

land use programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2186. A bill to provide access to health care insurance coverage for children; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Res. 307. A resolution electing Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 308. A resolution notifying the President of the United States of the election of Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 309. A resolution notifying the House of Representatives of the election of Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. NICKLES):

S. Res. 310. A resolution commending Kelly D. Johnston for his service to the U.S. Senate; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2184. A bill to require the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration to issue regulations limiting the advertising of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco over the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE TOBACCO-FREE CHILDREN'S INTERNET ACT OF 1996

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I introduce the Tobacco-Free Children's Internet Act of 1996, a bill to protect children from the health hazards of tobacco by extending to the Internet existing limitations on tobacco advertisements.

Mr. President, countless studies have demonstrated the persuasive effect that tobacco advertising has on minors. This advertising encourages young people to smoke, which in turn leads to more lung cancer, more heart disease, and more death. As a result, the Food and Drug Administration has now decided to limit tobacco advertising in publications with a significant readership under age 18 to black-and-white text only. This is a significant, positive step, and should substantially reduce the effectiveness of such advertising in appealing to children.

Mr. President, the Internet provides unprecedented access to information to persons of all ages. I believe that the widespread use of the Internet should be encouraged. However, certain material, such as tobacco advertising, is not appropriate for children. In addition to the eye-catching images common in tobacco print advertisements and billboards, cigarette and smokeless to-

bacco ads on the Internet have one feature exclusive to this medium—they can be interactive.

The indiscriminate bombardment of advertisements on the Internet is also troubling if tobacco ads on this medium are not subject to FDA regulations. To view certain ads, a child need only sign onto an Internet provider. If an online provider decides to use a tobacco advertisement for one of its so-called banner ads, there is no doubt that children will see it. Similarly, a child browsing the World Wide Web for a research project on camels could end up viewing over 300 web pages about or mentioning Joe Camel merely by typing camel on an Internet search program.

I therefore believe restrictions on tobacco advertising should be extended to the Internet. Minors comprise a large percentage of Internet users in our country and this number is increasing. Although this is a welcome indication that our youth has access to information that may not be available at their local library or at their school, I am concerned that minors may be especially affected by interactive tobacco ads.

Mr. President, I understand that the FDA was reluctant to extend their advertising restrictions to the Internet in their last rulemaking because they believed tobacco companies had not yet exploited this medium. It is true that the majority of tobacco ads currently on the Internet are posted by foreigners; however, I am confident that this situation will not last. The Internet is a veritable wild West to the tobacco industry seeking to hook children.

It is my hope that, in addition to applying applicable tobacco regulations to the Internet, the FDA, perhaps in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, will develop an effective means of implementing the Surgeon General's warning to Internet advertisements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be placed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2184

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 "Tobacco-Free Children's Internet Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) CHILD.—The term "child" means an individual who has not attained the age of 18.

(2) CIGARETTE.—The term "cigarette" means any roll of tobacco wrapped in—

(A) paper or any substance not containing tobacco; or

(B) tobacco if, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling, the roll wrapped in tobacco is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as a cigarette.

(3) COMMISSIONER.—The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

(4) INTERNET; INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The terms "Internet" and "interactive computer service" have the meaning given those terms in section 230(e) of the communications Act of 1934.

(5) SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—The term "smokeless tobacco" means any cut, ground, powdered, or leaf tobacco that, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as a tobacco product to be placed in the oral or nasal cavity.

SEC. 2. REGULATIONS.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall issue regulations limiting the advertising of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco over the Internet or other interactive computer service within the United States in a manner consistent with the regulations issued by the Commissioner on August 28, 1996, at 61 Fed. Reg. 44396 et seq. •

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2185. A bill to improve Federal environmental policy by providing incentives for State and local growth management and land use programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE LOCAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT INCENTIVES ACT

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in this Congress about assaults on our environment. But up until now, a serious, stealth assault that threatens our environment, our citizens' health, and quality of life has been essentially ignored.

The threat I am referring to arises not from action that this Congress has taken. Rather, it comes from decades of Federal inaction in the face of haphazard development activities that are slowly degrading the landscape of our states and our communities.

Mr. President, what I am referring to is the wholesale strip malling of America.

If this trend continues unchecked, it will imperil our Nation's productive lands and natural resources, while turning the landscape into an unbroken expanse of suburban sprawl.

This pattern of sprawling, uncontrolled development is in many instances promoted by the Federal Government. Despite the major impacts many Federal programs have on growth and land use, the Federal Government has largely turned a blind eye to the visual blight these programs spawn, let alone the environmental, health and economic impacts of unmanaged growth and development.

Besides turning our landscapes into eyesores, unmanaged growth contributes to traffic congestion that snarls our highways, creating both additional stresses for commuters and additional exhaust emissions that degrade the quality of our air.

Uncontrolled development not only hurts our citizens where they live and breathe, it also hits them in their wallets. Several studies have come out that show the costs of sprawling growth are significantly higher than

more compact, managed growth patterns. These studies show that taxpayers can save billions of dollars in public facility capital construction and operation and maintenance costs by opting for growth management.

Time and time again, I'm asked at town meetings what I can do at the Federal level to help manage growth in my home State of Oregon, so our State doesn't get overrun by suburban sprawl.

The answer, Mr. President, is not to create a new Federal program that will embroil the Federal Government in land use decisions that have historically been State and local issues. Rather, what we should do is create incentives to encourage and build on the State and local growth management efforts already underway.

For example, Oregon's pioneering Land Use Act builds environmental and resource protections into the State's growth management and development strategies. But our State gets no credit for this innovative program from the Federal Government.

As a result, Federal development projects in Oregon have to undergo Federal reviews that in many cases duplicate the process under State law. That's bureaucratic overkill.

Oregon and other States that have similar programs should be recognized by the Federal Government both when new Federal development projects are undertaken in these States and when new Federal requirements are imposed.

Today, I am introducing the Local Growth Management Incentives Act. This legislation will give Oregon and other States and localities with good growth management programs the credit they deserve.

Under this legislation, States that have good growth management programs will get several incentives.

First, the legislation directs Federal agencies to take steps to eliminate duplication of studies, environmental assessments, planning and other activities to the extent these actions have already been undertaken under a State or local growth management plan.

Because the State of Oregon and many cities in our State have environmentally protective growth management programs, development projects in our State frequently have to go through layers of duplicative environmental reviews—first at the local level, and then at the State level, and then again at the Federal level. In some cases, virtually identical environmental analyses are required by the different levels of government, each according to different sets of regulations.

Let me cite several examples affecting the Port of Portland in Portland, OR:

The Port of Portland's proposed development of additional marine terminals at Hayden Island in the Columbia River has already undergone extensive reviews and analysis by the city of Portland and by our State agencies. But in order for this project to proceed

to the actual development stage, it still must undergo still another round of reviews by two Federal agencies—the Army Corps of Engineers and the National Marine Fisheries Service. The port estimates that if it could just eliminate the duplicative requirements, two or more years of unnecessary delay could be avoided for this project.

The port's efforts to identify better ways of handling materials dredged from around its docks and piers and from the Willamette River navigation channel is subject to two virtually identical, essentially independent environmental analyses, one by the State of Oregon and another by the Corps of Engineers. Avoiding duplication by allowing the Corps of Engineers to rely upon the State analysis could save considerable money for both the port and the Corps and expedite this project.

The port is currently planning further development and expansion at the Portland International Airport, the port's marine terminals, and several port-owned general aviation airports, all of which contain wetland areas. These activities could be facilitated, without diminishing environmental protections, if the State of Oregon's extensive process for addressing the environmental impacts associated with wetlands could be relied upon by the appropriate Federal agencies.

Under my legislation, Federal agencies would have to incorporate, as part of the reviews they require, any relevant reviews and analyses already conducted under State and local programs. This would save the project sponsors considerable time and expense compared to starting the Federal reviews essentially from scratch.

The net effect of this provision is that Federal development projects reviewed and approved under good State and local programs can avoid redundant Federal reviews that increase costs and cause delays with no environmental benefits. If environmental safeguards are already in place under State law, these protections should be recognized when it comes time to develop federally supported projects in the State.

Second, States and localities with good growth management programs will be eligible for extensions of up to 1 year to comply with new Federal requirements, when this additional time is needed to integrate a new Federal requirement with the State or local growth management program. However, additional time would not be provided if an extension of time would adversely affect public health or the environment.

This incentive recognizes that good growth management programs offer a more comprehensive and more long-term approach to protecting our environment than many of the specific requirements imposed by Federal environmental programs. At the same time, coordinating Federal requirements with State and local programs is

hard work, as two leading growth management experts point out in their recent book "Land Use in America." For this reason, we should give those States and localities that are undertaking this difficult, but ultimately rewarding effort the extra time they need to do it right.

The same amount of additional time granted to the State or locality would also be provided to any private party in that jurisdiction who is subject to a compliance deadline under the new Federal requirement, unless this would adversely affect public health or the environment. While States and localities are working to meld their programs with Federal requirements, private parties should not be subject to double jeopardy by having to comply first with a Federal requirement and then subsequently with a different requirement after the State or locality modifies its program to meet the new Federal mandate.

Third, Federal agencies conducting development projects and other activities affecting growth must ensure that their activities are consistent with States' and localities' growth management programs. This provision, which is modeled on a similar consistency requirement in the Coastal Zone Management Act, empowers States and localities by giving them the ability to affect Federal activities that could undermine State and local efforts to manage growth locally.

Fourth, my legislation amends the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] to give priority for discretionary spending under ISTEA to any State or locality that has a growth management program that meets the eligibility criteria set out in the bill. Giving States and localities with good growth management programs priority for ISTEA funding will not only provide a financial incentive to establish these programs, it will also help reduce Federal, State, and local transportation costs and even help reduce air pollution from motor vehicles.

The legislation I am introducing is the beginning and not the end of a process. It is my hope that the Local Growth Management Incentives Act will begin a discussion on what the Federal Government should be doing to address the impacts Federal actions have on growth and land use. In the next Congress, I will be looking for additional incentives to offer States and localities so they will develop their own programs to manage growth.

In summary, I think there is an appropriate role for the Federal Government to help States and localities to manage growth so we have smart growth, instead of either uncontrolled sprawl or NIMBY [Not In My Back Yard] efforts to block any kind of growth. I am introducing my legislation today in an effort to jumpstart a dialog on how the Federal Government can promote well-managed, sustainable growth that will best serve our environment, our citizens' health and, our

Nation's economic well-being in the 21st century.●

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2186. A bill to provide access to health care insurance coverage for children; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE HEALTHY CHILDREN FAMILY ASSISTANCE
HEALTH INSURANCE ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce legislation today, joined by my friend, colleague, and esteemed senior Senator, TED KENNEDY, to help ensure that the 10 million uninsured children in this country get the health care they need and their parents get the peace of mind they deserve.

Mr. President, the fact is that most of these 10 million uninsured children have parents who work—90 percent of these uninsured children have parents who work, according to the General Accounting Office [GAO]. And three out of five of these children have parents who work fulltime during the entire year.

Unfortunately, the problem of uninsured children is getting worse, not better—each year, more than 1 million additional children lose private insurance. No parent should have to choose between medicine for a sick child and food for the family. The thought of a mother and father, working hard to make ends meet, waking up in the middle of the night with a child in pain, and waiting to see if the pain passes because they cannot afford to go to the hospital, is a stark image of a national tragedy. Mr. President, American children without health care are alone in the world—we are the only Western industrialized nation that does not provide health care for every child.

I am proposing today with Senator KENNEDY a voluntary subsidy program to help working families to purchase private health insurance for their children. Only families with incomes too high to qualify for Medicaid would be eligible to receive these vouchers. Participation in the voucher program would be voluntary. The premium subsidy would be provided on a sliding scale with families earning 185 percent or less of the poverty line receiving the full subsidy; the subsidy would phase down so that families earning more than 300 percent of the poverty line would not receive a subsidy. Cost-sharing would be limited but everyone would pay something. The proposal includes a comprehensive benefits package with a full range of the essential services needed by children. The total cost of the plan is \$24 billion over 5 years and is paid for by a combination of cuts in corporate welfare and a tobacco tax increase. Although it is apparent there is no chance the plan will be enacted this year, with Congress now in its final hour before adjourning prior to the election, we are introducing it as a bill today because we want to place this issue prominently on the national agenda during the next few

months preceding convening of the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, I want to discuss 2 of the 10 million compelling reasons to provide basic health insurance to children who are not covered now.

One of the first reasons is a 13-year-old student in Lynn, MA, named Costa Billias. He played football at Breed Junior High and loved the game, but said, "For the past 2 years I gave my best to football, but my mom explained that we were not insured and if I got hurt we would lose our house and everything we own to pay the hospital." He quit the team, but he cannot quit life. If he gets hurt doing something else, his family still stands to lose everything. In addition, I think it is wrong that Costa Billias is being denied the opportunity to play football again.

One more of the 10 million reasons we must pass this bill is the Pierce family. Jim and Sylvia Pierce were married in 1980 and live in Everett, MA. Jim was a plumber and they had three children, Leonard, Brianna, and Alyssa. In October 1993, Sylvia was pregnant with her fourth child when Jim was tragically killed on his way home from the store. In that one horrible minute her life changed forever. She not only lost her husband, but, pregnant and alone, she lost her health insurance as well. Her survivor's benefits made her income too high to qualify for long-term Medicaid, and too low to pay the \$400 a month it would take to extend her husband's health plan. Sylvia said, "I've always taken good care of my children. I feed them well; I take them to the doctors immediately when they need it. All of a sudden I couldn't do that anymore.

Mr. President, in addition to the moral imperative, the scientific evidence is overwhelming that lack of health coverage is bad for children, delaying medical care or making it impossible to get. A recent study in JAMA [the Journal of the American Medical Association] found that children with health coverage gaps were more likely to lack a continuing and regular source of health care—even when factors such as family income, chronic illness, and family mobility were factored out. Numerous studies by university researchers and by government agencies show that the uninsured are less likely to receive preventive care (such as immunizations for children), more likely to go to emergency rooms for their care, more likely to be hospitalized for conditions that could have been avoided with proper preventive care, and more likely to have longer hospital stays than individuals with health insurance coverage.

Mr. President, every hour we wait to take this step, another 114 children lose private health insurance. Every 30 seconds we wait, another child loses private health insurance. America's children cannot wait any longer. Families without insurance are forced to pay the full cost of medical services—

an impossible burden for struggling families, one that often takes a back seat to putting food on the table and a roof over the children's heads.

Mr. President, this plan is an important, incremental step toward guaranteeing health coverage for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is an honor to join Senator JOHN KERRY in introducing this visionary and practical program. Senator KERRY has been a consistent leader in the Senate in fighting for children, for health care, and for working families. This initiative sets a benchmark for the next Congress and the American people. It is a proposal that is a reflection of true family values.

Every American child deserves a healthy start in life, but too many don't receive it. Seventeen industrialized countries do better at preventing infant mortality than we do. A quarter of American children do not receive basic childhood vaccines. Every day, 636 babies are born to mothers who receive inadequate prenatal care, 56 babies die before they are a month old, and 110 babies die before they are a year old.

Access to affordable health care is one of the greatest problems children face. Ten-and-a-half million children under the age of 19 have no health insurance—one in every seven American children. If it were not for the expansions of Medicaid over the past 5 years, the number would be seven million higher. Under Republican proposals to cut Medicaid, four million children would lose their coverage. Employer-based insurance coverage is eroding. Too many pregnant women—more than 400,000 a year—are uninsured, and lack access to critical prenatal care.

Almost all uninsured children are members of working families. Their parents work hard—40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. But all their hard work does not buy their children the protection they deserve. Every family should have the right to health security for their children. No parents should fear that the loss of a job or their employer's failure to provide coverage will put their children out of reach of the health care they need.

Health insurance coverage for every child is a needed step in the fight to guarantee health care for every family. The cost is affordable. The benefits are great. The opportunities for bipartisanship are substantial.

The legislation we are introducing today is a simple, practical proposal. It imposes no new government mandates on the States or the private sector. It does not substitute for family responsibility. It fosters it, instead, by assuring that every family has the help it needs to purchase affordable health insurance for their children.

Our plan will establish no massive new Federal bureaucracy. Basic guidelines and financing would come from the Federal Government, but the plan

would be implemented and administered by States.

The program will make a major difference in the lives of millions of families, but its basic principles are not novel or untested. Fourteen States already have similar programs in place and running. Earlier their year, for example, Massachusetts enacted a program very similar to our proposal.

Under our plan, the Federal Government will assist all families with incomes under 300 percent of poverty to purchase health insurance for their children, if they do not already receive coverage under an existing public program. Families with incomes under 185 percent of poverty will receive a full subsidy. Families with incomes between 185 percent of and 300 percent of poverty will receive assistance on a sliding scale. Between 80 and 90 percent of all uninsured children live in families with incomes below 300 percent of poverty. Even uninsured families with higher incomes might buy coverage for their children if policies designed for children were available. Families with income under 150 percent of poverty will also receive assistance with the cost of copayments and deductibles. Similar assistance will be provided to uninsured pregnant women.

The program will be administered by States under Federal guidelines. In general, States will contract with private insurance companies to offer children's coverage to any family that wants it. Lower income families will receive assistance with the cost of coverage, but coverage will be available to all families at all income levels. Basic rules will guarantee that coverage is adequate and tailored to the special needs of children, especially the need for comprehensive preventive care.

This plan does not guarantee that every child will have insurance coverage, but it gives the opportunity to every family to cover their children at a cost the family can probably afford. It will be a giant step toward the day when every member of every American family has true health security.

The cost of a similar program has been estimated at \$24 billion over 5 years. We propose to finance our plan by a combination of tobacco tax increases and closing corporate tax loopholes. The Nation currently spends close to \$1 trillion per year on health care. The additional cost of this proposal is substantial, but it is a needed step toward healthier lives for millions of American children and peace of mind for their parents.

In this Congress, we made substantial progress toward improving the health care system. We turned back extreme proposals to slash Medicare and Medicaid. Working together in a bipartisan way, we were able to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy Health Insurance Reform Act, take a significant first step toward mental health parity, and protect mothers and infants from premature discharge from the hospital. Every Democratic and Republican

health plan in the previous Congress endorsed the idea of subsidizing private insurance coverage for children. This proposal should be a bipartisan health priority for the next Congress. I believe it is an idea whose time has finally come.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1178

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. FRAHM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1178, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of colorectal screening under part B of the Medicare Program.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. FRAHM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of periodic colorectal screening services under part B of the Medicare Program.

S. 2030

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2030, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, non-repairable, and rebuilt vehicles, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 73

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73, a concurrent resolution concerning the return of or compensation for wrongly confiscated foreign properties in formerly Communist countries and by certain foreign financial institutions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 307—ELECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

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

S. RES. 307

Resolved, That Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee be and he is hereby elected Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 308—A NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

S. RES. 308

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Gary Lee

Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 309—A NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

S. RES. 309

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 310—COMMENDING KELLY D. JOHNSTON FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. NICKLES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 310

Whereas Kelly D. Johnston faithfully served the Senate of the United States as Secretary of the Senate during the 104th Congress, and discharged the duties and responsibilities of that office with unflinching dedication and a high degree of efficiency; and

Whereas, as an elected officer of the Senate and as an employee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, Kelly D. Johnston has upheld the high standards and traditions of the United States Congress, from his service on the staff of the House of Representatives from the 96th through the 101st Congress and then on the staff of the Senate from the 102nd through the 104th Congress; and

Whereas, through his exceptional service and professional integrity as an officer and employee of the Senate of the United States, Kelly D. Johnston has earned the high esteem, confidence and trust of his associates and the Members of the Senate:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the notable contributions of Kelly D. Johnston to the Senate and to his country and expresses to him its appreciation and gratitude for faithful and outstanding service.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996 AMENDMENT ACT

DASCHLE AMENDMENT NO. 5424

Mr. MURKOWSKI (for Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2183) to make technical corrections to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.

Section 11 of the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Act (Public Law 103-318; 7 U.S.C. 2661 note) is amended by striking