other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. Res. 104. A resolution referring S. 676 entitled ''A bill for the relief of D.W. Jacobson, Roland Karkala, and Paul Bjorgen of Grand Rapids, Minnesota, and for other purposes''; to the chief judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a report on the bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Res. 105. A resolution condemning Iran for the violent suppression of a protest in Teheran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. ROTH):

S. 675. A bill to provide a streamlined contracting and ordering practices for automated data processing equipment and other commercial items; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

STREAMLINING LEGISLATION

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have been fighting for more than a decade to streamline the Federal procurement system and save taxpayer dollars by encouraging the use of more off-the-shelf products. Buying commercial products can lower costs by reducing or eliminating the need for research and development. The time and effort needed to buy a product can be reduced since commercial products are readily available and can be produced on existing production lines. Because the product is already built and has been shown to work, the need for detailed design specifications and expensive testing is also reduced.

Last fall we addressed this issue when we enacted the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act. This statute, which is the culmination of a comprehensive, 4-year review of the statutes governing the Federal procurement system, will substantially streamline the Federal procurement system and make it easier for Federal agencies to buy off-the-shelf commercial products instead of paying extra to design Government-unique products.

I am today introducing a bill to build on the achievement of that landmark legislation and further simplify the process of entering contracts and placing orders for commercial, off-the-shelf products. In particular, my bill would provide for streamlined contracting and ordering practices in multiple award schedule contracts for automated data processing equipment and other commercial items.

Mr. President, too often when we draft legislation to address a perceived problem, we ignore systems that are already in place and working well.

The multiple awards schedules are an example of a system that has served the taxpayers well. Since the 1950's, the Multiple Award Schedule Program has provided Federal agencies with a simplified method of purchasing small quantities of off-the-shelf commercial items, ranging from paper and furniture to sophisticated computer and telephone equipment. According to the General Accounting Office, the multiple award schedules cover in excess of 1.5 million line items, offered for sale by more than 4,000 vendors.

The multiple award schedules enable agencies to order small quantities of commonly used goods and services at a fair and reasonable price without going through the complex procurement process. They enable commercial companies to sell their products to a large number of potential customers without having to negotiate separate contracts with each. The taxpayers save and the vendors save.

Even so, the Multiple Award Schedule Program is not without its own problems. The negotiation of a single multiple award schedule contract can involve the review and analysis of thousands of pages of financial documents and may require hundreds of staff hours by both the government and the vendor. These paperwork demands are particularly unwelcome to commercial vendors, who complain that the negotiations are divorced from the reality of the commercial marketplace, in which prices are established by competition, not negotiation.

At the same time, the cumbersome process of negotiating multiple award schedule contracts sometimes locks in prices that turn out to be higher than the going market rate. This has been a particular problem in the case of rapidly developing products such as computer software, for which aggressive competition may cause prices to drop quickly in a short period of time.

Finally, because each vendor maintains its own price lists, it is extremely difficult for the thousands of agency officials purchasing products under the schedules to make any kind of effective comparison in vendor products and prices. As the GAO found in a June 1992 report:

> For the most part, procurement offices filled users' requests for a specific manufacturer's product without determining if other [Multiple Award Schedule] products could satisfy the requirement at a lower cost.* * * Procurement officials said that it is an unreasonable administrative burden to require buyers to consider all reasonably available suppliers and determine the lowest overall cost alternative before placing [Multiple Award Schedule]orders. They said that because many schedules have numerous suppliers offering many similar items, comparing all products and prices is too difficult and time-consuming, particularly because [Multiple Award Schedule] information is not automated.

All too often, this means that agencies continue to purchase the same products from the same vendors, even when other vendors offer better products through the schedules at lower cost.

For a number of years, I have pressed the General Services Administration to address these problems by automating the multiple award schedules, using modern computer technology to make it possible for agency officials to compare vendor products and prices. Such automation would bring real competition to the desks of individual purchasing officials, enabling them to select the best value product for their agencies' needs. Happily, such competition should also reduce or even eliminate the need for lengthy negotiations and burdensome paperwork requirements placed on vendors to ensure fair pricing.

With the enactment of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, we now have the means to make such competition a reality. The new statute creates a system for electronic interchange of procurement information between the private sector and Federal agencies, known as the Federal Acquisition Computer Network or ''FACNET.''

FACNET provides the ideal mechanism for automating the multiple award schedules. By integrating the multiple award schedules into FACNET, GSA can take advantage of a system that is already being developed and will be in place in the near future to bring the multiple award schedules directly to the desks of purchasing officials throughout the Government.

The bill I am introducing today would require the General Services Administration to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by FACNET to bring the multiple award schedules on-line. Under the bill, GSA would be required to establish a system to provide Governmentwide, on-line access to products and services that are available for ordering through the multiple award schedules, and to establish that system as an element of FACNET.

Once the Administrator has determined that the required computer systems have been implemented, it should be possible to reduce or even eliminate the need for lengthy negotiations and burdensome paperwork requirements placed on vendors to ensure fair pricing. Accordingly, the bill would establish a pilot program, under which direct competition at the user level would substitute for lengthy and paperintensive price negotiations with vendors.

The pilot program would sunset after 4 years, to give Congress an opportunity to evaluate the impact of the new approach on competition, on prices, on paperwork requirements, and on the small business community. A GAO review of the pilot program would be required to address these issues, as well.

Mr. President, I am well aware that we have just completed a complete overhaul of the Federal procurement laws. I tend to agree with those who believe that it would be a mistake to reopen issues directly addressed by last year's legislation without first giving the procurement community an opportunity to absorb the changes we have already made.

However, the change contemplated by the bill that I am introducing today is simple, feasible, and will save money and effort for both contractors and the

taxpayers. This change is possible today, in large part, because of last year's enactment of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act. I believe it is an idea whose time has come. Regardless of how this Congress may choose to address other procurement proposals, I hope that this measure will be considered and passed.●

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of D.W. Jacobson, Ronald Karkala, and Paul Bjorgen of Grand Rapids, MN, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE RELIEF LEGISLATION

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I introduce S. 676 and submit Senate Resolution 104, a congressional reference bill and companion a private relief bill for Norwood Manufacturing of Grand Rapids, MN.

On May 26, 1987, Norwood Manufacturing was awarded a contract by the U.S. Postal Service to manufacture wooden nestable pallets. On February 9, 1988, the U.S. Postal Service informed Norwood that it was terminating the contract.

The Postal Service first sought to terminate the contract for failure to make timely deliveries. But, when it appeared that this was not a legitimate claim, the Postal Service indicated that Norwood's pallets did not meet specification. This claim came even though Norwood's pallets passed all of the tests required under the contract. Norwood disputes the Postal Services claim and, if given a chance, can present evidence from the Postal Services' own inspectors that support this contention.

Norwood claims that any termination by the Postal Service should have been for convenience, whereby the Postal Service would pay Norwood for its costs of producing the pallets. Instead, the Postal Service chose to terminate the contract for fault causing the company to dissolve, leaving the small businessmen who owned and operated Norwood in debt.

The company contested the Postal Service's decision in the U.S. Court of Claims. On August 10, 1990, the Court of Claims ruled against Norwood on summary judgement; the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Court of Claims without any explanation or opinion. This came as a surprise to both the Postal Service and their lawyers in the Department of Justice. In fact, Justice Department lawyers had already indicated to Norwood a desire to discuss a settlement of the matter as soon as the Court of Claims denied the Postal Service's motion for summary judgement. Naturally, when the judge ruled in favor of the Postal Service the Justice Department saw no need to further negotiate a settlement.

Mr. President, Norwood deserves an impartial review of the facts. This is why I have submitted Senate Resolution 104, which merely requests a review of this case by the U.S. Court of Claims. After a 1-year review by the court, Congress will possess a determination by the court which will enable Congress to consider if the relief requested in the private bill is justified. Therefore, at this time, I am not advocating passage of the private bill, but instead, seeking Senate approval of Senate Resolution 104 that this matter deserves further judicial review.●

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 677. A bill to repeal a redundant venue provision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VENUE LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a bill that would implement a proposal made by the Judicial Conference of the United States to eliminate a redundant provision governing venue, section 1392(a) of title 28. This bill would make no substantive change in the law governing venue. Instead, it would simply clean up the United States Code by eliminating a provision that no longer serves any purpose.

Section 1392(a) states in its entirety: ''Any civil action, not of a local nature, against defendants residing in different districts in the same State, may be brought in any of such districts.'' I have no quarrel with the rule set forth in this section. I note, however, that it is entirely redundant of provisions of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990. In that act, Congress rewrote entirely the rules in section 1391 governing venue in diversity and Federal question cases. In so doing, it incorporated the rule of section 1392(a) directly into the provisions of section 1391. Section 1391(a)(1) now provides that venue in diversity cases is proper in ''a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same State.'' Section 1391(b)(1) uses the identical language for venue in Federal question cases.

In short, these 1990 changes have exactly duplicated the rule of section 1392(a) within the structure of the new section 1391. Section 1392(a) remains as a useless vestige of an earlier structure.

Again, I note that my bill implements a proposal made by the Judicial Conference of the United States. Specifically, in its September 20, 1993, report, the Judicial Conference states, ''The [Judicial] Conference also approved the [Federal-State Jurisdiction] Committee's recommendation to propose a repeal of 28 U.S.C. §1392(a) as redundant because of recent amendments to §§1391 (a)(1) and (b)(1).''

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 678. A bill to provide for the coordination and implementation of a national aquaculture policy for the private sector by the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish an aquaculture development and research program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND PROMOTION ACT

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I am introducing the National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act.

Our bill is virtually identical to the bill which the Senate Agriculture Committee reported to the floor last year. More than 50 Senators cosponsored last year's legislation, but like many bills during the 103d Congress, we did not take final action before Congress adjourned.

This bill is much more than a simple reauthorization of an expiring law. It will stimulate one of the fastest growing components of agriculture in the United States. The bill promotes policies which will allow our country to become more competitive in the expanding global market for aquaculture products. The National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act can serve as a road map for America's future success in aquaculture.

This legislation addresses some of the most pressing needs of aquaculture farmers, such as research, credit assistance, production and market data, conservation assistance, and better coordination among Federal agencies. But the bill can best be summarized in a simple, three word statement: aquaculture is agriculture.

For too long, aquaculture farmers have suffered because of the absence of a consistent Federal policy to promote this important sector of agriculture. Aquaculture has also been limited by an inability to fully participate in many of the farm programs available to dry-land agriculture. The time has come for the Federal Government to recognize that just because the crop you harvest has fins and gills instead of hoofs and horns, it is still agriculture and you deserve to be treated just like any other farmer who works hard for a living.

The world market for aquaculture is vast, and the United States is well-equipped to become a leader in aquaculture production and technology. Supported by a national commitment, American farmers have developed the most productive terrestrial agriculture system on earth. A similar effort is needed to help the United States increase its share of the rapidly expanding market for aquaculture products. Such a national commitment is essential to the future success of aquaculture in the United States. America has the finest research institutions in the world. We simply need to redirect some of our research energy toward new, promising technologies like aquaculture.

Efforts to expand the U.S. aquaculture industry will not go unrewarded. The United States imports 60 percent of its fish and shellfish,

which results in a $3.3 billion annual trade deficit for seafood. If we could reduce our seafood trade deficit by one-third through expanded aquaculture production, we would create 25,000 new jobs. That is what this aquaculture bill is about—creating jobs and putting Americans to work in new, promising industries.

By the year 2000, nearly one-quarter of global seafood consumption will come from fish farming. In order to keep pace with the rising demand for seafood, world aquaculture production must double by the end of this decade and increase sevenfold in the next 35 years. This estimate is based on current population projections and assumes a stable wild fishery harvest. The important question is whether U.S. aquaculture will share in this explosive growth.

Aquaculture is a diverse industry that affects all regions of the country. More than 30 States produce at least two dozen commercially important aquaculture species. Yet it is disturbing that the United States ranks 10th among nations in the value of its production. China, Japan, India, Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Norway, Thailand, and the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union, all enjoy a larger share of the global aquaculture market. As we work to resolve this problem with our balance of trade, aquaculture can be part of the solution.

Nowhere is the opportunity for aquaculture more promising than in Hawaii. We have a skilled labor force, access to Asian and North American markets, and a climate that permits harvesting throughout the year. Aquaculture can strengthen our employment base and help fill the gaps caused by the decline in sugar. Aquaculture farming is capable of supporting more jobs per acre than plantation agriculture, and these are usually high-wage and high-technology jobs. With the right encouragement, aquaculture can become a cornerstone of diversified agriculture in Hawaii.

More than 100 Hawaiian production and service businesses generate annual aquaculture sales of $25 million from the production of 35 different aquaculture species. Over the last 15 years, the State has spent $15.7 million to grow our aquaculture industry. This investment has helped generate cumulative revenues of $315.9 million during the period. The industry in Hawaii, like many other regions in the United States, is poised to increase production, sales revenues, and generate new employment opportunities.

However, the legislation I have introduced today was not designed merely to promote aquaculture in Hawaii. The bill was drafted with one basic principle in mind; namely, to assist all aquaculture farmers equally. It would be wrong to promote any segment of the industry—whether it is marine or fresh water aquaculture farming, or a particular species of fish or shellfish—over another.

In summary, this bill has the potential to diversify our agricultural base, strengthen rural economies, increase worldwide demand for U.S. agricultural commodities, and thereby reduce the U.S. trade deficit. I hope that we can consider this legislation as part of the 1995 farm bill.

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. 678

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act of 1995''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

(c) REFERENCES TO NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ACT OF 1980.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Subsection (a) of section 2 (16 U.S.C. 2801(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

''(1) The wild harvest or capture of certain seafood species exceeds levels of optimum sustainable yield, thereby making it more difficult to meet the increasing demand for aquatic food.

''(2) To satisfy the domestic market for aquatic food, the United States imports more than 59 percent of its seafood. This dependence on imports adversely affects the national balance of payments and contributes to the uncertainty of supplies and product quality.

''(3) Although aquaculture currently contributes approximately 16 percent by weight of world seafood production, less than 9 percent by weight of current United States seafood production results from aquaculture. As a result, domestic aquaculture production has the potential for significant growth.

''(4) Aquaculture production of aquatic animals and plants is a source of food, industrial materials, pharmaceuticals, energy, and aesthetic enjoyment, and can assist in the control and abatement of pollution.

''(5) The rehabilitation and enhancement of fish and shellfish resources are desirable applications of aquaculture technology.

''(6) The principal responsibility for the development of aquaculture in the United States must rest with the private sector.

''(7) Despite its potential, the development of aquaculture in the United States has been inhibited by many scientific, economic, legal, and production factors, such as—

''(A) inadequate credit;

''(B) limited research and development and demonstration programs;

''(C) diffused legal jurisdiction;

''(D) inconsistent interpretations between Federal agencies;

''(E) the lack of management information;

''(F) the lack of supportive policies of the Federal Government;

''(G) the lack of therapeutic compounds for treatment of the diseases of aquatic animals and plants; and

''(H) the lack of reliable supplies of seed stock.

''(8) Many areas of the United States are suitable for aquaculture, but are subject to land-use or water-use management policies and regulations that do not adequately consider the potential for aquaculture and may inhibit the development of aquaculture.

''(9) In 1990, the United States ranked only tenth in the world in aquaculture production based on total value of products.

''(10) Despite the current and increasing importance of private aquaculture to the United States economy and to rural areas in the United States, Federal efforts to nurture aquaculture development have failed to keep pace with the needs of fish and aquatic plant farmers.

''(11) The United States has a premier opportunity to expand existing aquaculture production and develop new aquaculture industries to serve national needs and the global marketplace.

''(12) United States aquaculture provides wholesome products for domestic consumers and contributes significantly to employment opportunities and the quality of life in rural areas in the United States.

''(13) Since 1980, the United States trade deficit in edible fishery products has increased by 48 percent, from $1,777,921,000 to $2,634,738,000 in 1991.

''(14) Aquaculture is poised to become a major growth industry of the 21st century. With global seafood demand projected to increase 70 percent by 2025, and harvests from capture fisheries stable or declining, aquaculture would have to increase production by 700 percent, a total of 77 million metric tons annually.

''(15) Private aquaculture production in the United States has increased an average of 20 percent by weight annually since 1980, and is one of the fastest growing segments of United States and world agriculture.

''(16) In 1990, private United States aquaculture production was 860,750,000 pounds, worth $761,500,000, up from 203,178,000 pounds, worth $191,977,000, in 1980.

''(17) Since 1960, per capita consumption of aquatic foods in the United States has increased by 49 percent to 14.9 pounds in 1991, and could reach 20 pounds by the year 2000. Total United States demand is projected to double by 2020.''.

(b) PURPOSE.—Subsection (b) of section 2 (16 U.S.C. 2801(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to promote aquaculture in the United States by—

''(1) declaring a national aquaculture policy;

''(2) establishing private aquaculture as a form of agriculture;

''(3) establishing cultivated aquatic animals, plants, microorganisms, and their products produced by private persons and moving in standard commodity channels as agricultural livestock, crops, and commodities;

''(4) establishing the Department as the lead Federal agency for the development, implementation, promotion, and coordination of national policy and programs for private aquaculture by—

''(A) designating the Secretary as the permanent chairperson of a Federal interagency aquaculture coordinating group;

''(B) assigning overall responsibility to the Secretary for coordinating, developing, and carrying out policies and programs for private aquaculture; and

''(C) authorizing the establishment of a National Aquaculture Information Center within the Department to support the United States aquaculture industry; and

''(5) encouraging—

''(A) aquaculture activities and programs in both the public and private sectors of the economy of the United States;

''(B) the creation of new industries and job opportunities related to aquaculture activities;

''(C) the reduction of the fisheries trade deficit; and

''(D) other national policy benefits deriving from aquaculture activities.''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 2802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the propagation'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the controlled cultivation of aquatic plants, animals, and microorganisms.'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or microorganism'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) The term 'Department' means the United States Department of Agriculture.''; and

(6) by inserting before paragraph (9) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)) the following:

''(8) The term 'private aquaculture' means the controlled cultivation of aquatic plants, animals, and microorganisms other than cultivation carried out by the Federal Government or any State or local government.''.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (c)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d), by striking ''Secretaries determine'' and inserting ''Secretary, in consultation with the other Secretaries, determines'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''Secretaries'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(B) by inserting ''and in consultation with the other Secretaries and representatives of other Federal agencies'' after ''coordinating group''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN AQUACULTURE PROGRAMS.—Not later than December 31, 1995, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the actions taken in accordance with subsection (d) with respect to the Plan, and making recommendations for updating and modifying the Plan. The report shall also contain a compendium on Federal regulations relating to aquaculture.''.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE INFORMATION CENTER; ASSIGNMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS.

Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 2804) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''Secretaries deem'' and inserting ''Secretary, in consultation with the other Secretaries, considers'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(B)—

(A) by striking ''Secretary shall—'' and inserting ''Secretary—'';

(B) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) may establish, within the Department, within the Agricultural Research Service, a National Aquaculture Information Center that shall—

''(I) serve as a repository and clearinghouse for the information collected under subparagraph (A) and other provisions of this Act;

''(II) carry out a program to notify organizations, institutions, and individuals known to be involved in aquaculture of the existence of the Center and the kinds of information that the Center can make available to the public; and

''(III) make available, on request, information described in subclause (I) (including information collected under subsection (e));'';

(C) in clause (ii)—

(i) by inserting ''shall'' before ''arrange''; and

(ii) by striking the comma and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) in clause (iii), by inserting ''shall'' before ''conduct'';

(3) in the first sentence of subsection (d), by striking ''Interior,,'' and inserting ''Interior,''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ASSIGNMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS.—In consultation with representatives of the United States aquaculture industry and in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, the Secretary may assess Federal aquatic animal health programs and make recommendations as to the appropriate assignment to Federal agencies of new programs, initiatives, and activities in support of aquaculture and resource stewardship and management.''.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION WITH THE AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY.

Section 6(b) (16 U.S.C. 2805(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) in order to facilitate improved communication and interaction among aquaculture producers, the aquaculture community, the Federal Government, and the coordinating group, establish a working relationship with national organizations, commodity associations, and professional societies representing aquaculture interests.''.

SEC. 7. NATIONAL POLICY FOR PRIVATE AQUACULTURE.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 7 through 11 as sections 12 through 16, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 6 the following:

''SEC. 7. NATIONAL POLICY FOR PRIVATE AQUACULTURE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of other agencies, as appropriate, shall coordinate and implement a national policy for private aquaculture in accordance with this section.

''(b) DEPARTMENT AQUACULTURE PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a Department Aquaculture Plan (referred to in this section as the 'plan') for a unified Department aquaculture program to support the development of private United States aquaculture.

''(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan shall address—

''(A) individual agency programs related to aquaculture in the Department that are consistent with Department programs applied to other agricultural programs, livestock, crops, products, and commodities under the jurisdiction of Department agencies;

''(B) the treatment of cultivated aquatic animals as livestock and cultivated aquatic plants as agricultural crops; and

''(C) means for effective coordination and implementation of aquaculture activities and programs within the Department, including individual agency commitments of personnel and resources.

''(3) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act of 1995, the Secretary shall submit the plan to Congress.

''(4) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the submission of the plan pursuant to paragraph (3), and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to Congress on actions taken to implement the plan during the year preceding the date of the report.

''(5) NATIONAL AQUACULTURE INFORMATION CENTER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 5, the Secretary may maintain and support a National Aquaculture Information Center (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Center') as a repository for information on national and international aquaculture.

''(B) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Information in the Center shall be made available to the public.

''(C) INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE.—The head of the Center shall arrange with foreign nations for the exchange of information relating to aquaculture and shall support a translation service.

''(D) SUPPORT.—The Center shall provide direct support to the coordinating group.

''(c) NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act of 1995, the Secretary shall revise the National Aquaculture Development Plan required to be established under section 4.

''(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall integrate and coordinate the aquaculture and related missions, major objectives, and program components of individual aquaculture plans of the coordinating group members.

''(3) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of

the National Aquaculture Development, Research, and Promotion Act of 1995, the Secretary shall submit a revised Plan to Congress.

''(4) UPDATES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the submission of the revised Plan pursuant to paragraph (3), and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall revise the National Aquaculture Development Plan.

''(d) TREATMENT OF AQUACULTURE.—The Secretary shall, for all purposes, treat—

''(1) private aquaculture as a form of agriculture; and

''(2) cultivated aquatic animals, plants, and microorganisms, and products of the animals, plants, and microorganisms, produced by private persons and moving in standard commodity channels as agricultural livestock, crops, and commodities.

''(e) RESOLUTION OF INTERAGENCY CONFLICT.—In consultation with representatives of affected Federal agencies, the Secretary shall be responsible for resolving any interagency conflict in the coordination or implementation of the policy described in this section.

''(f) PRIVATE AQUACULTURE POLICY COORDINATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(1) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary shall have overall responsibility for coordinating, developing, and carrying out policies and programs for private aquaculture.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) coordinate all intradepartmental functions and activities relating to private aquaculture;

''(B) establish procedures for the coordination of functions, and consultation, with the coordinating group; and

''(C) recommend to the Agricultural Research Service methods by which the aquaculture resources of the Service can be made more easily retrievable and can be more widely disseminated.

''(3) LIAISON.—

''(A) AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.—To facilitate communication and interaction between the aquaculture community and the Department, the head of each agency of the Department shall, if requested by the Secretary, designate an officer or employee of the agency to be the liaison of the agency with the Secretary.

''(B) DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior shall each designate an officer or employee of their respective Departments to be the liaison of their respective Departments with the Secretary.''.

SEC. 8. WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 (as added by section 7) the following:

''SEC. 8. WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT.

''(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to carry out, in collaboration with the Secretary, collaborative interagency programs that demonstrate the application of aquaculture to environmental enhancement and assessment, including a program to assess the environmental impact of waterborne contaminants on naturally occurring aquatic organisms and ecosystems using aquaculture-raised organisms to serve as an indicator of environmental pollution.

''(b) GRANTS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator may provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with private research organizations for research and demonstration of the technology authorized by this section.''.

SEC. 9. NATIVE AMERICAN FISHPOND REVITALIZATION.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 8 (as added by section 8) the following:

''SEC. 9. NATIVE AMERICAN FISHPOND REVITALIZATION.

''(a) DEFINITION OF NATIVE AMERICAN.—As used in this section, the term 'Native American' means—

''(1) an Indian, as defined in section 4(d) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(d));

''(2) a Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 8(3) of the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11707(3)) or section 815(3) of the Native American Programs Act (42 U.S.C. 2992c(3));

''(3) an Alaska Native, within the meaning provided for the term 'Native' in section 3(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(b)); and

''(4) a Pacific Islander, within the meaning of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991 et seq.)

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to carry out a program to revitalize fishponds used by Native Americans to cultivate aquatic species.

''(c) GRANTS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements with individuals and organizations, including Native American organizations, to promote fishpond revitalization. Funds provided under this section may be used to engage in fishpond research, pond culture technology development, the application of traditional pond culture techniques and modern aquaculture practices to ancient fishponds, technical assistance and technology transfer, and such other activities as the Secretary determines are appropriate.''.

SEC. 10. AQUACULTURE EDUCATION.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9 (as added by section 9) the following:

''SEC. 10. AQUACULTURE EDUCATION.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

''(1) POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'postsecondary vocational institution' has the same meaning given the term by section 481(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088(c)), except that the term only includes an institution that awards an associates degree but does not award a bachelor's degree.

''(2) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term 'secondary school' has the same meaning given the term by section 14101(25) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(25)).

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary is authorized to establish a program to expand and improve instruction, on aquaculture and the basic principles of aquaculture farming, in the agriculture curriculum for students attending secondary schools and postsecondary vocational institutions.

''(c) GRANTS AND CURRICULUM.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary may—

''(1) make grants to—

''(A) establish and maintain aquaculture learning centers in secondary schools and postsecondary vocational institutions;

''(B) promote aquaculture technology transfer; and

''(C) educate consumers and the public concerning the benefits of aquaculture; and

''(2) develop curriculum and supporting materials on aquaculture farming, field test the content of the curriculum, and supply training to educators at secondary schools and postsecondary vocational institutions on the aquaculture curriculum and materials developed.

''(d) PRIORITY FOR GRANTS.—In awarding grants under subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall give priority to—

''(1) the ability of the proposed aquaculture learning center to gain access to—

''(A) a commercial aquaculture farm;

''(B) a regional aquaculture center established by the Secretary under section 1475(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322(d));

''(C) an aquaculture research facility; or

''(D) a similar venture that would afford students the opportunity to experience aquaculture research and development or commercialization;

''(2) the ability of the center to achieve outreach to minority audiences or students in inner-city schools;

''(3) the ability of the center to foster awareness of aquaculture among consumers and the general public;

''(4) the ability of the center to serve as an aquaculture education facility for visiting students participating in a field trip or a similar educational experience for inservice training; and

''(5) the level of assistance to be provided from non-Federal sources.

''(e) LIMITATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a grantee may not receive a grant under this section for more than 5 fiscal years.

''(2) WAIVER.—In the case of grantees that receive grants under this section for fiscal year 1996, the Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) to the grantees for the fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the application of paragraph (1) to the grantees would result in the termination of an excessive number of grants.''.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The first sentence of section 15 (as redesignated by section 7(1)) is amended to read as follows: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (including the functions of the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture established under section 6(a)) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000.''.

SEC. 12. ELIGIBILITY OF AQUACULTURE FARMERS FOR FARM CREDIT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 343 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991) is amended by striking ''fish farming'' both places it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''aquaculture (as the term is defined in section 3(1) of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2802(1)))''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective on October 1, 1995.

SEC. 13. INTERNATIONAL AQUACULTURE INFORMATION AND DATA COLLECTION.

Section 502 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5692) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) INTERNATIONAL AQUACULTURE INFORMATION AND DATA COLLECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to establish and carry out a program of data collection, analysis, and dissemination of information to provide continuing and timely economic information concerning international aquaculture production.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture established under section 6(a) of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2805(a)), and representatives of the United States aquaculture industry, concerning means of effectively providing data described in paragraph (1) to the Joint Subcommittee and the industry.''.

SEC. 14. AQUACULTURE INFORMATION NETWORK REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall report to Congress on the feasibility of expanding current information systems at regional aquaculture centers established by the Secretary under section 1475(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322(d)), universities, research institutions, and the Agricultural Research Service to permit an on-line link between those entities for the sharing of data, publication, and technical assistance information involving aquaculture.

SEC. 15. VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION OF QUALITY STANDARDS.

The Act (16 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10 (as added by section 11) the following:

"SEC. 11. VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION OF QUALITY STANDARDS.

''The Secretary shall develop, in consultation with representatives of the aquaculture industry, a plan for voluntary certification of guidelines to ensure the quality of aquatic species subject to this Act in order to promote the marketing and transportation of aquaculture products.''.

SEC. 16. IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall report to Congress on the progress made in carrying out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of all programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture and all other agencies and Departments in support of private aquaculture;

(2) the specific authorities for the activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) recommendations for such actions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines are necessary to improve recognition and support of private aquaculture in each agency of the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BURNS, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 679. A bill to require that Federal agencies differentiate animal fats and vegetable oils from other oils and greases in issuing or enforcing regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE EDIBLE OIL REGULATORY REFORM ACT

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator PRESSLER, Senator HARKIN and others in introducing legislation to encourage regulatory common sense. Our legislation will correct two problems: First, the regulation of edible oils in a manner similar to toxic oils like petroleum, and second, the requirement that Certificates of Financial Responsibility [COFR] accompanying vessels carrying edible oils equal those of vessels carrying toxic oils. This bill is similar to legislation which passed Congress last year, but was not given final approval.

In response to the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1990, Congress passed the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, which requires several Federal agencies to enhance regulatory activities with regard to the shipping and handling of hazardous oils.

In 1993, the Transportation Department proposed regulations to guard against oil spills, and require response plans if spills did occur. DOT proposed to treat vegetable oils—that is, salad oils—in the same way as petroleum. Among other things, salad oils would have been officially declared ''hazardous materials,'' with all the regulatory requirements and extra costs which that designation entails.

This was a classic example of regulatory overreaching. Vegetable oil, of course, is distinctly different from petroleum. Vegetable oil processors thought it entirely appropriate that they undertake response plans to guard against major spills. The industry did not argue that they should be exempt from regulation.

The industry argued that regulators should take into account obvious differences—in toxicity, biodegradability, environmental persistence and other factors—between vegetable oils on the one hand, and toxic petroleum oils on the other.

Secretary Pena eventually agreed with us and prompted modification of DOT's position. However, he does not have jurisdiction over all agencies with a role in regulating oil spills. More recently, the industry has been working with other agencies which have a role in regulating oils and ensuring adequate financial responsibility in the event of a spill.

No one is any longer proposing to call salad dressing or mayonnaise ''hazardous material,'' but agencies are requiring that spill response plans for vegetable oils be quite similar to those for petroleum.

The most recent problem arose in December when Coast Guard regulations subjected vessels carrying vegetable oil to the same standard of liability and financial responsibility as supertankers carrying petroleum. On December 28, 1994, the Coast Guard began requiring the same standard—a $1,200 per gross ton or $10 million of financial responsibility—on vessels carrying vegetable oil and petroleum oil in U.S. waters or calling at U.S. ports. On July 1, similar standards will be phased in on barges operating on U.S. navigable waterways.

Prior to December 28, a COFR requirement of $150 per gross ton applied to all vessels regardless of the hazardous nature or toxicity of the cargo. The vegetable oil industry does not seek a return to this earlier standard, but seeks regulation under a $600 per gross ton COFR requirement that Coast Guard regulations apply to vessels carrying other commodities. It is worth noting that this new financial responsibility standard for edible oil would be four times the COFR required on toxic petroleum oils prior to December 28, 1994.

Application of the most stringent standard to vessels carrying vegetable oil adds to the cost of transporting U.S. vegetable oil to foreign markets. The additional costs of these burdensome regulations are passed back to farmers in reduced prices for commodities. Consumers may also bear a burden in higher food prices. In addition, there have already been instances in 1995 where this unjustified additional cost has made U.S. vegetable oil uncompetitive and has resulted in lost exports. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a February 15, 1995 Journal of Commerce report detailing these losses be printed in the RECORD.

Our bill would not exempt vegetable oil shipments from COFR requirements or regulation. It would only apply a more appropriate standard of financial responsibility to vegetable oil, similar to that applied to vessels carrying other commodities.

The scientific data collected to date indicate that the animal fats and vegetable oils industry has an excellent spill history justifying differentiation of these edible materials from toxic oils. Specifically, these products account for less than one-half of 1 percent of all oil spills in the U.S. In addition, most spills of these products are less than 1,000 gallons.

The industry seeks a separate category for vegetable oils. This is as much because of scientific differences in the oils as it is for economic reasons. There is no reason why non-toxic vegetable oils must be in the same category as toxic oils.

Second, the industry seeks response requirements that recognize the different characteristics of animal fats and vegetable oils within this separate category. A separate category without separate response requirements reflecting different toxicity and biodegradability is nothing more than a hollow gesture.

The Senate and House of Representatives last year passed virtually identical legislation on different legislative vehicles to ensure that both of these objectives were accomplished. Under our bill, the underlying principles of Oil Pollution Act of 1990 would remain unchanged with the language to require differentiation of animal fats and vegetable oils from other oils. The House approved this language twice last year as part of H.R. 4422 and H.R. 4852. The Senate passed the bill as S. 2559. Since final action on this legislation was not completed in the last Congress, we have introduced it again.

This bill does not tell the Coast Guard or any other agency what it must put into regulations. The legislation simply says that in rulemaking under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, these agencies must differentiate between vegetable oils and animal fats on one hand, and other oils including petroleum on the other.

The bill specifies that the agencies should consider differences in the physical, chemical, biological or other properties and the effects on human health and the environment effects of these oils.

This bill does not exempt vegetable oils from the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 or any other statute. It is a modest effort to encourage common sense in an area of regulation that has not always been marked by that characteristic. I hope my colleagues will cosponsor the legislation.

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. 679

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 ''Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act.''

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) ANIMAL FAT.—The term ''animal fat'' means each type of animal fat, oil, or grease (including fat, oil, or grease from fish or a marine mammal), including any fat, oil, or grease referred to in section 61(a)(2) of title 13, United States Code.

(2) VEGETABLE OIL.—The term ''vegetable oil'' means each type of vegetable oil (including vegetable oil from a seed, nut, or kernel), including any vegetable oil referred to in section 61(a)(1) of title 13, United States Code.

SEC. 3. DIFFERENTIATION AMONG FATS, OILS, AND GREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In issuing or enforcing a regulation, an interpretation, or a guideline relating to a fat, oil, or grease under a Federal law, the head of a Federal agency shall—

(a) differentiate between and establish separate categories for—

(A)(i) animal fats; and

(ii) vegetable oils; and

(B) other oils, including petroleum oil; and

(2) apply different standards to different classes of fat and oil as provided in subsection (b).

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In differentiating between the classes of animal fats and vegetable oils referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) and the classes of oils described in subsection (a)(1)(B), the head of the Federal agency shall consider differences in physical, chemical, biological, and other properties, and in the effects on human health and the environment, of the classes.

SEC. 4. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) LIMITS ON LIABILITY.—Section 1004(a)(1) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''for a tank vessel,'' and inserting ''for a tank vessel (other than a tank vessel carrying animal fat or vegetable oil),''.

(b) FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The first sentence of section 1016(a) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 2716(a)) is amended by striking ''in the case of a tank vessel,'' and inserting ''in the case of a tank vessel (other than a tank vessel carrying animal fat or vegetable oil),''.●

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator LUGAR in introducing legislation that will clarify the regulatory treatment of edible oils, including vegetable oils and animal fats. This legislation is very similar to legislation that we introduced last year and to legislation that both the Senate and House of Representatives passed last fall, but unfortunately not in the same bill.

Common sense would dictate that regulations governing the transportation, handling and storage of edible oils should not be as stringent as those applicable to other oils, such as petroleum oils or other toxic oils, which pose a far more significant level of health, safety, and environmental risk in the event of a spill, discharge or mishandling. Animal fats and vegetable oils are essential components of food products that we consume every day. The scientific evidence indicates they are not toxic in the environment, are essential nutritional components, are biodegradable and are not persistent in the environment. In any event, spills of animal fats and vegetable oils are relatively infrequent and small in quantity. Such spills accounted for less than 1 percent of oil spills in and around U.S. waters between 1986 and 1992, and were generally very small in quantity, with only 13 spills of more than 1,000 gallons in that period.

Regrettably, a common sense approach to regulation of animal fats and vegetable oils has been more difficult to achieve than one might think, as the experience under implementation of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 demonstrates. At one point, it was proposed that edible vegetable oils be regulated as ''hazardous material''. Although some of the problems have been worked out, whether regulators will properly differentiate edible fats and oils from petroleum and other toxic oils in applying the Oil Pollution Act and other Federal laws. This kind of overregulation imposes costs which must be borne by the industry and by farmers, in the form of lower prices, and by consumers, in the form of higher prices.

The legislation we are introducing today is simply designed to bring some clarity to this situation by ensuring that overly restrictive or unreasonable interpretations of Federal laws do not impose excessively burdensome or irrational regulations with respect to edible oils. The bill would not exempt edible oils from regulation, but would only require that regulators differentiate animal fats and vegetable oils from other oils, including petroleum oil, considering differences in physical, chemical, biological and other properties, and in the effects on human health and the environment, of the classes of oils.

To address a specific issue that has arisen, language has been added to this bill that was not in the previous version to clarify that under the Oil Pollution Act vessels carrying animal fats and vegetable oils are not subject to the same level of financial responsibility requirements as are applicable to vessels carrying petroleum oils. Again, this is a common sense approach, recognizing that animal fats and vegetable oils simply do not pose risks comparable to those associated with other oils such as petroleum oils.

In conclusion, this legislation will alleviate the substantial threat of overregulation of animal fats and vegetable oils in ways that clearly could not have been intended by Congress. It will bring some reasonableness and clarity to issues that are now characterized by confusion and uncertainty. I urge my colleagues to support this important, straightforward legislation.●

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel *Yes Dear;* to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

COASTWISE TRADING PRIVILEGES LEGISLATION

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to direct that the vessel *Yes Dear,* official number 578550, be accorded coastwise trading privileges and be issued a certificate of documentation under section 12103 of title 46, United States Code.

The *Yes Dear* was constructed in Hong Kong in 1976, and the vessel is a wooden trawler. It is 53.6 feet in length, 15 feet in breadth, has a depth of 6.5 feet, and is self-propelled.

The vessel was purchased by R. Milledge Morris of Beaufort, SC, who purchased it in 1991 with the intention of chartering the vessel for short sailing tours. The vessel was in disrepair, and Mr. Milledge has spent a considerable amount of time, effort, and resources in repairs. However, because the vessel was built in Hong Kong, it did not meet the requirements for coastwise license endorsement in the United States. Such documentation is mandatory to enable the owner to use the vessel for its intended purpose.

The owner of the *Yes Dear* is seeking a waiver of the existing law because he wishes to use the vessel for charters. His desired intentions for the vessel's use will not adversely affect the coastwise trade in U.S. waters. If he is granted this waiver, it is his intention to comply fully with U.S. documentation and safety requirements. The purpose of the legislation I am introducing is to allow the *Yes Dear* to engage in the coastwise trade and the fisheries of the United States.●

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. MACK):

S. 681. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions against Colombia with respect to illegal drugs and drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE NARCOTICS NATIONAL EMERGENCY SANCTIONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the drug problem today is worse then it was in 1992. Drug use by young people is up; addiction is up; and drugs on American streets can be acquired at cheaper prices and with greater purity levels than ever before. The most destructive

drug remains cocaine, which means the availability of ''crack'' continues unabated; and there are worrisome reports of increasing heroin availability and use.

The world's primary source of cocaine is Colombia. It is the headquarters for the international cocaine cartels, who are operating with virtual impunity in Colombia. Colombia is also a significant producer of heroin, having overtaken Mexico as the major Western Hemisphere heroin producer; and Colombia's cultivation and export of marijuana is increasing.

On March 1, as required by law, the Clinton Administration announced its annual decision regarding Colombian cooperation with the United States in the fight against drugs. The Administration said Colombia failed to cooperate, the result of which is, in the Clinton Administration's own words, that ''* * * the activities of the Colombian drug syndicates continue to ensure that the flow of cocaine, heroin, and marijuana from Colombia to the United States remains undiminished.''

This is a startling conclusion. Yet, the Clinton administration then gave Colombia a ''national interest'' waiver. The effect of this decision is to do nothing about Colombia's abysmal record, with our bilateral relationship continuing as if nothing is wrong. This is a grave moral and geopolitical mistake.

This is way Senator MACK and I are introducing the Narcotics National Emergency Sanctions Act of 1995, a bill to cut off all economic aid, trade benefits, and military assistance to Colombia if the nation does not fulfill the antinarcotics agenda outlined by Colombia's own President, Ernesto Samper.

This legislation requires the President to certify to the U.S. Congress that Colombia has made demonstrable progress in fighting drugs between now and February 6, 1996. If Colombia cannot fulfill what President Samper himself has outlined as his Government's antidrug agenda, then sanctions go into effect.

The objectives outlined by President Samper, and contained in the legislation, include: investigating the financing of political parties and candidates by the drug lords; capturing and imprisoning the major drug kingpins; confiscating the profits from illegal drug activities; reforming the penal code and plea-bargaining system, and increasing penalties for drug trafficking; and destroying 44,000 hectares of illegal coca and poppy plants in Colombia by February 6, 1996, and all remaining illegal crops by February 6, 1997.

These initiatives are in the legislation as the specific conditions that Colombia must meet. They were not created by this Senator, another Senator, or by anyone in the U.S. Government. They were announced by President Samper as his Government's own antidrug program in his July 15, 1994, letter to the U.S. Congress and in a February 6, 1995, speech.

We expect President Samper and the Colombian Government to fulfill their promises, and we will judge Colombia by their own standards.

I do not see how we can accept a national policy that fails to hold the Colombian Government responsible for the poison they are allowing to be sent to our children, especially in the inner cities. I recognize that Colombia's Government is not the only one at fault. However, Colombia is the corporate headquarters for the booming international drug trade.

How can we ask our local police and our Federal law enforcement agencies to continue a tough fight—including risking their lives—if their own national Government won't get tough with foreign governments protecting the drug bosses?

I find this situation amazing, given that the Clinton administration was prepared to sanction China for pirating video tapes and computer programs. Why is the United States prepared to sanction nations that harm U.S. businesses that allow the theft of intellectual property but is not prepared to take equally strong measures against a Government that allows the poisoning of our children?

Let me clearly state that I have no quarrel with the Colombian people. There are many dedicated Colombians who risk their lives every day fighting the drug cartels. Colombian citizens have suffered more wanton violence from greedy drug lords than any people on Earth. My concern is that the Colombian Government is not supporting these courageous individuals.

Mr. President, here is just a brief review of Colombia' record:

No arrest of any significant member of the Cali drug cartel, which accounts for 80 percent of the cocaine shipped into the United States. The brother of a major Cali cartel trafficker was arrested recently, but there are many—including some law enforcement agencies—who doubt that this person is a ''big fish.'' He may be a sacrifice by the drug lords to try to help the Colombian Government show resolve.

No significant steps have been taken to investigate or prosecute some 15,000 drug corruption cases, including no serious investigations into allegations that Colombian President Samper's Presidential campaign received millions of dollars from the Cali cartel or into corruption of Members of the Colombian Congress.

A plea-bargaining system that Colombia's own Justice Ministry criticized for its lenient use, noting that nearly 40 percent of convicted drug traffickers have been freed on parole, without serving a day in prison. According to Colombia's Chief Prosecutor, ''the system results in virtual impunity.''

Mr. President, the American people have every right to expect full cooperation in the ''drug war'' so long as our youth are being poisoned by Colombian cocaine. Countries that produce drugs should be put on notice that the United States will not look the other way.

William J. Bennett, former U.S. ''drug czar,'' and I jointly prepared an op-ed piece for yesterday's Wall Street Journal in which we asserted:

> The Colombian leaders must be sent a clear and unmistakable message: In the war on drugs, they can either continue to ally themselves with the [drug] cartels, and thereby become a pariah state like Libya and Iran; or they can return to the community of civilized nations, fulfill the promises President Samper made, and join with the U.S. in an effort to put the cartels out of business. The choice is theirs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Bennett-Helms Wall Street Journal op-ed piece, along with President Samper's July 15, 1994, letter to Senator Helms and his February 6, 1995, counterdrug speech, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of The Narcotics National Emergency Sanctions Act of 1995 be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 681

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 ''Narcotics National Emergency Sanctions Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Cocaine is the primary drug threat to the United States, and heroin poses an increasingly serious drug threat to the United States.

(2) Colombia is the ''corporate headquarters'' for the international cartels responsible for the production and distribution of at least 80 percent of the cocaine that enters the United States.

(3) Colombia is the primary producer of heroin in the Western Hemisphere and is a significant cultivator of marijuana.

(4) Courageous and dedicated Colombians risk their lives every day in order to fight drug traffickers, and these Colombians deserve the support of the United States and of the Government of Colombia.

(5) The Government of Colombia did not take significant actions in 1994 to dismantle drug cartels in Colombia, capture drug kingpins, or reverse the influence of drug-related corruption on the political system of Colombia.

(6) The lack of achievement of the Government of Colombia in 1994 in its efforts against drugs raises significant questions as to whether the Colombian people presently receive the support of that government in such efforts.

(7) The political and judicial systems of Colombia are plagued by drug-related corruption, including an ineffective plea-bargaining system that leaves law-abiding citizens virtually unprotected against crime.

(8) The plea-bargaining system in Colombia is so ineffective that at least 33 percent of the convictions for drug-related crimes do not result in imprisonment.

(9) The Prosecutor General of Colombia has stated that the judicial process in Colombia system ''results in virtual impunity [for drug traffickers]''.

(10) Colombia is a significant center for money-laundering activities, and, as a result, the financial system of Colombia is inundated with illegal monies.

(11) Despite repeated assurances it considers the war against drugs to be a ''moral imperative'' and a ''matter of national security'' requiring ''an all out effort, without limits,'' the Government of Colombia has failed to keep specific commitments made on July 15, 1994 by President-elect Samper that Colombia would—

(A) devote law enforcement resources, including creating an elite corps of investigators, to the investigation, apprehension, arrest, prosecution, and imprisonment of major drug traffickers and their accomplices, including political allies;

(B) rapidly reform the penal code of Colombia, including increasing penalties for drug traffickers, closing loopholes in the plea bargain system, and strengthening anti-corruption and money-laundering laws; and

(C) participate in the creation of an anti-narcotics force for Caribbean Basin countries and the implementation of a global export monitoring system for precursor chemicals.

(12) Evidence suggests that the influence of drug kingpins reaches the Congress of Colombia and the Office of the President of Colombia.

(13) The Government of Colombia has not taken any significant steps to investigate or prosecute cases of drug-related corruption, nor has that government undertaken a meaningful investigation into allegations that the campaign treasury of President Samper received millions of dollars from the Cali cartel or into allegations of extensive corruption in the Congress of Colombia.

(14) The Government of Colombia has not demonstrated the political will to move against major drug traffickers in Colombia, and President Samper has not used his considerable public influence to build political support for direct, effective action against drug kingpins and the scourge of drugs in Colombia.

(15) The Government of Colombia has not arrested or imprisoned any significant member of the Cali drug cartel, a cartel which accounts for at least 80 percent of the cocaine that is shipped into the United States.

(16) Colombia has in effect laws to address drugs and drug-related corruption in a meaningful manner, but the Government of Colombia does not enforce such laws.

(17) The democratically-elected Government of Colombia is being subjugated to the interests of drug traffickers in Colombia.

(18) On February 6, 1995, the President of Colombia outlined a program of the Government of Colombia called the ''Program of the War Against Illicit Drugs''.

(19) In promising to pursue the program, the President of Colombia stated that Colombia ''will continue fighting [narcotics] because we are convinced that the struggle against this serious scourge is a moral imperative, a response to a public health problem, and, most of all, an issue of national security.''

SEC. 3. SANCTIONS.

Subject to sections 4 and 6, the following sanctions shall apply against Colombia as of February 6, 1996:

(1) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—Funds available under the following programs of assistance may not be obligated or expended to provide assistance with respect to Colombia:

(A) DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—Assistance to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(B) ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE.—Assistance to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(C) FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Financing under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act.

(D) IMET ASSISTANCE.—Assistance to carry out chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(E) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—Activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(F) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.—Financing by the Export-Import Bank of the United States under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct each United States executive director of a multilateral development bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the respective bank to or for Colombia.

(3) LICENSES FOR COMMERCIAL ARMS EXPORTS.—Appropriated funds may not be obligated or expended to license the commercial export of items on the United States Munitions List under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act to Colombia.

(4) MILITARY ACTIVITIES.—Appropriated funds may not be obligated or expended for purposes of carrying out military activities in Colombia or that benefit Colombia, including joint military activities involving the Armed Forces of the United States and the Armed Forces of Colombia.

(5) TRADE PREFERENCES.—

(A) ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT.—The President shall withdraw the designation of Colombia as a beneficiary country under section 203 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3202). The President shall make such withdrawal without regard to the procedures set forth in subsection (e) of that section. Such withdrawal shall apply to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, after the date that is 45 days after the date sanctions under this section first apply to Colombia and such goods shall be subject to duty at the rates of duty specified for such goods under the general subcolumn of column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(B) TRADE ACT OF 1974.—The President shall terminate the designation of Colombia as a beneficiary developing country under section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462). The President shall terminate such designation without regard to the procedures set forth in subsection (a)(2) of that section. Such withdrawal shall apply to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, after the date that is 45 days after the date sanctions under this section first apply to Colombia and such goods shall be subject to duty at the rates of duty specified for such goods under the general subcolumn of column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(C) OTHER TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS.—Colombia may not be designated as eligible to receive preferential trade treatment under any other program.

(D) FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Colombia shall not be—

(i) extended tariff or quota treatment equivalent to that accorded to members of the North American Free Trade Agreement; or

(ii) allowed to participate in the discussion or implementation of a free trade agreement involving Western Hemisphere countries.

(E) SUPERSEDING EXISTING LAW.—The sanctions described in this paragraph shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(6) EXCLUSION FROM ENTRY INTO UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall take all reasonable steps provided by law to ensure that public officials in Colombia, regardless of rank, who are implicated in drug-related corruption, their immediate relatives, and business partners are not permitted entry into the United States, consistent with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) APPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply in the case of a public official in Colombia, and the relatives and business partners of such official, until the completion by the Government of Colombia of an investigation into the drug-related corruption of the official that is satisfactory to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General of the United States and is so certified to the President.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL PERIOD.—Subject to section 7(a)(1), the sanctions described in section 3 shall not apply to Colombia during the period beginning February 6, 1996, and ending February 5, 1997, if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees on February 6, 1996, the matters set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the following:

(1) That the Government of Colombia has made substantial progress in the following matters:

(A) Investigating contributions by drug traffickers to political parties in Colombia.

(B) Providing funding for a sustainable alternative development program to encourage Colombia farmers to grow legal crops.

(C) Utilizing the law enforcement resources of Colombia to investigate, capture, convict, and imprison major drug lords in Colombia and their accomplices.

(D) Implementing and funding fully a proposed plan for the improvement of the administration of the Ministry of Justice of Colombia.

(E) Acting effectively to confiscate profits from activities relating to illegal drugs.

(F) Enacting legislation to implement the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances.

(G) Dismantling the infrastructure in Colombia that is used for processing illegal drugs, interdicting the chemicals used for such processing, and seizing or disabling vehicles (including airplanes and ships) used to transport processed illegal drugs.

(H) Investing in technology to improve surveillance of airports, waterways, and seaports in Colombia.

(I) Constructing an installation for the Colombia Coast Guard on San Andres Island, Colombia, in order to provide effective surveillance of airplane and ship traffic that departs from the island.

(J) Improving the aircraft detection and interception systems of Colombia, including the purchase of aircraft detectors.

(K) Encouraging and participating in the adoption of an Inter-American convention to ban the establishment of a financial safe haven in any country in the Western Hemisphere.

(2) That the Government of Colombia has accomplished the following:

(A) The reform of the penal code of Colombia in order to increase penalties for drug traffickers and to remove opportunities for such traffickers to enter into plea bargains.

(B) The creation of an effective investigation unit to detect and bring to prosecution individuals in Colombia who engage in corrupt activities related to drugs.

(C) The enactment of legislation to implement the statute prohibiting money laundering that was enacted by the Colombia legislature in 1994.

(D) The destruction of 44,000 hectares of coca and poppy plants in Colombia by January 1, 1996.

(c) CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR SUBSEQUENT PERIOD.—Subject to section 7(a)(1), the sanctions described in section 3 shall not apply to Colombia, and any trade designations withdrawn or terminated under section 3(5) shall be reinstated with respect to Colombia, if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees on February 6, 1997, the matters set forth in subsection 6(b).

SEC. 5. DISCRETIONARY SANCTIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President may impose on Colombia the sanctions described in section 4, or such other sanctions as the President considers appropriate, if the President determines that the Government of Colombia is not cooperating with the United States in counter-drug activities in and with respect to Colombia.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPOSITION.—The President shall impose sanctions under this section by transmitting to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of the imposition of the sanctions. The notice shall set forth the sanctions imposed and the effective date of the sanctions.

(c) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—(1) Subject to section 7(a)(2), sanctions imposed under this section shall terminate 45 days after the date on which the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees the determination and certification referred to in section 6(a).

(2) Upon the termination of sanctions under this section, any trade designation withdrawn or terminated under section 3(5) shall be reinstated with respect to Colombia.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the President to impose sanctions under this section shall expire on February 5, 1996.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to subsection (c) and section 7(a)(2), the sanctions described in section 3 shall terminate 45 days after the date on which the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees the matters set forth in subsection (b).

(2) Upon the termination of sanctions under this subsection, any trade designation withdrawn or terminated under section 3(5) shall be reinstated with respect to Colombia.

(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the following:

(1) That the Government of Colombia continues to make substantial progress with respect to the following matters:

(A) Investigating contributions by drug traffickers to political parties in Colombia.

(B) Prosecuting the persons responsible for illegal contributions to political parties and campaigns.

(C) Providing funding for a sustainable alternative development program to encourage Colombia farmers to grow legal crops.

(D) Utilizing the law enforcement resources of Colombia to investigate, capture, convict, and imprison major drug lords in Colombia and their accomplices.

(E) Implementing a reform of the penal code of Colombia so as to punish and incarcerate drug traffickers and to terminate the availability of lenient plea bargains.

(F) Deploying an effective investigation unit to detect and bring to prosecution individuals in Colombia who engage in corrupt activities related to drugs.

(G) Implementing and funding fully a proposed plan for the improvement of the administration of the Ministry of Justice of Colombia.

(H) Acting effectively to confiscate profits from activities relating to illegal drugs.

(I) Enforcing effectively the statute prohibiting money laundering that was enacted by the Colombia legislature in 1994.

(J) Investing in technology to improve surveillance of airports, waterways, and seaports in Colombia and utilizing such technology.

(K) Improving the aircraft detection and interception systems of Colombia and utilizing such systems.

(L) Encouraging and participating in the adoption of an Inter-American convention to ban the establishment of a financial safe haven in any country in the Western Hemisphere.

(2) That the Government of Colombia has accomplished the following:

(A) The enactment of legislation to implement the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances.

(B) The destruction of all remaining hectares of illicit crops in Colombia.

(C) The construction of an installation for the Colombia Coast Guard on San Andres Island, Colombia, and in order to provide effective surveillance of airplane and ship traffic that departs from the island.

(c) DATE OF TRANSMITTAL.—The President shall transmit the determination and certification described in this section, if at all, not earlier than February 6, 1997.

SEC. 7. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY.—The sanctions described in section 3 shall apply to Colombia notwithstanding a determination of the President under subsection (a) or (c) of section 4 if, within 45 days after receipt of a certification under such subsection (a) or (c), respectively, Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the determination contained in such certification. The effective date of such sanctions shall be the date on which Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the determination concerned.

(2) REVIEW OF TERMINATION.—The sanctions described in section 3, and the sanctions authorized by section 5, shall not terminate notwithstanding a determination of the President under section 6(a) or 5(c), respectively, if, within 45 days after receipt of a certification under such section 6(a) or 5(c), respectively, Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the determination contained in such certification.

(b) PROCEDURES.—The procedures for the consideration of a joint resolution disapproving a determination under this section shall be governed by the procedures set forth in section 490A(f)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291k(f)(2)).

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COLOMBIA.

In fiscal year 1996 and in any other fiscal year in which sanctions are imposed on Colombia under this Act, the President shall transmit the applicable determination and certification under this Act in lieu of the determination and certification, if any, required with respect to Colombia in such fiscal year under section 490A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291k).

SEC. 9. REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) the progress made by the Government of Colombia in the matters set forth in paragraph (1) of section 4(b); and

(2) the accomplishments of that government with respect to the matters set forth in paragraph (2) of that section.

(b) DATES OF SUBMITTAL.—The Secretary shall submit a report under this subsection not later than—

(1) September 1, 1995; and

(2) September 1 of each year thereafter until the year following the year in which sanctions, if any, on Colombia under this Act terminate.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) DRUG.—The term ''drug'' refers to any substance that, if subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, would be a controlled substance within the meaning of section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)).

(3) DRUG TRAFFICKER.—The term ''drug trafficker'' means any person who transports, transfers, or otherwise disposes of illegal drugs, to another, as consideration for anything of value, or makes or obtains control of illegal drugs with the intent to so transport, transfer, or dispose of.

(4) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The term ''multilateral development banks'' includes the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 4, 1995]

COLOMBIA, AMERICA'S FAVORITE ''NARCO-DEMOCRACY''

(By William J. Bennett and Jesse Helms)

The deluge of illegal drugs flooding into the U.S. has become one of the principal threats to our national security. More Americans die each year from the use of cocaine, heroin and other illegal drugs than from international terrorism. Yet, while the Clinton administration has rightly maintained a tough line with Libya, Iran and other governments known to be sponsoring terrorism, it has let Colombia—which ships more cocaine into the U.S. than any other country—completely off the hook. It is time for the administration to stiffen its spine and show some resolve in its anti-drug efforts.

The administration's recent annual review of international cooperation on counter-drug efforts by major drug-producing and trafficking countries is instructive. Under this review, countries that fail to meet certain minimum standards of performance in combating drug trafficking are supposed to be denied U.S. aid. The Clinton administration acknowledged in its report that Colombia has indeed failed to meet minimum standards, yet, amazingly, granted Colombia a ''national interest waiver'' allowing U.S. aid to flow into Colombia despite its miserable record.

This is a grave moral and geopolitical mistake. All available evidence clearly indicates Colombia has totally capitulated to the drug lords. By extending certification to Colombia, despite overwhelming evidence that its government is rife with narco-corruption, the Clinton administration has sent a troubling signal to all drug-producing nations: The U.S. will impose no penalty for collusion in trafficking with the drug lords.

Colombia is no borderline case. It has indisputably become a ''narco-democracy''—a country with a facade of democratic government that is effectively controlled by drug kingpins who manipulate the political establishment with cocaine money. According to the administration's own background papers on Colombia:

The Cali cartel has been left free by the Colombian government to exploit the banking system and launder vast sums of drug money with impunity.

There is practically no effective investigation or prosecution of the more than 15,000 current cases of corruption involving government officials (more than half of them senior-level authorities).

A ''guilt-laundering'' system exists, in which Cali drug lords surrender, and submit to a jerry-rigged plea-bargaining system that leaves their assets intact and allows them to plead to minor charges.

The government's eradication programs have been half-hearted at best, despite massive increases in the growing of opium and new cocaine cultivation.

High-level government collusion enables the shipment of enormous quantities of cocaine into the U.S., with 727 jets transiting in Mexico with tons of the drug.

There is evidence of the corruption of many members of the Colombian Congress, and increasing evidence of presidential ties to the drug cartels.

The Clinton administration cannot plead ignorance as the excuse for its abdication of responsibility. But conditions in Colombia are in fact worse than even the administration's report acknowledges. The influence of the cartels and their blood money pervades almost all aspects of Columbia's political, social and economic life. Cartel money finances political campaigns. It silences journalists. It buys judges. It infiltrates virtually every major business activity in Columbia—from cut flowers, to oil, to paper, to banking.

Colombia is now the primary base for the cartels to extend their drug operations throughout the hemisphere. Despite the fact that the Cali cartel now supplies more than 80% of all the cocaine entering the U.S., the Colombian government has failed to arrest or prosecute even one significant cartel member. To the contrary, Colombia has given the cartel cover and protection from international extradition, allowing these drugs to end up on American streets and in American schools, where they destroy the lives of American children.

We believe the Colombian government collusion with the drug lords poses a direct threat to the national security of the U.S. It is time to meet this threat head-on. And since the Clinton administration has failed to provide leadership on this issue, it is all the more important that Congress assume responsibility. That is why a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee will hold a hearing today on the issue. And why legislation will be introduced this week to cut off all economic support, trade benefits, and military assistance to Colombia by Feb. 6, 1996, unless the president of the United States can certify that Colombian President Ernesto Samper has implemented the reform agenda he promised the U.S. Congress he would enact.

Elements of this agenda include investigating the financing by drug traffickers of political parties and candidates in Colombia; putting law enforcement resources behind investigating, capturing, convicting and imprisoning major drug lords in Colombia; ending the ''guilt-laundering'' system; confiscating assets of cartel leaders; and destroying 44,000 hectares (108,680 acres) of coca and poppy plants in Colombia by Jan. 1, 1996 (and all remaining acreage by Jan. 1, 1997).

The Colombian leaders must be sent a clear and unmistakable message: In the war on drugs, they can either continue to ally themselves with the cartels, and thereby become a pariah state like Libya and Iran; or they can return to the community of civilized nations, fulfill the promises President Samper made, and join with the U.S. in an effort to put the cartels out of business. The choice is theirs.

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 15, 1994.

HON. JESSE HELMS,
Ranking Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: Next month I will assume the Presidency of Colombia at a very important time in the relations between our two countries and in our common struggle against drug trafficking. I am well aware of your dedication and interest in this issue and I appreciate your efforts in support of Colombia. As I prepare my administration for the challenges which lie ahead, I wanted to take this opportunity to share with you my views about the ways we can strengthen our fight against drug trafficking.

I know, in a very personal way, the kind of threat drugtraffickers represent to our democracies. The four bullets still lodged in my body are a constant reminder of the 1989 Cartel attempt to assassinate me at Bogota International Airport. I was lucky, unlike many of my compatriots who have fallen victim of the brutal violence the cartels have wreaked in my country.

Once again, we are the target of their diabolic machinations. The taping of telephone conversations between a Cali Cartel leader and a journalist known to be on the Cartel's payroll revealed their frustrated efforts to infiltrate the campaign organizations of Colombian presidential candidates.

I was perfectly aware of this threat when I entered the Presidential race. That is why I established an independent moral ombudsman in my campaign. That is why my campaign books and records have always been open to public scrutiny. I also expelled several sympathizers when it became evident that they were not up to our rigid ethical standards. We rejected several contributions because of their unclear or obscure origin. That is why I am completely confident that my campaign was successful in rejecting drug traffickers undercover efforts to spread their corrupting influence. Nevertheless, I have called for a special investigation to carefully examine all of these issues and will take further action as needed to protect the integrity of my government.

Those who thought that the drug war was over with the destruction of Pablo Escobar's organization were wrong. We are entering what could be the last but decisive phase of the drug war. The Cartels know that their campaign of terror and intimidation has failed. Nevertheless, they will try to regain the ground lost during the past years. The Cali Cartel will rely on powerful weapons of choice: violence and fear, bank accounts, legal loopholes, computer networks and corruption.

Today, the task is much more complex and the international community has to readjust its strategy, sharpen its skills and develop new legal and institutional tools. Starting on the day of my inauguration, I will aggressively seek to secure the tools we will need to win, both at home and abroad. I invite the United States to join Colombia in leading this effort.

First, we will continue doing what we have done successfully: vigorously applying all our law enforcement resources to investigate, track and put in jail the drug lords and their accomplices. We know who the bosses of the Cali Cartel are and we will capture them. To achieve that goal we need a continuous commitment from the U.S. in terms of technical support, training, intelligence and evidence sharing. We must establish a high-level bilateral commission to permanently evaluate our cooperation, improve its performance and promptly overcome any problem or obstacle.

My administration will accelerate the reform of Colombia's penal code, increasing the penalties for drug traffickers and removing the loopholes in our plea-bargaining system. We will not tolerate leniency.

Drug traffickers failed in taking over our democracy through terrorism and assassination. Now they want to destroy it through infiltration and corruption. They will not succeed. An ''elite corp'' of investigators will be created to track down corruption and send the political cronies of the cartels to jail and we will present to Colombia's Congress stringent anti-corruption legislation. Additionally, we will introduce new legislation to strengthen our laws against money-laundering, that should be enforced with the support of a U.S.-Colombian financial crime task force, conformed by our best prosecutors and experts.

Equally important, we will urge the U.S. Congress to establish mandatory targets for the reduction of domestic drug consumption and to provide the resources needed to achieve those targets.

Our two countries cannot solely bear the burden of the global war on drugs. Consequently, my administration will work towards the enactment of the following initiatives:

The creation of a Caribbean Basin multilateral anti-narcotics force.

Joining current radar capabilities in a Hemispheric network to track trafficking activities.

The implementation of a global export monitoring system to impose strict controls on the flows of precursor chemicals, crucial to drug production, as well as assault and automatic weapons used by cartel hitmen.

The adoption of a new Inter-American convention to ban financial safe havens in the hemisphere. Drug Traffickers cannot be allowed to enjoy the benefits of their ill-gotten gains.

These are concrete initiatives I will launch August 7th, the day of my inauguration. I hope the United States will choose to help Colombia win the drug war instead of being paralyzed by the drug lords' disinformation campaign. I invite the United States to redouble its faith in the determination and courage of Colombians by joining us again in the difficult battles that lie ahead.

My administration looks forward to working with you on these issues and others of interest to both our countries.

Sincerely,

ERNESTO SAMPER-PIZANO,
President-elect of Colombia.

SPEECH BY DR. ERNESTO SAMPER PIZANO, PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA, AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE POLICY AGAINST DRUGS, SANTAFÉ DE BOGOTA, FEBRUARY 6, 1995

I wish to take the opportunity, on the occasion of the appointment of the Manger of the Illicit Crops Alternative Development Plan, to outline the Program of the War Against Illicit Drugs that my Administration will carry out in the years ahead. At the same time, I also wish to inform you about what we have already achieved in the first few months of my Administration.

Colombia has been seriously engaged for several years in the war against drug trafficking. Many of our countrymen have fallen in this battle, and the economic price we have had to pay has been very high, requiring us to postpone other important needs and make great sacrifices.

We are fighting this battle and we will continue fighting because we are convinced that the struggle against this serious scourge is a moral imperative, a response to a public health problem, and, most of all, an issue of national security.

AN INTEGRATED POLICY

The challenge posed by drug traffickers demands an integrated policy. We cannot continue in a cycle of action and reactions. This leads to doubt and uncertainty about the effectiveness of what we are doing. My Government is committed to an integrated policy that will be led and supervised directly by the President of the Republic.

The new policy's components are as follows:

1. Crop eradication

Unfortunately, Colombia has become a coca producing country: 14 percent of the land under coca cultivation worldwide is in our country.

Between 1993 and 1994, the number of hectares under cultivation increased 13 percent.

We will eradicate the coca and poppy crops. We will take advantage of the fact that most of these crops are grown for commercial reasons and are not for traditional use, as in other neighboring countries.

We have begun ''Operation Radiance'' that will destroy all existing illicit crops in the country in the next two years. The target for this year is 44,000 hectares.

The Government will be especially careful to ensure that these operations cause the least adverse social and environmental impact.

Those who criticize spraying operations often forget that the worst ecological damage is being caused by those who are destroying our natural reserves to grow illicit drugs. Two and a half hectares of forest are destroyed in order to plant one hectare of illicit crop, at the expense of approximately 180,000 hectares each year. If production continues like this, according to U.N. calculations, before the end of the century Colombia will have lost one-third of its tropical rain forest.

2. Alternative development plan

The objective of the Alternative Development Plan that we are announcing today is to provide an alternative means of living for the 300,000 small coca growers.

And, simultaneously to develop preventive programs in other areas of the country which are abandoned and could become areas for producing new crops. We do not want confrontations to happen again like the ones in Guaviare and Putumayo last year.

I have requested the Solidarity Network to institute programs in the most sensitive areas so that government programs will begin work before the drug traffickers arrive.

The Plan will provide better roads, health, education and working conditions to small farmers in isolated areas.

Likewise, with the assistance of government programs, the trading and marketing of substitute crops will begin.

The Plan will duplicate substitution programs that have been successful in other places.

In order to finance this ambitious crop substitution program, we have a US$150 million budget which we hope to double with international assistance.

My goal is to eliminate all illicit crops by the end of my term in office.

3. Industrial production of drugs

In addition to coca cultivation, we are also a drug producing country. To eliminate production, we will attack the infrastructure used for the processing of drugs, such as laboratories, importation of processing chemicals, and vehicles used to transport drugs.

With the use of the reinstalled radar system in the South, we will interdict the entry of coca paste, the essential raw material for the production of cocaine.

4. Distribution

Colombia will take strong actions to destroy the internal systems for the distribution and export of drugs through the following programs:

Investment in technology to improve the control capacity of airports, waterways and seaports.

Build a coast guard base on San Andres Island with resources already allocated in the 1995 and 1996 budgets, that will control all air and sea traffic arriving and departing from the island.

Improve the airplane interception system through the purchase of detectors, aerial platforms, and electronic intelligence gathering equipment.

5. Money laundering

Recent estimates show that profits from drug trafficking can reach nearly US$500 billion a year, which is ten times Colombia's gross national product.

Most of these funds are ''laundered'' through world financial markets. It is very important that controls be established in each country as well as at the international level.

If we allow the income produced by drugs, 75 percent of which is held in international financial centers, to be ''recycled'' into legitimate business, we will never be able to end drug trafficking.

At the hemispheric summit called by President Clinton and held in Miami, Colombia suggested that the countries of the region hold a convention to consider a War against Money Laundering. This initiative was received with enthusiasm. The organizational details of this convention will be spelled out during the first quarter of 1995.

On the domestic front, with the support of the Attorney General's Office, the Banking Superintendency, the DIAN (tax and national customs department), and the Stock Market Superintendency, we will act more forcefully to confiscate profits from illicit enrichment. We have already proposed changes in the law to give my Government the necessary powers to carry this out.

6. The rise of domestic consumption

Colombia is at risk of becoming a drug consuming country, according to the figures during the last few years.

We will strongly fight against any increase in drug use, particularly among our youth.

The Government's action in this regard will be directed at drug prevention, rehabilitation, special attention to individuals that are vulnerable to becoming drug users, and a massive education effort through the media and education centers, under the coordination of the Youth Vice-Ministry, on the harmful effects of drug use.

7. Law enforcement and administration of justice

The ''Surrender to Justice'' policy has become an open door to impunity because of inadequate convictions and sentencing by certain judges and prosecutors.

Its implementation included minimum sentences and granted maximum benefits.

We are going to reformulate the policy, so that turning oneself in is no longer perceived as a way to avoid prosecution.

We know that criminals will not turn themselves in if we do not maintain pressure on them. We will pursue them until either we catch them or they surrender.

We are convinced that the new policy, with international judicial cooperation, will enable us to successfully fight against criminal cartels.

8. Changes in justice administration

Those who think that all these changes require basic reform of our justice system are right. The battle against drugs must be fought within the rule of law. With our current weak judicial system and inefficient criminal policy, we will not be able to subject organized crime to the laws and justice of the State.

A Justice Department Plan, with allocations of around $500 million, will make the administration of justice more effective.

It is the intention of my Government to modernize the justice system to include a new program to find ways to defeat organized crime, especially kidnappers and drug cartels.

9. Prosecution of cartels

The Government has the clear intention to pursue, apprehend, prosecute, and convict drug traffickers. We are actively working to achieve this goal as soon as possible. To obtain it, we will improve our intelligence gathering capabilities against drug cartels with technical assistance from various foreign governments, starting, of course, with help from the Government of the United States.

10. International responsibility

It is clear that our objectives cannot be fulfilled entirely without more help and support from the international community. Colombia's efforts will have little impact on international narco-trafficking—

If the rising levels of consumption do not decrease;

If the control of air and sea traffic is not intensified;

If progress is not made to control international money laundering activities; and,

If the sale of precursor chemicals is not reduced.

Colombia will be alert to the international achievements on each of these issues while maintaining its own responsibility to combat the drug problem.

It is not a matter of unloading one's responsibility onto others. It is simply a matter of understanding that the complexity and seriousness of the drug trafficking problem are so extensive that its solution requires EVERYONE'S PARTICIPATION, with no exceptions nor excuses.

RESULTS

Now let me review the results obtained in the first few months since we began this integrated program.

During the first months of my Administration, until December 1994:

1. 6,950 hectares of illicit crops were eradicated, double the amount from the same period last year.

2. 18,416 kilos of cocaine were seized, an increase of 428% compared to the same period last year.

3. 20,200 kilos of coca paste was seized, 782% more than the same period the year before.

4. 194 cocaine laboratories were destroyed.

5. 530,000 gallons of fluid and 213,000 kilos of solid chemical precursors were seized, up from 219,000 gallons and 108,000 kilos seized the previous year.

6. 940 people linked to drug trafficking activities were arrested, of them 59 were foreigners and 5 were extradited.

7. Special Joint Command operations, whose basic responsibility is to pursue the heads of the drug trafficking cartels, were doubled.

It is clear that these statistics indicate progress in the eradication, capture, and interdiction campaign that we expect to continue.

More than that, during the first six months of my Government:

1. A disciplinary emergency was declared for the City of Cali police. More than half of the officers were dismissed.

2. The National Police Anti-Corruption Unit was created.

3. The United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances was ratified.

4. Thanks to the action of the National Government and the cooperation of the political parties, we were able to defeat a legislative proposal that would have greatly weakened the legal barriers to illicit enrichment.

5. Money laundering was classified as a crime and national legislation has been drafted and submitted to Congress as part of the anti-corruption statute, which will soon be passed by Congress.

6. A budget of $150 million per year was allocated for the next three years for the Alternative Development Plan we are presenting today.

7. The Attorney General's Office was reorganized to make it more effective in the fight against drug trafficking.

8. The Security Administration Department (DAS) was reorganized in order to improve the professional capabilities to combat organized crime.

9. Prison Emergency was declared in order to control highly dangerous prisoners, to clean up the areas surrounding maximum security prisons, and to improve performance of prison guards.

10. The Surrender to Justice Policy Study Commission was created by decree No. 159, 1995, in order to study and report on sentences and benefits adjustments, as well as to suggest any other reforms to the policy by March 6.

CONCLUSIONS

The Government of Colombia has been active for several years in the struggle against drug trafficking.

My Government reiterates its commitment to continue our efforts as I have described above.

The country has an excellent team to undertake this program including: The Attorney General of the Nation, the Ministers of Defense and Justice, as well as the DAS Director and the National Police Director, who have been working coherently and effectively since the beginning of my Administration in this struggle against drugs.

In the development of this program, Colombia has had the cooperation of several foreign governments among them the U.S. Government.

We trust that the policies and the facts presented here, together with the achievements of my predecessor's government, will renew the confidence that has characterized the relations between our two countries over the years.

Anything other than a strong bilateral relationship based on confidence would weaken the joint efforts we have undertaken and would only benefit the drug cartels' interests.

Colombia accepts international cooperation to achieve its anti-drug objectives, but only after acknowledgment of its sovereign right to formulate this policy on its own.

Over the years, during many administrations, we have never accepted any type of conditions from abroad.

I am optimistic that in the near future we will defeat the scourge of narco-trafficking.

The Colombian people deserve a better international image than that created by organized crime.

We deserve to be known as a country that respects the law.

We deserve to be judged on the basis of the majority of our hard working citizens who love their country, who fight for its progress, and who desire to leave their children the possibility of a life led with dignity.

To achieve this, we all have to make a commitment to fight against violence, beginning with narco-trafficking, which has plagued us like a curse.

We do not want any more heroes or martyrs buried in our cemeteries. Therefore, we must and we will bring crime and violence under control.

As President, I am sure that this would have been the wish of the four presidential candidates, the 23 magistrates, the 63 journalists, and the three thousand policemen who in the last ten years lost their lives fighting narco-trafficking.

In their memory we will overcome future difficulties. We are working very hard on this problem and we will continue to do so.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, there are any number of reasons, from the massive amount of cocaine entering the United States from Colombia, to the rise in high school drug use over the past 2 years, that I could rely on to explain my decision to cosponsor the Narcotics National Emergency Sanctions Act [NNESA]. The poor performance of Colombia's government in interrupting the flow of heroin, marijuana, and cocaine that originates or is processed in Colombia, would be justification enough for the extraordinary measures created by the NNESA. Above all, however, I am moved by the rank corruption the drug trade has spawned in Colombia and the colossal abuse of public trust by officials who ally themselves with criminals rather than the people they serve.

Colombia's government institutions, including the courts, the Congress, and the highest levels of the executive, have been penetrated by the influence of narcotics traffickers. Not surprisingly, in 1994, Colombia failed to meet minimum standards of performance in combating drug trafficking. The Clinton administration responded by granting a national interest waiver. Although it is possible to imagine circumstances in which a national interest waiver might be justified, Colombia is not such a case.

Colombia deserves to be taken out of the normal narcotics cooperation certification process because it is in a league of its own. We do not seek to penalize Colombia unnecessarily, or to impose an arbitrary standard. The NNESA responds directly to public commitments President Samper has repeatedly made to improve Colombia's anti-narcotics performance.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration itself has sent mixed signals about its commitment to the fight against illegal drugs. Enforcement of drug laws enjoys low priority at the Justice Department where Federal mandatory minimum prison terms are criticized as too harsh. Nationwide, Federal prosecutions of narcotics-related crimes have dropped dramatically since 1992. Colombia and Peru were refused intelligence information crucial to the interdiction of narcotics flights for several months in 1994. Although later overturned, the decision to cut off intelligence sharing dealt a severe blow to counter-drug efforts and broadcast the administration's ambivalence about the drug war. Overall, international interdiction efforts receive little support and dwindling resources in spite of efforts by some officials to protect this indispensable function.

The Clinton White House must restore anti-narcotics policy to the top priority status it has enjoyed under previous administrations. It can start by endorsing the NNESA and sending an unambiguous message to Colombia: the United States has no national interest in cooperating with any government that colludes with drug traffickers.

By Mr. FORD:

S. 682. A bill to provide for the certification by the Federal Aviation Administration of airports serving commuter air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

COMMUTER AIRPORT SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which will provide authority for the Federal Aviation Administration to issue safety certificates to airports serving commuter aircraft of 10 or more passenger seats. The FAA's authority to issue airport certificates is currently limited to airports serving air carrier aircraft with more than 30 passenger seats. This legislation is a result of a recent study of commuter airline safety conducted by the National Transportation Safety Board, which led the Federal Aviation Administration to issue a series of recommendations. The legislation I am proposing today compliments that regulatory effort by providing specific authority for the Federal Aviation Administrator to insure the safety of commuter airports. Safety improvements called for by new airport certification requirements will be eligible for grant funding consideration under the FAA's Airport Improvement Program.

This legislation will not mandate the issuance of airport certificates to commuter airports. It will only provide general authority pursuant to which the FAA Administrator may promulgate appropriate regulatory standards. To do so, the FAA will need to issue a proposed regulation that will undergo a public comment process before any final regulation will be issued as they do with any other safety regulation.

I am aware of a serious sense within the airport community with this new FAA authority. I would urge the FAA to initiate a negotiated process with the airport community which has been successful in the past. I understand the FAA is currently organizing a working group of affected aviation groups to assist in defining potential costs and reasonable certification requirements. I would urge the FAA to work with the industry as the goal of all concerned is safety.

FAA is often criticized for the tombstone mentality in that safety regulations are often the result of major accidents. The new authority in this legislation is proactive in nature. This legislation will put in place reasonable safety standards to protect commuter airline passengers before there are any fatalities. Let us not wait until an accident to justify the need for safety improvements. I commend the leadership at the FAA—David Hinson, Administrator and Linda Daschle, Deputy Administrator for this change in attitude. It is refreshing that FAA is looking forward instead of backward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

S. 682

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

Section 44706(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) that serves any scheduled passenger operation of an air carrier aircraft designed for more than 9 passenger seats or any unscheduled passenger operation of an air carrier aircraft designed for more than 30 passenger seats;''.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 683. A bill to protect and enforce the equal privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States and the constitutional rights of the people to choose Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ELECTORAL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as a strong supporter of congressional term limits and one who has promised voluntarily to limit my own tenure in Congress, I am today introducing a bill that would allow States to set their own limits.

The American people have spoken. Approximately 80 percent of them support term limits. Measures limiting congressional service have been passed in one form or another in 22 States. This Congress needs to restore the faith of a wary American public in its Federal Government by addressing this issue.

The legislation which I am introducing today would recognize the rights of the States to place term limits on their elected officials. Some may view this statute as redundant because the States already have the right to impose term limits on their Members of Congress. But a legal challenge by term-limit opponents is currently under consideration by the Supreme Court.

This legislation is designed to insulate State-imposed term limits from court challenges. It is based on section 5 of the 14th amendment, which lets Congress enforce the rights to due process and equal protection of the laws. To enhance fair and open competition for elective offices and promote effective representative government, States should be allowed to limit congressional terms. The legislation is also based on other rights afforded in other amendments to the Constitution.

Perhaps most importantly, this bill would restore the power to the American people to set the limits they prefer, without congressional interference. This Congress has already acknowledged that many of the important decisions about how this country is run should be left to the States. I believe that our citizens should determine whether and how to impose limits on their congressional representatives.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this important measure.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for determining the status of certain missing members of the Armed Forces and certain civilians, and for other purposes.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] 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.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the organization and administration of the Readjustment Counseling Service, to improve eligibility for readjustment counseling and related counseling, and for other purposes.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate under such act, and for other purposes.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were added as cosponsors of S. 440, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

S. 490

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 490, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exempt agriculture-related facilities from certain permitting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to provide a tax credit for families, to provide certain tax incentives to encourage investment and increase savings, and to place limitations on the growth of spending.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 647, a bill to amend section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to require phasing-in of certain amendments of or revisions to land and resource management plans, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a joint resolution designating April 9, 1995, and April 9, 1996, as ''National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day.''

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 31

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 31, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant Congress and the States the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 100, a resolution to proclaim April 5, 1995, as National 4-H Day, and for other purposes.