higher returns and facilitate a steadier and higher stream of distributions.

Under current law, there is a 10-year limit on leases of endowment lands.

The Craig-Kempthorne legislation repeals the 10-year limit, and allows the state land board to establish agreements that will maximize the long-term financial return on any lease that is made. This provision makes the management of lands available for education purposes on equal footing with the management of land in other endowments.

These changes may sound technical but in truth bring common-sense to managing the Idaho Endowment. The endowment, if it were created today, would be managed as a whole, and would have a diversified mix of equity assets, with smaller portions of fixed income and real estate. In addition, cash flow would be better regulated to meet a more consistent, and higher, level of distributions. This is the overwhelming practice of most endowments.

Instead, the Idaho Endowment is two separate entities, the land trust and the endowment fund. There is currently little coordination between these two entities, and each part of the endowment is concentrated in a particular type of asset. The land trust is dominated by timber, and the financial assets are exclusively fixed income, lower-yielding assets. There is currently no management of the distributions of overall cash flow and the investment policy has no long-term investment strategy, or prudent management of cash flow or a policy to decrease the concentration of assets to reduce investment risk. This is an outdated investment strategy. And there is now no comprehensive plan for the entire trust.

Governor Phil Batt appointed a committee of financial experts and public officials to review the endowment and land trust. This committee, chaired by Douglas Dorn, reviewed the endowment and the trust, and made a number of recommendations. Of particular importance, the committee recommended and concluded that the endowment should be managed as one fund by one governing body that would decide overall investment strategy using modern day so-called prudent investor investment strategies.

The creation of the land bank and the earnings reserve are key elements of this strategy. That is what this legislation provides, and I urge the Senate to adopt this bill at the first opportunity. And I will be urging the citizens of Idaho to do their part this November and vote for the constitutional amendments that are needed to modernize the legal framework of the Endowment.

I commend Governor Batt for his leadership and innovation in developing this legislative package which will clearly benefit Idaho children. I also want to commend Doug Dorn, and his committee of Rep. William L. Deal, State Controller J.D. Williams, Robert Montgomery, Dr. Thomas Stitzel, Robert Maynard, Michael Brassey, Clive Strong and Michael Ferguson for their effective and bipartisan work.

Today we see the results of the wisdom and foresight of the decisions made 100 years ago by Congress and the citizens of Idaho. I trust this Congress and the citizens of Idaho will match the wisdom of their predecessors, and adopt this legislative package which will provide more money so we can teach our children well.●

THE MEDICARE+CHOICE PAYMENT EQUITY ACT OF 1998

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, last year's balanced budget agreement contained provisions to make Medicare more efficient by moving away from wasteful practices that the private sector long ago consigned to history, while offering seniors in Oregon and other states more and better choices for their health care service. The bipartisan bill Senator SMITH and I are introducing today will make sure that those provisions are implemented in a way that will indeed bring about the full potential of these reforms.

The Medicare+Choice Payment Equity Act of 1998 will finish what we started with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 by creating payment equity under Medicare's formula for paying for managed care services . Without equity in payment, beneficiaries in Oregon could be penalized because they may never get the same kinds of services in their Medicare managed care package that are available in other areas of the country with less efficient health care systems.

For states like Oregon with cost efficient health care systems, the Medicare formula resulted in lower payment. While we made progress in correcting this inequity through the Balanced Budget Act, changes made at the last minute in the legislation will actually prevent efficient states from ever gaining full equity in payment under Medicare managed care plans.

This legislation corrects that by requiring full funding of what is known as the ''blend'' portion of the formula. With managed care taking a larger role in Medicare it is more important now to assure equity in the payment formula. This legislation is supported by the Fairness Coalition and the American Hospital Association.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed for the RECORD.

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

S. 2227

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Medicare+Choice Payment Equity Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF BUDGET NEUTRALITY ADJUSTMENT FACTOR IN CALCULATING THE BLENDED CAPITATION RATE FOR MEDICARE+CHOICE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking the comma at the end of clause (ii) and all that follows before the period at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part C of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1853(c)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), by striking ''(6)(C) and (7)'' and inserting ''(5)(C) and (6)''; and

(B) in paragraphs (1)(B)(ii) and (3)(A)(i), by striking ''(6)(A)'' and inserting ''(5)(A)''; and

(2) in subsections (b)(3)(B)(ii) and (c)(3) of section 1859, by striking ''1853(c)(6)'' and inserting ''1853(c)(5)''.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 20 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a legislative proposal that provides for aggregate decreases in Federal expenditures under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) as are equal to the aggregate increases in such expenditures under such program resulting from the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made under contracts entered into on or after January 1, 1999.●

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, today with my colleague, Senator WYDEN, I introduce legislation to restore equity in the Medicare payment rate otherwise known as the Average Adjusted Per Capita Cost (AAPCC) formula under Medicare. This formula, which is implemented by the Health Care Financing Administration, determines the payment rates made to health maintenance organizations (HMOs) that offer coverage to Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. President, prior to the passage of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, AAPCC rates were determined by calculating the five-year average of per-capita Medicare fee-for-service spending by county, as well as the graduate medical education (GME) and disproportionate share (DSH) payments. Since Medicare utilization rates, GME and DSH rates vary from county to county throughout the United States, those areas that have low Medicare utilization rates subsequently receive a lower payment than other areas where Medicare utilization rates are much higher. In 1997, those rates varied from $286 in Gilliam County, Oregon to $748 in Dade County, Florida.

The result of such disproportionate levels in payments to HMOs is a disproportionate amount of benefits provided to Medicare beneficiaries. For example, HMOs that provide coverage for Medicare beneficiaries living in Los Angeles, California or Dade County, Florida receive a significantly higher payment; therefore, they can afford to provide additional benefits such as prescription drugs, eye glasses, and dental coverage. Meanwhile, HMOs that provide coverage to beneficiaries in Portland, Oregon receive a lower payment rate and cannot afford to provide such additional benefits. Mr. President, this is blatantly unfair, and unacceptable. Medicare beneficiaries deserve the same access to the same benefits, regardless of where they live in this country.

To address this discrepancy, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 included three main provisions to change the calculation of the AAPCC payment rates. First, a minimum ''floor'' payment of $367 was implemented to provide assistance to those rural counties with low Medicare utilization rates. Second, a blended rate was established to benefit low and mid-level payment counties to slowly bring them up to a more equitable level. Third, a minimum two percent ''hold-harmless'' was established so that all counties, even those at a higher payment level, are guaranteed at least a two percent increase in their current payment rates.

As a member of the Senate Committee on the Budget, I was proud to support these provisions; however, the only component of this proposal that has been implemented, is the guaranteed two percent increase for all counties due to budget neutrality restrictions. While the two percent increase is a good start in restoring some equity to the payment system, beneficiaries living in rural counties in Oregon and throughout the country will not have access to Medicare+Choice options if we cannot find a way to provide funding for the blend component. This was the original intent of Congress, and I believe we have a responsibility to implement all three of these provisions in order to restore equity to the Medicare system.

The legislation that Senator WYDEN and I are proposing today would remove the budget neutrality provision used in calculating the blended capitation rate for Medicare+Choice organizations. To put this simply, we propose to fund the blend. Under this legislation, the Secretary of Health and Human Services would submit to Congress a legislative proposal outlining ways in which to restructure federal Medicare expenditures in order to implement the blend. We believe this is a fair and fiscally responsible way to address this matter and look forward to the Finance Committee's consideration of this issue in the year ahead.

Mr. President, I would like to commend my colleague, Senator WYDEN, for drafting this legislation and for the work of Stephanie Kennan of his staff on this bill. He has been a strong proponent of Medicare reform both as a member of the House of Representatives and as a member of the Senate Committee on the Budget. I thank him for this opportunity to join him in this effort.●

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself, Mr. GLENN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWNBACK and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 2228. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) to modify termination and reauthorization requirements for advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TERMINATION AND STREAMLINING ACT OF 1998

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, our democracy depends not just on our citizens exercising the franchise at every election. It also depends on the active participation of citizens in the operations of the government. To that end, the federal government has sought input and advice from citizens on a wide variety of issues by creating advisory committees. To solicit this input, however, costs the government around $180 million a year, and results in an accretion of advisory committees that continue long after their useful purpose is satisfied.

The operations of advisory committees are governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, commonly called ''FACA.'' This law was enacted out of a concern that federal advisory committees were proliferating without adequate review, oversight, or accountability. In adopting the FACA, Congress intended that the number of advisory committees be kept to the minimum necessary and that all advisory committees operate openly under uniform standards and procedures.

Although the FACA was not enacted until 1972, agencies of the federal government had been using advisory committees for many years. For example, the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy was established by Congress in 1879. There are four types of advisory committees used by federal agencies: committees mandated by Congress; committees authorized, but not mandated, by Congress; committees mandated by executive order of the President; and, finally, committees established by agencies under their organic statutes. Over the years, the number of advisory committees grew. In enacting the FACA, Congress mandated that all then-existing advisory committees terminate within two years but did not apply this mandate to advisory committees established directly by Congress, only to those created by agencies themselves. Despite this termination mandate, the number of advisory committees continued to increase after enactment of the FACA. Many of the advisory committees terminated two years after the FACA's enactment were simply reestablished, and many new committees have since come into existence.

While allowing public participation in government, advisory committees cost the federal government money. According to the General Services Administration, the 968 federal advisory committees used by federal agencies cost the government $178 million in fiscal year 1997 and consumed 1254 full-time equivalent positions. Advisory committees are expected to cost the government $183 million this year. Even though the number of advisory committees has fallen from 1305 in 1993, their costs have continued to increase, even in constant dollars. In 1988, the cost to operate advisory committees was $93 million. The cost to operate fewer advisory committees in 1997 was about $136 million in 1988 dollars.

The costs associated with advisory committees would be even higher were it not for initiatives taken to reduce the number of advisory committees created by executive branch agencies. The number of these ''discretionary'' committees, those created not at the direction of Congress or the President, is limited to 534. The GSA also conducts an annual review of advisory committees that no longer serve a useful purpose. Through this review, GSA has identified 61 advisory committees mandated by law that should be eliminated. The termination of these committees would save $8.4 million this year.

The time has come for Congress to step up and do its part to achieve further cuts in current advisory committees. Unless Congress acts, the cost of advisory committees will continue to increase, as new committees are created and old, useless committees continue with no legitimate purpose.

Today, joined by a bipartisan group of my colleagues on the Committee on Governmental Affairs, I am introducing the Advisory Committee Termination and Streamlining Act of 1998. I am pleased to be joined by the ranking member of the Committee, Senator GLENN, who has a long history of involvement with the FACA; Senator COCHRAN; Senator LEVIN, who formerly chaired the Subcommittee with oversight responsibility for the FACA; Senator BROWNBACK, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and Restructuring; and Senator LIEBERMAN, the ranking member on the Government Management and Restructuring Subcommittee. This bill has been developed with the assistance of the Administration, which proposed many of its provisions.

Let me briefly lay out what this legislation would accomplish. The focus of the legislation is to force the reappraisal of the need for all current advisory committees. To achieve this goal, the bill would terminate all advisory committees within three years of the bill's enactment. This three-year window applies to all advisory committees, whether established by congressional or presidential mandate, congressional authorization, or agency decision. Any advisory committee established by presidential order or agency decision will be subject to continuation if an affirmative decision is made that the committee's continuation is warranted. Similarly, three years will allow Congress enough time to review the advisory committees it has mandated, determine which of these continue to serve useful functions, and reauthorize such committees. This provision will clear away many advisory committees that continue to exist from inertia but no longer serve a useful function.

The bill excludes two categories of advisory committees. Advisory committees that provide peer review of grant applications, such as those used by the National Institutes of Health, will continue, whether or not they are reauthorized, as the termination provision does not apply to them. The second category exempt from the termination provision covers those committees that provide advice relating to the academic certification of federal institutions. This category includes the Boards of Visitors of the service academies. Finally, the bill exempts from the termination provision all advisory committees that ''address critical needs relating to health, safety, national security, or other concerns as the President may certify.'' This exemption allows sufficient flexibility to preserve those advisory committees that continue to serve useful purposes in areas deemed important by the President.

The other provisions of the bill can be quickly summarized. First, the bill allows the GSA to issue binding regulations and not just administrative guidelines. This change, proposed by the Administration, is needed to promote consistent, uniform application of the FACA's requirements throughout the executive branch. Second, the bill changes the date on which the Administration's annual report on advisory committees must be submitted to Congress from December 31 to March 15. The GSA has consistently failed to meet the December 31 deadline, due largely to its inability to collect the necessary information from other agencies in a timely manner. This change will provide a more realistic date for submission of the report, and the GSA has assured us that it will be able to meet the new March 15 deadline. Finally, the bill will allow the GSA to promulgate regulations authorizing notice of advisory committee meetings through means other than publication in the Federal Register. Many who have an interest in the work of specific advisory committees do not read the Federal Register, and the Administration is interested in experimenting with providing notice of meetings through the Internet or other electronic formats in order to determine whether other forms of notice are more effective at reaching large numbers of interested persons.

Mr. President, this bill would streamline the government and save us money. It will have the additional benefit of requiring Congress and the Administration to work jointly to revisit the charters of all advisory committees and evaluate the need for their continuation. I thank the Administration for working with us to develop this bill and my cosponsors for working towards a consensus on this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a copy of a June 22, 1998 article from the Gannett News Service entitled ''Committees Dwindle—but Costs Don't,'' which details some of these facts, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

S. 2228

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Advisory Committee Termination and Streamlining Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5. U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 4(a) of this Act and this section) and except as provided under paragraph (2), each advisory committee established, authorized, or reauthorized by statute shall terminate 3 years after the date of enactment of the Advisory Committee Termination and Streamlining Act of 1998.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to any advisory committee the purpose of which is to—

''(A) provide for peer review of Federal grant or research applications or similar activities;

''(B) provide advice and recommendations relating to academic certification of Federal institutions; or

''(C) address critical needs relating to health, safety, national security, or other concerns as the President may certify.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to reauthorize the continuation of any advisory committee covered under paragraph (1) beyond the termination date specified in the original authorization or any reauthorization for the committee.''.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

Section 7(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the first sentence by striking: ''administrative guidelines'' and inserting ''regulations''.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 6(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting: ''Not later than March 15 of each year, the President shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities, status, and changes in the composition of advisory committees in existence during the preceding fiscal year.''.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.

Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) Except when the President determines otherwise for reasons of national security, timely notice of each such meeting shall be published in the Federal Register. The Administrator shall prescribe regulations to provide for other types of public notice in addition to, or in lieu of, notices in the Federal Register to ensure that all interested persons are notified of such meeting prior thereto.''.

COMMITTEES DWINDLE—BUT COSTS DON'T

(By Chris Collins)

WASHINGTON.—In early 1993, President Clinton vowed to whack away at the tangled growth of hundreds of advisory committees that he described as proliferating throughout the federal government ''like kudzu,'' the notorious vine that engulfs objects virtually overnight.

Today, the number of such panels is down, as Clinton promised: 963 in 1997, the most recent year for which numbers are available, compared to 1,305 in 1993, when he issued an executive order to pare the committees.

But hold the applause. Both the number of committee members on the remaining panels and their cost to taxpayers have soared to all-time highs.

In 1993, according to the General Accounting Office, 28,317 people served on advisory committees. By 1997, the number of committee members had jumped to 36,586, although the number of committees was way down.

Costs were up, too: $178 million last year, compared to $143.9 million in 1993. Even using constant 1988 dollars, the cost to operate advisory committees has risen in the past decade from $93 million in 1988 to about $136 million in 1997, GAO said.

James L. Dean, director of the Committee Management Secretariat at the General Services Administration, attributes the bulk of the increase in committee members to the National Institutes of Health's increasingly prevalent practice of rapidly rotating memberships on some of its peer review committees.

NIH spokeswoman Laura Vazquez confirmed that ''memberships'' on NIH's 141 committees appear to have tripled in recent years as NIH pulled more experts onto its committees for temporary, often one-meeting tenures. In 1997, for example, NIH had 8,366 such short-term participants and 4,140 longer-term committee members.

But the cost of the committees to taxpayers is not higher simply because there are more members. The cost of caring for each committee member has risen, too: From $90,816 per member in 1988 to $184,868 in 1997, GAO said. Even in constant 1988 dollars, per-member expenses rose from $90,816 to $140,870 in that period.

Most of that money—$75.5 million last year—pays for federal staff support for the committees, Dean said. Most panelists are not paid for their time; only $10.4 million went last year to compensate non-federal committee members, said Dean, whose office had eight employees and a $645,000 budget in 1997 (up from $220,000 in 1988).

None of this, however, shows up in the annual message the president is required to send to Congress on the status of federal advisory committees.

Clinton's last message, sent in September, bragged about how the number of committees has dropped during his tenure and that $2.5 million was saved during the 1996 budget year by cutting out additional panels. There wasn't a mention of how much overall costs and overall membership had risen.●

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HATCH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 2230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity tax credit for 3 additional years; to the Committee on Finance.

THE WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT EXTENSION ACT

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAUCUS, HATCH, D'AMATO, CONRAD, MIKULSKI, JEFFORDS and ROCKEFELLER. I am introducing legislation that extends the current Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) program for three years. The program expires at the end of this month. While it is clear that the program will not be extended before we leave for the Fourth of July recess, I hope that Congress will act quickly upon its return to make sure that this very important program is reinstated and that no gap in the availability of the credit is created.

The WOTC program is a public-private partnership which encourages businesses to hire individuals on public assistance or who otherwise have life situations that make them difficult to employ. Employers who hire these individuals receive an income tax credit of as much as forty percent of the first $6,000 in wages they pay.

The WOTC program was established in 1996 as a replacement for the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC). Last year, as part of the Taxpayer Relief Act Congress affirmed its strong support for this program by extending it for nine months along with the other so-called ''expiring provisions.'' Unfortunately, the tax credit will expire at the end of this month before Congress will have an opportunity to extend it.

The legislation we are introducing today extends the program for three years. This extension is vital to the continued success of the WOTC program. In speaking with employers who utilize the program, their biggest concern is the on again, off again nature of the credit. Participation in the program requires significant resources and time commitments on the part of the employer. The uncertainty surrounding the continuation of this program makes it very difficult for employers to make that commitment. The loss of program certainty reduces the incentive to hire those currently on public assistance. During previous breaks employers have scaled back their programs, and some have even abandoned the program altogether.

Individuals hired under the WOTC program often require substantial time and effort on the part of an employer. In many instances these individuals lack even the most basic skills necessary to hold a job. Without the WOTC program there would be a strong disincentive for employers to make any effort to hire these individuals. The tax credit levels the playing field and gives these individuals an opportunity to move off the welfare rolls and take control of their futures. Thus far, nearly 300,000 people—mostly single mothers—have been hired under this program.

Those eligible for the WOTC are: members of families receiving AFDC benefits; qualified veterans who are members of families receiving food stamp benefits; 18–24 years olds who are members of families receiving food stamp benefits; 18–24 year olds who live in an empowerment zone or enterprise community; summer youth (16–17 year olds) who live in an empowerment zone or enterprise community who are hired during the summer months; SSI recipients; economically disadvantaged ex-felons; and individuals with physical or mental disabilities who have been referred to employers after or while receiving rehabilitative services under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

As I mentioned earlier, an employer will receive an income tax credit of forty percent of the first $6,000 in wages paid to an employee who is a member of one of these groups. Therefore, the maximum credit available is $2,400. The only exception is summer youth employees where the maximum amount of wages used to calculate the credit is $3,000. An employer can only receive this maximum credit, however, if the employee is employed for at least 400 hours. While that may sound like a short period of time, for many of these individuals, that represent a significant period of employment, perhaps longer than any job they've ever held.

A smaller credit equal to 25% of the first $6,000 of wages is available to an employer in those instances where the employee works less than 400 hours. No credit is available for any employee who works less than 120 hours.

The Work Opportunity Tax Credit is an important component of our efforts to make welfare reform work over the long term. It provides transitional assistance to employers who are willing to hire and take the time to train individuals before they become long-term welfare recipients and young people at high risk of going on public assistance programs.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting a long-term extension of the Work Opportunity Tax Credit.●

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my colleague Senator JOHN CHAFEE in introducing legislation to extend the Work Opportunities Tax Credit (WOTC). This program was created after extensive consultations between the Congress and the Administration as a replacement for the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit. It was improved in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 with changes designed to make the program more accessible to employers who identify, hire and train welfare recipients and equip them with basic job skills necessary for long-term employment.

As the June 30, 1998 expiration date for the WOTC program approaches, we are introducing this bill as a statement of Congressional commitment to the future continuation of the credit. WOTC encourages employers to participate in the national goal of moving millions from welfare to work through a hiring tax incentive that helps to offset the costs of recruiting, hiring and training those with few basic job skills.

Congress enacted welfare reform in 1996. Since that time, employers have utilized WOTC to hire nearly one in four of those coming off public assistance. The time limits that were implemented through the welfare reform legislation are now reaching many of the more difficult welfare cases, those with the fewest job skills that have had the most difficulty finding jobs. As these welfare recipients search for jobs, it is extremely important to continue providing an incentive which will help defray the extra costs experienced by companies hiring these workers.

The legislation we are introducing today will extend WOTC for three years. The current practice of extending the credit on a year-to-year, or partial-year, basis makes it extremely difficult for employers to use the credit. Small businesses in particular require some time to set up and use the program. All employers need some level of certainty for tax planning, which is not available when the credit is extended on a short-term basis. A multi-year extension will provide that certainty, and will show that Congress is serious about making the program work.

I thank Senators CONRAD, D'AMATO, HATCH, JEFFORDS, MIKULSKI and ROCKEFELLER for joining Senator CHAFEE and myself as original cosponsors of this bill. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to enact a multi-year extension of the Work Opportunities Tax Credit before the end of this legislative session.●

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MACK):

S. 2231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States business operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNATIONAL TAX SIMPLIFICATION FOR AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS ACT

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today with my friend and colleague Senator BAUCUS I introduce the International Tax Simplification for American Competitiveness Act of 1998. This bill will provide much-needed tax relief from complex and inconsistent tax laws that burden our American-owned companies which are attempting to compete in the world marketplace.

Our foreign tax code is in desperate need of reform and simplification. The rules in this arena are way too complex and, often, their results are perverse.

Mr. President, the economy of this country has entered into an environment like no other in our history. The American economy has experienced significant growth and prosperity. That success, however, is becoming more and more intertwined with the success of our businesses in the global marketplace. As the economic boundaries from country to country merge closer together, as technology blurs traditional geographical boundaries, and as competition continues to increase from previously lesser-developed nations, it is imperative that American-owned businesses be able to compete effectively.

It seems to me that any rule, regulation, requirement, or tax that we can alleviate to enhance competitiveness will insure to the benefit of American companies, their employees, and shareholders.

There are many barriers that the U.S. economy must overcome in order to remain competitive that Congress cannot hurdle by itself. All around the world, we have international trade negotiators working hard to remove the barriers to foreign markets that discourage and hamper U.S. trade. This is very important to the future economic growth of the U.S. economy. However, this effort has largely ignored the largest source of artificial and unnecessary trade barriers experienced by U.S. companies operating abroad—the complexities and inconsistencies contained in our own tax code.

We cannot continue the status quo—we must work to remove the barriers in our own back yard as diligently as we attack those imposed by other countries. The failure to do so will even jeopardize our own domestic economy as American companies are lured to other countries with simple, more favorable tax treatment.

The business world is changing at an increasingly rapid pace. Tax laws have failed to keep pace with the rapid changes in the world technology and economy. We enacted some foreign tax simplification in last year's Taxpayer Relief Act, but these changes are not enough. Too many of the international provisions in the Internal Revenue Code have not been substantially debated and revised in over a decade. Since that time, existing international markets have changed significantly and we have seen new markets created. The U.S. tax code needs to adapt to the changing times as well. The continued use of a confusing and archaic tax code only results in a mismatch with commercial reality.

If we close American companies out of the international arena due to complex and burdensome tax rules on exports and foreign production, then we are denying them the ability to compete and dooming the, and ourselves, to anemic economic growth and all its adverse subsidiary effects.

The bill we are introducing today is not a comprehensive solution, neither is it a set of bold new initiatives. Instead, this bill contains a set of important intermediate steps which will take us a long way toward simplifying the rules and making some sense of the international tax regime. The bill contains provisions to simplify and update the tax treatment of controlled foreign corporations, fix some of the rules relating to the foreign tax credit, and make other changes to international tax law.

Some of these changes are in areas that are in dire need of repair, and others are changes that take into consideration the changes we have seen in international business practices and environments during the last decade. The provisions in this bill are necessary to facilitate the American economy's ability to remain the driving economic force in the world of the future.

One example of the need for updating our laws to more adequately represent rapid changes that have occurred in the last few years is the financial service industry. This industry has seen technological and global changes that have changed the very nature of the way these corporations do business both here and abroad. This bill contains several provisions to help adapt the foreign tax regime to keep up with these changes.

In particular, I want to highlight the provision regarding a Subpart F Exception for active financial services income. This provision is based in large part on the one-year rule embodied in H.R. 2513, the House-passed bill that resulted from lengthy negotiations between the Treasury Department and the financial services industry. The bill's provisions are not intended to replace H.R. 2513. Rather, this bill goes further and provides additional options to facilitate discussion regarding the parameters of a permanent rule that would effectively level the playing field with respect to our foreign competition. This discussion is even more important in view of the Supreme Court's ruling on the line-item veto this morning.

The bill also allows deferral for cross-border income received by controlled foreign corporations engaged in the active conduct of a banking, financing, or similar business under narrowly defined circumstances. This provision is designed to preclude opportunities for excessive ''mobility'' of income. The first safeguard is the requirement that income eligible for deferral must be derived from a transaction with a ''customer.'' The definition of a customer would not permit a related-party transaction to qualify if one of the principal purposes for such transaction was to satisfy the underlying provision. Second, the requirement that employees meet a ''material participation'' test will reinforce the active nature of the covered activities. Thus, corporations holding passive investments would be precluded from relying on the rule.

There are many areas of the international tax regime not covered by this bill. This legislation represents a pragmatic collection of proposals, not an exhaustive one. One area I think needs to be explored is the foreign tax rules as they apply to foreign corporations with U.S. operations and subsidiaries. These companies are helping the U.S. economy grow. They buy and sell U.S. products, and they employ U.S. workers. We need to examine the international tax law and any barriers it creates for these companies. We must ensure that the U.S. tax law is written and enforced fairly for all companies operating in the U.S. I hope that we can include provisions in this area in future versions of this legislation.

This bill is not the end of the international tax debate. if we were to pass every provision it contains, we would still not have a simple tax code. We would need to make more reforms yet. We cannot limit this debate to only the intermediate changes such as those in this bill. We must not lose sight of the long term. I intend to continue this debate with an eye to the future and propel the discussion to broader, more sweeping areas in need of reform such as interest allocation, the international tax treatment of partnerships, issues raised by the European Union, and a broader debate of Subpart F itself. I believe that we must address these concerns in the next few years if we are to put U.S. corporations and the U.S. economy in a position to maintain economic position in the global economy of tomorrow.

This bill is important to the future of every American citizen. Without these changes, American businesses will see their ability to compete diminished, and the U.S. will have an uphill battle to remain the preeminent economic force in a changing world. This credible package of international tax reforms will help to keep our businesses and our economy competitive and a driving force in the world economic picture. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to join with my colleague, Senator HATCH, to introduce another in our series of international simplification bills. The International Simplification for American Competitiveness Act of 1998 will provide much-needed relief to American-owned companies that are struggling to compete in the world marketplace by simplifying our overly complicated international tax rules.

America's economy, and economies of our individual States, are increasingly interlinked with the success of our businesses in the international economy. As the economies of previously less-developed countries around the world begin to expand, and the economic boundaries between our countries become more blurred, it is increasingly important for our businesses to be able to operate abroad from their most competitive position. Restraining American companies through redundant and unnecessary complexity in our own tax code dampens their ability to compete for foreign business. This only hurts our own economy.

I have worked through the Trade Subcommittee to lower barriers to foreign markets and encourage agreements to keep trade free and fair. I have sought to open foreign markets for many Montana products, from beef to wheat, because of the positive impact on Montana's economy, and on the economy of our country. While we have made much progress on the trade front in opening barriers, our tax code remains mired in antiquated provisions that have not kept pace with the rapidly expanding global economic frontier. We must simplify our code, remove duplicative or outmoded provisions, and provide incentives for trade whenever possible, if we are to ensure continued U.S. success in the world economy. If we miss this opportunity, we risk the erosion of U.S. international competitiveness as countries with simple, favorable tax treatment of businesses lure away our foreign customers.

There is a strong correlation between American corporate competitiveness overseas and the ability of those companies to continue providing jobs at home. According to a report prepared by the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse, United States exports in 1996 totaled over $600 billion and supported almost 7 million direct and indirect jobs. Exports alone account for over 11% of our Gross Domestic Product, and when combined with imports, total about 17% of GDP. Even in Montana, a state which is struggling to expand its foreign markets, exports totaled almost one-half billion dollars and supported 58,000 jobs in 1996.

This bill does not by any means cure all of the problems in the international tax arena. But it is a good starting point which simplifies existing law, reduces the cost of compliance, and begins to rationalize the rules that need to be drafted with the competitiveness of U.S. businesses in mind. There are a lot of important international issues that this bill does not deal with. The problems associated with the interest allocation rules, for example. But Senator HATCH and I feel that these are larger issues that need more time to resolve, so they have not been included in this bill. I look forward to working with him, the Treasury Department and industry groups in an effort to find solutions to these bigger-picture issues over the next months.

We live in a global economy. And we must help make American companies competitive in this economy, while fairly taxing their profits, if we are to keep this unprecedented period of economic expansion going. The "International Tax Simplification for American Competitiveness Act of 1998" is a major step in that direction, and I look forward to working with Senator HATCH and my other colleagues on the Finance Committee to have its provisions enacted into law.●

By Mr. BUMPERS (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 2232. A bill to establish the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to designate Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, as a National Historic Site. Central High School is perhaps the most well-known school in the nation, as a result of the high profile and pivotal role it played in the desegregation of public schools in America. I am pleased to be joined by Senator HUTCHINSON in sponsoring this legislation.

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its landmark decision, Brown versus Board of Education, which held that the segregation of public schools was unconstitutional. The following year, in its Brown II decision, the Court ruled that integration of the public schools was the responsibility of local school districts, to be carried out "with all deliberate speed." This set the stage for the eventual confrontation in Little Rock.

Prior to the Brown decision, Central High was attended only by white students. Following the Court's decision, the Little Rock School Board initially made plans to comply with the decision in phases to be carried out over six years. However, by the time the district began to implement the decision in the fall of 1957, the political controversy had increased to the extent that only 9 black students decided to enroll at Central High, with approximately 1,900 white students. Those nine students later became known as the "Little Rock Nine," and are an inspiration to America.

Mr. President, earlier this Congress, Senator Mosely-Braun and I introduced legislation, S. 1283, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to those nine extraordinary individuals—Jean Brown Trickey, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Melba Patillo Beals, Terrance Roberts, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Thelma Mothershed Wair, Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, and Jefferson Thomas. It is my strong desire that both S. 1283 and this legislation will be enacted into law in the remaining months of this Congress. These nine sons and daughters of Little Rock are proud symbols of the progress we have made and a solemn reminder of the progress we have yet to make.

By the time the Little Rock Nine attempted to enter Central High in September of 1957, the issue of desegregation had polarized not only Little Rock, but the entire nation. The Governor of Arkansas, Orville Faubus, ordered the Arkansas National Guard to prevent the desegregation of Central High. Following several days of unrest, a Federal District Court in Little Rock issued an order preventing the National Guard from further obstructing desegregation efforts in Little Rock. Amid this period of intense feelings and acrimony, President Eisenhower issued an Executive Order which federalized the National Guard and deployed Federal troops to enforce the district court's order. Although several events of the following days were tense and often ugly, the eventual peaceful resolution that followed helped to ensure the successful implementation of the Brown decision, not only in Little Rock, but throughout the South.

Last fall, on the 40th anniversary of the 1957 events, the attention of the nation was once again focused on Central High, and the Little Rock Nine once again entered through the school's main doors. However, this time those doors were held open by the President of the United States and the Governor of Arkansas.

Establishment of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site will, for the first time, provide the National Park Service with the ability to interpret for all Americans the complete history of the desegregation of our public schools, certainly one of the most important social events in the history of our country. Let me hasten to add, Mr. President, that Central High will continue to be a functioning high school, managed by the Little Rock School District. Designation of the school as a National Historic Site will also complement the very successful interpretive activities already undertaken by the Central High Museum and Visitor Center.

There is no question as to the national significance of Central High School. The school is included on the National Register of Historic Places, and was designated in 1982 as a National Historic Landmark by the Secretary of the Interior.

There is strong support for this bill, both in Little Rock and with the entire Arkansas Congressional delegation. The City of Little Rock, the Little Rock School District, Central High Museum, Inc., area residents, and many other organizations and individuals in Little Rock have expressed support for this proposal. It is my hope to have a hearing scheduled for this bill in the very near future, with passage by the Senate shortly thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2232

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which mandated an end to the segregation of public schools, was one of the most significant Court decisions in the history of the United States;

(2) the admission of nine African-American students, known as the "Little Rock Nine", to Little Rock's Central High School as a result of the Brown decision, was the most prominent national example of the implementation of the Brown decision, and served as a catalyst for the integration of other, previously segregated public schools in the United States;

(3) 1997 marked the 70th anniversary of the construction of Central High School, which has been named by the American Institute of Architects as "the most beautiful high school building in America";

(4) Central High School was included on the National Register of Historic Places in 1977 and designated by the Secretary of the Interior as a National Historic Landmark in 1982 in recognition of its national significance in the development of the Civil Rights movement in the United States; and

(5) the designation of Little Rock Central High School as a unit of the National Park System will recognize the significant role the school played in the desegregation of public schools in the South and will interpret for future generations the events associated with early desegregation of southern schools.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit, education, and inspiration of present and future generations, Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, and its role in the integration of public schools and the development of the Civil Rights movement in the United States.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site in the State of Arkansas (hereinafter referred to as the ''historic site'') is hereby established as a unit of the National Park System. The historic site shall consist of lands and interests therein comprising the Central High School campus in Little Rock, Arkansas, as generally depicted on a map entitled ______________ and dated June, 1998. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF HISTORIC SITE.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall administer the historic site in accordance with this Act and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1, 2–4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467): *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall affect the authority of the Little Rock School District to administer Little Rock Central High School.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—(1) The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions (including, but not limited to, the State of Arkansas, the City of Little Rock, the Little Rock School District, Central High Museum, Inc., Central High Neighborhood, Inc., or the University of Arkansas) in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall coordinate visitor interpretation of the historic site with the Little Rock School District and the Central High School Museum, Inc.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within two years after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historic site.

(e) CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL USE.—The Secretary shall consult and coordinate with the Little Rock School District in the development of the general management plan and in the administration of the historic site so as to not interfere with the continuing use of Central High School as an educational institution.

(f) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, by exchange, or donation the lands and interested therein located within the boundaries of the historic site: *Provided*, That the Secretary may only acquire lands or interests therein within the consent of the owner thereof: *Provided further*, That lands or interests therein owned by the State of Arkansas or a political subdivision thereof, may only be acquired by donation or exchange.

SEC. 3. DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION THEME STUDY.

(a) THEME STUDY.—Within two years after the date fund are made available, the Secretary shall prepare an transmit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a National Historic Landmark Theme Study (hereinafter referred to as the ''theme study'') on the history of desegregation in public education. The purpose of the theme study shall be to identify sites, districts, buildings, structures, and landscapes that best illustrate or commemorate key events or decisions in the historical movement to provide for racial desegregation in public education. On the basis of the theme study, the Secretary shall identify possible new national historic landmarks appropriate to this theme and prepare a list in order of importance or merit of the most appropriate sites for national historic landmark designation.

(b) OPPORTUNITIES FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH.—The theme study shall identify appropriate means to establish linkages between sites identified in subsection (a) and between those sites and the Central High School National Historic Site established in section 2, and with other existing units of the National Park System to maximize opportunities for public education and scholarly research on desegregation in public education. The theme study also shall recommend opportunities for cooperative arrangements with State and local governments, educational institutions, local historical organizations, and other appropriate entities to preserve and interpret key sites in the history of desegregation in public education.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with one or more major educational institutions, public history organizations, or civil rights organizations knowledgeable about desegregation in public education to prepare the theme study and to ensure that the theme study meets scholarly standards.

(d) THEME STUDY COORDINATION WITH GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The theme study shall be prepared as part of the preparation and development of the general management plan for the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site established in section 2.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.●

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2233. A bill to amend section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the placed in service date for biomass and coal facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

BIOMASS AND COAL FACILITIES EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join with my friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, in the introduction of the Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act. This legislation would extend by eight months the placed-in-service date under section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code.

This change is necessary in order to alleviate the hardship suffered by taxpayers who relied on action Congress took almost two years ago, and made substantial commitments of resources to develop alternative fuel technology projects. These commitments were made in good faith pursuant to the 1996 Small Business Protection Act, in which Congress amended section 29 for synthetic coal and biomass by extending the ''binding contract'' provision for 12 months to December 31, 1996 and extending the ''placed-in-service'' provision for 18 months to June 30, 1998.

That should have settled the matter. However, when the Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget was submitted in February 1997, it contained a proposal to shorten by a full year the placed-in-service date for facilities producing gas from biomass and synthetic fuel from coal. The Administration was concerned about what it characterized as rapid growth in the section 29 credit. Congress considered that argument and concluded that any concern about the growth in the credit had been dealt with adequately in the 1996 Act.

In the tax legislative arena, even a mere proposal can have consequences, as the Administration's proposal to shorten the placed-in-service date illustrates. The Joint Committee on Taxation's analysis of the proposal, made in March 1997, warned Congress about just such a consequence as it noted that ''[b]ecause the binding contract date has already passed * * * the proposal might place an unfair financial burden on those taxpayers who are bound to contracts entered into prior to the Administration's announcement.''

Mr. President, that is exactly what happened—taxpayers in that situation lost their sources of financing because financial institutions had to treat the Administration proposal as a real possibility. Because the tax credit plays a significant role in the overall financial situation that lenders have to consider, its potential loss made securing necessary financing impossible for taxpayers who were proceeding under binding contracts made in good faith reliance on the Small Business Protection Act of 1996.

The bill we offer today would simply restore some of the lost time that taxpayers endured as a result of the unintended consequences stemming from Congressional consideration of the Administration's 1997 budget proposal. It would extend the placed-in-service date from June 30, 1998 to a date eight months from the date of the bill's enactment.

Taxpayers took Congress at its word in 1996 when it said that the development of environmentally friendly fuels from domestic biomass and coal resources was worth supporting. Their subsequent investment of large amounts of time, effort, and money should be allowed to fulfill its objectives rather than simply be forfeited as a result of circumstances over which these taxpayers had no control.

This is a modest proposal; it would not disturb the ''binding contract'' date of the 1996 Act. Thus, no new projects would qualify because of its enactment. It seeks only to allow taxpayers who began projects under the 1996 Act to proceed in an orderly manner—an option that was effectively denied them as a result of the uncertainty created during consideration of the fiscal year 1998 budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2233

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act''.

SEC. 2 EXTENSION OF PLACED IN SERVICE DATE FOR BIOMASS AND COAL FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29(g)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to extension for certain facilities) is amended by striking ''July 1, 1998'' and inserting ''the date which is 8 months after the date of the enactment of the Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.●

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today with my colleague, Senator CONRAD, I introduce the Biomass and Coal Facilities Extension Act. This legislation would extend the ''placed in service'' date under section 29 for facilities that produce alternative fuels by 8 months.

Section 29 was originally created to encourage the development of alternative fuels to reduce our dependence on imports and to reduce the environmental impacts of certain fuels. With the enormous reserves of low rank coals and lignite in the United States and around the world, and with the potential for use of biomass and other alternatives, it is particularly important to the American economy and the world's environment that new, more environmentally friendly fuels are brought to market here and in developing nations.

Bringing new technologies to market is financially risky. In particular, finding investors to take a new technology from a laboratory table to the market is difficult because working the bugs out of a first-of-a-kind, full-sized plant is a costly undertaking. Incentives to bring new, clean energy technologies to the market in the U.S. are a worthwhile use of the code.

The 1996 Small Business Protection Act provided sufficient incentives to make the development of alternative fuels a viable pursuit. In particular, it extended the section 29 ''placed in service'' date for facilities designed to produce energy from biomass or processed coals to July 1, 1998, provided that those facilities were constructed pursuant to a binding contract entered into before January 1, 1997.

However, the Administration's budget proposal, released in February 1997, effectively nullified the extension granted by Congress in the 1996 Small Business Protection Act. The Administration proposed that the placed in service date be moved up one year, to July 1, 1997, which, for many of these projects, was an impossible deadline to meet.

Without the assurance of the section 29 tax credit, financing for these projects dried up, stranding taxpayers in contracts, some of which contained significant liquidated damages clauses, already entered into in reliance on the Small Business Protection Act of 1996. As a result of the Administration's proposal, taxpayers essentially lost 8 months of the extension given them in 1996.

Mr. President, the bill before us would give these lost months back to companies with contracts signed by January 1, 1997. This bill does not extend the contract deadline, allow more projects to be initiated, or change the 2008 deadline for receiving the section 29 tax credit. This bill simply restores the time taxpayers lost in their efforts to develop environmentally friendly fuels under section 29.

Bringing new alternative fuel technologies to the market is an important part of our commitment to a cleaner environment and a secure economy. We reflected that commitment in our efforts to mitigate some of the financial risk involved in developing this much needed technology in the Small Business Protection Act of 1996. This bill maintains that commitment. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 2235. A bill to amend part Q of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage the use of school resource officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 1998

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I introduce the School Resource Officers Partnership Grant Act of 1998, a bill which will be an important step in our efforts to end crime in our nation's schools. This bill will help build thousands of deep, meaningful and lasting partnerships between America's local school systems, school children, and local law enforcement agencies. I am joined in introducing this legislation by my friend and colleague from Vermont, Senator JIM JEFFORDS, as an original cosponsor.

The need for this bill is clear. Violence in schools is both serious and deadly. Violence is disrupting our children's opportunity and ability to learn. No child anywhere in America should have to go to school with fear on their mind, rather than learning. The recent school-related shootings stand as stark and horrific examples of just how urgent the situation has become. These recent school shootings have occurred in suburbs, small towns, and major metropolitan areas all across our nation. They have shattered the myth that school violence is a problem solely confined to the inner cities. Events now clearly show that the potential for serious and deadly school violence is everywhere. Something must be done to ensure that our schools provide a safe place for our children to learn and grow.

Under this bill, schools in partnerships with local law enforcement agencies would be eligible to receive federal funding to hire ''School Resource Officers'' (SROs). A SRO would be a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community oriented policing, and assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with schools and community-based organizations. The SROs would be able to assist in several primary activities. First, SROs would address crime and disorder problems with a special focus on gangs, drug-related activities, and other crimes occurring in or around our schools. Second, SROs would develop or expand crime prevention efforts in cooperation with students. Third, SROs would help educate potential school-age victims in crime prevention and personal safety awareness. Fourth, SROs would develop or expand community justice initiatives. Fifth, and clearly increasingly more important in light of the recent school shootings, is that the SROs would train students in conflict resolution and teach students how to resolve their differences without feeling the need to resort to violence. Where childhood schoolyard hard feelings used to occasionally result in a scuffle, we now live in a time where they are resolved with firearms and lead to serious wounds and even death. This simply must end. Sixth, SROs would help identify changes in the school environment, like new graffiti or other indications of gang activity, that provide vital indicators. And finally, SROs would assist with the development of anti-crime, school policy and procedural changes.

According to the National School Safety Center, 25 students have been killed in U.S. schools since January 1, 1998. This is the same number of students that were killed for the full 1996 school year, but in half the time. At this rate, we are on track to a doubling of the schoolyard murder rate in just two short years.

The current school-based partnership grant program, which is administered by the Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), is not defined by statute, nor is the description of the qualifications and responsibilities of SROs. This legislation would ensure that SROs are career law enforcement officers, deployed in community-oriented policing assignments and directed by their agencies to work in collaboration with schools and other community-based organizations to address crime problems and assist school authorities in educating students about crime and violence prevention.

This legislation complements the existing school-based partnership research grant program administered by the COPS office. The existing demonstration program provides funds to specific, and relatively small scale, youth crime prevention programs. My legislation would build on this solid foundation, and allow the COPS program resources to be freed up for widespread and comprehensive partnerships between our nation's schools and law enforcement agencies, with the SROs providing the vital link between the two.

In addition, my bill is a companion to H.R. 4009, which our colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman

JIM MALONEY of Connecticut, introduced on June 5, 1998. This bill has received the endorsement of a number of education and law enforcement groups including the National Education Association, the International Brotherhood of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police. I believe that this powerful combination of endorsements clearly reflects the strength of, and compelling need for, this legislation.

On June 23rd , Senator JUDD GREGG, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, unveiled a $210 million Safe Schools Initiative. Largely thanks to Senator GREGG, the funding needed to combat school violence is on track to be made available in a few short months, on October 1st, 1998, the start of Fiscal Year 1999.

Together, these initiatives will target important funding and resources to where it is most urgently needed, in our nation's schools. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2235

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

SECTION 1. SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS.

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (10) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems by using school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools to combat school-related crime and disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities;''; and

(2) in section 1709—

(A) by redesignating the first 3 undesignated paragraphs as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) 'school resource officer' means a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community-oriented policing, and assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with schools and community-based organizations—

''(A) to address crime and disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school;

''(B) to develop or expand crime prevention efforts for students;

''(C) to educate likely school-age victims in crime prevention and safety;

''(D) to develop or expand community justice initiatives for students;

''(E) to train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness;

''(F) to assist in the identification of physical changes in the environment that may reduce crime in or around the school; and

''(G) to assist in developing school policy that addresses crime and to recommend procedural changes.''.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KYL, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution finding the Government of Iraq in unacceptable and material breach of its international obligations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IRAQI VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today S.J. Res. 54 concerning Iraq's violations of the cease-fire agreement that ended Operation Desert Storm in 1991.

Yesterday, the Chairman of the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) presented clear and compelling evidence to the U.N. Security Council that Iraq has lied about a critical aspect of its weapons of mass destruction programs.

UNSCOM has uncovered proof that Iraq has turned the deadly nerve agent known as VX into missile warheads. Iraq still denies the truth today, but no one should be fooled. The proof is certain.

And no one should be surprised. Iraq has consistently lied to UNSCOM for 8 years. It denied having any biological weapons. Iraq concealed the number of missiles it possessed. Iraq has refused to account for its chemical weapons programs. Iraq has refused to provide access to sites or documents necessary for UNSCOM to complete its work.

In the past, under both this administration and the previous administration, Iraq's violations led to action on the part of the U.S. Iraq has been found to be in material breach on many occasions which are spelled out in this resolution. Military action has been threatened and even employed to force compliance.

But now there is a different tune from the Clinton Administration. Now the Clinton Administration is on the defensive. Just keeping U.N. sanctions on seems to be enough—even though a U.S. veto would keep sanctions in place regardless of Russian or French pressure. I cannot understand why the Administration has been so passive in the face of the smoking fun demonstrating Iraq's deception to the world.

Earlier this year, President Clinton came close to using military force in response to Iraq's violations. Instead, U.N. Secretary General Annan went to Baghdad and made a deal with Saddam Hussein. Hussein promised to do what he has been obligated to do since 1991. In return, a new ''Special Envoy'' for Iraq was created. Special procedures of certain UNSCOM inspections were laid out.

If the goal was to avoid the difficult decision to use force, the Clinton Administration was successful. If the goal was to achieve Iraqi compliance with its international obligations, the Clinton Administration has failed.

In recent months there are a number of signs that the Clinton Administration is abandoning a serious policy toward Iraq. First, U.S. military deployments in the Persian Gulf have been reduced. There has been no change in Iraqi behavior. Congress fully funded the deployments through the fiscal year. Yet the force without which diplomacy is empty has been significantly and unilaterally reduced.

Second, the Administration refuses to support effective opposition to Saddam Hussein. The Congress provided $5 million in support for the Iraqi democratic opposition and required the Administration to submit its plan to Congress for using the money in 30 days. Today, almost 60 days later, we have received no report.

The Administration has refused to provide direct support to the Iraqi National Congress—the opposition group most effective in challenging Saddam Hussein in the past. Instead, they provided a list of dozens of so-called opposition groups that included fronts for Syrian intelligence, groups compromised by Iraq, groups linked to Iran, and a number of cultural and religious groups with no history in political opposition. This list—and the absence of a report—make it seem the Administration has no interest in an effective policy of supporting the Iraqi opposition.

Third, the Administration is acting in a very bizarre way in the case of Iraqis detained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in California. Six Iraqis involved in efforts to overthrow Saddam Hussein—part of more than 6,000 evacuated after Saddam invaded northern Iraq—are now subject to secret deportation proceedings. former CIA Director Woosley is representing them free of charge, but even he has been denied an opportunity to see the alleged ''evidence'' gathered by INS. Something very suspicious is going on here. The Congress will look at why the executive branch is trying to send Iraqis who supported our goals in Iraq back to certain death at the hands of Saddam Hussein.

Fourth, the U.S. acquiesced in a dramatic expansion of Iraq's oil exports for the ostensible purpose of feeding Iraqis. The new program, approved just before Secretary General Annan left for Baghdad, allows Iraq to export more than $10 billion a year. This is not about feeding Iraqis—it is about repairing Iraq's oil infrastructure, building roads and otherwise helping Saddam Hussein provide the services he has been denied because of U.N. sanctions. It goes a long way to allowing Saddam Hussein to enjoy the benefits of ending sanctions while the U.S. has received no additional support for keeping sanctions on Iraq. It is a bad deal that seems to be getting worse—for our position.

Finally, there is the mute response to evidence of the weaponization of VX by Saddam Hussein's regime. This is one of the most deadly substances know to man. A single drop can kill a person. Saddam Hussien had it in missile warheads. He denied it. UNSCOM caught him in his lies—again.

The Administration needs to do more than simply hear the evidence and say the sanctions should remain. They need to develop and implement a coherent policy that addresses the threat posed by Saddam Hussien's regime. The need to respond—as the U.S. and even the U.N.—has responded before to material breaches by Iraq. Instead they are, in effect, looking the other way and hoping the French and Russians are not too offended by UNSCOM.

This resolution is intended to put pressure on the Administration to act on the information uncovered by UNSCOM. This is a material and unacceptable breach of Iraq's obligations. If the Administration refuses to act, Congress will be forced to step into the vacuum.

I would like to thank the cosponsors of the resolution: Senators LIEBERMAN, HELMS, KYL, SHELBY, BROWNBACK, and MCCAIN. I look forward to continuing to work with them in supporting an effective policy toward Iraq.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 54

Whereas hostilities in Operation Desert Storm ended on February 28, 1991, and the conditions governing the cease-fire were specified in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 686 (March 2, 1991) and 687 (April 3, 1991);

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 requires that international economic sanctions remain in place until Iraq discloses and destroys its weapons of mass destruction programs and capabilities and undertakes unconditionally never to resume such activities;

Whereas Resolution 687 established the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) to uncover all aspects of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs and tasked the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency to locate and remove or destroy all nuclear weapons systems, subsystems or material from Iraq;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 715, adopted on October 11, 1991, empowered UNSCOM to maintain a long-term monitoring program to ensure Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs are dismantled and not restarted;

Whereas Iraq has consistently fought to hide the full extent of its weapons programs, and has systematically made false declarations to the Security Council and to UNSCOM regarding those programs, and has systematically obstructed weapons inspections for seven years;

Whereas In June 1991, Iraq forces fired on International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors and otherwise obstructed and misled UNSCOM inspectors, resulting in UN Security Council Resolution 707 which found Iraq to be in ‘‘material breach’’ of its obligations under United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 for failing to allow UNSCOM inspectors access to a site storing nuclear equipment;

Whereas in January and February of 1992, Iraq rejected plans to instal long-term monitoring equipment and cameras called for in UN resolutions, resulting in a Security Council Presidential Statement of February 19, 1992 which declared that Iraq was in ‘‘continuing material breach’’ of its obligations;

Whereas in February of 1992, Iraq continued to obstruct the installation of monitoring equipment, and failed to comply with UNSCOM orders to allow destruction of missiles and other proscribed weapons, resulting the Security Council Presidential Statement of February 28, 1992 which reiterated that Iraq was in ‘‘continuing material breach’’ and noted a ‘‘further material breach’’ on account of Iraq's failure to allow destruction of ballistic missile equipment;

Whereas on July 5, 1992, Iraq denied UNSCOM inspectors access to the Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture, resulting in a Security Council Presidential Statement of July 6, 1992 which declared that Iraq was in ‘‘material and unacceptable breach’’ of its obligations under UN resolutions;

Whereas in December of 1992 and January of 1993, Iraq violated the southern no-fly zone, moved surface to air missiles into the no-fly zone, raided a weapons depot in internationally recognized Kuwaiti territory and denied landing rights to a plane carrying UN weapons inspectors, resulting in a Security Council Presidential Statement of January 8, 1993 which declared that Iraq was in an ‘‘unacceptable and material breach’’ of its obligations under UN resolutions;

Whereas in response to continued Iraqi defiance, a Security Council Presidential Statement of January 11, 1993 reaffirmed the previous finding of material breach, followed on January 13 and 18 by allied air raids, and on January 17 with an allied missile attack on Iraqi targets;

Whereas on June 10, 1993, Iraq prevented UNSCOM's installation of cameras and monitoring equipment, resulting in a Security Council Presidential Statement of June 18, 1993 declaring Iraq's refusal to comply to be a ‘‘material and unacceptable breach’’;

Whereas on October 6, 1994, Iraq threatened to end cooperation with weapons inspectors if sanctions were not ended, and one day later, massed 10,000 troops within 30 miles of the Kuwaiti border, resulting in United Nations Security Council Resolution 949 demanding Iraq's withdrawal from the Kuwaiti border area and renewal of compliance with UNSCOM;

Whereas on April 10, 1995, UNSCOM reported to the Security Council that Iraq had concealed its biological weapons program, and had failed to account for 17 tons of biological weapons material resulting in the Security Council's renewal of sanctions against Iraq;

Whereas on July 1, 1995, Iraq admitted to a full scale biological weapons program, but denied weaponization of biological agents, and subsequently threatened to end cooperation with UNSCOM resulting in the Security Council's renewal of sanctions against Iraq;

Whereas on March 8, 11, 14 and 15, 1996, Iraq again barred UNSCOM inspectors from sites containing documents and weapons, in response to which the Security Council issued a Presidential Statement condemning ‘‘clear violations by Iraq of previous Resolutions 687, 707 and 715.’’;

Whereas from June 11–15, 1996, Iraq repeatedly barred weapons inspectors from military sites, in response to which the Security Council adopted United Nations Security Council Resolution 1060, noting the ‘‘clear violation on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 687, 707 and 715’’ and in response to Iraq's continued violations, issued a Presidential statement detailing Iraq's ‘‘gross violation of obligations’’;

Whereas in August 1996, Iraqi troops overran Irbil, in Iraqi Kurdistan, employing more than 30,000 troops and Republican Guards, in response to which the Security Council briefly suspended implementation on United Nations Security Council Resolution 986, the UN oil for food plan;

Whereas in December 1996, Iraq prevented UNSCOM from removing 130 Scud missile engines from Iraq for analysis, resulting in a Security Council presidential statement which ‘‘deplore[d]’’ Iraq's refusal to cooperate with UNSCOM;

Whereas on April 9, 1997, Iraq violated the no-fly zone in southern Iraq and United Nations Security Council Resolution 670, banning international flights, resulting in a Security Council statement regretting Iraq's lack of ‘‘specific consultation’’ with the Council;

Whereas on June 4 and 5, 1997 Iraqi officials on board UNSCOM aircraft interfered with the controls and inspections, endangering inspectors and obstructing the UNSCOM mission, resulting in a UN Security Council presidential statement demanding Iraq end its interference and on June 21, 1997, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1115 threatened sanctions on Iraqi officials responsible for these interferences;

Whereas on September 13, 1997 during an inspection mission, an Iraqi official attacked UNSCOM officials engaged in photographing illegal Iraqi activities, resulting in the October 23, 1997 adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1134 which threatened a travel ban on Iraqi officials responsible for non-compliance with UN resolutions;

Whereas on October 29, 1997, Iraq announced that it would no longer allow American inspectors working with UNSCOM to conduct inspections in Iraq, blocking UNSCOM teams containing Americans to conduct inspections and threatening to shoot down U.S. U–2 surveillance flights in support of UNSCOM, resulting in a United Nations Security Council Resolution 1137 on November 12, 1997 which imposed the travel ban on Iraqi officials and threatened unspecified ‘‘further measures.’’

Whereas on November 13, 1997, Iraq expelled U.S. inspectors from Iraq, leading to UNSCOM's decision to pull out its remaining inspectors and resulting in a United Nations Security Council presidential statement demanding Iraq revoke the expulsion;

Whereas on January 16, 1998, an UNSCOM team led by American Scott Ritter was withdrawn from Iraq after being barred for three days by Iraq from conducting inspections, resulting in the adoption on a United Nations Security Council presidential statement deploring Iraq's decision to bar the team as a clear violation of all applicable resolutions;

Whereas, despite clear agreement on the part of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein with United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan to grant access to all sites, and fully cooperate with UNSCOM, and the adoption on March 2, 1998 of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, warning that any violation of the agreement with Annan would have the ‘‘severest consequences’’ for Iraq, Iraq has continued to actively conceal weapons and weapons programs, provide misinformation and otherwise deny UNSCOM inspectors access;

Whereas on June 24, 1998, UNSCOM Director Richard Butler presented information to the UN Security Council indicating clearly that Iraq, in direct contradiction to information provided to UNSCOM, weaponized the nerve agent VX;

Whereas Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction programs threaten vital United States interests and international peace and security; and

Whereas the United States has existing authority to defend United States interests in the Persian Gulf region; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government of Iraq is in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations, and therefore, the President of the United States is urged to act accordingly.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 246

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 246, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide greater flexibility and choice under the medicare program.

S. 263

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 263, a bill to prohibit the import, export, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, acquisition, and receipt of bear viscera or products that contain or claim to contain bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 438

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 438, a bill to provide for implementation of prohibitions against payment of Social Security benefits to prisoners, and for other purposes.

S. 1222

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1222, a bill to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1321

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1321, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1413, a bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions.

S. 1635

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1635, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the maximum capital gains rates, to index capital assets for inflation, and to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make available to producers of the 1998 and subsequent crops of wheat and feed grains nonrecourse loans that provide a fair return to the producers in relation to the cost of production.

S. 1976

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1976, a bill to increase public awareness of the plight of victims of crime with developmental disabilities, to collect data to measure the magnitude of the problem, and to develop strategies to address the safety and justice needs of victims of crime with developmental disabilities.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to provide for regional skills training alliances, and for other purposes.

S. 2040

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2040, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the authority of State medicaid fraud control units to investigate and prosecute fraud in connection with Federal health care programs and abuse of residents of board and care facilities.

S. 2078

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 2084

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cease mineral leasing activity on submerged land of the Outer Continental Shelf that is adjacent to a coastal State that has declared a moratorium on mineral exploration, development, or production activity in adjacent State waters.

S. 2110

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2110, a bill to authorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional retirement savings opportunities for small employers, including self-employed individuals.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to exempt any credit, credit guarantee or other financial assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture for the purchase or other provision of food or other agricultural commodities from sanctions provided for under the Act.

S. 2162

At the request of Mr. MACK, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of printed wiring board and printed wiring assembly equipment.

S. 2185

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2185, a bill to protect children from firearms violence.

S. 2196

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2196, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for establishment at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of a program regarding lifesaving interventions for individuals who experience cardiac arrest, and for other purposes.

S. 2201

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2201, a bill to delay the effective date of the final rule promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2208, a bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to disapprove the rule submitted by the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services on June 1, 1998, relating to surety bond requirements for home health agencies under the medicare and medicaid programs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 97

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California