

“(B) the compilation and distribution of informational materials to educate and update potential donors;”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5), the following new paragraphs:

“(6) annually update the Donor Registry to account for changes in potential donor status;

“(7) not later than 1 year after the date on which the ‘Bone Marrow Program Inspection’ (hereafter referred to in this part as the ‘Inspection’) that is being conducted by the Office of the Inspector General on the date of enactment of this paragraph is completed, in consultation with the Secretary, and based on the findings and recommendations of the Inspection, the marrow donor program shall develop, evaluate, and implement a plan to streamline and make more efficient the relationship between the Donor Registry and donor centers;”.

(c) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—Section 379 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274k) is amended by striking subsection (j), and inserting the following new subsection:

“(j) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into contracts with, public or nonprofit private entities for the purpose of increasing unrelated allogeneic marrow transplants, by enabling such entities to—

“(A) plan and conduct programs to provide information and education to the professional health care community on the availability of unrelated allogeneic marrow transplants as a potential treatment option;

“(B) plan and conduct programs to provide information and education to the public on the availability of unrelated donor marrow transplants and the need for donations of bone marrow;

“(C) train individuals in requesting bone marrow donations; and

“(D) recruit, test and enroll marrow donors with the priority being groups for which there is a greater degree of marrow donor shortage than that of the general population.

“(2) PRIORITIES.—In awarding contracts under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to carrying out the purposes described in such paragraph with respect to population groups with such shortages.”.

(d) PATIENT ADVOCACY AND CASE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 379 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274k), as amended by subsection (c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(k) PATIENT ADVOCACY AND CASE MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Donor Registry shall establish and maintain an office of patient advocacy and case management that meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The office established under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be headed by a director who shall serve as an advocate on behalf of—

“(i) individuals who are registered with the Donor Registry to search for a biologically unrelated bone marrow donor;

“(ii) the physicians involved; and

“(iii) individuals who are included in the Donor Registry as potential marrow donors.

“(B) establish and maintain a system for patient advocacy that directly assists patients, their families, and their physicians in a search for an unrelated donor;

“(C) provide individual case management services as appropriate to directly assist individuals and physicians referred to in subparagraph (A), including—

“(i) individualized case assessment and tracking of preliminary search through activi-

vation (including when the search process is interrupted or discontinued);

“(ii) informing individuals and physicians on regular intervals of progress made in searching for appropriate donors; and

“(iii) identifying and resolving individual search problems or concerns;

“(D) collect and analyze data concerning the number and percentage of individuals proceeding from preliminary to formal search, formal search to transplantation, the number and percentage of patients unable to complete the search process, and the comparative costs incurred by patients prior to transplant;

“(E) survey patients to evaluate how well such patients are being served and make recommendations for expediting the search process; and

“(F) provide individual case management services to individual marrow donors.

“(3) EVALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall evaluate the system established under paragraph (1) and make recommendations concerning the success or failure of such system in improving patient satisfaction, and any impact the system has had on assisting individuals in proceeding to transplant.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 1996, the Secretary shall prepare and make available a report concerning the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A), including the recommendations developed under such subparagraph.”.

(2) DONOR REGISTRY FUNCTIONS.—Section 379(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274k(b)(2)) is amended by striking “establish” and all that follows through “directly assists” and inserting “integrate the activities of the patient advocacy and case management office established under subsection (k) with the remaining Donor Registry functions by making available information on (A) the resources available through the Donor Registry Program, (B) the comparative costs incurred by patients prior to transplant, and (C) the marrow donor registries that meet the standards described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), to assist”.

(e) STUDY AND REPORTS.—Section 379A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274l) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 379A. STUDIES, EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.

“(a) EVALUATION BY THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with a public or nonprofit private entity to conduct a study and evaluation of—

“(A) the role of a national bone marrow transplant program supported by the Federal Government in facilitating the maximum number of unrelated marrow donor transplants; and

“(B) other possible clinical or scientific uses of the potential donor pool or accompanying information maintained by the Donor Registry or the unrelated marrow donor scientific registry.

“(2) INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—The Secretary shall request the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to enter into the contract under paragraph (1) to conduct the study and evaluation described in such paragraph. If the Institute declines to conduct the study and evaluation under such paragraph, the Secretary shall carry out such activities through another public or nonprofit private entity.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Institute of Medicine (or other entity as the case may be) shall complete the study required under paragraph (1) and prepare and submit to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report de-

scribing the findings made as a result of the study.

“(b) BONE MARROW CONSOLIDATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct—

“(A) an evaluation of the feasibility of integrating or consolidating all federally funded bone marrow transplantation scientific registries, regardless of the type of marrow reconstitution utilized; and

“(B) an evaluation of all federally funded bone marrow transplantation research to be conducted under the direction and administration of the peer review system of the National Institutes of Health.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate a report concerning the evaluations conducted under paragraph (1).

“(3) DEFINITION.—As used in paragraph (1), the term ‘marrow reconstitution’ shall encompass all sources of hematopoietic cells including marrow (autologous, related or unrelated allogeneic, syngeneic), autologous marrow, allogeneic marrow (biologically related or unrelated), umbilical cord blood cells, peripheral blood progenitor cells, or other approaches that may be utilized.”.

(f) BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION SCIENTIFIC REGISTRY.—Part I of title III of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274k et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 379B. BONE MARROW SCIENTIFIC REGISTRY.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, acting through the Donor Registry, shall establish and maintain a bone marrow scientific registry of all recipients of biologic unrelated allogeneic marrow donors.

“(b) INFORMATION.—The bone marrow transplantation scientific registry established under subsection (a) shall include information with respect to patients who have received biologic unrelated allogeneic marrow transplant, transplant procedures, pretransplant and transplant costs, and other information the Secretary determines to be necessary to conduct an ongoing evaluation of the scientific and clinic status of unrelated allogeneic marrow transplantation.

“(c) REPORT.—The Donor Registry shall submit to the Secretary on an annual basis a report using data collected and maintained by the bone marrow transplantation scientific registry established under subsection (a) concerning patient outcomes with respect to each transplant center and the pretransplant comparative costs involved at such transplant centers.”.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Part I of title III of such Act (42 U.S.C. 274k et seq.) as amended by subsection (f), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 379C. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 379, \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 1997, \$12,150,000 for fiscal year 1998, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1999.”.

## MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE FEDERAL OIL AND GAS ROYALTY MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1982

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4018) to make technical corrections in the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4018) was deemed read for a third time and passed.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, now, the closing information, at the end of which I will note that Senator MURRAY is here, and following her remarks the Senate will stand in adjournment. I wanted her to know we would close that way so she would not have concerns that we would close without her having a opportunity to speak.

I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 10; further, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate immediately turn to the consideration of H.R. 3396, the Defense of Marriage Act, as under a previous order.

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

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Tomorrow morning the Senate will be debating the Defense of Marriage Act for 3 hours, until the hour of 12:30.

I now ask unanimous consent the Senate recess between the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 for the weekly policy conferences.

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

Mr. LOTT. When the Senate reconvenes at 2:15, there will be two consecutive rollcall votes, the first on the adoption of the Defense authorization conference report to be followed by a vote on the passage of H.R. 3396, the Defense of Marriage Act. There will then be 30 minutes of debate, and a vote on S. 2056, the employment discrimination bill. This 30 minutes, of course, will be equally divided.

Following those votes on Tuesday, the Senate will turn to the consideration of the Treasury/Postal Service appropriations bill. Therefore, additional votes can be expected during tomorrow's session. Also, as a reminder to all Senators, at 10 a.m. on Wednes-

day of this week there will be a joint meeting of Congress to hear the address of Prime Minister Bruton of Ireland. Members are asked to be in the Senate Chamber at 9:40 a.m., so we may proceed to the House of Representatives.

That is on Wednesday. That was just a reminder for the Members to make plans to be here for that special occasion.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MURRAY.

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

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

#### THE EMPLOYMENT NONDISCRIMINATION ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, to express my strong support for this important legislation. I do so in the belief that every single American deserves fair treatment under the law, no matter their gender, race, religion, or sexual orientation. As one of the few women ever to serve in the U.S. Senate, I bring a different perspective to this issue. As a mother and as the ninth woman ever elected to the Senate and the first ever from my home State of Washington, I understand very clearly what it means to be part of a group who seeks fairness and equal opportunity.

Not so long ago, many thought it impossible for women to serve in the Senate, much less elected office of any other kind. Today, I am confident none of my colleagues would deny the contributions women have made here, in the House, in the State and local governments, and at every level of public service.

Mr. President, I am proud, not only that I was elected to one of the highest offices in the land, but also because I know now that my daughter will have the same opportunity.

The point is this: She will have choices and she will have the opportunity, because these are the values of the American people.

I do not believe elected leaders serve our country well if they deny any of our citizens these choices. A person's success or failure must depend on their qualifications, skills, effort, and sometimes even luck. Most important, their fate should rest on having the opportunity to test these things. No one, not one person, should be denied opportunity because of their race, their religion, their gender, or their sexual orientation.

I know that historic debates such as this one have been very hard, but I say to my colleagues, change is never easy

and we should let our past successes be our guide in the future.

Thirty-five years ago, our national conscience was challenged like never before as the civil rights movement blossomed. By passing the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we made unquestionable progress toward ensuring equality for all citizens. Today, none among us would deny that we did the right thing by outlawing discrimination based on race. We know we did the right thing by guaranteeing the civil rights of women, racial minorities, and members of every religion. The same must be done in this case.

So we can be justifiably proud of our rich history of protecting civil rights, and we should dedicate ourselves to doing better. And make no mistake, we can do better. To my colleagues, I offer this caution: Do not be convinced by those who argue that discrimination is no longer a problem in the workplace.

Every day, citizens of this Nation somewhere feel the sinister burn of job discrimination, be they women, racial minorities, or gays and lesbians. And unlike the rest of America, this latter group cannot today count on the protection of Federal law to ensure equal opportunity in the workplace.

I recently heard the story of a woman named Nan Miguel who worked for a hospital in my home State of Washington as an administrator in the radiology department. She oversaw a small staff and worked very hard at her job. Three years ago, she hired a woman she believed was the most qualified candidate for an x-ray technician's position. She did this despite pressure from certain staff members who believed that the woman she wanted to hire was a lesbian. The new employee went on to work hard and did an excellent job, just as Nan expected she would.

Unfortunately, it did not end there. One coworker in particular was opposed to working with a woman because of the rumors about her sexual orientation. Nan sought help from senior management in resolving this issue, but to her shock, they told her that the coworker must simply be responding to the discord created by the technician.

Her employee's job performance was strong and, therefore, she felt it wrong to fire her. Instead, she continued to try and find a solution. In the end, the hospital told Nan that it would be easier for them to remove her than to remove her coworker. Nan was placed on administrative leave and subsequently fired. A short time later, the technician was fired as well. Only the worker who displayed intolerance on the job stayed on the job.

If the same situation had occurred because the technician was Hispanic, because she was a woman, or because she belonged to the Mormon Church, the same outcome could not have happened. We would not even be talking about it, because today no one would question the competence of an employee based on those characteristics,