

Whereas section 901(b) of such Act (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)) requires that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of other ocean borne cargo generated directly or indirectly by the Federal Government be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas cargo reservation programs are very important for the shipowners of the United States who require compensation for maintaining a United States-flag fleet;

Whereas the United States-flag vessels that carry reserved cargo provide quality jobs for seafarers of the United States;

Whereas, according to the most recent statistics from the Maritime Administration, in 1990, cargo reservation programs generated \$2,400,000,000 in revenue to the United States fleet and accounted for one-third of all revenue from United States-flag foreign trade cargo;

Whereas the Maritime Administration has indicated that the total volume of cargoes moving under the programs subject to Federal cargo reservation laws is declining and will continue to decline;

Whereas, in 1970, Congress found that the degree of compliance by Federal agencies with the requirements of the cargo reservation laws was chaotic, uneven, and varied from agency to agency;

Whereas, to ensure maximum compliance by all agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws, Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-469) to centralize monitoring and compliance authority for all cargo reservation programs in the Maritime Administration;

Whereas, notwithstanding section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)), and the purpose and policy of the Federal cargo reservation programs, compliance by Federal agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws continues to be uneven;

Whereas the Maritime Administrator cited the limited enforcement powers of the Maritime Administration with respect to Federal agencies that fail to comply with section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)) and other Federal cargo reservation laws; and

Whereas the Maritime Administrator recommended that Congress grant the Maritime Administration the authority to settle any cargo reservation disputes that may arise between a ship operator and a Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) each Federal agency should administer programs of the Federal agency that are subject to Federal cargo reservation laws (including regulations of the Maritime Administration) to ensure that such programs are, to the maximum extent practicable, in compliance with the intent and purpose of such cargo reservation laws; and

(2) the Maritime Administration should closely and strictly monitor any cargo that is subject to such cargo reservation laws.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the law of the land, specifically section 1 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declares that the United States shall have a merchant marine sufficient, among other things, to:

Carry a substantial portion of our international waterborne Commerce; and to serve as a fourth arm of defense in time of war and national emergency.

The importance of these requirements has been dramatically illustrated by the vital role of our merchant marine in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, during Operations Desert

Shield and Desert Storm, and most recently in Haiti.

While the privately owned and operated U.S. flag merchant marine has performed so magnificently and effectively in times of crisis, it has also made extraordinary efforts to ensure that a substantial portion of commercial cargo bound to and from the United States moves on U.S. bottoms. Given the chronic overtonnaging in international shipping, cut-throat competition, and the competitive edge our trading partners give their national flags, this has not been easy. Nevertheless, if our commercial fleet is to continue to be an effective auxiliary in times of war or national emergency, it must first be commercially viable in times of peace. Otherwise, there will be no merchant fleet when the need arises.

I think we all would agree that there is a substantial national interest in promoting our merchant fleet. Indeed, several laws of our land recognize that national interest and spell out specifically how the U.S. Government is to go about promoting it. Federal laws require that all U.S. military cargo, cargo purchased with all loan funds and guarantees from the Eximbank, 75 percent of concessionary agricultural, and at least 50 percent of all other international ocean borne cargo generated directly or indirectly by the Federal Government, be carried on U.S. flag vessels. According to the latest statistics of the Maritime Administration [MarAd], in 1993 these cargo reservation programs generated \$1.58 billion in revenue to the U.S. fleet and accounted for one-third of all revenue from the U.S. flag foreign trade cargo. The alarming news is that according to MarAd the total volume of cargo moving under these programs is declining and will continue to do so.

According to a soon to be published report by Nathan Associates Inc., the 1992 economic impacts of cargo preference for the United States were 40,000 direct, indirect and induced jobs, \$2.2 billion in direct, indirect and induced household earnings, \$354 million in direct, indirect and induced Federal personal and business income tax revenues—\$1.20 for every dollar of government outlay on cargo preference, and \$1.2 billion in foreign exchange.

It is, therefore, imperative that U.S. flag vessels carry every ton of cargo which these programs and the law intend them to carry. This brings me to the reason for the resolution I am introducing today. There are two substantial problems which threaten the viability of these programs and, therefore, the viability of our merchant fleet.

Several agencies administering cargo reservation programs continue to do their almighty best to evade the spirit and letter of the reservation laws, that is, find the law inapplicable to a particular program, or employ other loopholes.

Because of this problem of evasion and uneven confidence, the Congress amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 to centralize monitoring and compliance authority for all cargo reservation programs in MarAd. Nevertheless, the problem remains. Critics of MarAd maintain the agency is too timid, and does not discharge its obligation aggressively. MarAd, on the other hand, says it has limited enforcement powers over those Government agencies which are not in compliance.

As the Secretary of Transportation recently announced the administration's intent to consolidate the Department of Transportation's operating divisions, I believe it is more important than ever for the Congress to reiterate its support for our cargo reservation laws, so that their administration and enforcement will not suffer from any Departmental reorganization.

Mr. President, the resolution I am introducing today merely expresses the sense of the Senate that all of these Federal agencies do what they are supposed to be doing now, under existing law.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 23—RELATIVE TO THE OREGON OPTION

Mr. HATFIELD submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

##### S. RES. 23

Whereas Federal, State and local governments are dealing with increasingly complex problems which require the delivery of many kinds of social services at all levels of government;

Whereas historically, Federal programs have addressed the Nation's problems by providing categorical assistance with detailed requirements relating to the use of funds which are often delivered by State and local governments;

Whereas although the current approach is one method of service delivery, a number of problems exist in the current intergovernmental structure that impede effective delivery of vital services by State and local governments;

Whereas it is more important than ever to provide programs that respond flexibly to the needs of the Nation's States and communities, reduce the barriers between programs that impede Federal, State and local governments' ability to effectively deliver services, encourage the Nation's Federal, State and local governments to be innovative in creating programs that meet the unique needs of the people in their communities while continuing to address national goals, and improve the accountability of all levels of government by better measuring government performance and better meeting the needs of service recipients;

Whereas the State and local governments of Oregon have proposed a pilot project, called the Oregon Option, that would utilize strategic planning and performance-based management that may provide the new models for intergovernmental social service delivery;

Whereas the Oregon Option is a prototype of a new intergovernmental relations system, and it has the potential to completely transform the relationships among Federal, State and local governments by creating a

system of intergovernmental service delivery and funding that is based on measurable performance, customer satisfaction, prevention, flexibility, and service integration; and

Whereas the Oregon Option has the potential to dramatically improve the quality of Federal, State and local services to Oregonians: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Oregon Option project has the potential to improve intergovernmental service delivery by shifting accountability from compliance to performance results and the Federal Government should continue in its partnership with the State and local governments of Oregon to fully implement the Oregon Option.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum of understanding and a letter regarding the Oregon Option be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING  
"THE OREGON OPTION"

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum Of Understanding is to encourage and facilitate cooperation among Federal, State and local entities to redesign and test an outcomes oriented approach to intergovernmental service delivery. This special partnership and long-range commitment will serve as demonstration of principles and practices which may serve as a model for improvements nationwide.

II. BACKGROUND

In July 1994, Oregon proposed a multi-year demonstration with the Federal Government to redesign intergovernmental service delivery, structured and operated to achieve measurable results that will improve the lives of Oregonians.

Oregon is uniquely suited for an experimental demonstration to develop an outcomes oriented approach to intergovernmental services. The State and many local governments have begun using an outcomes model for establishing longrange vision, setting public priorities, allocating resources, designing services, and measuring results. The Oregon Legislature has endorsed the Oregon "Benchmarks." Further, many non-profit organizations, businesses, and civic groups in Oregon are aligned to a benchmark process with State, county and local jurisdictions.

III. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE COOPERATION

The following principles should guide the parties cooperation in this undertaking:

A re-designed system would be:

Structured, managed, and evaluated on the basis of *results* (i.e., progress in achieving benchmarks).

Oriented to customer needs and satisfaction, especially through integration of services.

Biased toward prevention rather than remediation of problems.

Simplified and integrated as much as possible, delegating responsibilities for service, design, delivery, and results to front-line, local-level providers, whether they are local agencies or local offices of state agencies.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES

The parties to this memorandum will work together as partners to (1) identify benchmarks, strategies, and measures that provide a framework for improved intergovernmental service delivery and (2) undertake efforts to identify and eliminate barriers to achieving program results.

V. AUTHORITIES

The principles and responsibilities covered in this memorandum are intended to improve the coordinated delivery of intergovernmental programs. This memorandum does not commit any of the parties to a particular level of resources; nor is it intended to create any right or benefit or diminish any existing right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, State of Oregon, any state or federal agency, any state or federal official, any party of this agreement, or any person. While significant changes to the intergovernmental service delivery system are anticipated as result of this effort, this is not a legally binding or enforceable agreement. Nothing in this memorandum alters the responsibilities or statutory authorities of the Federal agencies, or State or local governments.

OREGON PROGRESS BOARD,  
Salem, OR, January 3, 1993.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Thank you for introducing a Senate Resolution in support of the Oregon Option.

For the past six years, the Oregon Progress Board has been developing and championing Oregon Benchmarks, measurable indicators of how our state is performing in education, health, environmental quality and economic development. The Benchmarks have been extensively reviewed through public meetings, and the measures are used widely to guide public, non-profit and private sectors activities.

Through the Oregon Option, we hope to apply the Oregon Benchmarks to federal programs. The typical federal approach to domestic programs carried out by state and local governments is to structure and manage service delivery from the top down. Officials in Washington define problems and solutions, prescribe service activities, impose complex but often conflicting and wasteful regulations and measure program success based on compliance rather than on true results.

Under the Oregon Option, federal, state and local partners work together to define results—in the form of benchmarks—that they want to achieve with federal dollars. State and local service providers then have the latitude to determine how best to achieve those results. The approach unburdens Oregon's state and local service providers from paperwork and frees their time and energy to deliver results.

We hope that the Oregon Option can become a model for a different way to deliver intergovernmental services, a model that empowers communities and front line workers to achieve the results citizens demand.

Endorsement by the Senate would give the Oregon Option an enormous boost. We greatly appreciate your support for this effort.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN WYSE,  
Executive Director.

MARION COUNTY, OREGON,  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,  
December 30, 1994.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: I am writing to offer my sincere thanks to you for introducing your Senate Resolution recognizing the importance of The Oregon Option and calling for its full implementation.

The Oregon Option offers us an historic opportunity to create a more responsive, effi-

cient government which gives local communities greater responsibility for their own success. Ultimately, through this collaborative effort, I believe that we can restore credibility for our institutions and redefine governance for our citizens.

Much of the current debate over intergovernmental relations revolves around the level of government at which we place authority and responsibility for delivering services. Such a debate is empty if it does not take the time to ensure accountability for results, which The Oregon Option has as its central focus.

I hope that the Senate will enthusiastically adopt your resolution, and that the Federal Administration will work quickly to fully implement this important proposal which is already showing signs of success in Oregon.

Sincerely,

RANDALL FRANKE,  
Marion County Commissioner; President,  
National Association of Counties.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24—PROVIDING FOR THE BROADCASTING OF PRESS BRIEFINGS ON THE FLOOR

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 24

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding the provisions of S. Res. 28 (99th Congress, 2nd Session), live television coverage of those periods before the Senate comes into session in which the press is allowed on the Floor to ask questions of the Majority and Minority Leaders be permitted.

SENATE RESOLUTION 25—RELATIVE TO SECTION 6 OF SENATE RESOLUTION 458 OF THE 98TH CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 25

*Resolved*, That, for the purpose of section 6 of Senate Resolution 458 of the 98th Congress (agreed to October 4, 1984), the term "displaced staff member" includes an employee in the office of the Minority Whip who was an employee in that office on January 1, 1995, and whose service is terminated on or after January 1, 1995, solely and directly as a result of the change of the individual occupying the position of Minority Whip and who is so certified by the individual who was the Minority Whip on January 1, 1995.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE RULES OF THE SENATE

HARKIN (AND OTHERS)  
AMENDMENT NO. 1

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. PELL, and Mr. ROBB)