for NATO membership. NATO should and will expand. NATO expansion will strengthen stability in Europe for members and nonmembers alike. But new members must be ready to undertake the obligations of membership, just as we and our allies must be ready to extend our solemn commitments to them. Our present steady and deliberate approach to NATO expansion is intended to insure that each potential member is judged individually, according to its capacity to contribute to NATO's goals.

That approach gives every new European democracy a strong incentive to consolidate reform. But if we arbitrarily lock in advantages now for some countries, we risk discouraging reforms in countries not named and fostering complacency to countries that are. Indeed, the effect of the measure before Congress could be instability in the very region whose security we seek to bolster.

Third, the bill would effectively abrogate our treaty obligation to pay our share of the cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations that we have supported in the Security Council. The bill would require us to reduce our peacekeeping dues dollar for dollar by the cost of operations we conduct voluntarily in support of U.S. interests. These operations deter aggressors, isolate parish states and support humanitarian relief in places like Bosnia and Iraq.

If we deduct the cost of our voluntary actions against our U.N. dues, it would cancel our entire peacekeeping payment. Other nations—Japan and our NATO allies—would surely follow, and U.N. peacekeeping would end. Under current circumstances, it would end U.N. peacekeeping overnight.

That would eliminate peacekeepers already stationed at important flash points like the Golan Heights on the Israel-Syria border, where U.N. forces support progress in the Middle East peace process. It would pull U.N. forces from the Iraq-Kuwait border, from Cyprus and from the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia. In short, this bill would eliminate an effective tool for burden sharing that every President from Harry Truman to George Bush has used to advance American interests. It would leave the President with an unacceptable option whenever an emergency arose: act alone or do nothing.

The measure would also impose unnecessary, unsound and unconstitutional restrictions on the President's authority to place our troops under the operational control of another country—even a NATO ally—for U.N. operations. Our forces always remain under the command authority of the President, and we already apply the most rigorous standards when we pass even the most limited responsibility to a competent foreign commander. But the Commander-in-Chief must retain the flexibility to place troops temporarily under the operational control of officers of another nation when it serves our interests, as we did so effectively in Operation Desert Storm and in most other conflicts since the Revolution. By restricting that flexibility, the bill would undercut our ability to get the international community to respond to threats.

Effective American leadership abroad requires that we back our diplomacy with the credible threat of forces. When our vital interests are at stake, we must be prepared to act alone. And in fact, our willingness to do so is often the key to effective joint action. By mobilizing the support of other nations and leveraging our resources through alliances and institutions, we can achieve important objectives without asking American soldiers to bear all the risks, or American taxpayers to pay all the bills. That is a sensible bargain the American people support.

This Administration has worked hard to improve our consultation with the Congress on every issue raised by the National Security Revitalization Act. But in each case, what is at stake is fundamental: the authority of our President to protect the national security and to use every effective option to advance the interests of the U.S. In its present form, the bill unwisely and unconstitutionally deprives the President of the flexibility he needs to make the right choices for our nation's security.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that ''Reagan ran up the Federal debt'' or that ''Bush ran it up,'' bear in mind that the Founding Fathers made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at $4,807,066,615,385.66 as of the close of business Tuesday, February 14. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is $18,247.71.

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 Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 419. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 420. A bill to establish limitations on the use of funds for United Nations peacekeeping activities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FORD:

S. 421. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of a hydroelectric project in Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 422. A bill to authorize the appropriations for international economic and security assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COHEN:

S. 423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide improved access to quality long-term care services, to create incentives for greater private sector participation and personal responsibility in financing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 424. A bill to provide for adherence with MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 425. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the establishment in the Department of Veterans Affairs of mental illness research, education, and clinical centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 426. A bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should not have granted diplomatic recognition to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 422. A bill to authorize the appropriations for international economic and security assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FOREIGN AID REFORM LEGISLATION

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me there are two good reasons for a complete overhaul of foreign aid the world has changed and Congress has changed. The cold war is over replaced by a new, ambitious Russia, a host of violent smaller regimes, ethnic tensions, nuclear concerns, and massive refugee movements affecting even our own borders.

On the bright side, there are former communist nations actively seeking U.S. support, the flourishing of free enterprise and democracy, giant leaps in free trade and real prospects for peace in some of the most war-torn parts of the world.

Since the world has changed so dramatically, our tools of foreign policy must change with it—and one of the key tools is foreign aid.

That is the impetus for the proposal I am introducing today.

Our ability to effectively target foreign aid is crippled in large part by the outmoded and unduly complicated Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The 300-plus pages of this document contain 33 conflicting goals, 75 questionable priorities, which effectively tyrannize the 10,000 AID employees who carry out 1,700 projects in 89 countries.

There is no real sense of coherence, strategy, or focus to the law or our aid program. It may seem reasonable to direct the President to support a rural development program, but should we be

requiring him to protect ''community woodlots''? Maybe the law should define an ''increase in foreign crop productivity'' as an American national priority, but should we go so far as requiring the President to ''strengthen foreign systems to deliver fertilizer to farmers?'' Creating national standards for nutrition is one thing, but should the law direct U.S. assistance support a ''strategy for breast-feeding''?

While many of the goals enshrined in law may be admirable, I question whether they are American national priorities. My bill presents three clear, supportable goals: first, foreign aid must protect American security; second, foreign aid must promote American economic interests and finally, foreign aid must preserve political and regional stability.

Together with these broad goals, I want to adopt specific conditions and performance criteria. If the conditions can't be met, the program should not be funded. Throughout my tenure on the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I can't think of a single country that has graduated from U.S. assistance.

This is partly due to the fact that we send money to countries where government policies actually defeat the prospects for real economic growth. It's in our interests to facilitate the transition to free markets, not subsidize failures.

So, as a beginning point, this bill radically changes our approach to bilateral economic aid. In the past development assistance has focused on relieving the symptoms of poverty and despair. No doubt there are people and communities where the quality of life has improved somewhat. But by any standard, the fact is most poor countries are still poor and that is largely because of government practices and policies.

This bill starts from scratch. Development assistance, economic support funds and related programs are eliminated and instead I have established a new, smaller bilateral economic aid account. Funds can only be spent in countries committed to the road to free-market reform.

Aid will flow if a government encourages free trade and investment, protects private property, ownership and interests, limits state control of financial institutions, production and manufacturing and restricts interference in establishing wages and prices.

Several weeks ago at the Miami summit we heard 33 nations extol the merits of trade not aid. Chile's impressive record may have had a great deal to do with this hemispheric shift in emphasis.

In 1970, it had the twin distinction of being the world's largest recipient of U.S. aid per capita and being an economic basket case. Setting aside wrenching internal political events, once cut loose from aid dependency, Chile implemented a comprehensive free-market system, turned an economic corner and the rest, as they say, is history. The success of these reforms is evident in the fact that Chile's economic strength has opened the door to early membership in NAFTA.

Chile offers a good lesson in why foreign aid fails. If countries resist market reforms no amount of aid will improve economic or political conditions.

Absent meaningful reforms, foreign aid, like crack for an addict, only fuels failure.

The only way to break the devastating cycle of dependency is to end foreign aid entitlement programs, to change our economic aid agenda.

We should be contributing to a cure, supporting and energizing economic growth and opportunity, not just offering temporary relief from symptoms.

Why? Well setting aside altruistic motives, it is in our economic interests to encourage countries to embrace free-market principles. As we turn the corner on this century, it is clear our own economic health and progress, improving and expanding American job opportunities are closely tied to export opportunities in developing countries.

This mutually enriching scenario depends upon changing how we administer foreign aid—aid must become performance based.

Beyond defining broad goals and performance based economic aid strategy, the bill also funds specific national priorities. As drafted, the bill creates two separate titles—one for Europe and the NIS and the other for the Middle East.

There is little question in my mind that the security interests of our Nation are directly affected by stability in the Middle East and Europe. In the former, the administration has actively pursued a comprehensive peace agreement. Whether or not negotiations produce sound, durable agreements, the United States has ongoing interests driven by a number of issues including our close alliance with Israel, the important relationship with Egypt, as well as concerns about political extremism, energy security and terrorism.

I believe our assistance supports vital American interests in the region and should be sustained.

Turning to the second region where I think we have vital interest, the bill provides $350 million for Eastern Europe and the Baltics and $750 million for assistance to the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. Within the NIS account, the bill earmarks funds for Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia.

I also toughen conditions on Russian aid. No funds can be provided if there is any evidence the government is directing or supporting the violation of another nation's territory or sovereignty.

Beyond the NIS, many of my colleagues share a concern about expanding the sphere of NATO's stabilizing influence. This bill builds on this interest and targets excess defense articles and IMET for the Baltic nations and the Visegrad group.

In addition, as an alternative to Russia's ambition to exercise a unilateral security role in the region, I earmark money for a training and support of a joint peacekeeping battalion for the Baltics. This was a program the President announced in Riga this summer and then immediately told Congress, he was diverting the funding to Haiti. This reversal was a serious mistake which the bill corrects.

This bill not only spells out what needs to be done, but which agency should do it.

There are two major structural changes: first, trade and export promotion efforts are consolidated. The Trade Development Agency and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation are merged and the funding level is boosted.

One clear way to strengthen popular support for foreign aid is to make it more effectively serve American business interests—as I mentioned, American jobs, exports, and income depend on it.

Second, the bill abolishes AID and consolidates the agency's functions under the Secretary of State. This recommendation reflects my view that U.S. foreign aid must better serve U.S. foreign policy interests. The connection between U.S. aid and U.S. interests has been lost with agencies acting wholly independent of our collective interests and common good.

And, there is no more compelling illustration of the problem than the difficulties which plague the NIS program. Here you have the first major initiative since the Marshall plan. It enjoys the President's personal attention and bipartisan support in Congress—if anything was designed to work it should have been our NIS effort.

Instead, bureaucratic redundancy has allowed AID to blame the State Department, State to blame AID—and when all else fails, both blame the host government for not asking for a program in the first place.

But for a combination of these excuses, we could have had an aggressive effort underway 2 years ago—helping lay a foundation for a legal and commercial code protecting citizens and property throughout the NIS.

Instead, Judge Freeh has been put in the unfortunate position of playing catch-up with an international Mafia capable of undermining the successful transition to free markets throughout the region, not to mention engaging in nuclear terrorism against the United States.

Let me add one more point on the need to reorganize the foreign policy bureaucracy.

I have only addressed issues that fall directly within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Given the opportunity, I would also recommend consolidating USIA activities under the State Department and abolish ACDA altogether.

It makes no sense not to have the agency responsible for communicating U.S. interests separate and apart from the agency it serves. The State Department and USIA are integrated overseas and should be here at home. As for ACDA, it is completely unclear what they do that couldn't be done by the Undersecretary for International Security Affairs. Since these agencies are beyond the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, I will leave their reorganization and funding to the good judgment of Senator HELMS and Senator GRAMM.

This bill is a new lease on life for American assistance programs. Although drafted here in Congress, I should point out that I worked hard to assure that we do not micromanage the process.

Presidential flexibility is clearly preserved in general, by broadening goals and specifically by maintaining various waiver and transfer authorities, although I have restructured them somewhat to address a number of problems which have developed in the past several years.

Recently, the administration has increased its use of waivers to move forward with programs which I think everyone would agree are controversial. The fact that waivers have been so frequently invoked at the last possible minute, suggest one of two things: either the administration is incapable of even short-term planning or they are intentionally undermining the congressional notification and consultation process.

I am not prepared to pass judgment at this stage, but let me point out that waiver authorities included in this bill in sections 208, 701, and 703 must now either meet a national security interests test or Congress must be notified in advance of the use of the waiver.

Let me conclude by summing up where my bill takes foreign aid: First, I clearly define American interests; second, I set standards for performance; third, I fund American priorities in the Middle East and Europe and, fourth, I reorganize the bureaucracy so that foreign aid better serves our foreign interests.

If we don't produce real changes in how we administer foreign aid—soon—we will end up with no foreign aid at all.

In 1961, when he transmitted the Foreign Assistance Act to the Hill, President John Kennedy said:

> No objective supporter of foreign aid can be satisfied with the existing program—actually a multiplicity of programs. Bureaucratically fragmented, awkward and slow, its administration is diffused over a haphazard and irrational structure covering at least four departments and several agencies. The program is based on a series of legislative measures and administrative procedures conceived at different times for different purposes, many of them obsolete, inconsistent and unduly rigid and thus unsuited for our present needs and purposes. Its weaknesses have begun to undermine our confidence in our effort both here and abroad.

Forty-four years later, President Kennedy's words couldn't be more accurate.

Let me conclude by expressing my appreciation to Senator COVERDELL and Senator D'AMATO who have joined in cosponsoring this measure. When I released this bill in December, Senator COVERDELL was quick to point out many features which he supported and one which caused him serious concern. It is in deference to his considerable expertise and strong views that I revised my original draft and removed the Peace Corps from my reorganization plan.

I look forward to working with Senator COVERDELL and his colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee to reform the foreign aid and policy process. Let me pay special recognition to the committee chairman, Senator HELMS, whose leadership is crucial to changing the way this country carries out both its foreign policy and foreign aid agenda. It is my hope that working together in the authorization and appropriations process we can take advantage of a unique moment in history and complete a comprehensive reorganization of the foreign policy bureaucracy.●

● Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, in introducing legislation to overhaul our current foreign aid program. I commend him on his efforts and his leadership in this matter, and look forward to working with him and others to forge a new foreign assistance framework for the 21st century.

That foreign aid reform is needed is clear. Amazingly, after 32 years, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 remains the basic statute for our foreign aid program. Since then, the world has changed in ways few could have imagined. The collapse of Soviet influence, the growing interdependence of markets and the regionalization of conflict are realities that face this Congress and the American people. Reform efforts must be as sweeping as the changes that have made them necessary.

By almost any standard by which Congress evaluates programs, foreign aid has fallen short. Despite years of U.S. assistance, few countries have been able to make the transition from poor to developed. Examples of countries graduating from U.S. assistance to self-sufficiency are few and far between. While many nations have made serious efforts to help themselves, U.S. assistance is all too often a disincentive to economic reform and real growth. As a result, most Americans hold foreign aid in contempt. Their frustration is understandable, but it must be changed if we are to remain world leaders.

The world has changed dramatically, demanding a new foreign aid apparatus to address the new international environment. In this current climate of global unpredictability an shrinking budget resources, a new approach is needed. The bill we are introducing today meets that challenge. It states very simply that foreign assistance should meet three goals: It must protect American security, promote American economic interests, and preserve political and regional stability.

To meet these goals, our bill consolidates bureaucracies originally designed to meet the cold-war reality, and streamlines them in order to meet the new security environment. It provides additional resources to assist and promote U.S. economic interests oversees, creating more jobs and opportunities here at home. Our bill addresses what I believe has been a dangerous trend toward subcontracting our unique military capability to international institutions by prohibiting voluntary peacekeeping funds from being used to support U.S. personnel under U.N. command. Finally, the legislation anchors United States strategic interested throughout the globe by maintaining our commitment to the Middle East and Europe.

Additionally, I would like to thank Senator MCCONNELL for his cooperation in another matter regrading this legislation. As originally written, this bill would have folded the U.S. Peace Corps into the State Department. As former Director of the Peace Corps, I believe such a move would ultimately have detracted from the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. The safety of Peace Corps volunteers, in my judgment, depends on its independent status. I raised these concerns with Senator MCCONNELL, and I appreciate his willingness to remove this provision.

To close, I want to commend the Senator from Kentucky for his hard work in this matter. Prudently managed, properly targeted foreign aid serves the national interests of the Untied States. Our challenge is to build a system that does both. I am proud to be included in this effort, and will continue to work toward the principles and objectives outlined in this legislation.●

By Mr. COHEN:

S. 423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide improved access to quality long-term care services, to create incentives for greater private sector participation and personal responsibility in financing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE PRIVATE LONG-TERM CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE PRIVATE LONG-TERM CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Purpose: The Cohen legislation is designed to provide improved access to long term care services. An emphasis is placed on removing tax barriers and creating incentives which encourage individuals and their families to finance their future long term care needs.

The bill creates consumer protection standards for long term care insurance, and provides incentives and public education to encourage the purchase of private long term care insurance.

TITLE I—TAX TREATMENT OF LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE

Sec. 101. Qualified long term care services treated as medical expenses

Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code is clarified to allow qualified individuals to deduct out-of-pocket long term care services as medical expenses subject to a floor of 7.5 percent of adjusted gross income. Qualified long term care services include necessary diagnostic, preventive, therapeutic, rehabilitative, maintenance and personal care performed in either a residential or nonresidential setting. Qualified individuals must be determined by a licensed professional or qualified community case manager to be unable to perform without substantial assistance at least two activities of daily living (ADLs) or suffer from a moderate cognitive impairment.

Sec. 102. Treatment of long term care insurance

Section 213 is also amended to allow qualified long term care insurance premiums to be deducted as medical insurance subject to the 7.5 percent-of-adjusted-gross-income-floor. Qualified long term care insurance premiums are also deductible as a business expense and employer-provided long term care insurance is excluded from an employee's taxable income. A qualified long term care insurance policy must meet the regulatory standards as established in Title II.

Sec. 103. Treatment of qualified long term care policies

Benefits paid under qualified long term care insurance policies would be excluded from income under section 105(c) ''Payments Unrelated to Absence from Work'', and employer-paid long term care insurance would be a tax free employee fringe benefit.

The daily benefit cap for all long term care policies would be established at $200 per day and indexed for inflation. There is no ''cliff'' on per diem distributions, meaning that only payments above the established cap are treated as income.

● Private long-term care insurance is exempt from the continuation of coverage requirements created by COBRA. In addition, long-term care will be considered a ''qualified benefit'' that may be included in a cafeteria plan.

Sec. 105. Tax treatment of accelerated death benefits under life insurance contracts

Clarifies that an accelerated death benefit received by an individual on the life of an insured who is terminally ill individual (expected to die within 12 months) is excluded from taxable income as payment by reason of death.

TITLE II. STANDARDS FOR LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE

Sec. 201. National Long-Term Care Insurance Advisory Panel

Establishes a national advisory board to help implement the long-term care consumer protection standards, and educate the public, insurers, providers and other regulatory bodies of issues related to long-term care insurance.

Sec. 202. Policy requirements

Insurers are required to meet the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) January 1, 1993 standards for long-term insurance. Additional federal requirements include: a mandatory offer of nonforfeiture benefits, rate stabilization, minimum rate guarantees, limits and notification of increases on premiums and reimbursement mechanisms for long-term care policies. Policies that do not meet these consumer protection standards would be denied the favorable tax treatment described in Section I.

Sec. 203. Additional requirements for issuers of long-term care insurance policies

A penalty of $100 per day per policy shall be imposed on long-term care issuers failing to meet the minimum federal standards as outlined in this section. The civil monetary penalty per policy may not exceed $25,000 against carriers, and may not exceed $15,000 per policy against insurance agents.

Sec. 204. Coordination with State requirements

A State retains the authority to apply additional standards or regulations that provide greater protection of policyholders of long-term care insurance.

Sec. 205. Uniform language and definitions

The National Advisory Council shall issue standards for the use of uniform language and definitions in long-term care insurance policies, with permissible variations to take into account differences in State licensing requirements for long-term care providers.

TITLE III—INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE THE PURCHASE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE

Sec. 301. Public information and education programs

The Secretary of Health and Human Services is directed to establish a program designed to educate individuals on the risks of incurring catastrophic long-term care costs and the coverage options available to insure against this risk. Education should increase consumers knowledge of the lack of coverage for long-term care in Medicare, Medigap and most private health insurance policies and explain the various benefits and features of private long-term care insurance.

Sec. 302. Assets or resources disregarded under the Medicaid program

Amends Section 1917(b) of the Social Security Act, related to Medicaid Estate Recoveries, to allow for States to establish asset protection programs for individuals who purchase qualified long-term care insurance policies, without requiring States to recover such assets upon a beneficiaries death. This provision is aimed at encouraging more middle-income persons to purchase long-term care insurance by allowing individuals to keep a limited amount of assets and still qualify for Medicaid, if they have purchased long-term care insurance.

States that develop asset protection programs to encourage private insurance purchase are required to conform with uniform reporting and documentation requirements established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Sec. 303. Distributions from individual retirement accounts for the purchase of long-term care insurance coverage

Individuals above 59½ are allowed tax-free distributions from an IRA or an individual retirement annuity for the purchase of a long-term policy. This provision also allows individuals below the age of 59½ to withdraw from their individual retirement account without penalty in order to purchase a qualified long-term care plan. Individuals who obtain tax-free distributions from their IRA or individual retirement annuity would be restricted from deducting their long-term care insurance premium as a medical expense under Title I of this act.●

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 424. A bill to provide for adherence with MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Finance.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to offer the Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act. This legislation seeks to deter efforts to use the work place as an arena of discrimination in Northern Ireland. I am pleased that my colleague from New York, Representative BEN GILMAN, chairman of the House International Affairs Committee has introduced this bill, H.R. 470, in the House.

The Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act incorporates the MacBride Principles, which are modeled after the famous Sullivan Principles, one of the initial efforts to apply United States pressure to change the system of apartheid in South Africa. The MacBride Principles are named in honor of the late Sean MacBride, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and cofounder of Amnesty International.

This amendment will enlist the cooperation of United States companies active in Northern Ireland in the campaign to force the end of discrimination in the workplace by:

First, eliminating religious discrimination in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs and significantly increasing the representation in such jobs of individuals from underrepresented religious groups;

Second, providing adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the workplace;

Third, banning provocative sectarian and political emblems from the workplace;

Fourth, publicly advertising all job openings and undertaking special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from underrepresented religious groups, and establishing procedures to identify and recruit minority individuals with potential for further advancement, including managerial programs;

Fifth, establishing layoff, recall, and termination procedures which do not favor particular religious groupings;

Sixth, abolishing job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions, and differential employment criteria which discriminate on the basis of religious or ethnic origin;

Seventh, developing and expanding upon existing training and educational programs that will prepare substantial numbers of minority employees for managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs; and

Eighth, appointing a senior management staff member to oversee the U.S. company's compliance with the principles described above.

It is at the workplace in Northern Ireland, which can be used to either foster or eliminate discrimination, where improving the employment opportunities for the underprivileged will help factor out the economic causes of the current strife in Northern Ireland

and, hopefully, begin the process toward a peaceful resolution of the so-called troubles.

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. 424

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 ''Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Overall unemployment in Northern Ireland exceeds 14 percent.

(2) Unemployment in some neighborhoods of Northern Ireland comprised of religious minorities has exceeded 70 percent.

(3) The British Government Fair Employment Commission (F.E.C.), formerly the Fair Employment Agency (F.E.A.), has consistently reported that a member of the minority community is two and one-half times more likely to be unemployed than a member of the majority community.

(4) The Industrial Development Organization for Northern Ireland lists twenty-five firms in Northern Ireland which are controlled by United States persons.

(5) The Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC), Washington, District of Columbia, lists forty-nine publicly held and nine privately held United States companies doing business in Northern Ireland.

(6) The religious minority population of Northern Ireland is frequently subject to discriminatory hiring practices by United States businesses which have resulted in a disproportionate number of minority individuals holding menial and low-paying jobs.

(7) The MacBride Principles are a nine point set of guidelines for fair employment in Northern Ireland which establishes a corporate code of conduct to promote equal access to regional employment but does not require disinvestment, quotas, or reverse discrimination.

SEC. 3. RESTRICTION ON IMPORTS.

An article from Northern Ireland may not be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States unless there is presented at the time of entry to the customs officer concerned documentation indicating that the enterprise which manufactured or assembled such article was in compliance at the time of manufacture with the principles described in section 5.

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRINCIPLES.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—Any United States person who—

(1) has a branch or office in Northern Ireland, or

(2) controls a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise in Northern Ireland,

in which more than twenty people are employed shall take the necessasry steps to insure that, in operating such branch, office, corporation, partnership, or enterprise, those principles relating to employment practices set forth in section 5 are implemented and this Act is complied with.

(b) REPORT.—Each United States person referred to in subsection (a) shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a detailed and fully documented annual report, signed under oath, on showing compliance with the provisions of this Act; and

(2) such other information as the Secretary determines is necessary.

SEC. 5. MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES.

The principles referred to in section 4, which are based on the MacBride Principles, are as follows:

(1) Eliminating religious discrimination in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs and significantly increasing the representation in such jobs of individuals from underrepresented religious groups.

(2) Providing adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the workplace.

(3) Banning provocative sectarian and political emblems from the workplace.

(4) Advertising publicly all job openings and undertaking special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from underrepresented religious groups.

(5) Establishing layoff, recall, and termination procedures which do not favor particular religious groupings.

(6) Providing equal employment for all employees, including implementing equal and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions of employment for all employees, and abolishing job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions, and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of religion or ethnic origin.

(7) Developing training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of minority employees for managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs, including—

(A) expanding existing programs and forming new programs to train, upgrade, and improve the skills of all categories of minority employees;

(B) creating on-the-job training programs and facilities to assist minority employees to advance to higher paying jobs requiring greater skills; and

(C) establishing and expanding programs to enable minority employees to further their education and skills at recognized education facilities.

(8) Establishing procedures to assess, identify, and actively recruit minority individuals with potential for further advancement, and identifying those minority individuals who have high management potential and enrolling them in accelerated management programs.

(9) Appointing a senior management staff member to oversee the United States person's compliance with the principles described in this section.

SEC. 6. WAIVER OF PROVISIONS.

(a) WAIVER OF PROVISIONS.—In any case in which the President determines that compliance by a United States person with the provisions of this Act would harm the national security of the United States, the President may waive those provisions with respect to that United States person. The President shall publish in the Federal Register each waiver granted under this section and shall submit to the Congress a justification for granting each such waiver. Any such waiver shall become effective at the end of ninety days after the date on which the justification is submitted to the Congress unless the Congress, within that ninety-day period, adopts a joint resolution disapproving the waiver. In the computation of such ninety-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or because of an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS.—

(1) Any resolution described in subsection (a) shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

(2) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and adoption of a resolution under subsection (a) in the House of Representatives, a motion to proceed to the consideration of such resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS AND PRESUMPTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term ''United States person'' means any United States resident or national and any domestic concern (including any permanent domestic establishment of any foreign concern);

(2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce; and

(3) the term ''Northern Ireland'' includes the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Londonderry, Down, Tyrone, and Fermanagh.

(b) PRESUMPTION.—A United States person shall be presumed to control a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise in Northern Ireland if—

(1) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise;

(2) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) 25 percent or more of the voting securities of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise, if no other person owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) an equal or larger percentage;

(3) the corporation, partnership, or enterprise is operated by the United States person pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(4) a majority of the members of the board of directors of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise are also members of the comparable governing body of the United States person;

(5) the United States person has authority to appoint the majority of the members of the board of directors of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise; or

(6) the United States person has authority to appoint the chief operating officer of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect six months after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 425. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the establishment in the Department of Veterans Affairs of mental illness research, education, and clinical centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

THE VA MENTAL HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce legislation that would establish up to five centers of excellence in the area of mental illness at existing VA health care facilities. These centers, to be known as mental illness research, education, and clinical centers [MIRECC's] would be a vitally important and integral link in VA's efforts in the areas of research, education, and furnishing of clinical care

to veterans suffering from mental illness. I am delighted to be joined in introducing this bill by Senators AKAKA, CAMPBELL, DORGAN, and WELLSTONE.

Mr. President, the need to improve services to mentally ill veterans has been recognized for a number of years. For example, the October 20, 1985, report of the Special Purposes Committee to Evaluate the Mental Health and Behavioral Sciences Research Program of the VA, chaired by Dr. Seymour Kety—generally referred to as the Kety Committee—concluded that research on mental illness and training for psychiatrists and other mental health specialists at VA facilities were totally inadequate. The Kety report noted that about 40 percent of VA beds are occupied by veterans who suffer from mental disorders, yet less than 10 percent of VA's research resources are directed toward mental illness.

Little has changed since that report. Information provided to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at our August 3, 1993, hearing showed that the percentage of VA patients suffering with mental illness continues to hover over the same 40 percent rate found by the Kety Committee. Likewise, VA's research on mental illness has not increased to any appreciable extend and was estimated to be approximately 12 percent.

Mr. President, VA provides mental health services to more than one half to three quarters of a million veterans each year, yet in the decade between the time the Kety Committee began its work and now, there has not been a significant effort to focus VA's resources on the needs of mentally ill veterans. Among the recommendations of the Kety Committee was one that VA centers of excellence be established to develop first-rate psychiatric research programs within VA. Such centers, in the view of the Kety Committee, would provide state-of-the-art treatment, increase innovative basic and clinical research opportunities, and enhance and encourage training and treatment of mental illness.

Based on the recommendations of the Kety Committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs began efforts more than 6 years ago to encourage research into mental illnesses and to establish centers of excellence. For example, on May 20, 1988, Public Law 100–322 was enacted which included a provision to add an express reference to mental illness research in the statutory description of VA's medical research mission which is set forth in section 7303(a)(2) of title 38.

At that time, the committee—see S. Rept. 100–215, page 138—urged VA to establish three center of excellence, or MIRECC's, as proposed by the Kety Committee. In March 1992, Senator Cranston, then chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, noted that the VA had not taken any action to implement those recommendations. I unfortunately must tell you today that the VA still has done little to implement the recommendations of the Kety committee and has made no progress on the establishment of centers of excellence.

Mr. President, I also note that the January 1991 final report of the blue ribbon VA Advisory Committee for Health Research Policy recommended the establishment of MIRECC's as a means of increasing opportunities in psychiatric research and encouraging the formulation of new research initiatives in mental health care, as well as maintaining the intellectual environment so important to quality health care. The report stated that these ''centers could provide a way to deal with the emerging priorities in the VA and the Nation at large.''

In light of VA's failure to act administratively to establish these centers of excellence, our committee has developed legislation to accomplish this objective. The proposed MIRECC's legislation is patterned after the legislation which created the very successful geriatric research, education, and clinical centers [GRECC's], section 302 of Public Law 96–330, enacted in 1980. The MIRECC's would be designed first, to congregate at one facility clinicians and research investigators with a clear and precise clinical research mission, such as PTSD, schizophrenia, or drug abuse and alcohol abuse; second, to provide training and educational opportunities for students and residents in psychiatry, psychology, nursing, social work, and other professions which treat individuals with mental illness; and third, to develop new models of effective care and treatment for veterans with mental illnesses, especially those with service-connected conditions.

The establishment of MIRECC's should encourage research into outcomes of various types of treatment for mental illnesses, an aspect of mental illness research which, to date, has not been fully pursued, either by VA or other researchers. The bill would promote the sharing of information regarding all aspects of MIRECC's activities throughout VHA by requiring the Chief Medical Director to develop continuing education programs at regional medical education centers.

Finally, beginning February 1, 1997, the Secretary would be required to submit to the two Veterans' Affairs Committees annual reports on the research, education, and clinical care activities at each MIRECC and on the efforts to disseminate the information throughout the VA health care system.

At our committee hearing on August 3, 1993, numerous witnesses, including Dr. John Lipkin, representing the American Psychiatric Association, and Mr. Richard Greer, representing the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, testified in favor of the MIRECC legislation. All of the veterans service organizations testifying at the hearing—the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and Paralyzed Veterans—supported the enactment of MIRECC legislation.

Mr. President, the VA for too long has made inadequate efforts to improve research and treatment of mentally ill veterans and to foster educational activities designed to improve the capabilities of VA mental health professionals. The establishment of MIRECC's will be a significant step forward in improving care for some of our neediest veterans. I am hopeful that this long recognized need will become more than a forgotten want item for veterans who suffer, in many cases, in silence.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported, and the Senate has passed, comparable legislation in each of the last three Congresses. I hope to bring this legislation before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs soon and remain optimistic that we can move forward with this important legislation.

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

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

S. 425

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

SECTION 1. MENTAL ILLNESS RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND CLINICAL CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 7319. Mental illness research, education, and clinical centers

''(a) The purpose of this section is to improve the provision of health-care services and related counseling services to eligible veterans suffering from mental illness, especially mental illness related to service-related conditions, through research (including research on improving mental health service facilities of the Department and on improving the delivery of mental health services by the Department), education and training of personnel, and the development of improved models and systems for the furnishing of mental health services by the Department.

''(b)(1) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health and pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, shall—

''(A) designate not more than five health-care facilities of the Department as the locations for a center of research on mental health services, on the use by the Department of specific models for furnishing such services, on education and training, and on the development and implementation of innovative clinical activities and systems of care with respect to the delivery of such services by the Department; and

''(B) subject to the appropriation of funds for such purpose, establish and operate such centers at such locations in accordance with this section.

''(2) The Secretary shall designate at least one facility under paragraph (1) not later than January 1, 1996.

''(3) The Secretary shall, upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health, ensure that the facilities designated for centers under paragraph (1) are located in various geographic regions.

''(4) The Secretary may not designate any health-care facility as a location for a center under paragraph (1) unless—

''(A) the peer review panel established under paragraph (5) has determined under that paragraph that the proposal submitted by such facility as a location for a new center under this subsection is among those proposals which have met the highest competitive standards of scientific and clinical merit; and

''(B) the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health, determines that the facility has developed (or may reasonably be anticipated to develop)—

''(i) an arrangement with an accredited medical school which provides education and training in psychiatry and with which the facility is affiliated under which arrangement residents receive education and training in psychiatry through regular rotation through the facility so as to provide such residents with training in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illness;

''(ii) an arrangement with an accredited graduate school of psychology under which arrangement students receive education and training in clinical, counseling, or professional psychology through regular rotation through the facility so as to provide such students with training in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illness;

''(iii) an arrangement under which nursing, social work, or allied health personnel receive training and education in mental health care through regular rotation through the facility;

''(iv) the ability to attract scientists who have demonstrated creativity and achievement in research—

''(I) into the evaluation of innovative approaches to the design of mental health services; or

''(II) into the causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness;

''(v) a policymaking advisory committee composed of appropriate mental health-care and research personnel of the facility and of the affiliated school or schools to advise the directors of the facility and the center on policy matters pertaining to the activities of the center during the period of the operation of the center; and

''(vi) the capability to evaluate effectively the activities of the center, including activities relating to the evaluation of specific efforts to improve the quality and effectiveness of mental health services provided by the Department at or through individual facilities.

''(5)(A) In order to provide advice to assist the Under Secretary for Health and the Secretary to carry out their responsibilities under this section, the official within the Central Office of the Veterans Health Administration responsible for mental health and behavioral sciences matters shall establish a panel to assess the scientific and clinical merit of proposals that are submitted to the Secretary for the establishment of new centers under this subsection.

''(B) The membership of the panel shall consist of experts in the fields of mental health research, education and training, and clinical care. Members of the panel shall serve as consultants to the Department for a period of no longer than six months.

''(C) The panel shall review each proposal submitted to the panel by the official referred to in subparagraph (A) and shall submit its views on the relative scientific and clinical merit of each such proposal to that official.

''(D) The panel shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

''(c) Clinical and scientific investigation activities at each center may compete for the award of funding from amounts appropriated for the Department of Veterans Affairs medical and prosthetics research account and shall receive priority in the award of funding from such account insofar as funds are awarded to projects and activities relating to mental illness.

''(d) The Under Secretary for Health shall ensure that at least three centers designated under subsection (b)(1)(A) emphasize research into means of improving the quality of care for veterans suffering from mental illness through the development of community-based alternatives to institutional treatment for such illness.

''(e) The Under Secretary for Health shall ensure that useful information produced by the research, education and training, and clinical activities of the centers established under subsection (b)(1) is disseminated throughout the Veterans Health Administration through publications and through programs of continuing medical and related education provided through regional medical education centers under subchapter VI of chapter 74 of this title and through other means.

''(f) The official within the Central Office of the Veterans Health Administration responsible for mental health and behavioral sciences matters shall be responsible for supervising the operation of the centers established pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

''(g)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the basic support of the research and education and training activities of the centers established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) the following:

''(A) $3,125,000 for fiscal year 1996.

''(B) $6,250,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 1999.

''(2) In addition to the funds available under the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1), the Under Secretary for Health shall allocate to such centers from other funds appropriated generally for the Department of Veterans Affairs medical care account and the Department of Veterans Affairs medical and prosthetics research account such amounts as the Under Secretary for Health determines appropriate in order to carry out the purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 73 of such title is amended by adding at the end of the matter relating to subchapter II the following:

''7319. Mental illness research, education, and clinical centers.''.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than February 1 of each of 1997, 1998, and 1999, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the status and activities during the previous fiscal year of the mental illness, research, education, and clinical centers established pursuant to section 7319 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)). Each such report shall contain the following:

(1) A description of—

(A) the activities carried out at each center and the funding provided for such activities;

(B) the advances made at each center in research, education and training, and clinical activities relating to mental illness in veterans; and

(C) the actions taken by the Under Secretary for Health pursuant to subsection (d) of such section (as so added) to disseminate useful information derived from such activities throughout the Veterans Health Administration.

(2) The Secretary's evaluations of the effectiveness of the centers in fulfilling the purposes of the centers.●

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 426. A bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVEREND DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR, MEMORIAL LEGISLATION

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, since 1926 this Nation has designated February as the month to honor the contributions of African-Americans and their proud heritage, which has so powerfully enriched our land. As we honor the accomplishments of African-American citizens throughout the country, I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues legislation introduced today by myself and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, to recognize and honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As you know, Dr. King's life was one of extraordinary accomplishments and has had a significant and lasting impact on our Nation's history. The legislation Senator WARNER and I have introduced today would recognize these accomplishments by authorizing the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, the oldest African-American fraternity in the United States, to establish a monument to Dr. King on Federal land in the District of Columbia. Identical legislation passed the Senate in the 102d Congress with 60 cosponsors, but was unfortunately not passed by the House of Representatives before adjournment sine die.

Pursuant to this proposal, the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity of which Dr. King was a member, will coordinate the design and funding of the monument. The bill provides that the monument be established entirely with private contributions at no cost to the Federal Government. The Department of the Interior, in consultation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission on Fine Arts, will select the site and approve the design.

Alpha Phi Alpha was founded in 1906 at Cornell University and has hundreds of chapters across the country and many prominent citizens as members, including the late Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Alpha Phi Alpha has strongly endorsed the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial project and is committing its considerable human resources to the project's development.

Since 1955, when in Montgomery, AL, Dr. King became a national hero and an acknowledged leader in the civil rights struggle, until his tragic death in Memphis, TN in 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr. made an extraordinary contribution to the evolving history of our Nation. His courageous stands and unyielding belief in the tenent of nonviolence reawakened our Nation to the injustice and discrimination which continued to exist 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation and the

enactment of the guarantees of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

A memorial to Dr. King erected in the nation's Capital will provide continuing inspiration to all who visit it, and particularly to the thousands of students and young people who visit Washington, DC every year. While these young people may have no personal memory of the condition of civil rights in America before Dr. King, nor of the struggle in which he was the major figure, they do understand that there is much more that still needs to be done. As Coretta King said so articulately:

Young people in particular need nonviolent role models like him. In many ways, the Civil Rights movement was a youth movement. Young people of all races, many of whom were jailed, were involved in the struggle, and some gave their lives for the cause. Yet none of the youth trained by Martin and his associates retaliated in violence, including members of some of the toughest gangs of urban ghettos in cities like Chicago and Birmingham. This was a remarkable achievement. It has never been done before; it has not been duplicated since.

It is our hope that the young people who visit this monument will come to understand that it represents not only the enormous contribution of this great leader, but also two very basic principles necessary for the effective functioning of our society. The first is that change, even every fundamental change, is to be achieved through nonviolent means; that this is the path down which we should go as a nation in resolving some of our most difficult problems. The other basic principle is that the reconciliation of the races, the inclusion into the mainstream of American life of all its people, is essential to the fundamental health of our Nation.

Mr. President, Martin Luther King, Jr., dedicated his life to achieving equal treatment and enfranchisement for all Americans through nonviolent means. As we continue to celebrate Black History Month, I urge all of my colleagues to join Senator WARNER and me in this effort to ensure that the essential principles taught and practiced by Dr. King are never forgotten.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 198

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes.

S. 218

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 218, a bill to repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, and for other purposes.

S. 233

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 233, a bill to provide for the termination of reporting requirements of certain executive reports submitted to the Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of S. 277, a bill to impose comprehensive economic sanctions against Iran.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 356, a bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.

S. 415

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to apply the antitrust laws to major league baseball in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 248

At the request of Mr. DORGAN his name was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 248 proposed to H.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 248 proposed to H.J. Res. 1, supra.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—RELATIVE TO THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Ms. SNOWE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES.

Whereas the United States has strong and enduring economic, political, and strategic ties with the Hellenic Republic of Greece;

Whereas Greece has been a strategic ally of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean during every major conflict in this century;

Whereas historical and archaeological evidence demonstrates that the ancient Macedonians were Greek;

Whereas Macedonia is a Greek name that has designated the northern area of Greece for over 2,000 years;

Whereas in 1944, the United States opposed the changing of the name of the Skopje region of Yugoslavia by Marshall Tito from Vardar Banovina to Macedonia as part of a campaign to gain control of the Greek province of Macedonia, and the major port city of Salonika;

Whereas the regime in Skopje has persisted in inflaming tensions between it and Greece through a sustained propaganda campaign and the continued use of an ancient Greek symbol, the Star of Vergina, in its flag;

Whereas the Skopje regime has refused to remove paragraph 49 from its constitution, a reference to the 1944 declaration by the then communist regime calling for the ''unification'' of neighboring territories in Greece and Bulgaria with the ''Macedonian Republic'';

Whereas Greece has no claim on the territory of the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia and has repeatedly reaffirmed the inviolability of all borders in the area of the 2 countries; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of the United States to oppose any expansionist or irredentist policies in order to promote peace and stability in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should not have extended diplomatic recognition to the Skopje regime that insists on using the Greek name of Macedonia; and

(2) the President should reconsider this decision and withdraw diplomatic recognition until such time as the Skopje regime renounces its use of the name Macedonia, removes objectionable language in paragraph 49 of its constitution, removes symbols which imply territorial expansion such as the Star of Vergina in its flag, ceases propaganda against Greece, and adheres fully to Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe norms and principles.

AMENDMENT SUBMITTED

BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 252–258

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BYRD submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 252

On page 2, line 3, strike beginning with ''unless'' through ''vote'' on line 6 and insert ''unless the Congress shall provide by law for a specific excess of outlays over receipts''.