

# KYL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2107

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. KYL, for himself, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, supra; as follows:

On page 403, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

## SEC. 1095. REVIEW OF NATIONAL POLICY ON PROTECTING THE NATIONAL INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE AGAINST STRATEGIC ATTACKS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the following:

(1) The national policy and architecture governing the plans for establishing procedures, capabilities, systems, and processes necessary to perform indications, warning, and assessment functions regarding strategic attacks by foreign nations, groups, or individuals, or any other entity against the national information infrastructure.

(2) The future of the National Communications System (NCS), which has performed the central role in ensuring national security and emergency preparedness communications for essential United States Government and private sector users, including, specifically, a discussion of—

(A) whether there is a federal interest in expanding or modernizing the National Communications System in light of the changing strategic national security environment and the revolution in information technologies; and

(B) the best use of the National Communications System and the assets and experience it represents as an integral part of a larger national strategy to protect the United States against a strategic attack on the national information infrastructure.

# MCCAIN (AND LIEBERMAN) AMENDMENT NO. 2108

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. MCCAIN, for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

## SEC. —. IRAN AND IRAQ ARMS NONPROLIFERATION.

(a) SANCTIONS AGAINST TRANSFERS OF PERSONS.—Section 1604(a) of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (title XVI of Public Law 102-484; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting “to acquire chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or” before “to acquire”.

(b) SANCTIONS AGAINST TRANSFERS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Section 1605(a) of such Act is amended by inserting “to acquire chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or” before “to acquire”.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1608(7) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), other than urgent humanitarian assistance or medicine;”.

# THURMOND AMENDMENT NO. 2109

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, supra; as follows:

On page 468, after line 24, add the following:

## SEC. 2825. FINAL FUNDING FOR DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION.

Section 2902(k) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title

XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer from the account referred to in subparagraph (B) such unobligated funds in that account as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties under this part during October, November, and December 1995. Funds transferred under the preceding sentence shall remain available until December 31, 1995.

“(B) The account referred to in subparagraph (A) is the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established under section 207(a) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).”.

# THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT ACT OF 1995

## STEVENS (AND AKAKA) AMENDMENT NO. 2110

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. STEVENS, for himself, and Mr. AKAKA) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 402) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of Title I of H.R. 402, add the following new section 110:

## SEC. 110. DEFINITION OF REVENUES.

(a) Section 7(i) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Public Law 92-203 (43 U.S.C. 1606(i)), is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(i)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term “revenues” does not include any benefit received or realized for the use of losses incurred or credits earned by a Regional Corporation.”.

(b) This amendment shall be effective as of the date of enactment of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Public Law 92-203 (43 U.S.C. 1601, *et seq.*).

# NOTICES OF HEARINGS

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management to review the implementation of Section 2001 of the fiscal year 1995 Emergency Appropriations and Funding Rescissions bill. This is the section that deals with emergency salvage of diseased dead timber on Federal forest lands.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, August 10, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those who wish to submit written statements for the record should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey at (202) 224-2878.

# AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, at 9 a.m., in SR-332, to consider the nomination of Ms. Jill Long to be Undersecretary for Rural Economic and Community Development and to be a member of the Board of Directors for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, at 10 a.m. in SD-226.

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

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, 1995, at 2 p.m., in SD-226, to hold a hearing on judicial nominees.

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

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing to discuss Federal oversight of Medicare HMO's.

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON DRINKING WATER, FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Drinking Water, Fisheries and Wildlife be granted permission to conduct a hearing Thursday, August 3, at 9:30 a.m. on reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act.

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, 1995, at 10:00 a.m.

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee

of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, August 3, 1995, at 2:00 p.m.

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

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RELEASE OF GAO REPORT ON SUPERFUND

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to draw my colleagues attention to a report just released by the General Accounting Office that I requested on May 24, 1995. The report is entitled "Superfund: Information on Current Health Risks," and it examines the actual, current health risks at Superfund sites. I believe the results of this study are very surprising, and may have very important implications for the Superfund budget and possibly for Superfund reauthorization.

At the recent White House Conference on Small Business, Superfund reform was voted the No. 5 issue out of literally hundreds of topics of concern to small business. As these small businesses representatives know all too well Superfund liability is literally killing many small businesses. As chairman of the Small Business Committee in addition to being a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the EPA, I asked GAO to prepare this report because I wanted to get a better understanding of the reduction in health risks and other benefits of the money spent on Superfund.

The GAO report looked at EPA's own data from 225 recent records of decision signed between 1991 and mid-1993. These are the sites that will soon be moving into the expensive construction phase and will be driving a big portion of the Superfund budget in the next few years.

The report found that less than one third of the sites posed health risks serious enough to warrant a cleanup under current land uses. Some of the sites in this category have no current exposure and hence no current risk. However, under current land uses, there could be a risk in the future if, for example, a ground water plume migrated to a currently used drinking water source. So this category is over-inclusive if anything. In addition, about one-half of the other sites in this category used to pose a health risk but a removal action has already been completed to address any immediate risks.

Over one-half of the 225 sites do not pose any risk warranting a cleanup under existing conditions, although they might pose a risk in the future if current land use patterns change. The remaining 15 percent of the sites do not pose risks serious enough to warrant cleanup under existing conditions or under foreseeable future conditions.

They are already in EPA's target risk range for completed cleanups.

The implications of these findings are profound. Superfund sites clearly do not threaten the health of millions of Americans. As is often stated in fact, if we stopped conducting Superfund remedial actions altogether there are only a few sites that would have any impact on human health today. However, I do not think we can conclude from this report that Superfund should be abolished entirely, this report shows that some sites do indeed pose a risk to health, and other sites may pose environmental risks sufficient to warrant cleanup, but dramatic reform is clearly needed.

I believe this report can help us to use our increasingly scarce Federal dollars more wisely, without putting anyone's health at risk. In fact, I think we can use this report to protect people's health by better prioritizing EPA's efforts on sites posing current health risks. This doesn't mean we should ignore environmental risks or future risks, but current health risks should be our first priority.

The decline in overall discretionary spending in forcing us to make significant changes in the EPA's budget. As chairman of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, I must make reductions totaling more than \$9 billion in budget authority from the fiscal year 1995 VA-HUD bill. This is a reduction of about 12 percent, and will impact virtually all of the agencies under my subcommittee's jurisdiction, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, HUD, NASA, EPA, and the National Science Foundation, to name a few. This reduction in discretionary spending will mean that increases for any program will be nearly impossible.

Clearly, in coming years, the Agency will simply have to get used to doing more with less. The Superfund Program will not be exempt from these changes. With decreasing resources available to EPA, Superfund can be expected to take its share of cuts. In this tight budgetary climate, it is only prudent to plan for smaller budgets by focusing on prioritizing among Superfund NPL sites.

The taxes funding the Superfund trust fund are set to expire on December 31, 1995.

Legislation to reauthorize Superfund is currently moving through Congress that will bring much needed reform to the program. Fiscal year 1996 will likely be a transition year for the Superfund Program. I want to ensure that the transition is an orderly one and the Agency can avoid the problems encountered by the program during the last transition in 1985 and 1986.

In my opinion, the highest priority of the Superfund Program should be to protect current risks to human health and to ensure that sites on the national priorities list are not currently causing illness. It is inappropriate to expend significant resources on remedial ac-

tion at sites that will only pose a risk in the future, and only under changed circumstances, while sites that pose a health risk today—that are making people sick today—go unaddressed.

Currently, the Agency is not doing a sufficient job or prioritizing its resources to address the worst sites first, in part because it does not distinguish between current risks, future risks under current land uses and future risks that will only exist under changed circumstances. In response to a question by the Appropriations Subcommittee on how the Agency prioritizes its Superfund resources, EPA responded, "Once sites are listed on the NPL, Ban effort is made to maintain a stable pipeline of projects in the remedial process through resource allocation decisions." I am very concerned that by its own admission, EPA is placing a greater emphasis on bureaucratic convenience than on ongoing impacts to human health.

Our first obligation must be to protect the health of people who live around Superfund sites to stop people from getting sick due to real, ongoing exposures. It seems wrong to divert funds from these sites to sites that might only pose a risk warranting cleanup under changed circumstances simply "to maintain a stable pipeline of projects."

This GAO Report shows that Superfund is even more broken than we realized. I urge all my colleagues to read this report and consider its findings as we move forward to fund the program in fiscal year 1996 and to reauthorize the Superfund Program. I ask that the GAO Report be printed in the RECORD.

The report follows:

##### SUPERFUND—INFORMATION ON CURRENT HEALTH RISKS

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,  
RESOURCES, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION,  
Washington, DC, July 19, 1995.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,  
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Superfund cost estimates are growing at a substantial rate. The Superfund program was authorized through 1994 at \$15.2 billion, covering over 1,100 non-federal sites on the National Priorities List (NPL).<sup>1</sup> These figures could grow to \$75 billion (in 1994 dollars) and 4,500 nonfederal sites, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).<sup>2</sup> Because of these escalating costs, congressional decision makers want to know more about the human health risks addressed by the program. Although the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently testified to the Congress that approximately 73 million people live fewer than 4 miles from at least one Superfund site, much debate has occurred about the extent to which these sites pose health risks for cancer or other conditions, such as birth defects or nerve or liver damage.

To help measure the health risks from Superfund sites, you asked us to provide the best available information on (1) the extent to which sites may pose health risks under

Footnotes at end of article.