

concerned about growth in Government bureaucracy.

I am particularly concerned by the fact that the intelligence conferees have decided to establish four new senior positions under the Director of Central Intelligence, all requiring Senate confirmation. In addition to a new Deputy Director, which the administration requested, the Intelligence Conferees have agreed to create three new Assistant Directors of Central Intelligence. The administration has clearly indicated its opposition to the establishment of these Assistant Director positions.

In my view, this is an unnecessary expansion of bureaucracy at a time when virtually every other area of Government is shrinking. There is no evidence that I am aware of to justify this growth. The Presidential commission that just completed its study of these matters, the Brown Commission, did not make such a recommendation, nor has the Director of Central Intelligence.

Since the organization of the Office of the Director of Central Intelligence does not come under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN and I have not sought to oppose the establishment of these new positions on behalf of the Armed Services Committee, even though we agree that the case for their creation is not compelling. In the areas where the Armed Services Committee does have jurisdiction, the intelligence conference report has been adjusted to address concerns that Senator NUNN and I raised on behalf of the Armed Services Committee and the Department of Defense. Since the Intelligence Conferees addressed these concerns in a satisfactory manner, Senator NUNN and I have agreed not to oppose the intelligence conference report.

Notwithstanding our general satisfaction with the intelligence authorization conference report, Senator NUNN joins me in registering opposition to what we view as an unwarranted expansion of intelligence bureaucracy. It is my intent to follow this matter closely in the future. The executive branch may choose not to fill these positions. Nevertheless, I plan to reexamine the legislation establishing these new positions during the 105th Congress.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the conference report appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

ANIMAL DRUG AVAILABILITY ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2508, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2508) to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to provide for improvements in the process of approving and using animal drugs, and for other purposes.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 2508) was deemed read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate turn to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 295.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 295) to designate October 18, 1996, as "National Mammography Day."

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the preamble be agreed to, en bloc, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 295) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 295

Whereas according to the American Cancer Society, 184,300 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in 1996, and 44,300 women will die from this disease;

Whereas in the decade of the 1990's, it is estimated that about 2,000,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, resulting in nearly 500,000 deaths;

Whereas, the risk of breast cancer increases with age, with a woman at age 70 having twice as much of a chance of developing the disease than a woman at age 50;

Whereas, at least 80 percent of the women who get breast cancer have no family history of the disease;

Whereas, mammograms, when operated professionally at a certified facility, can provide a safe and quick diagnosis;

Whereas, experts agree that mammography is the best method of early detection of breast cancer, and early detection is the key to saving lives; and

Whereas, mammograms can reveal the presence of small cancers of up to 2 years or more before regular clinical breast examination or breast self-examination (BSE), saving as many as 30 percent more lives: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved, That the Senate designates October 18, 1996, as "National Mammography Day". The Senate requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs and activities.

AUTHORITY TO PRINT REPORT AS SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report mandated by Public Law 101-423, entitled "Final Report to Congress on the Joint Resolution to Establish a National Policy on Permanent Papers," be printed as a Senate document, and I ask further that 300 additional copies be made available for use of the Joint Committee on the Library.

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

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues—especially those who co-sponsored my legislation establishing a national policy on permanent paper—the final mandated report to the Congress on progress in reaching the objectives of that policy. That legislation, which became Public Law 101-423 on October 12, 1990, stated that:

It is the policy of the United States that Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value be produced on acid free permanent papers.

The Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and the Public Printer were required to make three progress reports to the Congress over a 5 year period, and the last of these has now been made, reporting developments through 1995. This latest report is a record of remarkable progress and I am pleased that it will be printed as a Senate document.

When I first introduced a permanent paper bill in October 1988, almost all documents and publications produced by the Federal Government or by Federal funds were on acidic papers with a useful life of less than 100 years. These papers had been in general use since the mid-19th century. The Federal Government was not unique. State and local governments and private publishers all used such papers.

Librarians and archivists had for some time expressed their concerns about the loss of irreplaceable historical, cultural and scientific books, publications and other records. Many millions of dollars were already being spent by research libraries, foundations, and State and Federal governments either to save these materials by deacidification or to preserve their contents by microfilming—both costly processes.

I might note that when the present Librarian of Congress, James H. Billington, appeared before the Senate

Committee on Rules and Administration for his confirmation hearing on July 14, 1987, he described at considerable length the deterioration of the holdings of our national library. In response to our questions, he told us that he regarded the problem of "brittle books" as a major one, both retrospectively, in terms of salvaging the records of the last century and a half, and prospectively, in terms of preventing continuation of the problem. He spoke of the need for "mobilizing informed opinion to assure that we get a better response from those who publish, so that this problem is not with us in the future."

It was by no coincidence that an active campaign to "mobilize informed opinion" ensued thereafter. Many people throughout the library community were actively involved, but I would particularly like to cite the efforts of Robert Frase, former vice president and economist of the Association of American Publishers. Mr. Frase was instrumental in conceiving and helping to bring to fruition the resolution to establish a National Policy on Permanent Paper, which as I indicated, was first introduced in 1988.

Looking back at the short span of eight years since that time, one is struck by the relatively low level of activity in permanent paper production that then prevailed. Research had demonstrated that the deterioration of papers produced from mid-19th century onward was caused by chemicals in a process using wood pulp rather than rags as raw material. The resulting acidic papers began to yellow and crumble (hence the term "brittle books") within a few decades, while the earlier rag papers continued to last for centuries. Research financed by the Council on Library Resources and others, however, had demonstrated that wood pulp based papers could be produced by an alkaline process, resulting in estimated useful lives comparable with the old rag papers. A small amount of such papers was actually being produced.

What was required at that point was an increased awareness of the problem and a dramatic demonstration that something was going to be done about it. This would then lead to an increased demand for new papers, and in turn induce paper mills to convert to an alkaline process. Increased production would result in lower costs and prices competitive with acidic papers. The American Library Association started the ball rolling by passing its first resolution on this subject in January 1988. After my first bill was introduced in October of that year it was promptly endorsed by another ALA resolution in early 1989. This led to similar resolutions by other U.S. organizations and then by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions [IFLA] and the International Publishers Association later in 1989.

A big and prominent institution was needed to provide the impact of taking

the first step into an action program, and the U.S. Government was an obvious choice. Its responsible agencies—the Library of Congress and National Archives—were well aware of the issues and the enormous problems and costs which were building up for the future unless alkaline paper came into general use; it was the world's largest producer of publications and documents; and its example would have a profound influence both at home and abroad. These were the considerations that led to the introduction of the bills that became Public Law 101-423—my Senate Joint Resolution 57 and Representative PAT WILLIAMS' House Joint Resolution 226, both in early 1989.

Public Law 101-423 did not mandate the use of alkaline papers by Federal agencies. To have done so would have been impractical because the supply of such papers was limited and the price uncompetitive. But by establishing a policy and a goal, it set a process in motion which in a period of a few years would achieve the same results.

An important technical prerequisite to realizing the goal was the establishment of a clear definition of the term "acid free permanent paper." Since the most important factor in paper deterioration is acidity any long-lived paper must be acid free, or alkaline. To be permanent, however, a paper must conform to additional technical specifications, the most widely recognized of which is designated as the American National Standard and often referred to by the acronym ANSI/NISO. The technical designation is "American National Standard for Permanence of Paper for Publications and Documents in Libraries and Archives, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992." As a practical matter, companies deciding to produce alkaline paper can easily take the small further steps required to produce permanent paper meeting the ANSI/NISO standard.

An important feature of Public Law 101-423 was a monitoring device to help ensure that the national policy was actually being carried out, and that device is the requirement that three progress reports be made to the Congress on December 31, 1991, 1993, and 1995, by the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and the Public Printer. Although the 1995 report is the last to be required by law, these three officials have stated their intention to continue to monitor progress in achieving the goals of the legislation on an ad hoc basis. I welcome their decision, a sentiment I am sure is shared by the many members of Congress who have taken an interest in this matter, as well as those in the library, archival, scholarly and historical professions throughout the world. I urge that these progress reports continue to be issued every 2 years through the rest of this century.

PROGRESS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Since Public Law 101-423 focused on the production of Federal records, books and publications of enduring

value on acid-free permanent paper, I am very pleased to note that the third report documents a number of very encouraging developments in this regard. Here are some of the most notable:

The National Archives and Records administration has circulated widely bulletin No. 95-7, Procurement of Writing, Copying, and Printing Papers for Federal Records, which provides guidance to Federal agencies in the use of alkaline and permanent papers. Permanent or alkaline papers are recommended for all Federal records; at least alkaline for routine use; and permanent in offices that create and file a high proportion of long-term and permanent records.

There has been a notable increase in the availability of permanent and alkaline paper for Government use. When Public Law was enacted in 1990, the Joint Committee on Printing listed only one grade of permanent paper. In 1995 it had four; plus 16 grades of alkaline paper.

The General Services Administration provides papers for purchase by Federal agencies that match the standards set by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The executive branch has ruled that the requirements of Executive Order 12873 mandating the use of recycled paper by Federal agencies are not to conflict in any way with the concurrent requirement for permanent paper use.

The National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Historical Records Commission mandate the use of permanent and alkaline papers in projects they fund.

The National Library of Medicine has carried on a remarkably successful, and little recognized, campaign to ensure that the world's biomedical journals are printed on alkaline or permanent paper. This effort was started in 1988. Then only 4 percent of the 3,000 journals throughout the world that were indexed in the Library's Index Medicus were being printed on alkaline paper. Due in large part to the Library's campaign, this figure had risen by April 1995 to 91 percent.

PROGRESS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The ultimate success of the permanent paper campaign depends on inducing changes in the nongovernmental sector. Governments—Federal, State, and local—primarily produce documents, many of which, of course, need to be preserved. But publications, the carriers of our literature, culture, history and science, are overwhelmingly produced by private publishers, profit and nonprofit. These publishers had to be persuaded to use permanent paper and the paper mills had to be persuaded to produce it. Publishers would not use permanent paper, even if they thought they should, because it was not easily available at competitive prices. Paper manufacturing companies saw no reason to shift to an alkaline process lacking a strong demand from publishers.

It was here that the development of standards for permanent paper played

an important role. These were developed primarily in the private sector by a collaborative effort of profit and non-profit organizations, but with participation also of Government agencies. Such standards enable publishers to state their permanent paper requirements without having to develop, by themselves, the specifications included in their paper purchasing contracts. We have already taken note of the 1992 American National Standard ANSI/NISO, which was first developed by the library and publishing committee of the American National Standards Institute in 1984 and subsequently revised and expanded in 1992. Standards had also been developed by the American Society for Testing and Materials and the Council on Library Resources. Since publishing, paper manufacturing, and libraries are not confined to national boundaries, it was appropriate that an international standard for permanent paper compatible with the American standard should be published in 1994.

In the spring of 1988, the New York Public Library began a campaign, jointly with well-known authors, to get book publishers to use alkaline or permanent paper. Public pledges to this effect were secured from prominent publishing houses. The industry trade group, the Association of American Publishers, gave its endorsement to the campaign. University presses—publishers of scholarly, scientific, and historical works, had earlier recognized the problem of paper deterioration and had begun to use alkaline paper for their relatively small editions. They have not only been the most faithful in doing so, but also in noting this fact in the books themselves and in the bibliographic information provided to the Library of Congress under the Cataloging in Publication program.

But the most gratifying development in the private sector in the past several years has been the great increase in the production of permanent papers in the United States and Canada. A 1988 report of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment had estimated that only 15 to 25 percent of the books produced in the United States were on acid-free paper and predicted that this percentage was unlikely to change. It now appears that this prediction has proven to be unduly cautious.

Two indications of this production increase may be noted. The first is the fact that 99.9 percent of book papers procured through bulk purchase by the Government Printing Office in 1995 were alkaline. The second is the information provided in North American Permanent Papers 1995, published as a public service by Abbey Publications of Austin, Texas. This catalog of papers produced by 34 United States and Canadian companies lists by brand name 423 different papers that are reported to meet the specifications of the 1994 ANSI/NISO permanent paper standard.

The great increase in permanent paper production has come about pri-

marily through the conversion of existing paper mills from acid to alkaline processes, a shift encouraged by regulations issued under the Clean Water Act, requiring the reduction of pollution of streams by the effluent of paper mills. Conversion to an alkaline process reduces this pollution, but also results in the production of paper at the same or lesser cost. The happy result was that environmental preservation helped to promote the availability of acid-free paper.

PROGRESS IN THE STATES

Connecticut led the way to conversion to permanent paper at the State level. As a result of a campaign led by the State Librarian, the first statute was enacted in 1988. Subsequently additional legislation extended the use long-lived paper to most State and local documents. In later years many other States took action, either by legislation or administrative rulings, to require alkaline or permanent paper use to some degree. But few went as far as Connecticut. The progress of State legislation was stimulated by three letters to State Governors from the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Services calling attention to developments under the Federal law and requesting information on State activity. The last such survey, jointly with the Library of Congress, was conducted in July 1995. In the third report the following 21 States were listed as having taken some kind of action: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Utah has now been added to that list.

INTERNATIONAL

The international library community had long been aware of the problem of brittle books. The subject was discussed as early as the 1920's at a conference in Europe. It was not until 1989, however, that the first resolution urging action was adopted by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions [IFLA]. A similar resolution was adopted that same year by the International Association of Publishers. Note has already been taken of the impact of the program of the U.S. National Library of Medicine on biomedical journals throughout the world.

Nevertheless, until recently European publishers and governments lagged behind this country. A 1993 survey of 142 publishers in 17 European countries reported that: 31 did not know that most currently used book paper becomes brittle after 50 years; and 90 were unaware of the ANSI/NISO permanent paper standards. Governments, with some notable exceptions, have been slow to require the use permanent paper by legislation or administrative regulations, even with respect to their own publications and documents. The same has been true of the

agencies of the United Nations. But in the last couple of years the pace has picked up. A number of European organizations, both official and private, are now actively promoting permanent paper. European paper manufactures contributed to a 1994 catalog listing about 100 different permanent papers being sold by 26 paper mills or their agents—papers meeting the specifications of the 1992 American National Standard.

SUMMARY

It is now 9 years since I first raised the question with Librarian of Congress Billington as to whether something could not be done to bring to an end the indefinite production of brittle books. Enormous progress been made—at least in the United States, in Canada, in much of Europe, and in Japan—in the production of books, other publications, and documents on paper which should endure for several centuries, instead of self-destructing in less than 100 years. Many individuals and organizations, public and private, have contributed to this result—some known to me and others not. I note once again the efforts of Robert Frase in this connection. We owe them all a debt of gratitude. I celebrate the fact that the Congress and Federal agencies have made major contributions to this progress in a variety of ways, not the least of which has been through the passage and the implementation of Public Law 101-423 to establish a National Policy on Permanent Papers.

EXTRADITION OF MARTIN PANG FROM BRAZIL TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 132, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 132) relating to the extradition of Martin Pang from Brazil to the United States.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on January 5, 1995, four firefighters were killed in a blaze in Seattle's International District. After intensive investigations by the Seattle police and fire departments, the King County Prosecutor's Office, the U.S. Attorney General's Office, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Martin S. Pang was charged with deliberately setting his parents' seafood warehouse on fire to collect insurance money. In January of 1995, Mr. Pang fled to Brazil where he stayed until March 1, 1996. He was extradited on the condition that murder charges not be brought against him.