTHERFORD, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD A. RUTLEDGE, 000-00-0000
 LARRY E. RYALS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS M. RYAN, 000-00-0000
 DAVID S. RYDER, 000-00-0000
 STEPHAN E. RYECZEK, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM T. RYERSON, 000-00-0000
 PAMELA M. SABONIS, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH T. SAFFER, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM D. SAILERS, 000-00-0000
 LLOYD F. SAMMONS, 000-00-0000
 RAFAEL SANCHEZ, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS J. SANDBOTHE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID R. SANDERS, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH R. SANDERS, 000-00-0000

RICHARD A. SANDERS, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT SANKNER, 000-00-0000
 DONALD V. SAPP, 000-00-0000
 MERRIEL E. SAVAGE, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. SCHAAB, 000-00-0000
 ALAN L. SCHANTZ, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN F. SCHARF, 000-00-0000
 ESTHER S. SCHAU, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH G. SCHIEMAN, 000-00-0000
 MARCIA S. SCHIFF, 000-00-0000
 ROGER R. SCHLEIDEN, 000-00-0000
 BENJAMIN SCHLEIDER, 000-00-0000
 TERRY R. SCHMALTZ, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL E. SCHMIDT, 000-00-0000
 PAUL G. SCHMITT, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY L. SCHMITZ, 000-00-0000
 PAUL A. SCHNEIDER, 000-00-0000
 CLIFFO SCHOLLMAYER, 000-00-0000
 GARRY G. SCHOONOVER, 000-00-0000
 EDWARD W. SCHORK, 000-00-0000
 MELV SCHUCKENBROCK, 000-00-0000
 JAMES D. SCHULTZ, 000-00-0000
 BARBARA A. SCHWARTZ, 000-00-0000
 BRION L. SCHWEBKE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD D. SCIASCIA, 000-00-0000
 TRAVIS F. SCOGIN, 000-00-0000
 DAVID O. SCOTT, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL E. SCOTT, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS D. SCOTT, 000-00-0000
 SHERWOOD SEAGRAVES, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD D. SEAMAN, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS S. SEARS, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL B. SEELEY, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN R. SEITER, 000-00-0000
 PETER A. SEITZ, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTOPHER SERPA, 000-00-0000
 BARBARA A. SERVE, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN M. SEYFRIED, 000-00-0000
 JONATHAN H. SHAFFER, 000-00-0000
 DAVID L. SHAKES, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG SHARP, 000-00-0000
 JOHN M. SHAUGHNESSY, 000-00-0000
 TROY C. SHAVER, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS M. SHEA, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, 000-00-0000
 JOHN C. SHEDD, 000-00-0000
 RONALD P. SHELDON, 000-00-0000
 LARRY A. SHELTON, 000-00-0000
 JOHN E. SHEPARD, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD D. SHIELDS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS M. SHIRK, 000-00-0000
 KATHLEEN R. SHRANK, 000-00-0000
 ARTHUR J. SHULTZ, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL C. SIBBALD, 000-00-0000
 LANNEAU H. SIEGLING, 000-00-0000
 SAUL J. SIEMASKA, 000-00-0000
 RAYMON SIENKIEWICZ, 000-00-0000
 MARK P. SIINO, 000-00-0000
 GENE S. SILVERBLATT, 000-00-0000
 ANNIE L. SIMMONS, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES J. SIMMONS, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH R. SIMMONS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS O. SIMON, 000-00-0000
 NORMAN W. SIPE, 000-00-0000
 KELLY L. SIPLE, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTINE SKIBBIE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT G. SKILES, JR., 000-00-0000
 LARRY G. SLADE, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM A. SLUYTER, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD W. SMALL, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS D. SMILEY, 000-00-0000
 BRENT L. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 BYRON J. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 CHERYL A. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 CURT N. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 DAVID B. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 DAVID G. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY A. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 JAMES A. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH E. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 LAWRENCE B. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL SMITH, 000-00-0000
 PERRY J. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN W. SMITH, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM SMITH, 000-00-0000
 JOHN C. SNELLING, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL L. SNOWDEN, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS A. SOBECKI, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM SOBOTKA, 000-00-0000
 KEITH L. SODERSTROM, 000-00-0000
 HENRY A. SOLOMON, 000-00-0000
 NORRIS A. SOLOMON, 000-00-0000
 SERAFIN SOTOMAYOR, 000-00-0000
 ALAN P. SOUERS, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTOPH SOUTHARD, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN E. SPATOLA, 000-00-0000
 RONALD D. SPEARS, 000-00-0000
 ANNIE B. SPENCER, 000-00-0000
 TERRANCE J. SPOON, 000-00-0000
 STEPHEN O. SPRAGUE, 000-00-0000
 PAUL L. STACHURA, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD STADELMANN, 000-00-0000

ROBERT E. STANEK, 000-00-0000
 JOHN T. STANG, 000-00-0000
 DAVID W. STARR, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL R. STASZAK, 000-00-0000
 MATTHEW STCLAIR, JR., 000-00-0000
 BRYAN F. STEARNS, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS STEINBRUNNER, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL E. STEPHANY, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. STEPHENS, 000-00-0000
 JEANETTE L. STERNER, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT B. STEVENS, 000-00-0000
 ANDREW O. STEWART, 000-00-0000
 ARTHUR L. STEWART, 000-00-0000
 JON D. STEWART, 000-00-0000
 ALAN W. STIEVO, 000-00-0000
 DON S. STINSON, 000-00-0000
 JOHN B. STINSON, 000-00-0000
 PAUL M. STTTES, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY M. STOCK, 000-00-0000
 GREGORY W. STOKES, 000-00-0000
 DENNIS K. STOLL, 000-00-0000
 KENNET STONEBRAKER, 000-00-0000
 RICKEY D. STORM, 000-00-0000
 JAMES F. STOWELL, 000-00-0000
 TED F. STRAHAN, 000-00-0000
 BILLY J. STRAIN, 000-00-0000
 BENNY L. STRANGE, 000-00-0000
 GERALD B. STREET, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN P. STROH, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD B. STRONG, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM H. STROUSE, 000-00-0000
 BILLIE J. STUBBS, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES B. STULTS, 000-00-0000
 JERROLD T. SULLIVAN, 000-00-0000
 JOHN T. SULLIVAN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT W. SURTEES, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH L. SWAITHES, 000-00-0000
 KEITH A. SWALLEY, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES D. SWAN, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM N. SWANDAL, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL SWANSBURG, 000-00-0000
 ANDREW A. SWANSON, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD L. SWEENEY, 000-00-0000
 FRANK M. SWETT, 000-00-0000
 JEFFREY SWOKOWSKI, 000-00-0000
 DEREK C. SWOPE, 000-00-0000
 FRANK A. SZYMANSKI, 000-00-0000
 DORIS P. TACKETT, 000-00-0000
 RICK W. TAGUE, 000-00-0000
 BRIAN J. TALASKE, 000-00-0000
 VINCENT C. TAMY, 000-00-0000
 BRUCE TARNOPOLSKI, 000-00-0000
 JOHN C. TAYLOR, 000-00-0000
 REGINALD A. TEAGUE, 000-00-0000
 DWYANE L. TEAL, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES C. TEISING, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL L. TEMPLE, 000-00-0000
 NICHOLAS TEODOROU, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS P. TERRY, 000-00-0000
 STEVEN L. TETREAULT, 000-00-0000
 RONALD H. TEUFEL, 000-00-0000
 ANNA L. THACKER, 000-00-0000
 NANCY A. THOMAS, 000-00-0000
 CAREY G. THOMPSON, 000-00-0000
 DANA D. THOMPSON, 000-00-0000
 DAVID W. THOMPSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM D. THOMPSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. THOMSON, 000-00-0000
 COLUMBUS THORNHILL, 000-00-0000
 RODERICK THORNTON, 000-00-0000
 RONALD L. THORSETT, 000-00-0000
 EMELIO K. TIO, 000-00-0000
 SHERRY L. TOBERMAN, 000-00-0000
 ALBERT TOCZYDLOWSKI, 000-00-0000
 JOHN A. TODD, 000-00-0000
 JAMES TOLBERT, JR., 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM G. TOLLESON, 000-00-0000
 FREDERICK TONSING, 000-00-0000
 LEN E. TONTZ, 000-00-0000
 JEFFREY A. TOTARO, 000-00-0000
 LEWIS B. TOWNSEND, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES A. TRAFFORD, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH V. TRAHAN, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM D. TROUT, 000-00-0000
 PATRICK M. TUCKER, 000-00-0000
 VERLYN E. TUCKER, 000-00-0000
 LEWIS T. TURNER, 000-00-0000
 KARL W. UCHRINSCKO, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL ULEKOWSKI, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES B. UPSHAW, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL S. UPTON, 000-00-0000
 DANIEL P. VALENTINE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT VANDERMALE, 000-00-0000
 RUSSELL VANHOUTEN, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT W. VAUGHAN, 000-00-0000
 JANIS K. VAUGHN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES B. VAUGHT, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM V. VEJCIK, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM H. VENEMA, 000-00-0000
 ERIC C. VERBER, 000-00-0000
 JAMES W. VERMASON, 000-00-0000
 ROGER A. VERNON, 000-00-0000
 FERNAND R. VERRIER, 000-00-0000

GARRY L. VEST, 000-00-0000
 RAYMOND B. VIETS, 000-00-0000
 JOSEPH F. VISKOCIL, 000-00-0000
 DALE T. VITALE, 000-00-0000
 DALE L. VOLLEY, 000-00-0000
 OTTO VONOETTINGEN, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM D. WAFF, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL D. WALDROP, 000-00-0000
 JAMES B. WALK, 000-00-0000
 DAVID M. WALKER, 000-00-0000
 DOLTON G. WALKER, 000-00-0000
 LOYA W. WALL, 000-00-0000
 SALLY WALLACE, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. WALLEY, 000-00-0000
 KILFRED WALLEY, 000-00-0000
 GLENN H. WALTON, 000-00-0000
 MATTHEW J. WANCHENA, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS J. WARD, 000-00-0000
 MELINDA L. WARD, 000-00-0000
 ARLON I. WARNER, 000-00-0000
 CLYDE C. WARNICK, 000-00-0000
 JOHN H. WARREN, 000-00-0000
 TOM E. WARREN, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM A. WARREN, 000-00-0000
 PAUL V. WATERBURY, 000-00-0000
 DIANE K. WATERS, 000-00-0000
 LEACLE W. WATERS, 000-00-0000
 FELTON WATKINS III, 000-00-0000
 JOYCE I. WATSON, 000-00-0000
 HENRY L. WAY, JR., 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL R. WEAVER, 000-00-0000
 CRAIG A. WEBBER, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE L. WEBSTER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN K. WEEMS, 000-00-0000
 LEE L. WEISHAR, 000-00-0000
 THOMAS WEISSMILLER, 000-00-0000
 JOHN WEISZ, 000-00-0000
 DICK WELCH, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT E. WELCH, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT F. WELCH, 000-00-0000
 JOHN L. WELLS, 000-00-0000
 WAYNE A. WELLS, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH E. WELTY, 000-00-0000
 BEAUREGARD A. WENDT, 000-00-0000
 JAMES E. WEST, 000-00-0000
 DONALD G. WESTBROOK, 000-00-0000
 MARTIN A. WESTMAN, 000-00-0000
 JIM B. WESTMORELAND, 000-00-0000
 MARY WESTMORELAND, 000-00-0000
 AMELIA J. WESTON, 000-00-0000
 GRANT L. WHITE, 000-00-0000
 RICHARD K. WHITE, 000-00-0000
 ROBERT M. WHITED, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL WHITEHEAD, 000-00-0000
 FLOYD G. WHITNEY, 000-00-0000
 ROGER D. WIEDEMAN, 000-00-0000
 JAMES A. WIEGEL, 000-00-0000
 DELANCE E. WIEGELE, 000-00-0000
 JACK I. WIER, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS WILKINSON, 000-00-0000
 MICHAEL WILLBANKS, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES L. WILLCOX, 000-00-0000
 BARRY J. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 FREDDIE L. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 GUY T. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES A. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 JAMES R. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 SAMUEL T. WILLIAMS, 000-00-0000
 EDDY WILLIAMSON, 000-00-0000
 DELLOYD WILSON, 000-00-0000
 JOEL W. WILSON, 000-00-0000
 LEON E. WILSON, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM T. WILSON, 000-00-0000
 CALVIN B. WIMBISH, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM R. WING, 000-00-0000
 GARY L. WINSPER, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY E. WINSTEAD, 000-00-0000
 GEORGE A. WITHROW, 000-00-0000
 TED E. WITTE, 000-00-0000
 ROYCE L. WITTIE, 000-00-0000
 CHARLES D. WOHLRAB, 000-00-0000
 ANTHONY A. WOLF, 000-00-0000
 RUSSELL S. WOLFE, 000-00-0000
 CHRISTIN WOLFFRAMM, 000-00-0000
 WILLIAM E. WOOD, JR., 000-00-0000
 KENNETH W. WOODARD, 000-00-0000
 DANNY L. WOODYARD, 000-00-0000
 JAMES H. WOOLEY, 000-00-0000
 PAUL D. WOOLMAN, 000-00-0000
 HOWARD N. WOOSTER, 000-00-0000
 DUNCAN W. WORTMANN, 000-00-0000
 DOUGLAS R. WRIGHT, 000-00-0000
 FRANK M. WYCKOFF, 000-00-0000
 NEIL YAMASHIRO, 000-00-0000
 MERRILL K. YEE, 000-00-0000
 EDWIN G. YOCHER, 000-00-0000
 BARBARA YOERG, 000-00-0000
 JAMES W. YOUNG, 000-00-0000
 KENNETH ZABIELSKI, 000-00-0000
 JOHN A. ZERILLO, 000-00-0000
 GARY M. ZICKEFOOSE, 000-00-0000
 VINCENT A. ZIKE, 000-00-0000