

EC-374. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-373 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-375. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-374 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-376. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-375 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-377. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-376 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-378. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-377 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-379. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-378 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-380. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-379 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-381. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-380 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-382. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-381 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-383. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-382 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-384. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-383 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-385. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-385 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-386. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-386 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-387. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-387 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-388. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-388 adopted by the Council on De-

ember 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-389. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-391 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-390. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-390 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE):

S. 360. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties imposed on States for noncompliance with motorcycle helmet and automobile safety belt requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 361. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the monthly amounts paid by a State to blind disabled veterans shall be excluded from the determination of annual income for purposes of payment of pension by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 362. A bill to amend the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 to provide for the reorganization of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and for local review of proposed actions of the Airports Authority affecting aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 363. A bill to improve water quality within the Rio Puerco watershed, New Mexico, and to help restore the ecological health of the Rio Grande through the cooperative identification and implementation of best management practices that are consistent with the ecological, geological, cultural, sociological, and economic conditions in the region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 365. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the use of biological monitoring and whole effluent toxicity tests in connection with publicly owned treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 366. A bill to amend certain Federal civil rights statutes to prevent the involuntary application of arbitration to claims that arise from unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, na-

tional origin, age, or disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that installment sales of certain farmers not be treated as a preference item for purposes of the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. Con. Res. 5. A concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE):

S. 360. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties imposed on States for noncompliance with motorcycle helmet and automobile safety belt requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

##### MOTORCYCLE HELMET AND SAFETY BELT PENALTY ELIMINATION

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, section 153 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] of 1991 (Public Law 102-240) penalizes States that do not institute mandatory motorcycle helmet and seatbelt laws. Today, I will introduce a measure to repeal this patently unfair provision that forces States to transfer scarce construction funds to other programs.

The November elections have shown that the American people want more decisionmaking authority with their State and local governments as opposed to heavy handed Federal mandates. Furthermore, outlining how a State spends its own money, which is collected through the consumer gas tax, infringes on States' ability to control their own budgets. Dangling essential highway construction money in front of States to coerce them into adopting helmet and seatbelt laws is fiscal blackmail. State governments are aware of the need for safety programs and I do not support Washington's micromanagement of issues that should clearly be left up to the States.

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of highway safety. However, mandatory motorcycle and seatbelt laws do not guarantee safety. In fact, of the 10 safest States in which to ride

a motorcycle, 7 do not require mandatory helmet use for adults. Furthermore, New Hampshire, which does not have mandatory helmet and seatbelt laws, has been ranked as one of the five States with the best highway safety record in the Nation, as far as fatalities per million miles traveled.

Mr. President, highway safety education programs are the key to highway safety and I believe that States have the expertise and know-how to develop their own programs without Federal intimidation. I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting their States' highway departments and highway users by repealing helmet and seatbelt mandates.●

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 361. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the monthly amounts paid by a State to blind disabled veterans shall be excluded from the determination of annual income for purposes of payment of pension by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### LEGISLATION TO ASSIST BLIND VETERANS

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, since the mid-1930's, New York State has paid blind disabled veterans a monthly annuity. Qualified veterans—of which there are less than 2,000—receive monthly payments of \$41.66, the same amount as has been paid since the program's inception.

The blind annuity has not been adjusted upward, because should a State decide to increase its blind annuity, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs would respond by reducing Federal pensions paid to these individuals by the same amount. Thus, there would be no net benefit for veterans receiving the annuity.

The legislation that I and my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, are reintroducing today will prevent the VA from penalizing blind veterans, should any State undertake or increase a blind annuity. Charity begins at home. My legislation will allow States to compensate those who have paid a very high price in defense of our country, at no cost to the Federal Government.

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. 361

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

#### SECTION 1. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS FROM INCOME DETERMINATION FOR PENSION PURPOSES.

Section 1503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

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

"(11) amounts equal to amounts paid to a veteran by a State under a program of such State to make monthly payments to qualifying veterans who are blind and totally disabled."●

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 362. A bill to amend the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 to provide for the reorganization of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and for local review of proposed actions of the Airports Authority affecting aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### WASHINGTON AIRPORT ACT AMENDMENTS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I introduce S. 362, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act Amendment of 1995.

In light of the Supreme Court's decision last month which compels congressional action, I am sponsoring this legislation which finally eliminates congressional oversight over the Airports Authority Board of Directors, and makes this Board more accountable to the communities it serves. Similar legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleague, Mrs. MORELLA of Maryland.

This legislation will amend the Metropolitan Washington Airport Act of 1986 by reorganizing the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and providing for greater local involvement in the management of Dulles and Washington National Airports.

I believe in strong local involvement in the management of our airports. The Airports Authority Board structure which was struck down recently by the Supreme Court did not adequately incorporate representation of local communities. The legislation will restore the involvement of communities in this region into the management of the Washington area airports by reorganizing the Airports Authority Board of Directors into 11 members who reside in the Washington, DC, region. These board members will be appointed by the chief executives of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, the Virginia State legislature, or by the local council of governments.

The legislation also ensures local involvement in any decision by the Washington Metropolitan Airports Authority Board of Directors which could result in a change in aircraft noise in the vicinity our local airports. The legislation mandates that a local group of citizens, the committee on noise abatement, be notified by the Board of any decision affecting noise abatement so that they have the opportunity to review the proposed action. In the interest of the citizens most affected by aircraft noise, I feel that local oversight is important in any airport authority decision involving the serious issue of noise abatement.

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that airports should be accountable to the communities they serve, and I

hope we will see enactment of this legislation during the 104th Congress. 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. 362

*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 "Metropolitan Washington Airports Act Amendments of 1995".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 6002(7) of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 (49 U.S.C. App. 2451(7)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "declining" after "perceived"; and

(2) by striking "the growing local interest," and inserting "the increasing need for local planning and management on a metropolitan statistical area basis,".

#### SEC. 3. AIRPORTS AUTHORITY.

(a) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Section 6007 of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 (49 U.S.C. App. 2456) is amended by striking subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following:

"(e) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

"(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Airports Authority shall be governed by a board of directors of 11 members as follows:

"(A) 1 member shall be appointed by the Governor of Virginia.

"(B) 1 member shall be appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

"(C) 1 member shall be appointed by the Governor of Maryland.

"(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the Virginia State legislature.

"(E) 2 members shall be appointed by those representatives from Virginia local governments who are on the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

"(F) 2 members shall be appointed by those representatives from the District of Columbia government who are on the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

"(G) 2 members shall be appointed by those representatives from Maryland local governments who are on the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

The Chairman shall be appointed from among the members by a majority vote of the members and shall serve until replaced by a majority vote of the members.

"(2) RESTRICTIONS.—Members (A) shall serve without compensation other than reasonable expenses incident to board functions, and (B) must reside within the Washington Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

"(3) TERMS.—Member shall be appointed for terms of 4 years.

"(4) REQUIRED NUMBER OF VOTES.—7 votes shall be required to approve bond issues and the annual budget.

"(f) AIRPORT NOISE.—

"(1) BALANCED ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.—In order to protect the public from the impact of aircraft noise and at the same time provide for suitable air transportation service to the Washington Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, a proposed action of the board of directors which could result in a change in the impact of aircraft noise in the vicinity of a Metropolitan Washington Airport may not take unless, at least 60 days before the action is to take effect, the board of directors—

“(A) notifies, in writing, the Committee on Noise Abatement at National and Dulles Airports of the Washington Council of Governments of the action for the purpose of allowing such committee the opportunity to review, and submit comments on, the action; and

“(B) submits, in writing, to such committee a response to any comment of such committee with respect to the action within 30 days after the date of receipt of such comment.”

#### SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.—Persons appointed as members of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority on the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to serve on such board until their respective terms expire under former section 6007(e).

##### (c) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—

(1) VIRGINIA APPOINTMENTS.—The Governor of Virginia shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(A) a person to fill the vacancy of the first member appointed by the Governor of Virginia under former section 6007(e)(1)(A) whose term expires after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Virginia State legislature shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(D) persons to fill the vacancies of the second and third members appointed by the Governor under former section 6007(e)(1)(A) whose terms expire after such date of enactment. Representatives from Virginia local governments shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(E) persons to fill the vacancies of the fourth and fifth members appointed by the Governor under former section 6007(e)(1)(A) whose terms expire after such date of enactment.

(2) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPOINTMENTS.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(B) a person to fill the vacancy of the first member appointed by the Mayor of District of Columbia under former section 6007(e)(1)(B) whose term expires after the date of the enactment of this Act. Representatives from the District of Columbia government shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(F) persons to fill the vacancies of the second and third such members appointed by the Mayor under former section 6007(e)(1)(B) whose terms expire after such date of enactment.

“(3) MARYLAND APPOINTMENTS.—The Governor of Maryland shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(C) a person to fill the vacancy of the first member appointed by the Governor of Maryland under former section 6007(e)(1)(C) whose term expires after the date of the enactment of this Act. Representatives from Maryland local governments shall appoint under new section 6007(e)(1)(G)—

(A) a person to fill the vacancy of the second member appointed by the Governor under former section 6007(e)(1)(C) whose term expires after such date of enactment; and

(B) a person to fill the vacancy of the member appointed by the President under former section 6007(e)(1)(D) when the term of such member expires after such date of enactment.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) FORMER SECTION 6007(e).—The term “former section 6007(e)” means section 6007(e) of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) NEW SECTION 6007(e).—The term “new section 6007(e)” means section 6007(e) of the

Metropolitan Washington Airport Act of 1986, as amended by section 3 of this Act.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 363. A bill to improve water quality within the Rio Puerco Watershed, New Mexico, and to help restore the ecological health of the Rio Grande through the cooperative identification and implementation of best management practices that are consistent with the ecological, geological, cultural, sociological, and economic conditions in the region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

##### RIO PUERCO WATERSHED ACT

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will authorize a coordinated approach for restoration of the Rio Puerco Watershed, which at 7,000 square miles is the largest tributary to the Rio Grande in terms of area and sediment. The Rio Puerco was once known as New Mexico's breadbasket, with water supply and soil tilth to support that reputation.

Over time, extensive ecological changes have occurred in the Rio Puerco Watershed, some of which have resulted in damage to the watershed that has seriously affected the economic and cultural well-being of its inhabitants. This has resulted in the loss of existing communities that were based on the land and were self-sustaining. Mr. President, a healthy and sustainable ecosystem is essential to the long-term economic and cultural viability of the region.

According to the Bureau of Land Management, the Rio Puerco contributes only 6 percent of the total water but over 50 percent of the sediments which enter the Rio Grande. Accelerated, progressive soil erosion within the basin threatens not only the sustained productivity of the rangeland watershed, but also the middle Rio Grande aquatic system, irrigators dependent on those waters, and the economic foundation of the Mesilla Valley dependent on Elephant Butte Reservoir.

A substantial proportion of the rural population is concerned about its ability to maintain a traditional lifestyle with an economy which is natural resource based and dependent upon the productivity of land with multiple ownership. The vast Rio Puerco drainage system is a mosaic of land ownership and agency management. No single agency has watershed-wide expertise and management responsibility. It is imperative that the numerous agencies and individuals with resource management responsibility—Indian pueblos, Federal and State agencies, and private citizens—work together to develop a plan for and implement an effective Rio Puerco Watershed management program.

This legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior to lead and coordinate a

management program in the Rio Puerco Watershed with the advice and input of a Rio Puerco Management Committee composed of the various landowners, affected Indian pueblos, local, regional, State, and Federal governments, and other interested citizens.

The committee will prepare a management plan to identify reasonable and appropriate goals and objectives for land owners and managers in the Rio Puerco Watershed; to describe potential alternative actions to meet the goals and objectives; to recommend voluntary implementation of appropriate best management practices on both public and private lands; to provide for cooperative development of management guidelines for maintaining and improving the ecological, cultural, and economic conditions on both public and private lands; and other activities that will promote cooperation and information sharing among those that own and manage land in the Rio Puerco Watershed.

Mr. President, I am pleased that Senator DOMENICI is a cosponsor of this legislation. It is our hope that this legislation will advance the restoration of and maintenance of a healthy Rio Puerco Watershed that will serve New Mexico and its citizens in the future as well as it has served us in the past. We have a lot of work ahead of us. A clear path must be outlined and a base of authorization, from which this program can be funded, established. Most importantly, this legislation authorizes an approach that brings all of the stakeholders together. The Federal Government cannot, and should not, undertake this effort alone. The support and contributions of local citizens, tribes, governmental entities, and others is crucial. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my remarks and this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 363

*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 “Rio Puerco Watershed Act of 1995”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) over time, extensive ecological changes have occurred in the Rio Puerco watershed, including—

- (A) erosion of agricultural and range lands;
- (B) impairment of waters due to heavy sedimentation;
- (C) reduced productivity of renewable resources;
- (D) loss of biological diversity;
- (E) loss of functioning riparian areas; and
- (F) loss of available surface water;

(2) damage to the watershed has seriously affected the economic and cultural well-being of its inhabitants, including—

(A) loss of communities that were based on the land and were self-sustaining; and

(B) adverse effects on the traditions, customs, and cultures of the affected communities;

(3) a healthy and sustainable ecosystem is essential to the long-term economic and cultural viability of the region;

(4) the impairment of the Rio Puerco watershed has caused damage to the ecological and economic well-being of the area below the junction of the Rio Puerco with the Rio Grande, including—

(A) disruption of ecological processes;

(B) water quality impairment;

(C) significant reduction in the water storage capacity and life expectancy of the Elephant Butte Dam and Reservoir system due to sedimentation;

(D) chronic problems of irrigation system channel maintenance; and

(E) increased risk of flooding caused by sediment accumulation;

(5) the Rio Puerco is a major tributary of the Rio Grande, and the coordinated implementation of ecosystem-based best management practices for the Rio Puerco system could benefit the larger Rio Grande system;

(6) the Rio Puerco watershed has been stressed from the loss of native vegetation, introduction of exotic species, and alteration of riparian habitat which have disrupted the original dynamics of the river and disrupted natural ecological processes;

(7) the Rio Puerco watershed is a mosaic of private, Federal, tribal trust, and State land ownership with diverse, sometimes differing management objectives;

(8) development, implementation, and monitoring of an effective watershed management program for the Rio Puerco watershed is best achieved through cooperation among affected Federal, State, local, and tribal entities;

(9) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, in consultation with Federal, State, local, and tribal entities and in cooperation with the Rio Puerco Watershed Committee, is best suited to coordinate management efforts in the Rio Puerco watershed; and

(10) accelerating the pace of improvement in the Rio Puerco watershed on a coordinated, cooperative basis will benefit persons living in the watershed as well as downstream users on the Rio Grande.

### SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall—

(1) in consultation with the Rio Puerco Management Committee established by section 4—

(A) establish a clearinghouse for research and information on management within the area identified as the Rio Puerco Drainage Basin, as depicted on the map entitled “The Rio Puerco Watershed” dated June 1994, including—

(i) current and historical natural resource conditions; and

(ii) data concerning the extent and causes of watershed impairment; and

(B) establish an inventory of best management practices and related monitoring activities that have been or may be implemented within the area identified as the Rio Puerco Watershed Project, as depicted on the map entitled “The Rio Puerco Watershed” dated June 1994; and

(2) provide support to the Rio Puerco Management Committee to identify objectives, monitor results of ongoing projects, and develop alternative watershed management plans for the Rio Puerco Drainage Basin, based on best management practices.

(b) RIO PUERCO MANAGEMENT REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Rio Puerco Management Committee, shall prepare a report for the improvement of watershed conditions in the Rio Puerco Drainage Basin described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify reasonable and appropriate goals and objectives for landowners and managers in the Rio Puerco watershed;

(B) describe potential alternative actions to meet the goals and objectives, including proven best management practices and costs associated with implementing the actions;

(C) recommend voluntary implementation of appropriate best management practices on public and private lands;

(D) provide for cooperative development of management guidelines for maintaining and improving the ecological, cultural, and economic conditions on public and private lands;

(E) provide for the development of public participation and community outreach programs that would include proposals for—

(i) cooperative efforts with private landowners to encourage implementation of best management practices within the watershed; and

(ii) involvement of private citizens in restoring the watershed;

(F) provide for the development of proposals for voluntary cooperative programs among the members of the Rio Puerco Management Committee to implement best management practices in a coordinated, consistent, and cost-effective manner;

(G) provide for the encouragement of, and support implementation of, best management practices on private lands; and

(H) provide for the development of proposals for a monitoring system that—

(i) builds on existing data available from private, Federal, and State sources;

(ii) provides for the coordinated collection, evaluation, and interpretation of additional data as needed or collected; and

(iii) will provide information to—

(I) assess existing resource and socioeconomic conditions;

(II) identify priority implementation actions; and

(III) assess the effectiveness of actions taken.

### SEC. 4. RIO PUERCO MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Rio Puerco Management Committee (referred to in this section as the “Committee”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be convened by a representative of the Bureau of Land Management and shall include representatives from—

(1) the Rio Puerco Watershed Committee;

(2) affected tribes and pueblos;

(3) the National Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture;

(4) the Bureau of Reclamation;

(5) the United States Geological Survey;

(6) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(7) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(8) the Army Corps of Engineers;

(9) the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture;

(10) the State of New Mexico, including the New Mexico Environment Department and the State Engineer;

(11) affected local soil and water conservation districts;

(12) the Elephant Butte Irrigation District;

(13) private landowners; and

(14) other interested citizens.

(c) DUTIES.—The Rio Puerco Management Committee shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, on the development and implementation of the Rio Puerco Management Program described in section 3; and

(2) serve as a forum for information about activities that may affect or further the development and implementation of the best management practices described in section 3.

(d) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

### SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Rio Puerco Management Committee, shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing—

(1) a summary of activities of the management program under section 3; and

(2) proposals for joint implementation efforts, including funding recommendations.

### SEC. 6. LOWER RIO GRANDE HABITAT STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with appropriate State agencies, shall conduct a study of the Rio Grande that—

(1) shall cover the distance from Caballo Lake to Sunland Park, New Mexico; and

(2) may cover a greater distance.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a survey of the current habitat conditions of the river and its riparian environment;

(2) identification of the changes in vegetation and habitat over the past 400 years and the affect of the changes on the river and riparian area; and

(3) an assessment of the feasibility, benefits, and problems associated with activities to prevent further habitat loss and to restore habitat through reintroduction or establishment of appropriate native plant species.

(c) TRANSMITTAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit the study under subsection (a) to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

### SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 a total of \$7,500,000 for the 10 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 366. A bill to amend certain Federal civil rights statutes to prevent the involuntary application of arbitration to claims that arise from unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURES PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill that I also introduced in the 103d Congress. This bill mirrors a House bill introduced last year by Representatives PATRICIA SCHROEDER, EDWARD MARKEY, and Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky as companion legislation to my original bill, S. 2012, the Protection From Coercive Employment Agreements Act of 1994.

This bill addresses a rapidly growing practice in employment relations—the practice of requiring employees to submit claims of discrimination or harassment to arbitration as a term or condition of employment or advancement, and prohibiting the employee from resolving their claim in a court of law.

This bill amends seven specific civil rights statutes to make clear that the powers and procedures provided under those laws are the exclusive ones that apply when a claim arises. The legislation would invalidate existing agreements between employers and employees that require the employment discrimination claims to be submitted to mandatory arbitration.

The statutes this will amend are title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans With Disabilities Act, section 1977 of the Revised Statutes, the Equal Pay Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the Federal Arbitration Act [FAA]. The amendment to the FAA extends the protections of the bill to claims of unlawful discrimination that arise under State or local law, and other Federal laws that prohibit job discrimination.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate that this legislation, as in the case of S. 2012, is in no way intended to bar the use of voluntary arbitration, conciliation, mediation or other informal quasi-judicial methods of dispute resolution. In fact, I strongly support the use of voluntary alternative dispute resolution methods as a way of reducing the caseloads of civil and criminal courts where appropriate.

This bill closes a widening loophole in the enforcement of civil rights laws in our Nation. An entire industry—Wall Street—and a growing number of companies and firms in many other industries have been able to circumvent formal legal challenges to their unlawful employment practices in court—a right intended to be protected by the statutes this bill amends. Employers can tell current and prospective employees, “if you want to work for us, you’ll have to check your rights as an American citizen at the door.”

Mr. President, this practice should be stopped now. It is simply unfair to require an employee to waive, in advance, his or her statutory right to seek remedy in a court of law, in exchange for employment or a promotion. This bill will restore integrity in the relations between employees and employers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

S. 366

*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 “Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act of 1995”.

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “EXCLUSIVITY OF POWERS AND PROCEDURES

“SEC. 719. Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a claim arising under this title, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such claim unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 16 and 17 as sections 17 and 18, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 15 the following new section 16:

##### “EXCLUSIVITY OF POWERS AND PROCEDURES

“SEC. 16. Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim arising under this Act, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such right or such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 4. AMENDMENT TO THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.

Section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 795) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the procedures expressly applicable to a claim based on right under section 501, such procedures shall be the exclusive procedures applicable to such claim unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 5. AMENDMENT TO THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.

Section 107 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a claim based on a violation described in subsection (a), such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such claim unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1977 OF THE REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1977 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the procedures expressly applicable to a right to make and enforce a contract of employment under this section, such procedures shall be the exclusive procedures applicable to a claim based on such right unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve

such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 7. AMENDMENT TO THE EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENT UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the powers or procedures expressly applicable to a claim based on violation of this subsection, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive procedures applicable to such claim unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 8. AMENDMENT TO THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993.

Title IV of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “SEC. 406. EXCLUSIVITY OF REMEDIES.

“Notwithstanding any Federal statute of general applicability that would modify any of the procedures expressly applicable to a claim based on a right provided under this Act or under an amendment made by this Act, such procedures shall be the exclusive procedures applicable to such claim unless after such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”.

#### SEC. 9. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 9 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 14 of title 9, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” before “This”; and

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

“(b) This chapter shall not apply with respect to a claim of unlawful discrimination in employment if such claim arises from discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.”.

#### SEC. 10. APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to claims arising on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

##### HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I rise to urge my colleagues in Congress to work quickly to pass legislation to correct a serious problem affecting our Nation’s farmers, ranchers, and small businesses.

As you know, the 25-percent tax deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals expired on December 31, 1993. This provision is absolutely critical to the health care concerns of small business owners and farmers who conduct their businesses as sole proprietors. While the 25-percent health costs tax deduction enjoys broad bipartisan support, it was not restored last year when the prospects for broader health care reform collapsed.

We should expect the outcry from small businesses to be deafening this

April unless we move quickly to extend this provision beyond its December 31, 1993 expiration date. Further, it is indefensible that our tax laws tell some businesses that they can deduct 100 percent of their health costs, while others, mostly smaller businesses, are told they can deduct none of their health care costs.

The health of a farm family or small business owner is no less important than the health of the president of a large corporation, and the Internal Revenue Code should reflect this simple fact.

That's way I am reintroducing legislation to restore tax fairness for sole proprietors who acquire health insurance coverage for themselves and their families. My bill would renew the 25-percent health insurance tax deduction as if it had not expired in December 1993. It also expands the current 25-percent deduction to 100 percent over the next several years. As a result, sole proprietors would receive the exact same tax treatment that large corporations now enjoy.

Almost no one disagrees that the tax code unfairly discriminates against self-employed business owners with respect to health care costs. Yet, Congress has always scrambled to simply retain the current 25-percent health tax deduction.

We can no longer afford to allow this provision to be held hostage to sunset provisions or politics. So long as we turn a blind eye to this problem, millions of Americans are prevented from purchasing adequate and affordable health care for themselves and their families.

We ought to move to correct this matter without further delay. This matter needs immediate attention.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that installment sales of certain farmers not be treated as a preference item for purposes of the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Finance.

TAX TREATMENT OF INSTALLMENT SALES  
LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation to rectify a serious tax problem confronting our family farmers.

The Internal Revenue Service [IRS] has, in my opinion, mistakenly taken a position that may preclude our farmers from using deferred payment grain contracts, which have been routinely used in their businesses for decades. In my judgment, the IRS' position imposes an unintended and unacceptable financial hardship on the farming industry.

Let me briefly explain. For years, family farmers have used deferred payment grain contracts to sell their commodities to grain elevators to help manage the business income. A typical grain contract between a farmer and grain elevator calls upon a farmer to sell and deliver grain to a grain elevator—often because the farmer does not

have adequate storage—for a fixed amount. In many cases, one or more payments paid by the elevator to the farmer under the contract occur after the close of the farmer's taxable year.

For regular tax purposes, farmers are allowed to defer income from the deferred payments under the grain contracts in computing their regular tax liability. But because the IRS apparently views all deferred payment grain contracts as installment sales, it now requires them to add back this income in computing the Alternative Minimum Tax [AMT] in the tax year preceding the year of payment. As a result, thousands of family farmers are facing hefty tax bills because they are being whip-sawed by an AMT provision which effectively repeals their ability to use such contracts.

To make matters worse, many farmers were advised by tax experts that some kinds of traditional deferred payment grain contracts do not amount to an installment sale that would require an AMT calculation. For this reason, they did not make an AMT adjustment on their income tax returns. Now they are being told by the IRS that they owe large tax bills on income that they will not receive until later.

That is why I am introducing legislation to ensure that our family farmers are allowed to engage in deferred payment transactions and get the same kind of tax treatment they have always received.

I do not believe that Congress intended this kind of tax treatment for farmers using deferred payment grain contracts for legitimate business purposes. It seems to me that the IRS position is based upon an incorrect interpretation which ignores the fact that our family farmers are, by law, permitted to manage their business operations on a cash basis.

My bill would simply make clear the original intent of Congress in the Tax Acts of 1986 and 1987, which was to allow farmers to continue to receive the tax benefit provided from the use of cash method accounting and from installment sales for their deferred payment grain transactions.

I urge my colleagues to include this much-needed legislation in any revenue measure considered by the Senate this year.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 5

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of S. 5, a bill to clarify the war powers of Congress and the President in the post-cold war period.

S. 104

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 104, a bill to establish the position of Coordinator for

Counter-Terrorism within the office of the Secretary of State.

S. 150

At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to authorize an entrance fee surcharge at the Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 154

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 154, a bill to prohibit the expenditure of appropriated funds on the Advanced Neutron Source.

S. 157

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to reduce Federal spending by prohibiting the expenditure of appropriated funds on the United States International Space Station Program.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of S. 184, a bill to establish an Office for Rare Disease Research in the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 223

At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] were added as cosponsors of S. 223, a bill to provide for the termination of reporting requirements of certain executive reports submitted to the Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of S. 234, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt a State from certain penalties for failing to meet requirements relating to motorcycle helmet laws if the State has in effect a motorcycle safety program, and to delay the effective date of certain penalties for States that fail to meet certain requirements for motorcycle safety laws, and for other purposes.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to impose comprehensive economic sanctions against Iran.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 281, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to change the date for the beginning of the Vietnam era for the purpose of veterans benefits from August 5, 1964, to December 22, 1961.