AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF COPIES OF THE PUBLICATION ENTITLED ''THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL'' AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 115, submitted earlier by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 115) to authorize the printing of copies of the publication entitled ''The United States Capitol'' as a Senate document.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 115) was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. CON. RES. 115

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) a revised edition of the publication entitled ''The United States Capitol'' (referred to as ''the pamphlet'') shall be reprinted as a Senate document.

(b) There shall be printed 2,000,000 copies of the pamphlet in the English language at a cost not to exceed $100,000 for distribution as follows:

(1)(A) 206,000 copies of the publication for the use of the Senate with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member;

(B) 886,000 copies of the publication for the use of the House of Representatives, with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member; and

(C) 908,000 of the publication for distribution to the Capitol Guide Service; or

(2) if the total printing and production costs of copies in paragraph (1) exceed $100,000, such number of copies of the publication as does not exceed total printing and production costs of $100,000, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as in paragraph (1).

(c) In addition to the copies printed pursuant to subsection (b), there shall be printed at a total printing and production cost of not to exceed $70,000—

(1) 50,000 copies of the pamphlet in each of the following 5 languages: German, French, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese; and

(2) 100,000 copies of the pamphlet in Spanish;

to be distributed to the Capitol Guide Service.

AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SENATE ATTENDING THE FUNERAL OF A SENATOR

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 263, submitted earlier by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 263) to authorize the payment of the expenses of representatives of the Senate attending the funeral of a Senator.

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

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 263) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 263

Resolved, That, upon approval by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the representatives of the Senate who attend the funeral of a Senator, including the funeral of a retired Senator. Expenses of the Senate representatives attending the funeral of a Senator shall be processed on vouchers submitted by the Secretary of the Senate and approved by the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CURT FLOOD ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 231, S. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 53) to require the general application of the antitrust laws to major league baseball, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Curt Flood Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this legislation to clarify that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust laws (i.e., that major league players will have the same rights under the antitrust laws as do other professional athletes, e.g., football and basketball players), along with a provision that makes it clear that the passage of this Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 27. (a) The conduct, acts, practices, or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the major league level are subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent such conduct, acts, practices, or agreements would be subject to the antitrust laws if engaged in by persons in any other professional sports business affecting interstate commerce: Provided, however, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed as providing the basis for any negative inference regarding the caselaw concerning the applicability of the antitrust laws to minor league baseball.

''(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to change the application of the antitrust laws to the conduct, acts, practices, or agreements by, between, or among persons engaging in, conducting, or participating in the business of organized professional baseball, except the conduct, acts, practices, or agreements to which subsection (a) of this section shall apply. More specifically, but not by way of limitation, this section shall not be deemed to change the application of the antitrust laws to—

''(1) the organized professional baseball amateur draft, the reserve clause as applied to minor league players, the agreement between organized professional major league baseball teams and the teams of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, commonly known as the 'Professional Baseball Agreement', the relationship between organized professional major league baseball and organized professional minor league baseball, or any other matter relating to professional organized baseball's minor leagues;

''(2) any conduct, acts, practices, or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional baseball relating to franchise expansion, location or relocation, franchise ownership issues, including ownership transfers, and the relationship between the Office of the Commissioner and franchise owners;

''(3) any conduct, acts, practices, or agreements protected by Public Law 87–331 (15 U.S.C. 1291 et seq.) (commonly known as the 'Sports Broadcasting Act of 1961'); or

''(4) the relationship between persons in the business of organized professional baseball and umpires or other individuals who are employed in the business of organized professional baseball by such persons.

''(c) As used in this section, 'persons' means any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

Mr. JEFFORDS. Senator HATCH has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 3479.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Curt Flood Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this legislation to state that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust laws (i.e., that major league baseball players will have the same rights under the antitrust laws as do other professional athletes, e.g., football and basketball players), along with a provision that makes it clear that the passage of this Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §12 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 27(a) Subject to subsections (b) through (d) below, the conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball directly relating to or affecting employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level are subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent such conduct, acts, practices or agreements would be subject to the antitrust laws if engaged in by persons in any other professional sports business affecting interstate commerce.

''(b) No court shall rely on the enactment of this section as a basis for changing the application of the antitrust laws to any conduct, acts, practices or agreements other than those set forth in subsection (a). This section does not create, permit or imply a cause of action by which to challenge under the antitrust laws, or otherwise apply the antitrust laws to, any conduct, acts, practices or agreements that do not directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level, including but not limited to—

''(1) any conduct acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the minor league level, any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players.

''(2) the agreement between organized professional major league baseball teams and the teams of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, commonly known as the 'Professional Baseball Agreement,' the relationship between organized profession major league baseball and organized professional minor league baseball, and organized professional minor league baseball, or any other matter relating to organized professional baseball's minor leagues;

''(3) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting franchise expansion, location or relocation, franchise ownership issues, including ownership transfers, the relationship between the Office of the Commissioner and franchise owners, the marketing or sales of the entertainment product of organized professional baseball and the licensing of intellectual property rights owned or held by organized professional baseball teams individually or collectively;

''(4) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements protected by Public Law 87–331 (15 U.S.C. §1291 et seq.) (commonly known as 'the Sports Broadcasting Act of 1961');

''(5) the relationship between persons in the business of organized professional baseball and umpires or other individuals who are employed in the business of organized professional baseball by such persons; or

''(6) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons not in the business of organized professional major league baseball.

''(c) Only a major league baseball player has standing to sue under this section. For the purposes of this section, a major league baseball player is—

''(1) a person who is a party to a major league player's contract, or is playing baseball at the major league level; or

''(2) a person who is a party to a major league player's contract or playing baseball at the major league level at the time of the injury that is the subject of the complaint; or

''(3) a person who has been a party to a major league player's contract or who has played baseball at the major league level, and who claims he has been injured in his efforts to secure a subsequent major league player's contract by an alleged violation of the antitrust laws, provided however, that for the purposes of this paragraph, the alleged antitrust violation shall not include any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the minor league level, including any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players; or

''(4) a person who was a party to a major league player's contract or who was playing baseball at the major league level at the conclusion of the last full championship season immediately preceding the expiration of the last collective bargaining agreement between persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball and the exclusive collective bargaining representative of major league baseball players.

''(d)(1) As used in this section, 'person' means any entity, including an individual, partnership, corporation, trust or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof. As used in this section, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, its member leagues and the clubs of those leagues, are not 'in the business of organized professional major league baseball.'

''(2) In cases involving conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate or affect both employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level and also relate to or affect any other aspect of organized professional baseball, including but not limited to employment to play baseball at the minor league level and the other areas set forth in subsection (b) above, only those components, portions or aspects of such conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level.

''(3) As used in subsection (a), interpretation of the term 'directly' shall not be governed by any interpretation of 29 U.S.C. §151 et seq. (as amended).

''(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the application to organized professional baseball of the nonstatutory labor exemption from the antitrust laws.

''(5) The scope of the conduct, acts, practices or agreements covered by subsection (b) shall not be strictly or narrowly construed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I offer on behalf of myself and Senator LEAHY, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 53, the Curt Flood Act of 1997. This bill, which was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on July 31, 1998, by a vote of 12–6, clarifies that the antitrust laws apply to labor relations at the major league level, but does not have any affect on any other persons or circumstances. Given our limited time, I will only make a few brief comments, and would ask unanimous consent that my full statement be entered into the RECORD.

In a baseball season that is likely to set records in a number of different categories, I am extremely pleased to be able to report that a truly historic milestone in the history of professional baseball has been reached. People said it would never happen, but today I can tell you that major league baseball players, along with both major and minor league club owners, have reached an agreement on a bill clarifying that the antitrust laws apply to major league professional baseball labor relations. This agreed upon language is reflected in the substitute we are offering today.

With this historic agreement, I am confident that Congress will, once and for all, make clear that professional baseball players have the same rights as other professional athletes, and will help assure baseball fans across the United States that our national pastime will not again be interrupted by strikes. With the home run battles and exciting pennant races, baseball is enjoying a resurgence. And, as fans are returning to the ballparks, they deserve to know that players will be on the field, not mired in labor disputes. I am pleased that Congress will, it now appears, be able to help guarantee that this is the case.

Due to an aberrant Supreme Court decision in 1922, labor relations in major league baseball have not been subject to antitrust laws, unlike any other industry in America. In every other professional sport, antitrust laws serve to stabilize relations between the team owners and players unions. That is one of the principal reasons why, in recent years, baseball has experienced more work stoppages, including the disastrous strike of 1994–95, than professional basketball, hockey and football combined.

In the 103d Congress, the House Judiciary Committee took the first important step by approving legislation which would have ensured that the antitrust laws apply to major league baseball labor relations, without impacting the minor leagues or team relocation issues. During the 104th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved and reported S. 627, The Major League Baseball Antitrust Reform Act, to apply federal antitrust laws to major league baseball labor relations. None of these bills were passed, however, as many Members of Congress were reluctant to take final action while there was an ongoing labor dispute.

With the settling of the labor dispute and with the signing of a long term agreement between the major league baseball team owners and the players union, the time was right this Congress finally to address this matter. In fact, in the new collective bargaining agreement, the owners pledged to work with the players to pass legislation that makes clear that major league baseball is subject to the federal antitrust laws with regard to owner-player relations.

At the beginning of this Congress, we introduced S. 53, a bill which was specifically supported by both the players and owners and which was reported out of the Judiciary Committee almost exactly one year ago. At the Committee markup, however, several Members indicated a concern that the bill might

inadvertently have a negative impact on the Minor Leagues. Although both Senator LEAHY and myself were firmly of the view that the bill as reported adequately protected the minor leagues against such a consequence, we pledged to work with the minor leagues' representatives, in conjunction with the major league owners and players, to make certain that their concerns were fully addressed.

Although this process took much longer, and much more work, than I had anticipated, I am pleased to report that it has been completed. I have in my hand a letter from the minor leagues, and a letter co-signed by Don Fehr and Bud Selig, indicating that the major league players, and major and minor league owners, all support a new, slightly amended version of S. 53. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL LEAGUES, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 27, 1998.

Re baseball legislation.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, Inc. (''NAPBL'') objected to S. 53 as it was reported out of the Judiciary Committee last year. Since that time, we have been consulted about proposals to amend the bill to assure the continued survival of minor league baseball. We understand that a draft of an amended bill has been put forth by the major leagues and the Players' Association (copy attached) that I believe addresses the concerns of the NAPBL which we support in its final form.

Respectfully yours,

Stanley M. Brand.

July 21, 1998.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Chairman,*
Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH AND SENATOR LEAHY: As requested by the Committee, the parties represented below have met and agreed to the attached substitute language for S. 53. In particular, we believe the substitute language adequately addresses the concerns expressed by some members of the Judiciary Committee that S. 53, as reported, did not sufficiently protect the interests of the minor leagues. We understand that the minor leagues will advise you that they agree with our assessment by a separate letter.

We thank you for your leadership and patience. Although, obviously, you are under no obligation to use this language in your legislative activities regarding S. 53, we hope that you will look favorably upon it in light of the agreement of the parties and our joint commitment to work together to ensure its passage.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FEHR,
Executive Director,
Major League Baseball Players Association.

ALLAN H. ''BUD'' SELIG,
Commissioner, Major League Baseball.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL,
July 21, 1998.

DONALD M. FEHR, ESQUIRE,
Executive Director and General Counsel, Major League Baseball Players Association, New York, NY.

DEAR DON: As you know, in our efforts to address the concerns of the minor leagues with S. 53, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, several changes in the bill were agreed to by the parties, i.e., the Major League Clubs, the Major League Baseball Players Association and the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues (minor leagues). Among those changes was the addition of the word ''directly'' immediately before ''relating to'' in new subsection (a) of the bill.

This letter is to confirm our mutual understanding that the addition of that word was something sought by the Minor leagues and is intended to indicate that this legislation is not meant to allow claims by non major league players. By using ''directly'' we are not limiting the application of new subsection (a) to matters which would be considered mandatory subjects of bargaining in the collective bargaining context. Indeed, that is the reason we agreed to add paragraph (d)(3). There is no question that, under this Act, major league baseball players may pursue the same actions as could be brought by athletes in professional football and basketball with respect to their employment at the major league level.

I trust you concur with this intent and interpretation.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN H. SELIG,
Commissioner of Baseball.

Mr. HATCH. This new bill specifically precludes courts from relying on the bill to change the application of the antitrust laws in areas other than player-owner relations; clarifies who has standing under the new law; and adds several provisions which ensure that the bill will not harm the minor leagues.

Senator LEAHY and I have incorporate these changes into our substitute, which, given its support across the board, we hope and expect to be passed today without objection. I urge my colleagues to adopt this substitute.

This amendment, while providing major league players with the antitrust protections of their colleagues in the other professional sports, such as basketball and football, is absolutely neutral with respect to the state of the antitrust laws between all entities and in all circumstances other than in the area of employment as between major league owners and players. Whatever the law was the day before this bill passes in those other areas it will continue to be after the bill passes. Let me emphasize that the bill affects no pending or decided cases except to the extent a court would consider exempting major league clubs from the antitrust laws in their dealings with major league players.

But because of the complex relationship between the major leagues and their affiliated minor leagues, it was necessary to write the bill in a way to direct a court's attention to only those practices, or aspects of practices, that affect major league players. It is for that reason, that a bill that ought to be rather simple to write goes to such lengths to emphasize its neutrality. And, although much of the Report filed by the Committee with respect to S. 53 is still applicable to this substitute, there have been some changes.

Section 2 states the bill's purpose. As originally contained in S. 53, the purpose section used the word ''clarify'' instead of the word ''state'' as used in this substitute. That language had been taken verbatim from the collective bargaining agreement signed in 1997 between major league owners and major league players. When the minor leagues entered the discussions, they objected to the use of the word ''clarify'' on the grounds that using this term created an inference regarding the current applicability of the antitrust laws to professional baseball. The parties therefore agreed to insert in lieu thereof the word ''state.'' Both the parties and the Committee agree that Congress is taking no position on the current state of the law one way or the other. It is also for that reason that subsection (b) was inserted, as will be discussed.

Section 3 amends the Clayton Act to add a new section 27. As was the case with S.53, as reported, new subsection 27(a) states that the antitrust laws apply to actions relating to professional baseball players' employment to play baseball at the major league level and as in S.53 is intended to incorporate the entire jurisprudence of the antitrust laws, as it now exists and as it may develop.

In order to accommodate the concerns of the minor leagues however, new subsection (a) has been changed by adding the word ''directly'' immediately before the phrase ''relating to or affecting employment'' and the phrase ''major league players'' has been added before the phrase ''to play baseball.'' These two changes were also made at the behest of the minor leagues in order to ensure that minor league players, particularly those who had spent some time in the major leagues, did not use new subsection (a) as a bootstrap by which to attack conduct, acts, practices or agreements designed to apply to minor league employment. This is in keeping with the neutrality sought by the Committee with respect to parties and circumstances not between major league owners and major league players.

Additionally, the new draft adds a new paragraph (d)(3) that states that the term directly is not to be governed by interpretations of the labor laws. This paragraph was added to ensure that no court would use the word ''directly'' in too narrow a fashion and limit matters covered in subsection (a) to those that would otherwise be known as mandatory subjects of bargaining in the labor law context. The use of directly is related to the relationship between the major leagues and

the minor leagues, not the relationship between major league owners and players. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Commissioner of Baseball, Mr. Allan H. ''Bud'' Selig, to the Executive Director of the Major League Baseball Players Association, confirming this interpretation of the use of the word ''directly'' and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

As in S. 53, as reported, new subsection (b) is the subsection which implements the portion of the purpose section stating that the ''passage of the Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.'' In other words, with respect to areas set forth in subsection (b), whatever the law was before the enactment of this legislation, it is unchanged by the passage of the legislation. With the exception of the express statutory exemption in the area of television rights recognized in paragraph (d)(4), each of the areas set forth depend upon judicial interpretation of the law. But Congress at this time seeks only to address the specific question of the application of the antitrust laws in the context of the employment of major league players at the major league level.

Thus, as to any matter set forth in subsection (b), a plaintiff will not be able to allege an antitrust violation by virtue of the enactment of this Act. Nor can the courts use the enactment of this Act to glean congressional intent as to the validity or lack thereof of such actions.

New subsection ''c'' deals specifically with the issue of standing. Although normally standing under such an act would be governed by the standing provision of the antitrust laws, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 15, the minor leagues again expressed concern that without a more limited standing provision, minor league players or amateurs would be able to attack what are in reality minor league issues by bootstrapping under this Act through subsection (a). The subsection sets forth the zone of persons to be protected from alleged antitrust violations by major league owners under this Act.

New paragraph (d)(1) defines ''person'' for the purposes of the Act, but includes a provision expressly recognizing that minor league clubs and leagues are not in the business of major league baseball. This addition was requested by the minor leagues to ensure that they would not be named as party defendants in every action brought against the major leagues pursuant to subsection (a).

New paragraph (d)(2) was added to give the courts direction in cases involving matters that relate to both matters covered by subsection (a) and to those matters as to which the Act is neutral as set forth in subsection (b). In such a case, the acts, conducts or agreements may be challenged under this Act as they directly relates to the employment of major league players at the major league level, but to the extent the practice is challenged as to its effect on any issue set forth in subsection (b), it must be challenged under current law, which may or may not provide relief.

New paragraph (d)(5) merely reflects the Committee's intention that a court's determination of which fact situations fall within subsection (b) should follow ordinary rules of statutory construction, and should not be subject to any exceptions or departures from these rules.

As stated in the Committee Report, nothing in this bill is intended to affect the scope or applicability of the ''nonstatutory'' labor exemption from the antitrust laws. See, e.g., Brown v. Pro Football, 116 S.Ct. 2116 (1996).

Before yielding to my good friend from Vermont, I would like to thank him for his hard work on this bill. His bipartisan efforts have been vital to the process. I would also like to thank our original cosponsors, Senators THURMOND and MOYNIHAN. I urge the quick adoption of this bill, which will help restore stability to major league baseball labor relations.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this summer we are being treated to an exceptional season of baseball, from the record breaking pace of the New York Yankees and the resurgence of the Boston Red Sox, to a number of inspiring individual achievements, including the perfect game of David Wells and the home run displays of McGwire, Griffey and Sosa. Such are the exploits that childhood memories are made of—and which we all thought could be counted on, that is until the summer of 1994.

Now finally, after years of turmoil, major league baseball is just beginning to emerge from the slump it inflicted upon itself, by returning to that which makes the game great—the game and the players on the field. And, last weekend, Larry Doby and others at long last were inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame. These are steps in the right direction.

Today, the Senate will give baseball another nudge in the right direction by passing S. 53, the ''Curt Flood Act of 1998.'' Murray Chass, a gifted reporter writing for The New York Times noted that on this issue we have finally ''moved into scoring position with a bill that would alter the antitrust exemption Major League Baseball has enjoyed since 1922.''

I am gratified that 76 years after an aberrant Supreme Court decision, we are finally making it clear that with respect to the antitrust laws, major league baseball teams are no different than teams in any other professional sport. For years, baseball was the only business or sport, of which I am aware, that claimed an exemption from antitrust laws, without any regulation in lieu of those laws. The Supreme Court refused to undue its mistake with respect to major league baseball made in the 1922 case of Federal Baseball. Finally, in the most well-known case on the issue, Flood v. Kuhn, the Court reaffirmed the Federal Baseball case on the basis of the legal principle of stare decisis while specifically finding that professional baseball is indeed an activity of interstate commerce, and thereby rejecting the legal basis for the Federal Baseball case.

Mr. President, as a result of that and subsequent decisions, and with the end of the major league reserve clause as the result of an arbitrator's ruling in 1976, there has been a growing debate as to the continued vitality, if any, of any antitrust exemption for baseball. It is for precisely this reason that this bill is limited in its scope to employment relations between major league owners and major league players. That is what is at the heart of turmoil in baseball and what is at the heart of the breach of trust with the fans that marked the cancellation of the 1994 World Series. At least we can take this small step toward ensuring the continuity of the game and restoring public confidence in it.

When David Cone testified at our hearing three years ago, he posed a most perceptive question. He asked: If baseball were coming to Congress to ask us to provide a statutory antitrust exemption, would such a bill be passed? The answer to that question is a resounding no. Nor should the owners, sitting at the negotiating table in a labor dispute, think that their anticompetitive behavior cannot be challenged. That is an advantage enjoyed by no other group of employers.

The certainty provided by this bill will level the playing field, making labor disruptions less likely in the future. The real beneficiaries will be the fans. They deserve it.

Mr. President, I just wanted to comment briefly on a couple of changes made in the substitute from the bill as reported by the Committee. First, the changes in the language in subsection (a) are not intended to limit in any way the rights of players at the major league level as they would be construed under the language of the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee last July. The additional language was added to ensure that a minor league player, or someone who had played at the major league level and returned to the minor leagues, cannot use subsection (a), concerned with play at the major league level, to attack what is really a minor league employment issue only. Alternatively, neither can the major leagues use the wording of subsection (a) and that of subsection (d) to subvert the purpose of subsection (a) merely by linking a major league practice with a minor league practice. That linkage itself may be an antitrust violation and be actionable under this Act. It cannot be used as a subterfuge by which to subject players at the major league level to acts, practices or agreements that teams or owners in other sports could not subject athletes to.

Finally, the practices set forth in subsection (b) are not intended to be affected by this Act. While this is true, it should be remembered that although the pure entrepreneurial decisions in this area are unaffected by the Act, if those decisions are made in such a way as to implicate employment of major league players at the major league level, once again, those actions may be actionable under subsection (a). More importantly, we are making no findings as to how, under labor laws, those issues are to be treated.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to thank all those involved in this undertaking: Chairman HATCH, of course, without whose unfailing efforts this result would not be possible; our fellow cosponsors, Senators THURMOND and MOYNIHAN, and other members of our Committee; and JOHN CONYERS, the Ranking Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, for making this bill a priority. And I want to commend the interested parties for working to find a solution they can all support. Not only have they done a service to the fans, but they may find, on reflection, that they have done a service to themselves by working together for the good of the game.

Finally, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not comment on the man for whom this legislation is named, Curt Flood. He was a superb athlete and a courageous man who sacrificed his career for perhaps a more lasting baseball legacy. When others refused, he stood up and said no to a system that he thought un-American as it bound one man to another for his professional career without choice and without a voice in his future.

I am sad that he did not live long enough to see this day. In deference to his memory and in the interests of every fan of this great game, I hope that Congress will act quickly on this bill. I am delighted that we are moving forward today and that we are finally able to enjoy the game once again.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and agreed to, the bill be considered read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3479) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 53), as amended, was considered read a third time and passed.

INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 471, S. 1134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1134) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1134) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1134

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

SECTION 1. CONSENT OF CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent and approval of Congress is given to an interstate forest fire protection compact, as set out in subsection (b).

(b) COMPACT.—The compact reads substantially as follows:

''THE NORTHWEST WILDLAND FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENT

''THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between the State, Provincial, and Territorial wildland fire protection agencies signatory hereto, hereinafter referred to as ''Members''.

''FOR AND IN CONSIDERATION OF the following terms and conditions, the Members agree:

''Article I

''1.1 The purpose of this Agreement is to promote effective prevention, presuppression and control of forest fires in the Northwest wildland region of the United States and adjacent areas of Canada (by the Members) by providing mutual aid in prevention, presuppression and control of wildland fires, and by establishing procedures in operating plans that will facilitate such aid.

''Article II

''2.1 The agreement shall become effective for those Members ratifying it whenever any two or more Members, the States of Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Idaho, Montana, or the Yukon Territory, or the Province of British Columbia, or the Province of Alberta have ratified it.

''2.2 Any State, Province, or Territory not mentioned in this Article which is contiguous to any Member may become a party to this Agreement subject to unanimous approval of the Members.

''Article III

''3.1 The role of the Members is to determine from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be found for enhancing the prevention, presuppression, and control of forest fires in the area comprising the Member's territory; to coordinate the plans and the work of the appropriate agencies of the Members; and to coordinate the rendering of aid by the Members to each other in fighting wildland fires.

''3.2 The Members may develop cooperative operating plans for the programs covered by this Agreement. Operating plans shall include definition of terms, fiscal procedures, personnel contacts, resources available, and standards applicable to the program. Other sections may be added as necessary.

''Article IV

''4.1 A majority of Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of its general business. Motions of Members present shall be carried by a simple majority except as stated in Article II. Each Member will have one vote on motions brought before them.

''Article V

''5.1 Whenever a Member requests aid from any other Member in controlling or preventing wildland fires, the Members agree, to the extent they possibly can, to render all possible aid.

''Article VI

''6.1 Whenever the forces of any Member are aiding another Member under this Agreement, the employees of such Member shall operate under the direction of the officers of the Member to which they are rendering aid and be considered agents of the Member they are rendering aid to and, therefore, have the same privileges and immunities as comparable employees of the Member to which the are rendering aid.

''6.2 No Member or its officers or employees rendering aid within another State, Territory, or Province, pursuant to this Agreement shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith to the extent authorized by the laws of the Member receiving the assistance. The receiving Member, to the extent authorized by the laws of the State, Territory, or Province, agrees to indemnify and save-harmless the assisting Member from any such liability.

''6.3 Any Member rendering outside aid pursuant to this Agreement shall be reimbursed by the Member receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries and maintenance of personnel and equipment incurred in connection with such request in accordance with the provisions of the previous section. Nothing contained herein shall prevent any assisting Member from assuming such loss, damage, expense or other cost or from loaning such equipment or from donating such services to the receiving Member without charge or cost.

''6.4 For purposes of the Agreement, personnel shall be considered employees of each sending Member for the payment of compensation to injured employees and death benefits to the representatives of deceased employees injured or killed while rendering aid to another Member pursuant to this Agreement.

''6.5 The Members shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this Article.

''Article VII

''7.1 When appropriations for support of this agreement, or for the support of common services in executing this agreement, are needed, costs will be allocated equally among the Members.

''7.2 As necessary, Members shall keep accurate books of account, showing in full, its receipts and disbursements, and the books of account shall be open at any reasonable time to the inspection of representatives of the Members.

''7.3 The Members may accept any and all donations, gifts, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services from the Federal or any local government, or any agency thereof and from any person, firm or corporation, for any of its purposes and functions under this Agreement, and may receive and use the same subject to the terms, conditions, and regulations governing such donations, gifts, and grants.

''Article VIII

''8.1 Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of