

1996; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2263. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed rescissions of budgetary resources; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2264. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of activities for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2265. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to requests for extraordinary contractual relief; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2266. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to foreign aviation authorities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2267. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2268. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Aviation System Capital Investment Plan; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2269. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of accomplishments during fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2270. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to export vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2271. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Department of Transportation Regulatory Reform Act of 1996"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2272. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on waste disposal sites; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2273. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled "The Automotive Fuel Economy Program"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2274. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Airport Improvement Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2275. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tanker simulator training; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2276. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tanker navigation safety standards; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2277. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the evaluation of oil tanker routing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 811. A bill to authorize research into the desalinization and reclamation of water and authorize a program for States, cities, or qualifying agencies desiring to own and operate a water desalinization or reclamation facility to develop such facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-254).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. Stevens, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

Robert E. Morin, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 1682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Liberty*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1683. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to regard adult relatives who meet State child protection standards as the preferred placement option for children, and to provide for demonstration projects to test the feasibility of establishing kinship care as an alternative to foster care for a child who has adult relatives willing to provide safe and appropriate care for the child; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1684. A bill to require that applications for passports for minors have parental signatures; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1685. A bill to provide income and economic security to the American family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. 1686. A bill to provide for early deferred annuities under chapter 83 of Title 5, United

States Code, for certain former Department of Defense employees who are separated from service by reason of certain defense base closures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1687. A bill to provide for annual payments from the surplus funds of the Federal Reserve System to cover the interest on obligations issued by the Financing Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. LUGAR):

S.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. PELL):

S. Res. 248. A resolution relating to the violence in Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1683. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to regard adult relatives who meet State child protection standards as the preferred placement option for children, and to provide for demonstration projects to test the feasibility of establishing kinship care as an alternative to foster care for a child who has adult relatives willing to provide safe and appropriate care for the child; to the Committee on Finance.

THE KINSHIP CARE ACT OF 1996

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I introduce the Kinship Care Act of 1996. Today Representative Connie Morella is introducing companion legislation in the House.

Grandparents caring for grandchildren represent one of the most underappreciated natural resources in our Nation. They hold tremendous potential for curing one of our society's most pressing maladies: The care of children who have no parents, or whose parents simply aren't up to the task of providing children a stable, secure and nurturing living environment.

There is such a great reservoir of love and experience available to us, and more especially to the tens of thousands of American children who desperately need basic care giving. We provide public assistance to strangers for this kind of care, but the folks available to provide foster care homes are in short supply.

At the same time, inflexibility in current regulations often force us to

ignore a precious alternative that is right at our doorstep. Our public policy planners have missed the forest for the trees. Grandparents can fill the gap. They are ready, willing and able to provide the kind of care these youngsters so desperately need.

The legislation I plan to introduce in the Senate today will give States the flexibility to provide the support these grandparents need, so that our seniors can help fill the care gap.

The House included my legislation, similar to today's bill, as part of the welfare reform measure last year. My new legislation will continue the process of shifting the focus of our child welfare system from turning children over to strangers, to granting them the loving arms of grandparents and other relatives.

States have been moving in this direction for over a decade. Over the past 10 years the number of children involved in extended family arrangements has increased by 40 percent. Currently, more than 3 million children are being raised by their grandparents. In other words, 5 percent of all families in this country are headed by grandparents.

It's time that the Federal Government get with the program and start developing policies that make it easier, instead of more difficult, for families to come together to raise their children.

My bill has several parts. The first would require States to give preference to relative providers when a child is removed from their parents' home. Too often I have heard stories of grandparents or other relatives, not finding out that their grandchildren have been removed from their children's home. By the time they know what is happening, the grandchildren are locked into the foster care system.

Often I have heard stories where brothers and sisters are split up and grandparents spend years in court trying to reunite their own families. As we rethink our child protection system, we need to rededicate ourselves to looking to families, including extended families, for solutions. When a child is separated from their parents, it is usually a painful and traumatic experience. Living with people that a child knows and trusts gives children a better chance in the world and gives families a better chance to rebuild themselves.

The second part of my bill allows States to obtain waivers to set up kinship care guardianship systems where grandparents and other relative providers can receive some financial assistance without having to turn over custody of the child to the State, and without having to go through the paperwork and bureaucratic hurdles of the foster care system.

Our child protection system is where our welfare system was about 10 years ago. We know it isn't working well, but States and the Federal Government are still fumbling for solutions. What we

need to do now, as we did for our welfare system, is start opening the door for States to try new ideas to both protect children and keep families together.

As we reevaluate the effectiveness of our country's child protection systems, it's time that we identify new ideas and new ways to find loving environments for our Nation's most vulnerable children. Grandparents can provide the lynchpin for such a new system.●

By Mr. REID:

S. 1684. A bill to require that applications for passports for minors have parental signatures; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE MIKEY KALE PASSPORT NOTIFICATION ACT
OF 1996

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation I intended to offer as an amendment to the immigration bill. Unfortunately, it does not appear I will have the opportunity to offer this as an amendment to that bill. I therefore decided to offer this as a free-standing bill as I believe it is an issue that needs to be addressed whether or not we decide to go back to this bill.

Much of the debate on the immigration legislation involves complex issues and arcane areas of the law. My legislation is pretty easy to understand. It is a common sense legislative solution to a simple, but troubling, issue. The issue my bill attempts to resolve is that of international parental abductions. Significantly, my bill does not attempt to right a wrong. Rather, it attempts to prevent future wrongs from occurring. And there is little dispute that absent legislation, future wrongs will occur.

The wrong that occurs is best illustrated by a living nightmare forced upon an American family from Henderson, NV. No parent should ever have to go through what Fred and Barbara Spierer went through in 1993. That year, on Valentine's Day, Barbara Spierer's ex-husband took her son to his native country, war-torn Croatia. She would soon learn that upon their arrival, her ex-husband initiated official custody proceedings in a Croatian court.

Through tremendous emotional and financial costs, Fred and Barbara Spierer were able to secure the return of young Mikey. Incredibly, this could all have been prevented if our laws didn't permit such easy procurement of passports for minors. Few would disagree that parental consent should be given before a passport is issued to a minor child. Both parents ought to be notified before the State Department issues a document permitting their child to be taken out of this country.

Presently, such joint notification is not required. Under current law, one parent can apply for a U.S. passport for his or her child, receive it, and then depart from the country with that child. Again, this can all be accomplished without the notification of the other parent. Current law is an invitation to

engage in the grossest of misbehavior by a scurrilous parent. And engage in it they do. Sadly, the case of Fred and Barbara Spierer is not an isolated incident.

International parental abductions are a growing problem. In 1994, there were over 600 cases of children being abducted from the U.S.A. Thousands of parents are attempting to bring home their children who were taken from this country by a mother or father. While these cases are tracked by the State Department, children's advocates believe many more go unreported. Often, the children are snatched during a divorce. The abducting parents usually have strong ties to a foreign country. But sometimes an American-born mother or father will take off for an unfamiliar nation to flee U.S. law. Regrettably, such surreptitious travel is made quite easy because of current law. Why? Because one parent can procure the child's passport without the other one knowing.

Left-behind parents are faced with wading through a maze of foreign laws and customs in their efforts to secure their child's return. Imagine how difficult it is to find a missing child in the United States and then multiply it by 1,000. That's about how difficult it is to locate and return a child abducted overseas. And finding a missing child is only the start.

A parent must then take their case to the foreign country's legal system. Most nations do not recognize custody orders from U.S. courts. Even when criminal charges have been filed against the abducting parent in the United States, many nations will not honor a U.S. request for extradition. Some countries simply discriminate against women. The decision to fight for a child's return consumes enormous amounts of time and money. Many parents are simply without the financial wherewithal to engage in a protracted international legal battle.

For a variety of reasons, the Government is able to do very little to assist these parents. The current budgetary constraints realistically preclude doing more to secure the return of abducted children. But they do not preclude efforts to implement additional barriers to prevent these tragic abductions from occurring.

My bill takes cost effective steps toward preventing future abductions. It implements a system of checks prior to the issuance of a minor child's passport. Both parents would be required to sign the passport application of a child under the age of 16. Or, if the parents were already divorced, the application would have to be signed by the parent of the child having primary custody. If such a law had been in place by 1993, Barbara Spierer's ex-husband would not have been able to abduct their child to Croatia. The passport would not have been issued because her written permission had not been given. I believe it is drafted in such a manner so as to give the State Department the

discretion to implement a reasonable and flexible rule.

This bill is not just about parental rights and preventing these tragic international abductions. It is also about protecting the rights of our children. No one disagrees that the rights, liberties and freedoms provided in our Nation make it the best country in the world. No child should be forced to lose these rights. No child should be forced to undergo what Mikey Kale lived through. No American child, regardless of his age, should be abducted to the middle of a war torn part of the world. American parents should not be forced to endure the living nightmare that the Spierers' were forced to go through. If my bill prevents only one family from having to endure this nightmare it will be judged a success. I believe that more can be done but this is the most cost effective step we can take today.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and support it should we return to consideration of the immigration 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. 1684

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

SECTION 1. PASSPORTS ISSUED FOR CHILDREN UNDER 16.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of title IX of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 213) is amended—

(1) by striking "Before" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—Before", and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) PASSPORTS ISSUED FOR CHILDREN UNDER 16.—

"(1) SIGNATURES REQUIRED.—In the case of a child under the age of 16, the written application required as a prerequisite to the issuance of a passport for such child shall be signed by—

"(A) both parents of the child if the child lives with both parents;

"(B) the parent of the child having primary custody of the child if the child does not live with both parents; or

"(C) the surviving parent (or legal guardian) of the child, if 1 or both parents are deceased.

"(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) if the Secretary determines that circumstances do not permit obtaining the signatures of both parents."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications for passports filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1685. A bill to provide income and economic security to the American family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY INCOME AND ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the American Family Income and Economic Security Act.

Not long ago the Treasury announced that the leading economic indicators were up 1.3 percent for February, the gross domestic product rose half a percent, the stock market is at record levels, inflation is subdued, interest rates are stable, unemployment is the lowest in the industrial world, job growth is the highest with over 8 million jobs since 1993; and—to topoff all of these positive indicators—the Democratic economic plan—that passed without one Republican vote—has cut the deficit by more than half—down from \$290 billion to \$140 billion.

We worked hard with the President against Republican stonewalling, gridlock, and continued opposition to make this happen so that even the Republican Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, told me 2 weeks ago, at a Banking Committee hearing, that this is the longest period of the most robust and sustained economic growth since the end of the Second World War, and he expects the economy to continue to grow "at a steady clip."

But this economic growth is best reflected in corporate boardrooms—businesses are finding it easier to borrow money, interest rates are low, executive salaries are up and continue to mushroom, regulations are being eased in every sector from financial services to basic manufacturing. But, in living rooms across Massachusetts there is extraordinary anxiety about jobs, health care, education, wages, and retirement.

Mr. President, I have talked to family after family in Massachusetts who told me that people at the top are doing great, but their friends on the shop floor are not. Statistics show that corporate executives are earning 170 times that of their lowest paid worker. Just last year CEO's had an average salary increase of 15 percent while their workers are downsized into the street. These workers—whose real wages have fallen half-a-percent every year since 1973—worry about the future, about elderly parents getting sick, about their kids' education, about their own health care if they lose their job, about the debt they are carrying, and about their retirement.

I understand how difficult it is when productivity rose 7 percent but real wages fell 3 percent in the first 6 years of the 1990's. A family that used to take out a loan for a major expense like a car, now put gas on their credit cards. They took out loans to send kids to college, now they take out loans to send kids to the pediatrician. The American family is sinking further and further into debt and this Republican Congress is making it worse.

In 1995 commercial banks earned an all-time record high profit of \$48.8 billion while consumer debt has soared 39 percent in the last 5 years and now exceeds \$1 trillion. Personal bankruptcies rose by 6 percent in 1 year, and consumers owe \$360 billion on their credit cards. And families in Massachusetts,

fourth in the Nation in loan delinquencies, have defaulted on \$80 million in consumer loans.

Mr. President, in these economic times, the average American family has four credit cards—each with balances of \$4,800. It's no wonder we are anxious. Thousands and thousands of families are one paycheck away from economic disaster. But, it took Pat Buchanan to wake up the Republican Party to do something the Democrats have been doing since the Roosevelt administration—fighting for working families and people struggling to make ends meet. Yet the Republicans have done nothing to alleviate this anxiety. They will not even raise the minimum wage—in fact they have downsized the American dream for millions of hard working families, but voted time and again to increase corporate welfare, and give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

Therefore, today, to fight back, I am announcing that I will introduce the American Family Income and Economic Security Act.

It helps families by increasing the minimum wage, helps them educate their kids and re-educate themselves, helps secure portable, affordable, health care with no preexisting conditions clause, and makes investments for retirement easier. I believe that this legislation can go a long way to restoring faith in the American dream.

The American Family Income and Economic Security Act gives incentives to businesses that become better corporate citizens and that foster a family-friendly environment that provides high-wage jobs for the 21st century.

It includes 10 new approaches to family economic problems, and 10 initiatives that I have sponsored before. But, what makes this proposal unique is that it takes simple, necessary, common sense steps in the right direction. Each element of this plan can stand alone. It uses the Tax Code to help workers keep up, and rewards businesses that reward workers.

I believe that these proposals are what real families need to make ends meet and to feel that they have a chance in the new economy.

Let us start with wages. Under this proposal we reward work—those who are on the job and off the dole—by increasing the minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour. Maybe my Republican opponents don't know what an increase means in real terms: It means an additional \$1,800—the equivalent of 7 months of groceries.

Second, when it comes to educating kids—while the Republicans are cutting Pell grants and student loans for average working families—I want to use the Tax Code creatively. This proposal gives every family a \$10,000 maximum deduction for tuition costs; and it allows their sons or daughters, who take out a student loan, to deduct the interest on that loan so they are not saddled with debt as soon as they graduate.

But more than helping families pay for tuition costs, I want to help parents get the lifetime education and training they will need to compete. That is why my proposal encourages companies to provide education and training with a \$5,200 per employee tax deduction for training.

These proposals are real-life solutions to real-life family problems. How can we say that everyone should go to college—everyone should be trained and retrained—and then make it as difficult as we can to do it. How can we not provide incentives to help educate our workforce when we know that in 1972 people with advanced degrees earned 72 percent more than high school graduates—when we know that by 1992 those with graduate degrees made 2.5 times more than high school graduates—and when we know that today high school dropouts earn scarcely half as much as high school graduates and the education gap is widening?

But education costs and retraining are not the only hurdles families are facing. Health care costs and the fear of catastrophic illness of a loved one add to America's insecurities. Every American has the right to feel secure that if they get sick, or their child or parents get sick, they will not face financial ruin. So, my plan endorses the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that makes health insurance portable and limits preexisting condition clauses. But it goes one step further.

We know too well the horrors of a family who has tragically lost a loved one at a young age. The entire family, in a time of grief, can be faced with mounting medical bills. This proposal provides some security for younger families who are forced to sell family property because of a terminal illness. It zeroes-out capital gains taxes for them to give them a chance to recover.

I am tired of going around Massachusetts and hearing stories of a family that took 10 years to crawl out from under the burden of debt caused by the loss of a loved one to breast cancer—which strikes 1 in every 9 Massachusetts women—or AIDS—which is the leading killer of Massachusetts residents aged 25 to 44. I am tired of going back to Washington to see Republicans continue their attempts to cut Medicare and Medicaid and cruelly leave so many of these young families in their political wake.

Young families are the strength of this Nation. If they work hard they have every right to expect success, security, and a piece of the dream—and it is up to us to help them achieve it. I came to the Senate when my daughters were young and I know how hard it is to have a career and be a good parent. Many families cannot afford the cost of daycare, and do not want to be separated from their children. That is why I am proposing that businesses get a tax credit of up to 50 percent of their investment up to \$150,000 for establishing on-site daycare centers for employ-

ees. Since the average American family spends \$9,000 a year on daycare, it makes sense to help businesses keep families together—kids can be a few floors away rather than a few miles away, and we can take away parental anxiety while we raise their productivity. The Glass Ceiling Commission and others said that on-site daycare raises the productivity of American workers by 10 percent. So what are we waiting for?

These are proposals to put more money in people's pockets, and there is one more proposal that is especially important to Massachusetts and working families everywhere: I am proposing to create a Federal tax deduction for local sewer and water fees to help those hardest hit by soaring water rates that are above 1 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

In and around Boston, water rates continue to escalate—from \$185 per year in 1985 to \$525 per year in 1992 and \$618 for 1996. By the year 2000, the rate is projected to rise to \$800. The Tax Code allows deductions for State and local taxes, and this will similarly avoid the double tax on water and sewer rates for homeowners.

And most importantly I reiterate my strong desire to double the income levels for those who participate in IRA's. I want individuals with incomes of \$50,000 and couples who make \$80,000 to be allowed to deduct IRA contributions. And I want them to be allowed early distribution to finance education, first time home buying, medical bills associated with catastrophic illness and long-term unemployment. This is a common sense approach to increasing the national savings rate without breaking the Treasury. This is an innovative approach that gives families the flexibility to grow and build and cope with economic reality.

These are the creative programs we should incorporate into the Tax Code instead of giving tax breaks to McDonalds to finance their foreign advertising budget. That is why I sponsored a bipartisan bill to cut \$60 billion in corporate welfare and that is why I am proposing to stop companies from deducting the salaries of employees who earn over \$1 million a year.

No wonder the average American does not trust Government to help them.

To begin helping business move us in the right direction I am proposing today a seven part business-to-family plan that provides direct assistance to high-growth, high-wage, job-producing businesses; and punishes businesses that put the bottom-line first and families last.

On the positive side, I am proposing to completely eliminate capital gains taxes for investors who hold stock for more than 10 years in qualified small, high-growth, job-creating, critical-technology companies that do at least 75 percent of their business in the United States; and I am proposing to reduce the tax burden by 50 percent for

investors who hold stock for at least 5 years.

Massachusetts leads the Nation in these cutting-edge technology-driven businesses, and is a model for the Nation on making investments count for American working families. Let us make the Massachusetts high-tech experience, America's experience.

These businesses are doing it right and expanding into the global market, and we should be encouraging that expansion. That is why this plan encourages small businesses to export and that is why it levels the playing field in Federal export financing between the Export-Import Bank's 90-percent guaranteed coverage and the Small Business Administration's 75 to 80 percent coverage. The Coalition of New England Companies for Trade strongly supports this export enhancement idea because they know it will work. But, most importantly, it encourages companies to keep jobs in this country and—like Aaron Feuerstein—it encourages them to recognize that their employees are an asset not a liability.

My friends, as I meet people across this State, I find that many are concerned about their retirement. Employee pension plans should be sacred. That is why this proposal makes sure that private pension plans are not the toybox of corporate America. I am proposing that we prohibit companies from using pension plans when considering financing mergers and acquisitions; and we prohibit companies from deducting merger and acquisition expenses if the merger results in a 15 percent reduction in the work force.

And we should not be rewarding corporate behavior with misguided tax loopholes that gives favorable tax treatment to companies that move offshore. If nothing else, a good corporate citizen keeps jobs in America, stays in America, and builds the American economy. I am proposing that we close those loopholes immediately.

To take corporate citizenship one step further, I think we should punish Federal contractors that hire illegal immigrants. The Federal Government should lead by example and not allow its contractors to hire undocumented foreign workers at the expense of an American job. That is common sense and it's the kind of corporate citizenship that we have every right to demand.

I am also proposing that Congress give its unequivocal support to the idea of companies granting stock options to people they layoff and downsize out of a job. Why should not CEO's with guaranteed golden parachutes give loyal workers at least a tin parachute to make downsizing easier?

I am also proposing that we retroactively and permanently extend the Research and Development tax credit that is so critical to a pro-growth, future oriented economy that understands that responsible, thoughtful investment in research and development can and will create the kind of high-

wage jobs we need. This provision is, perhaps, the most critical of all. It establishes our commitment to investing in the future. It is not a gamble or a waste of taxpayers' dollars. It is a sure bet; and we should be willing to make it.

We should be willing to accept the costs of any and all of these proposals—first because they can be offset by the \$60 billion in savings we get from stopping corporate welfare under the bi-partisan bill that Senator MCCAIN and I sponsored; and second, because we have to step up to the plate for what's right for working families and what's right for America.

So, what does my American Family Income and Economic Security Act do? It helps workers, it supports businesses, and it rewards corporate citizenship. It addresses the anxieties of American working families, and it begins to move us in the right direction. It fights against the wrong-headedness of Republican policies that have downsized the American dream and shifted wealth to the top 10 percent of Americans.

It is time to begin the shift back at least enough to protect hard working families from the extreme political agenda of the Republicans in Congress. So, this proposal is a hedge against the incredible odds that working families face every day in meeting the bills for health care, education, and a decent retirement. It is a hedge against stagnant wages, and it is a challenge to businesses to be good corporate citizens, and to build a family friendly workplace so that, together, we can build a better stronger American economy.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 1686. A bill to provide for early deferred annuities under chapter 83 of Title 5, United States Code, for certain former Department of Defense employees who are separated from service by reason of certain defense base closures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

DEFENSE PRIVATIZATION AND WORKER PROTECTION LEGISLATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, this country has undergone tremendous changes over the last few years as a result of military downsizing and base closures. Making the transition has proved very difficult to communities all across the country and today, in an effort to ease that transition, I am introducing legislation with original cosponsors Senators COATS, LUGAR, HUTCHINSON, and MCCONNELL directed at specific problems we've seen with privatization of these bases.

I know many of my colleagues are aware of the job loss that results from downsizing. That is because many jobs have become obsolete or redundant. But, there's also a whole other category of affected employees, whose

skills and expertise are still needed by the military in the same roles, but in new privatized facilities. Under the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC), these employees are still eligible to work for the Federal Government and receive a Federal pension.

However, this would defeat one of our major goals in privatization—to save the taxpayer money. The idea under privatization is to continue utilizing these workers' much-needed skills, but in the private sector, at a reduced cost to the taxpayer. Yet, by sending these workers out into the private sector, we are asking a huge portion of them to give up their retirement benefits.

These workers are in a catch-22. If they move into the privatized facilities, where they would be performing the same mission and jobs as they had as Federal employees, they lose hard-earned pensions. If they remain in the Federal Government, they could face lower paying positions, while the community loses those workers altogether.

With little incentive to move into the private sector, these employees could create a vacuum that private contractors are unable to fill. Under that scenario everyone loses: Highly skilled workers will be underemployed and underpaid. Private contractors won't be able to meet the challenge of taking over government facilities. And the taxpayer will foot the \$390 million cost-avoidance bill the Navy estimates the government faces if they have to keep these workers on the payroll and deal with the failure of privatization.

This problem was brought to my attention when the Louisville Naval Ordnance Station began the process of privatization, where unlike other base closings, moving the work would be a far greater cost than privatizing. But, it is a problem faced by workers in the same situation all across the country.

That is why I am introducing legislation to provide a deferred annuity for those Department of Defense employees who are targeted for privatization, but stand to lose their benefits under the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS). With this legislation, we can make good on the promise our Government made with these employees when they entered Government Service, and assure private contractors that a skilled work force will be available to them when they assume control of former Defense Department facilities.

Most Federal employees hired before 1984 participate in the CSRS, while workers hired after 1984 belong to the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS). Unlike CSRS, FERS is a portable plan, allowing a Federal employee to move between Federal and non-federal employment, without significantly penalizing the accrual of Federal benefits. Unfortunately, CSRS participants do not enjoy this same flexibility, because CSRS is a single component defined benefit plan.

Because CSRS-covered employees are forced to separate from Federal em-

ployment before they're eligible for an immediate annuity, they see their federal retirement benefits lose considerable value. And, employees who withdraw their retirement contribution not only forfeit all benefits, but also cost the government money up front.

I think we can all agree that privatization is a key component of reorganizing our defense priorities in this post-cold-war era of military downsizing. But, I believe my legislation is critical to ensuring that privatization works.

It can accomplish these goals by providing a deferred annuity with indexing pension benefits for CSRS Department of Defense employees. Their positions will be immediately transferred to contractors assuming the workload designated for privatization. In this way we can provide a very restricted, but common sense way of keeping our military infrastructure running smoothly as we embark on military privatization's maiden voyage.

And perhaps equally important, my legislation sends a clear message to this work force that their loyalty and dedication did not go unnoticed. These workers provided our men and women in uniform with the finest maintenance, supply and logistics system in the world. The best way we can repay this commitment to excellence is to uphold the Federal Government's end of the contract made when these workers first entered Government Service. That's in the workers' best interest and in the best interest of the Nation.

I would also like at this time to thank Mrs. Carolyn Merk of the Congressional Research Service for her outstanding professional work in helping craft this legislation that we're introducing today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1686

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

SECTION 1. EARLY DEFERRED ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Civil Service Retirement System" means the retirement system under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term "defense contractor" means any entity that—

(A) contracts with the Department of Defense to perform a function previously performed by Department of Defense employees;

(B) performs that function at the same installation at which such function was previously performed by Department of Defense employees or in the vicinity of that installation; and

(C) is the employer of one or more transferred employees;

(3) the term "early deferred retirement age" means the first age at which a transferred employee would have been eligible for immediate retirement under subsection (a)

or (b) of section 8336 of title 5, United States Code, if such transferred employee had remained an employee within the meaning of section 8331(1) of such title continuously until attaining such age;

(4) the term "severance pay" means severance pay payable under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) the term "separation pay" means separation pay payable under section 5597 of title 5, United States Code; and

(6) the term "transferred employee" means a former employee of the Department of Defense (other than a temporary employee) who—

(A) while employed by the Department of Defense at a military installation to be closed or realigned pursuant to recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission that were approved by the President in 1995 under section 2903(e) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and while covered under the Civil Service Retirement System, was separated from Federal service in a reduction-in-force resulting from conversion from performance of a function by Department of Defense employees at that military installation to performance of that function by a defense contractor at that installation or in the vicinity of that installation;

(B) is employed by the defense contractor within 60 days following such separation to perform substantially the same function performed before the separation;

(C) remains employed by the defense contractor or a successor defense contractor, or subcontractor of a defense contractor until attaining early deferred retirement age or is involuntarily separated from employment by the defense contractor before attaining such age for reasons other than misconduct;

(D) at the time separated from Federal service, was not eligible for an immediate annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System;

(E) does not withdraw retirement contributions under section 8342 of title 5, United States Code; and

(F)(i) has not received separation pay or severance pay due to a separation described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) has repaid the full amount of such pay with interest (as determined by the Office of Personnel Management) to the Department of Defense before attaining early deferred retirement age.

(b) RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF TRANSFERRED EMPLOYEES.—Notwithstanding the age requirement under section 8338(a) of title 5, United States Code, payment of a deferred annuity for which a transferred employee is eligible under that section shall commence on the first day of the first month that begins after the date on which the transferred employee attains early deferred retirement age.

(c) COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE PAY.—(1)(A) This paragraph applies to the computation of the annuity of a transferred employee who retires under this section who immediately before separation from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A) was employed in a position classified under the General Schedule.

(B) Subject to subparagraph (C), in the computation of an annuity referred to under subparagraph (A) for a transferred employee, the average pay of the transferred employee under section 8331(4) of title 5, United States Code, shall be adjusted at the same time and by the same percentage that rates of basic pay are increased under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, during the period beginning on the date on which the transferred employee separates from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A) and end-

ing on the date on which the transferred employee attains early deferred retirement age.

(C) Average pay as adjusted by this paragraph may not exceed the limitation on maximum pay, final pay, or average pay (as applicable) under section 8340(g)(1) (A) or (B) of title 5, United States Code.

(2)(A) This paragraph applies to the compensation of an annuity of a transferred employee who retires in accordance with this section who immediately before separation from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A) was a prevailing rate employee as defined under section 5342(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(B) In the computation of an annuity referred to under subparagraph (A) for a transferred employee, average pay under section 8331(4) of title 5, United States Code, shall be adjusted at the same time and by the same percentage that pay rates for positions that are in the same area as, and are comparable to, the last position the transferred employee held as a prevailing rate employee, are increased under section 5343(a) of such title during the period beginning on the date on which the transferred employee separates from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A) and ending on the date on which the transferred employee attains early deferred retirement age.

(d) SERVICE FOR A DEFENSE CONTRACTOR RELATING TO CREDITABLE SERVICE AND HEALTH INSURANCE.—(1) Service performed by a transferred employee for a defense contractor after separation from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A) shall not be treated as creditable service for purposes of computing the amount of an early deferred annuity in accordance with this section.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require employee or agency contributions under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, for any period of service performed by a transferred employee for a defense contractor after separation from Federal service as described under subsection (a)(6)(A).

(e) RECEIPT OF BENEFITS WHILE EMPLOYED BY A DEFENSE CONTRACTOR.—A transferred employee may commence receipt of an early deferred annuity in accordance with this section while continuing to work for a defense contractor.

(f) LUMP-SUM CREDIT PAYMENT.—If a transferred employee dies before attaining early deferred retirement age, such employee shall be treated as a former employee who dies not retired for purposes of payment of the lump-sum credit under section 8342(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(g) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on August 1, 1996, and shall apply to transferred employees separated from Federal service on or after that date.

BRAC PRIVATIZATION: THE CSRS ISSUE

The 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission recommended the privatization of certain military facilities. The President has directed the Air Force to privatize two Air Force logistic centers. For privatization to succeed, the maintenance of an experienced workforce is critical. Retirement benefits have become recognized as a major impediment to the privatization of the Louisville and Indianapolis Navy facilities and other Department of Defense (DOD) facilities.

Without legislation to protect their retirement benefits many employees will—and

are—transferring to other Federal positions to maintain and protect their retirement benefits under the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS).

If many key employees transfer within the Government rather than work for a private sector contractor, privatization savings to the Government may not be fully realized. The Department of the Navy estimates that privatization of Louisville and Indianapolis would provide up to \$390 million in "cost avoidance" to the Government. Unlike other Base closings, the cost to the Federal government to close and move the work at Louisville and Indianapolis is far greater than the cost of privatization. The retention of the Federal employees at these facilities is essential to the private contractor.

BACKGROUND

The 1995 BRAC Commission directed privatization of two Navy facilities with a large federal workforce, the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Louisville, Kentucky and the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indianapolis, Indiana. In addition, President Clinton directed the Air Force to try and privatize two Air Force logistic centers, one in Texas and one in California which were ordered to be closed by the 1995 BRAC.

These Federal employees are different from other employees adversely affected by downsizing. The key difference is that these employees are not being separated because their services are no longer needed or because the work they accomplished is redundant or unnecessary. Under the BRAC "Close and Move" scenario, these employees would have been eligible to continue their Federal employment (and qualify for an annuity) at another federal installation. These employees are expected to continue accomplishing the same mission as before, but they will be working as private sector employees.

Most Federal employees hired before 1984 currently participate in the CSRS. Those workers hired after 1984 participate in the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS). FERS is different than CSRS because it is a portable plan that allows a Federal employee to move between Federal and non-federal employment. In doing so, the accrual of Federal benefits is not significantly penalized.

However, employees under CSRS have no portability because it is a single component defined benefit plan. Therefore, when CSRS-COVERED workers are forced to separate from Federal employment before they are eligible for an immediate annuity, their retirement benefits lose considerable value. Employees who lose their Federal position and withdraw their retirement contribution early will forfeit all benefits from the Federal government and thereby are not eligible for a pension.

Employees with the most experience tend to be covered under CSRS. These are the employees the contractor taking over the work at a government facility considers to be very valuable. For example, 46% of the employees at the Louisville Naval Surface Warfare Center are covered by CSRS and are not eligible for retirement. Many of these employees, and those in Indiana, Texas and California who are highly skilled, are seeking to transfer to other Federal positions. Some are even accepting lower paid positions within DOD so they may maintain their CSRS retirement benefits. As a result, there is little incentive for CSRS employees to accept positions with the private contractor. Therefore, the privatization of Federal facilities could fail at a significant cost to the Government and the U.S. taxpayers.

LEGISLATIVE REMEDY:

To rectify the CSRS issue, the attached draft legislation proposes to index a deferred

annuity for certain DOD CSRS Employees. The legislation would address the issue of CSRS employees receiving a retirement benefit by:

Indexing the average pay on which the annuity is computed, and

Allowing a Federal deferred annuity to be paid to specific CSRS employees at the individuals optional retirement age.

The legislation will apply only to Transferred Employees of the Department of Defense. A Transferred Employee is one whose job is privatized pursuant to a 1995 decision of the BRAC Commission and pursuant to a President directive privatizing a base to be closed by the 1995 BRAC. This indexed deferred annuity will be available only to individuals participating in CSRS, and not to those participating in FERS. The proposed legislation will apply to only those CSRS employees who are ineligible to retire and who accept work with the private contractor. They will be ineligible for severance pay.

Reasons for legislation:

At this time there are no administrative remedies.

Treats employees equitably and thus stabilizes the work force for privatization.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1687. A bill to provide for annual payments from the surplus funds of the Federal Reserve System to cover the interest on obligations issued by the Financing Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUS ACT OF 1996

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am introducing the Federal Reserve Surplus Act of 1996 to provide a solution to an impending crisis in our financial services industry, and to avoid once again having to use taxpayers' money to bail out another round of S&L failures. I am happy to join my colleague in the House, Congressman BARNEY FRANK as well as other members of the Massachusetts delegation, Congressmen JOE KENNEDY, MARTY MEEHAN, and RICHARD NEAL, who introduced the companion bill in the House of Representatives.

This bill will ease the obligation remaining from the savings and loan crisis of the 1980's with a creative approach that does not burden the banking institutions or taxpayers, but uses an existing \$3.7 billion fund at the Federal Reserve. The GAO tells us that because the Federal Reserve's interest income so far exceeds its expenses, we believe it is highly unlikely the System will ever incur sufficient annual losses such that it would be required to use any funds in the surplus account.

Savings and loans are required to pay almost \$800 million per year in interest on financing corporation bonds which were sold to cover depositor claims on S&L's that failed in the 1980's. This legislation would use \$3 billion from the Federal Reserve's surplus fund as a contribution toward the payment of the FICO interest obligation. This would leave about \$1 billion in the fund.

It is generally believed, within the financial community, as Congressman FRANK has said, that "continuing to require the savings and loans to pay the

entire FICO interest obligation would worsen the disparity between what banks must pay to such a degree as to risk default by the SAIF, which would ultimately result in a further drain on the Treasury."

Mr. President, this just makes sense. The Federal Reserve is controlling a fund with no specific purpose—paid in by banks—and the Congress should turn to this fund first before asking bankers in this country to bear the burden of recapitalizing the savings association insurance fund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1687

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 "Federal Reserve Surplus Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUS FUNDS TO MEET FICO CARRYING COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) FICO PAYMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of the Federal Reserve Surplus Act of 1996 and ending on the date on which the Financing Corporation ceases to have any obligations outstanding under section 21(e) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Board shall annually transfer (in addition to the transfers of funds required under paragraph (3)) to the Financing Corporation, from amounts in the surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks, an amount equal to \$3,000,000,000 divided by the number of calendar years any portion of which falls within such period for use in accordance with section 21(f)(1) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

"(B) ALLOCATION.—The Board shall annually determine, on the basis of such factors as the Board considers appropriate, the manner in which the amount of the obligation of the Board under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated among the surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 21(f) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred to the Financing Corporation by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from the surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks in accordance with section 7(a)(4) of the Federal Reserve Act.

"(B) TREATMENT IN CASE OF BANK INSURANCE FUND MEMBER ASSESSMENTS.—To the extent Bank Insurance Fund members (as defined in section 7(l)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) are subject to any assessments under this subsection, the total amount of such assessments which, but for this subparagraph, would be imposed on all such members for any year shall be reduced by the transferred amount referred to in subparagraph (A) with respect to such year." •

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MURKOW-

SKI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. LUGAR):

S.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POLAND CONSTITUTION 205TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution which salutes and congratulates Polish people around the world on the occasion of the 205th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. I am pleased to be joined by Senators SIMON, ABRAHAM, MOSELEY-BRAUN, MURKOWSKI, MIKULSKI, HELMS, ROTH, SANTORUM, and LUGAR. This resolution is being introduced today in the House by Congressman JACK QUINN of New York and a number of bipartisan cosponsors.

Poland is one of America's oldest and closest friends. Many of its sons and daughters have crossed the ocean to our shores over the past 200 years. Indeed, from the very birth of our great nation we have benefited from the talent and dedication of the Polish people. When we fought for our independence, Thaddeus Kosciuszko—a native son of Poland—fought alongside General Washington. Today, memorials to Kosciuszko's courage, military skill, and genuine friendship, can be found in our Capital and in many cities across the United States.

Following the War of Independence, Kosciuszko carried back to Poland the American concept of constitutional democracy. Poland's 1791 Constitution was the first constitution in Central and Eastern Europe to secure individual and religious freedom for all persons. It also formed a government much like ours, composed of distinct legislative, executive, and judicial powers. I would like to quote from the Polish Constitution which declares, "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people."

Tragically, this Constitution was only in effect for less than 2 years. However, its principles endured for 2 centuries. And over the last 5 years—since the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact—Poland has finally realized the promise of freedom and democracy held in the 1791 Constitution.

So, on May 3, 1996, when the citizens of Poland celebrate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first Constitution, we want them to know that the United States Congress shares in their celebration. No doubt, all across our 50 States, Polish-Americans will be celebrating and taking pride in their rich heritage. This joint resolution salutes and congratulates all Polish people, wherever they may now reside, on this great and historic occasion.

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

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

S.J. RES. 51

Whereas, on May 3, 1996, Polish people around the world, including Americans of Polish decent, will celebrate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of the first Polish constitution;

Whereas American Revolutionary War hero Thaddeus Kosciuszko introduced the concept of constitutional democracy to his native country of Poland;

Whereas the Polish constitution of 1791 was the first liberal constitution in Europe and represented Central-Eastern Europe's first attempt to end the feudal system of government;

Whereas this Polish constitution was designed to protect Poland's sovereignty and national unity and to create a progressive constitutional monarchy;

Whereas this Polish constitution was the first constitution in Central-Eastern Europe to secure individual and religious freedom for all persons in Poland;

Whereas this Polish constitution formed a government composed of distinct legislative, executive, and judicial powers;

Whereas this Polish constitution declared that "all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people";

Whereas this Polish constitution revitalized the parliamentary system by placing preeminent lawmaking power in the House of Deputies, by subjecting the Sejm to majority rule, and by granting the Sejm the power to remove ministers, appoint commissars, and choose magistrates;

Whereas this Polish constitution provided for significant economic, social, and political reforms by removing inequalities between the nobility and the bourgeoisie, by recognizing town residents as "freemen" who had judicial autonomy and expanded rights, and by extending the protection of the law to the peasantry who previously had no recourse against the arbitrary actions of feudal lords;

Whereas, although this Polish constitution was in effect for less than 2 years, its principles endured and it became the symbol around which a powerful new national consciousness was born, helping Poland to survive long periods of misfortune over the following 2 centuries; and

Whereas, in only the last 5 years, Poland has realized the promise held in the Polish constitution of 1791, has emerged as an independent nation after its people led the movement that resulted in historic changes in Central-Eastern Europe, and is moving toward full integration with the Euro-Atlantic community of nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) the people of the United States salute and congratulate Polish people around the world, including Americans of Polish descent, as on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of the first Polish constitution;

(2) the people of the United States recognize Poland's rebirth as a free and independent nation in the spirit of the legacy of the Polish constitution of 1791; and

(3) the Congress authorizes and urges the President of the United States to call upon the Governors of the States, the leaders of local governments, and the people of the United States to observe this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 881

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from North Caro-

lina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension benefit plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 953, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of black revolutionary war patriots.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to prohibit the import, export, sale, purchase, and possession of bear viscera or products that contain or claim to contain bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 984

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, *supra*.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act), to revise the standards for coverage under the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1355

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1355, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end deferral for United States shareholders on income of controlled foreign corporations attrib-

utable to property imported into the United States.

S. 1400

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue guidance as to the application of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to insurance company general accounts.

S. 1473

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1473, a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to permit the posting in space under the control of the Administrator of notices concerning missing children, and for other purposes.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to reduce risk to public safety and the environment associated with pipeline transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1537, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a regulation that consolidates all environmental laws and health and safety laws applicable to the construction, maintenance, and operation of above-ground storage tanks, and for other purposes.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve eligibility for medical care and services under that title, and for other purposes.

S. 1568

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1568, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the extension of certain expiring provisions.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the standards used for determining whether individuals are not employees.