

to law, the rule entitled "Training Personnel for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities," received on May 23, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2859. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Foreign Language Assistance Grants," received on May 24, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2860. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Foreign Language Assistance Grants," received on May 24, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2861. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years 1996-1997 for a Research and Demonstration Project," received on May 29, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2862. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Unemployment Insurance Program Letter 22-96," received on May 31, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2863. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy, Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule concerning chlorofluorocarbon propellants in self-pressurized containers, received on May 31, 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2864. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule entitled "Compensation for Disability Resulting from Hospitalization, Treatment, Examination, or Vocational Rehabilitation," (RIN2900-AH44) received on May 23, 1996, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2865. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule entitled "National Cemeteries," (RIN2900-AI06) received on May 28, 1996, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2866. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule entitled "Gender Policy for VA Publications and Other Communications," (RIN2900-AI09) received on May 28, 1996, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2867. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Revenue Procedure 96-33 relative to examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement, received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2868. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Treasury Notice 96-32 relative to weighted average interest rate update, received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2869. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Treasury Regulation relative to nonpayroll withheld income taxes, (RIN 1545-AT86) received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2870. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Treasury Announcement 96-26 relative to refund requests, received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2871. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Treasury Notice 96-24 relative to weighted average interest rate update, received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2872. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Revenue Procedure 96-29 relative to closing agreements, received on May 28, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2873. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Payment by Employer of Expenses for Meals and Entertainment, Club Dues, and Spousal Travel," (RIN1545-AS74) received on May 29, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2874. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Enterprise Zone Facility Bonds," (RIN1545-AM01) received on May 29, 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2875. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Nationality Procedures," received on May 23, 1996; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2876. A communication from the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "Import Quotas and Fees," (RIN0551-AA46) received on May 24, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2877. A communication from the General Sales Manager of the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to agricultural commodities, (RIN0551-AA43) received on May 24, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2878. A communication from the Administrator of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "The Rangeland Research Grants Program," received on May 24, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2879. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled "The Fluid Milk Promotion Order," received on May 30, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2880. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of three rules relative to Oregon-California Potatoes, received on May 31, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2881. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a certification and justification; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2882. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice relative to eleven retirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2883. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a multiyear contract for the C-17 program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2884. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Defense Environmental Quality Program for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2885. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the possible use of private-sector sources for air transportation of military personnel and cargo; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## 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 Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1837. A bill to require that 401(k)-type pension plans be subject to the same prohibited transaction rules that apply to traditional defined benefit pension plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

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

S. 1838. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the first manned flight of Orville and Wilbur Wright in Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, on December 17, 1903; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1839. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for human space flight; science, aeronautics, and technology; mission support; and Inspector General; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. GORTON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BRYAN, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1840. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (by request):

S. 1841. A bill to reform the Nation's welfare system by requiring work and demanding personal responsibility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 1842. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve protections for workers in multiemployer pension plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1843. A bill to provide for the allocation of funds from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1844. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to direct a study of the opportunities for enhanced water based recreation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED  
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1837. A bill to require that 401(k)-type pension plans be subject to the same prohibited transaction rules that apply to traditional defined benefit pension plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE 401(K) PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I introduced a bill to protect America's 401(k) retirement savings.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to close a major, unintended loophole in Federal pension law, a loophole that jeopardizes 401(k) pension plans.

The legal protections afforded traditional pension plans are not applied equally to 401(k) pension plans. Traditional pension plans, known as defined benefit pension plans, may not invest more than 10 percent of their assets in securities and real property of the corporation they work for. Federal law further requires that all traditional pension plans investments be diversified. This protection does not uniformly apply to 401(k) plans.

This increases the investment risk to 401(k) plans. This increased investment risk is borne totally by 401(k) plan members, not by the companies sponsoring the 401(k) plans.

Furthermore, Mr. President, 401(k) plans do not have Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation insurance, as do traditional pension plans, in the event the employer corporation goes bankrupt. So the protections of diversity become even more urgent.

The protections for traditional plans were wisely put in Federal law when the Pension Reform Act, known as ERISA, was adopted in 1974. The limitations were designed to prevent the recurrence of the many pension scandals that predated the passage of ERISA, scandals in which employers used their employees' pension plans as the company piggy-bank. Scandals in which the sponsoring company went bankrupt and the employees lost not only their jobs, but their pensions.

Unfortunately, these protections do not apply to 401(k) plans. That is an unintended consequence, a quirk of history.

When ERISA was passed, there was no section 401(k). 401(k) was added 4 years later, in 1978, to a section of ERISA governing profit sharing plans, not pension plans. At the time no one thought 401(k) plans would be any more than small supplemental, profit-sharing plans.

At the time, no one predicted that 401(k) plans would become the predominant form of pension plan. Consequently, no one thought to protect them as ERISA protected pension plans. Consequently, Federal law permitted 401(k) plans to invest more than 10 percent of their assets in the employer sponsoring the 401(k) plan. In fact, 401(k) plans are permitted to invest all of their assets in the sponsoring company.

That was hardly noticed when 401(k) was added in 1978; 401(k) plans were tiny—thought of as profit sharing plans. But today, the investment loophole represents a danger to the retirement security of Americans. It is a danger to the 23 million Americans who belong to 401(k) plans. It is a danger to the 675 billion dollars that these Americans have saved in their 401(k) plans.

Today's Wall Street Journal reports just how dangerous it is. The Journal today describes the plight of thousands of employees of Color Tile, Inc. Until January, Color Tile was a major name in retailing, operating 774 stores in 48 States, coast-to-coast. There were 62 stores in my State of California alone.

Suddenly in January, Color Tile went into bankruptcy; 234 stores were closed. Hundreds of employees lost their jobs, many with only 30 minutes notice. The jobs of thousands more are at risk. Unfortunately, so are their pensions.

Color Tile employees were shocked to learn after the bankruptcy that nearly 85 percent of Color Tile's 401(k) assets were Color Tile stores. The 401(k) plan owned 44 stores leased to Color Tile. As a result of the bankruptcy, Color Tile broke many of the leases on stores owned by its employees' 401(k) plan. Moreover, the 401(k) plan borrowed to build many of the stores. Those mortgage-loan payments to the plan's banks still have to be paid, but, because Color Tile repudiated many of the leases, rent payments to pay bank loans are no longer available. As a result, the plan told shocked workers last month, that it isn't "clear that the plan has sufficient cash to pay the bills, including mortgage payments."

For Color Tile employees, things could not be much worse. Color Tile's only pension plan is the 401(k) plan. The employees are facing, not only the loss of their jobs, but their pension savings.

This would not be possible if 401(k) plans were protected by the rules that protect traditional pension plans. If my bill had been law, Color Tile's pension plan would not be in jeopardy.

My bill would simply apply the same pension protections to all plans—401(k) and traditional pension plans—that deliver retirement security. For the first time, 401(k) plans would have the same 10 percent conflict-of-interest limitations on investments with the sponsoring company that have always applied to traditional pension plans. It would be illegal to do what Color Tile did to its employees.

It would be illegal for a company to borrow more than 10 percent of its employees 401(k) plan assets—as the company slides into bankruptcy. That's exactly what happened to the employees of Metacor, Inc., of Deerfield Beach, FL. In the 24 months before Metacor filed for bankruptcy, the company used its employees 401(k) plan as a piggy bank. The 401(k) plans made 34 separate loans to Metacor in those 24

months, until nothing was left to loan. Most people believe that was made illegal in 1974 when Congress passed the Pension Reform Act. They are misinformed. Unfortunately, we exempted 401(k) plans. My bill would close that loophole.

The only plans exempted under my bill would be plans designed as true profitsharing plans, stock bonus, or stock option plans—plans not designed specifically for retirement.

My bill also exempts employee-directed 401(k) plans, because employees should be able to waive the 10-percent limitations if they want to. It's their money.

My bill would have protected not only the employees of the 62 Color Tile stores in my State—8 in Orange County alone—but the employees of Color Tile stores everywhere. Had this bill been law, the employees of the 12 stores shut down in Illinois, the 5 stores shut in Wisconsin, the 4 stores shut in Virginia, the 3 stores shut in Michigan, the stores shut in Texas, Oregon, and Minnesota would not be worried today about losing their 401(k) pension plan assets.

Remember many have already lost their jobs, now many are losing their pensions too.

The employees of stores shut in my State, California, in Visalia and San Diego, would not be worried about their 401(k) plan.

Mr. President, I hope my two colleagues—the Senators from the State of Mississippi—are listening. One of you may soon be the majority leader and in a position to greatly help the passage of this bill.

I say to both of them: you can remember the 225 former employees of the Cleveland, MS, Color Tile factory. You can help assure the unfolding tragedy of the Color Tile 401(k) plan will not happen again. You can help pass this bill. I will work with you.

Here is a picture of 12 of those Mississippi employees. This picture was taken at the front gate of the factory after it was closed in February. This picture is America. Unfortunately, it says that America needs better protections for 401(k)'s.

This is Dorsey Kelsey, 57 years old. Dorsey worked at the plant 18 and a half years, as a janitor. Her husband is Robert Kelley. Robert worked at the plant for over 20 years. Between them, Robert and Dorsey had \$20,000 in the 401(k) plan. \$20,000 that Robert needs, but can't get access to, if he ever will. Robert and Dorsey are why we need this bill.

This is Woodrow "Moose" Issacs, 57, also of Cleveland, MS. Moose was a maintenance mechanic and worked at the plant for 38 years. His last statement from the 401(k) plan, as of September 30, 1995, showed he had \$57,900 in the plan. A good deal of that money he may never see.

Raymonda Almond, 53, of Boyle, MS was in outside sales. She worked for the plant for 9 years and saved \$17,000.

She planned on using the money to supplement her Social Security when she retired. Now she needs it to live on, but cannot get access to it. Some of it she possibly never will see.

She will just have to make do with Social Security.

Paul Locke, 24 years old, worked at the plant for 3½ years. He was a full-time student at Delta State University and worked full time at Color Tile. He saved \$4,000, money that he was going to use as a down payment on a house when he graduated. That house will probably have to wait.

I could list the other seven former Color Tile employees in this picture, some holding their children, some holding grandchildren. Suffice to say that collectively this picture represents \$199,900 in savings in the 401(k) plan. Saved through years of work at Color Tile. Money that is at risk because the Federal Government is not adequately protecting 401(k) plans.

Mr. President this picture says more than I could ever say about why we need this bill. I ask all my colleagues to join me in protecting 401(k) pension plans—just as well as we protect traditional pension plans.

It is time to close an unintended and unforeseen loophole in ERISA. It is time to apply the 10-percent limitations on conflict-of-interest investments to 401(k) plans. Let us protect 401(k) members just as we protect the members of traditional pension plans.

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

S. 1838. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the first manned flight of Orville and Wilbur Wright in Kitty Hawk, NC, on December 17 1903; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### THE FIRST FLIGHT COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise today, joined by my colleague from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, to introduce the First Flight Commemorative Coin Act. This revenue-neutral legislation instructs the Treasury Secretary to mint coins in commemoration of the Wright Brothers' historic 1903 flight on the North Carolina coast.

Mr. President, in the cold morning hours of December 17, 1903, a small crowd watched the Wright flyer lift off the flat landscape of Kitty Hawk. Orville Wright traveled just 120 feet—less than the wingspan of a Boeing 747—in his 12-second flight. It was, however, the first time that a manned machine sailed into the air under its own power.

The residents of Kitty Hawk, then an isolated fishing village, thus bore witness to the realization of the centuries-old dream of flight.

The significance of the Wright Brothers' flight reaches far beyond its status as the first flight. There flight represented the birth of aviation. On that morning, aeronautics moved from un-

tested theory to nascent science, and it triggered a remarkable technological evolution.

In fact, just 24 years after their fragile craft rose unsteadily and took to the air, Charles Lindbergh crossed the Atlantic Ocean. In 1947, less than half a century after the pioneer 31 mph flight over Kitty Hawk, Chuck Yeager shattered the sound barrier over the Mojave Desert.

The rapid aeronautical progression, which the Wright Brothers initiated on that December morning in Kitty Hawk, is, of course, remarkable. Mr. President, it was just 66 years after the Wright Brothers' 120-foot flight—a timespan equivalent to the age of many Members of this body—that Neil Armstrong traveled 240,000 miles to plant the American flag on the Moon.

Today, some 86,000 planes lift off from American airports on a daily basis, and air travel is routine. It was with a sprinkling of onlookers, however, that the Wright Brothers ushered in the age of flight on that cold winter morning in Kitty Hawk.

The site of the first flight, at the foot of Kill Devil Hill, was initially designated as a national memorial in 1927 and is visited by close to a half-million people each year.

I think that First Flight Commemorative Coin Act is a most appropriate tribute to the Wright Brothers as the centennial anniversary of the first flight approaches. The coin will be minted in \$10, \$1, and 50¢ denominations, and its sales will fund educational programs and improvements to the visitor center at the memorial.

These commemorative coins are struck to celebrate important historical events, and, of course, the proceeds are an important revenue source to the custodians of these legacies. The centennial anniversary of the Wright Brothers' flight merits our observance.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues for their support, and 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. 1838

*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 "First Flight Commemorative Coin Act".

#### SEC. 2. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$10 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 500,000 \$10 coins, each of which shall—

- (A) weigh 16.718 grams;
- (B) have a diameter of 1.06 inches; and
- (C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 3,000,000 \$1 coins, each of which shall—

- (A) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(3) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 10,000,000 half dollar coins each of which shall—

- (A) weigh 11.34 grams;
- (B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and
- (C) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) REDUCED AMOUNTS.—If the Secretary determines that there is clear evidence of insufficient public demand for coins minted under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury may reduce the maximum amounts specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

(c) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

#### SEC. 3. SOURCES OF BULLION.

The Secretary shall obtain gold and silver for minting coins under this Act pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under other provisions of law, including authority relating to the use of silver stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as applicable.

#### SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the first flight of Orville and Wilbur Wright in Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, on December 17, 1903.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

- (A) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (B) an inscription of the year "2003"; and
- (C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

- (1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Board of Directors of the First Flight Foundation and the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (2) reviewed by the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee.

#### SEC. 5. PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the period beginning on August 1, 2003, and ending on July 31, 2004.

(b) EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary determines that there is sufficient public demand for the coins minted under section 2(a)(3), the Secretary may extend the period of issuance under subsection (a) for a period of 5 years with respect to those coins.

#### SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins;
- (2) the surcharge provided in subsection (d) with respect to such coins; and
- (3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, shipping, and profit).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

(d) SURCHARGES.—All sales shall include a surcharge of—

- (1) \$35 per coin for the \$10 coin;

(2) \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin; and  
 (3) \$1 per coin for the half dollar coin.  
 (e) **MARKETING EXPENSES.**—The Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) a plan is established for marketing the coins minted under this Act; and  
 (2) adequate funds are made available to cover the costs of carrying out that marketing plan.

**SEC. 7. GENERAL WAIVER OF PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), no provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods and services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.**—Subsection (a) shall not relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this Act from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

**SEC. 8. DISTRIBUTION OF SURCHARGES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the First Flight Foundation for the purposes of—

(1) repairing, refurbishing, and maintaining the Wright Brothers Monument on the Outer Banks of North Carolina; and

(2) expanding (or, if necessary, replacing) and maintaining the visitor center and other facilities at the Wright Brothers National Memorial Park on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, including providing educational programs and exhibits for visitors.

(b) **AUDITS.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the First Flight Foundation as may be related to the expenditures of amounts paid under subsection (a).

**SEC. 9. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.**

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government.

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself,  
 Mr. BURNS, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1839. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for human space flight; science, aeronautics, and technology; mission support; and inspector general; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE NASA AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL  
 YEAR 1997

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Space, I introduced the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997. The bill is cosponsored by the chairman of our Space Subcommittee, Senator CONRAD BURNS, who has provided the committee with great leadership and direction on space policy matters.

In the past, the main challenges NASA faced were technological. Today, NASA faces a new set of challenges which are mainly budgetary, but they are no less daunting than the Apollo missions to the Moon. To the credit of Administrator Dan Goldin, rather than complain about the current budget challenge faced by the Federal Government, he has faced them head on. Last

year, he developed an ambitious budget-cutting plan to reduce his agency's budget by more than \$5 billion over the next 5 years. Under the plan, NASA funding would drop from its current level of \$13.9 billion to \$11.6 billion by the year 2000.

To date, NASA has not revealed precisely how it will make these cuts while at the same time fulfilling its commitment to its major ongoing programs—including multibillion-dollar initiatives like space station and Mission to Planet Earth. There is a growing sense NASA's budget is already cut to the bone and further cuts by Congress might prevent the agency from realizing its bold visions in space science and exploration. With that in mind, my bill is aimed at providing NASA sufficient funding authority to continue the missions and programs that have inspired our Nation and the world.

Mr. President, my bill authorizes \$13.7 billion in fiscal year 1997 to support a diverse and forward-looking space program to move NASA into the 21st century. It authorizes all of NASA's major current programs such as Mission to Planet Earth, space station, space science, and aeronautics and, in almost all cases, at their requested funding levels. It also continues funding for the new Reusable Launch Vehicle Program aimed at providing private industry the technology to eventually build a shuttle replacement. The bill contains an authorization for NASA's new radar satellite program which is so critical to U.S. leadership in space science and our competitiveness in the growing satellite remote sensing market.

Mr. President, let me make special mention of certain portions of the bill.

I believe Mission to Planet Earth may be NASA's most important and relevant program. The satellite data from Mission to Planet Earth will deliver direct benefits to the taxpayer in contrast to the speculative spinoffs promised by other space activities. For this reason, the bill fully funds this activity at the requested level of \$1.4 billion.

Using the latest satellite technology, Mission to Planet Earth will help researchers understand and predict the global climate trends that affect our lives. As a Senator representing an agricultural State, I have a keen interest in this program's potential to provide detailed data on soil conditions, topography, crops, and other information critical to the farming and ranching community. I also take great pride in the selection of the EROS Data Center in Sioux Falls, SD as one of the regional data centers that will collect and distribute this satellite data.

I am very concerned that, under the new budget constraints in which we find ourselves, some may seek to sacrifice Mission to Planet Earth, and space science in general, to fund space station. That would be a disservice to the Nation and I will oppose any such move strongly.

I am pleased with the direction of the baseline plan for the Mission to Planet Earth Program and am concerned about the possibility of NASA taking any imprudent and unnecessary efforts to restructure the program. Accordingly, the bill specifically prohibits NASA from changing the program unless, 60 days before such action, NASA has reported to Congress on the nature and overall impact of the planned changes.

The bill also provides the full \$2.1 billion requested funding for space station. However, this authorization should not be interpreted as a ringing endorsement of that program. I am a longstanding support of the program, but, in recent years, I have become concerned that it has become too expensive, too complex, and too dependent on the contributions of Russia, the latest station partner.

In a June 1995 report, the General Accounting Office [GAO] estimated that the total cost of the design, launch, and operation of the space station will be \$94 billion. That is almost seven times the entire annual budget for NASA. Given the history of past missions, it is fair to assume that \$94 billion price tag for the program will increase over time. If that happens, we may wake up to find the enormous space station budget has crowded out every other NASA program to become NASA's only mission. Because of my reservations about space station, I may well reconsider my support in the future. But, for now, with the start of the space station assembly only 1 year away, I am supporting full funding in fiscal year 1997 for the space station effort.

The bill also authorizes NASA's Reusable Launch Vehicle Program, which will support the X-33 and X-34 activities to pave the way for the later development by private enterprise of a replacement for the shuttle in the next decade. Employing 1970's technologies and costing \$400 million per flight, the shuttle may have outlived its usefulness. However, within today's budget constraints, the Government cannot afford to foot the entire bill for a new multibillion dollar spacecraft development program. That is why the Reusable Launch Vehicle Program, with its emphasis on sharing financing with industry and its goal of moving our national space transportation system toward privatization, seems a viable concept worth pursuing.

The bill also authorizes \$35 million for NASA feasibility studies and subsequent development and operations work for a new radar satellite program. Earlier this year, at the urging of the Commerce Committee and the Congress, NASA announced its commitment to study the feasibility of developing a new civilian radar satellite with scientific applications. Because radar satellites have the ability to see through cloud cover, they will dramatically enhance the capability of the Nation's existing optical-based satellite

systems such as Landsat. With Japan, Europe, and Canada already operating radar satellite systems, and with Canada poised to deploy one later this year, the United States cannot afford to be left behind in this critical technology.

In my role as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, it has become apparent to me that small-city, rural States like my home State of South Dakota are often forgotten in our vast \$70-billion Federal science and technology enterprise. That part of America wants and deserves to be part of the technological revolution. More importantly, it wants to contribute. It is in the national interest to strengthen the scientific talent, resources, and infrastructure in our rural States through appropriate research, education, and outreach activities. The bill attempts to accomplish this in several ways. It increases funding for the Experimental Program To Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] from its current level of \$4.9 million to \$10 million. NASA's EPSCoR Program, as well as similar programs in six other science agencies, have been instrumental in providing Federal funding for academic research in rural States. My bill also funds the efforts of two separate university-led consortia formed to process Mission to Planet Earth satellite data into useful information for the farming and research communities in the Upper Plains States region.

Finally, Mr. President, my bill urges NASA to consider the use of underutilized military and other Federal Government facilities before committing to new leases of the construction of new facilities to fulfill agency requirements. With the end of the cold war and the drawdown of our military infrastructure, we have many facilities and property that are unused or woefully underutilized. In my home State of South Dakota, I can cite the Ellsworth Air Force Base as an example, but every Member in the Senate can no doubt identify an underutilized military facility in his or her State that might be put to some cost-effective use in our U.S. space program. I strongly believe that NASA should start taking a serious look at using some of these valuable assets and properties that have served as the foundation of our national defense before making huge financial commitments to new leases or facilities. My bill would simply require NASA to engage in this kind of review as a matter of agency policy.

Mr. President, I believe NASA is up to the challenge of keeping America preeminent in aeronautics and space despite the intense budget pressure and despite the increasing competition from other spacefaring nations. I am convinced this authorization bill provides NASA with the support it needs to meet that challenge.

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1997,

introduced by Senator PRESSLER, the chairman of our Commerce Committee. Let me take this opportunity to thank Senator PRESSLER for crafting a bill which provides the funding NASA will need to complete billion-dollar missions like space station and Mission to Planet Earth on schedule and prepare for the next century.

As chairman of the Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee, I have concerns about NASA's cost-cutting plan to reduce its budget by \$5 billion over 5 years and cut its spending to \$11.6 billion by the year 2000. The goals and missions of our space agency must be balanced within fiscal responsibility. This legislation authorizes \$13.7 billion for NASA in fiscal year 1997. This level, slightly less than the \$13.8 billion budget request, will allow NASA to continue all of its major ongoing aeronautics and space programs, including Mission to Planet Earth, space station aeronautics research, and space science and exploration.

The bill authorizes the full \$1.4 billion requested by NASA for its Mission to Planet Earth. This program has come a long way in recent years. Originally, it was misperceived as being exclusively focused on global warming and developing justifications for caps and timetables on industry emissions. Now we realize it is much broader than that. From several oversight hearings before the Science Subcommittee, we now know it is really about using satellite technology to help farmers predict weather on a year-to-year basis and measure soil moisture using a desk-top computer. It is about giving land planners, mappers, and foresters a cost-effective tool to help them do their work. It is about mineral exploration and archaeology. In short, Mission to Planet Earth is about using NASA's satellites to help average citizens in their everyday activities. At the University of Montana and other institutions in the Plains States, our researchers are already eager to gather data from the program so they can start developing useful applications for the community. It is time to proceed with carrying out the sound baseline plan for the program and not get sidetracked by calls for delays, cutbacks, and unnecessary studies from vocal opponents of this important initiative. The bill's full funding for Mission to Planet Earth should help the program go forward.

The bill also provides \$2.1 billion for the space station account and related activities. After more than a decade of planning and hard work, the United States and its foreign partners will finally start the assembly of the mammoth orbiting laboratory late next year. Let me first say that I wholeheartedly support the space station. I believe the space station represents the next logical step in our manned space exploration program. If successful, this program will demonstrate what great nations can do when combining their talent and resources for peaceful sci-

entific purposes. Beyond that, the space station will help our Nation maintain and strengthen its traditional leadership in aeronautics and space. While I continue to have some concerns about the heavy reliance of the current space station plan on Russian participation, I am optimistic that space station will successfully proceed within budget and on schedule.

I believe that NASA's aeronautics research program is one of the main reasons for our Nation's preeminence in aerospace. Aeronautics is the first A in NASA. Yet, for many years, aeronautics seemed to be reduced to a small A status. It always seemed to take a back seat to the higher profile space missions. However, under Dan Goldin's leadership, that is beginning to change and NASA is giving aeronautics the backing it deserves. For instance, the High Speed Research Program is developing precompetitive technologies in support of supersonic aircraft. It is estimated that the first country to market such an aircraft stands to gain \$200 billion in sales and 140,000 new jobs. Similarly, the Advanced Subsonic Technology Program funds research in support of subsonic airplanes—a market that generates 1 million jobs and contributes over \$25 billion annually to the U.S. trade balance. These programs are money-makers and it is in the national interest to give them whatever support they need. Accordingly, our NASA bill authorizes aeronautics research at the requested level of \$858 million.

Our bill also provides authorization for NASA's successful collection of technology transfer, education, and outreach activities. These programs have been very effective in allowing our quality research institutions in rural States and regions to contribute to the technological revolution. For instance, last May, our Science Subcommittee heard from Professor Steve Running of the University of Montana about his promising research in the use of remote sensing satellite data in forest and crop management. Our rural States can make an enormous contribution to the civilian space program if only given the chance.

In that connection, the bill provides \$10 million for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] Program—an increase of \$5.5 million over the requested level of \$4.5 million. This authorized increase reflects the important role that NASA's EPSCoR, as well as its counterparts at other Federal science agencies, has played in supporting vital academic research in rural States like Montana. The bill also includes sufficient funding to enable NASA to continue support for a new Rural Teacher Resource Center and a new Rural Technology Transfer and Commercialization Center to serve the Upper Plains States region. NASA made commitments to those new centers this year to fill in coverage gaps in NASA's outreach programs.

Full funding is also provided for on-going technology programs to keep NASA on the cutting edge. The bill supports the Reusable Launch Vehicle Program aimed at developing, and flight testing, new technologies to reduce the cost of access to space and eventually lay the foundation for a Shuttle replacement. In addition, there is funding to continue NASA's commitment to a new radar satellite program. Unlike conventional satellites, radar satellites are unaffected by cloud cover or nightfall. Now that Canada, Japan, and Europe have operational systems, it is clearly in the national interest for this country to develop that capability for civilian purposes as soon as practicable.

Finally, Mr. President, I note that the bill contains buyout provisions that we worked out with NASA that are intended to reduce the need for the agency to resort to reductions in force to downsize its work force. We recognize the need for NASA to reduce its 25,000-person work force to meet its budget targets. However, such personnel reductions need to be implemented in a gradual and thoughtful manner, with proper consideration for the personnel affected. It is with that in mind that we have provided the buyout authority in the bill to encourage voluntary separations in support of NASA's downsizing effort.

Mr. President and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation when it is considered by the full Senate later this year. ●

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself,  
Mr. GORTON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr.  
BRYAN, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1840. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I am pleased to introduce, along with Senators GORTON, HOLLINGS, and BRYAN, the Federal Trade Commission Reauthorization Act of 1996. This bill reauthorizes the Federal Trade Commission [FTC] for 2 years with funding sufficient to maintain current staffing levels.

Congress last reauthorized the FTC in 1994. That authorization was the Commission's first since 1980. In that reauthorization legislation we significantly modified the Federal Trade Commission Act. At present, we see no need to further modify the FTC's authorizing statutes. Therefore, this is an extremely simple piece of legislation. It authorizes funding for the FTC of \$107 million for fiscal year 1997 and \$111 million for fiscal year 1998. As I mentioned earlier, these authorization levels would simply maintain the existing staffing level of 979 FTE's.

The Federal Trade Commission is a law enforcement agency. The Commission's primary authority is derived from section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act through the declaration that "unfair methods of competition \* \* \* and unfair or deceptive acts or practices" are unlawful. The FTC's dual mission is to enforce Federal consumer protection laws and antitrust and competition laws. The FTC has enforcement and administrative duties under 37 separate acts.

The Commerce Committee held a hearing on the FTC on May 7, 1996. We are pleased with the general direction of the Commission. Under the leadership of Chairman Pitofsky, and his predecessor, Chairman Steiger, the Commission has established a solid performance record.

No comprehensive controversy surrounds the FTC today as it did in the late 1970's and early 1980's. As one would expect of a law enforcement entity acting in complex and, often, uncertain situations, individual Commission actions are sometimes not met with universal approval. Nevertheless, there is a general consensus that the Commission is functioning efficiently and effectively.

The FTC fulfills its mission with minimal burden on taxpayers because it generates over half its annual operating budget through fees from the corporations it regulates.

I hope the Senate will join Senators GORTON, HOLLINGS, BRYAN, and myself in supporting this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1840

*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 Trade Commission Reauthorization Act of 1996".

**SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.**

Section 25 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57c) is amended by striking "and not to exceed" and inserting "not to exceed" and by inserting before the period the following: "; not to exceed \$107,000,000 for fiscal year 1997; and not to exceed \$111,000,000 for fiscal year 1998".

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (by request):

S. 1841. A bill to reform the Nation's welfare system by requiring work and demanding personal responsibility; to the Committee on Finance.

THE WORK FIRST AND PERSONAL  
RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I rise to introduce the Work First and Personal Responsibility Act of 1996. This was sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on April 26, 1996, by Alice M. Rivlin, Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

I do not support this bill, and will indeed oppose it with great conviction.

All the same, the President is entitled to the courtesy of having his bills introduced, printed, and referred to the appropriate committee. This particular bill will be referred to the Finance Committee, of which I am the ranking Democratic member. Hence this simple duty falls to me.

I have a further purpose in introducing this bill. As Senators know, it is the fixed practice of the Office of Management and Budget to require a report from the appropriate Department or Departments on the impact an administration measure would have on the area of concern. Such a report is required of legislation passed by Congress and presented to the President for approval. Last October 24, 1995, at the first—and only—meeting of the House-Senate conference on H.R. 4, the House-passed Personal Responsibility Act and the Senate-passed Work Opportunity Act, I stated that "when fully implemented the time limits in the House bill would cut off benefits for 4,800,000 children." This was not a complicated calculation. There are this many children receiving benefits, that many who can expect to receive benefits for more than 5 years, and so forth. The mean stay on AFDC is 12.9 years. I concluded my statement calling on the White House to release a report on the Senate-passed bill which had been prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Three days later, on October 27, 1995, Elizabeth Shogren in the Los Angeles Times reported that the Senate-passed bill, thought to be moderate as compared with the House-passed bill, "would push an estimated 1.1 million children into poverty and make conditions worse for those already under the poverty line \* \* \*"

The Senate needs to know what would be the poverty impact of this newest administration proposal. It cannot be much less, or so I would think. Bear in mind that OMB estimates \$41 billion in Deficit Reduction from fiscal year 1996 through 2002.

I await an early reply from the administration. There has been more than sufficient time to make the calculations. One may be sure that if there were any prospect that the bill would reduce the number of children in poverty, we would have learned this by now.

The problem of understanding within the administration and the Congress, or so it appears to me, is that there is simply too little grasp of just how bad conditions are among America's children. None of us is without responsibility for this. Some protecting the good name of the poor; others assuming knowledge about behavior and behavioral change. Too few following Hippocrates' dictum: Primum non nocere. First do no harm. But it is not too late, if only we will look at the facts.

Two weeks ago, my revered colleague, Representative SAM M. GIBBONS and I requested of the Office of Management and Budget an analysis of S.

1795, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, which is the latest Republican welfare reform bill. The poverty impact. Today I am also requesting an analysis of the poverty effects of the President's latest proposal. This will be critical for Members to better understand the potential effects on children of both pieces of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill and the letter of transmittal from Dr. Alice M. Rivlin, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### TITLE-BY-TITLE SUMMARY

##### TITLE I—WORK-BASED ASSISTANCE

Title I repeals the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program and replaces it with a time-limited, work-based Temporary Employment Assistance (TEA) program. TEA continues open-ended Federal matching payments for State expenditures on welfare assistance. It also repeals the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program and replaces it with a new Work First program. (Funding for JOBS, AFDC Administration, and Emergency Assistance is merged into Work First. Most activities under these programs remain allowable under Work First.) Title I requires welfare recipients to sign personal responsibility contracts and mandates that they work or engage in job training within two years of first receiving benefits.

Title I also requires States to meet welfare recipient work targets. It includes a five-year time limit on the receipt of cash benefits, but allows States to exempt a portion of the caseload from the time limits. Vouchers must be provided to children in families that lose assistance due to the time limit. In addition, Title I provides performance bonuses to States based on their job placement effectiveness. It also gives States the option to deny additional welfare benefits to families that have another child while receiving welfare benefits.

Title I mandates that States operate child abuse prevention and protection, child support enforcement, foster care, and adoption assistance programs as a condition of receiving the Federal match. States also must operate a child care program under the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act of 1990. Title I amends the CCDBG Act and consolidates the three individual child care programs under current title IV-A of the Social Security Act into one program. Funding for child care is significantly increased. This title also continues the one-year entitlement to transitional Medicaid benefits for families losing welfare benefits due to employment or excess income. In addition, it allows States to enter into demonstration programs to make periodic advances of the earned income tax credit (EITC) to welfare recipients in jobs programs (as opposed to having workers file for the EITC themselves).

##### TITLE II—CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Title II proposes stringent child support enforcement measures including a State case registry of child support enforcement orders. It improves paternity establishment and requires employers to report new hires to a central State data base. Title II allows States to revoke drivers and professional licenses for parents who refuse to pay child support. It also removes administrative barriers that impede the enforcement of child support orders.

##### TITLE III—FOOD ASSISTANCE

Title III amends the Food Stamp and Child Nutrition programs. It adjusts the maximum Food Stamp allotment to 100 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan and reduces the standard deduction and indexes it to the Consumer Price Index thereafter. Title III also counts all energy assistance as income and includes a work requirement that makes adults age 18 to 50 with no dependents ineligible for food stamps after six months of each year unless they work 20 hours a week or participate in workfare or training (although eligibility continues if a State fails to supply a training or workfare slot). It also includes State flexibility measures and new program integrity proposals to reduce Food Stamp trafficking and program waste. Finally, Title III better targets food subsidies for family day care homes and makes other minor changes in Child Nutrition programs.

##### TITLE IV—TREATMENT OF ALIENS

Title IV makes only "qualified aliens" eligible for the TEA (formerly AFDC), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and Medicaid programs. In addition, it gives States the option of applying the same eligibility criteria to State funded needs-based assistance. Title IV also lengthens until citizenship the deeming period during which a sponsor's income is presumed available to support a legal permanent resident should he or she apply for SSI, TEA, or Food Stamps. It makes all future affidavits of support legally binding and provides States the option to extend sponsor income deeming to State funded needs-based cash assistance if the immigrant is denied TEA, SSI, or Food Stamps.

##### TITLE V—SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REFORMS

Title V tightens eligibility standards for disabled children who receive SSI benefits. Children currently on the rolls who are found no longer eligible would not receive benefits as of January 1, 1998. It creates new guidelines for the Social Security Administration to conduct continuing disability reviews (CDRs).

Title V also creates a dedicated savings account for SSI-eligible disabled children for education, job training, and equipment or housing modifications related to their disability, and allows this account to be excluded from income and resource determinations. It establishes an installment schedule for paying past-due SSI benefit amounts, and authorizes the Commissioner of Social Security to reduce Social Security (OASDI) benefits by the amount of overpayment of SSI benefits without an OASDI beneficiary's consent.

Title V also denies SSI eligibility if drug addiction or alcoholism is the basis for the disability determination. Current SSI recipients who are eligible on the basis of drug addiction or alcoholism will no longer receive benefits as of January 1, 1997. A portion of the savings from this proposal (\$50 million annually during FYs 1997-1998) will be used to fund additional drug (including alcohol) treatment programs and services through the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant program.

Title V also makes individuals convicted in Federal or State court of having fraudulently misrepresented their residence in order to receive welfare benefits from two or more States ineligible to receive SSI for ten years from the date of conviction. It makes fugitive felons ineligible for SSI. In addition, it provides that the appropriation of additional administrative funds to SSA for FYs 1996-2002 for conducting Social Security Disability Insurance and SSI CDRs should trigger an increase, within specified limits, to the discretionary spending caps. The title

would also provide authority to increase the discretionary spending caps, within specified limits, upon appropriation of funds for FYs 1996-1997 to the Social Security Administration to implement any changes to the SSI program pursuant to adoption of welfare reform.

Title V provides that when private insurance covers the costs of SSI eligible children in medical care facilities, these children will no longer be eligible for their full SSI benefits. Instead, they will only be eligible to receive the same \$30 per month standard amount that Medicaid-covered SSI eligible children receive.

##### TITLE VI—SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANTS (SSBG)

This title reduces the amount required to be allotted among States for SSBG under Title XX of the Social Security Act from \$2.8 billion to \$2.73 billion in FY 1996, and to \$2.52 billion for each of FYs 1997-2002.

##### DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Office of Management and Budget estimates that the Administration's welfare reform proposal saves \$41 billion during FYs 1996 through 2002. This total includes \$3 billion in savings resulting from the enactment of P.L. 104-121, which extended the debt limit and modified the Social Security Act, and reflects interactions with Medicaid proposals in the President's FY 1997 Budget.

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

*Washington, DC, April 26, 1996.*

Hon. ALBERT GORE, Jr.,  
*President of the Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress the Administration's "Work First and Personal Responsibility Act of 1996," a comprehensive proposal to reform the Nation's failed welfare system. The President remains committed to working with the Congress to pass a bipartisan welfare reform bill this year that honors the values of work, responsibility, and family. This proposal will end the current welfare system by requiring work, demanding responsibility, strengthening families, and protecting children.

Under this legislative proposal, everyone who can work must go to work, and no one who can work can stay on welfare indefinitely. This proposal replaces Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with a time-limited benefit conditioned on work. It imposes tough work requirements and time limits, including a lifetime limit of five years for receipt of welfare benefits. It gives States the means to provide child care that is essential to imposing tough work requirements and moving people from welfare to work. States are given broad new flexibility to tailor welfare reforms to local needs, but are also held accountable for continuing their commitment to move people from welfare to work. The proposal permits adjusting to changing economic circumstances and provides vouchers to meet the most basic needs of children in families whose benefits end.

The Work First proposal demands responsibility as well. It includes the toughest child support enforcement measures ever proposed. The proposal requires minor mothers to live at home and stay in school as a condition of receiving assistance and gives States the option to deny additional benefits for additional children born to parents who are on welfare.

The proposal achieves significant savings by reforming the Food Stamp and Child Nutrition programs, while preserving the national nutritional safety net. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these reforms would save almost \$22 billion over

seven years through provisions such as counting energy assistance as income and tough new program integrity measures to crack down on Food Stamp fraud. The proposal gives States unprecedented flexibility to administer the Food Stamp program, with new work requirements and time limits on able-bodied, childless adults. It continues to index basic benefits with inflation, better targets food subsidies for family day care homes, and makes other adjustments in the Child Nutrition program. The proposal protects children by preserving the school lunch program and important child welfare programs for abused and disabled children.

The proposal achieves substantial savings in other areas by requiring sponsors who bring immigrants into the country to be held legally responsible for their financial well-being, and by better targeting eligibility for childhood disability benefits. It also includes two provisions that are part of the recently enacted Public Law 104-121. The first provision modifies the Social Security Act to deny benefits to adults who are on Supplemental Security Income due to drug abuse or alcoholism. The second provision improves program integrity measures through expanded continuing disability reviews. The savings from these enacted proposals should be applied towards the total savings to be achieved through welfare reform.

The Administration's welfare reform proposal reduces spending by \$41 billion over seven years. This total includes the \$3 billion in savings resulting from the enactment of Public Law 104-121 and reflects interactions with Medicaid proposals in the President's FY 1997 Budget.

I urge the Congress to act favorably and expeditiously on this important proposal. Welfare reform is at the top of the President's and the Nation's agenda. The Administration is confident that agreement can be reached this year on bipartisan welfare reform legislation that is tough on work and responsibility and serves the interests of our Nation's children. We look forward to working with the Congress to achieve this urgent national goal.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,  
*Director.*

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 1842. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve protections for workers in multiemployer pension plans, to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE WORKERS PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I introduce the Workers' Pension Protection Act of 1996 in order to level playing field for millions of American workers who participate in multi-employer pension plans. This bill will extend, to them, the protections previously established for workers in single-employer pension plans. First, the legislation harmonizes the rules for all workers by adopting a 5-year vesting requirement which conforms to vesting rules applicable to other qualified pension plans. Furthermore, this bill also protects workers' pension benefits by making sure that these multi-employer plans are sufficiently funded so that the benefits promised today will actually be there for the worker when he retires.

One benefit which has long been extend to workers in single-employer

pension plans is the guarantee of benefits after a maximum of 5 years of service. Workers whose employers contribute to multi-employer plans may work for up to 10 years before they are guaranteed to receive any benefits from their pension plan. This bill extends the same 5-year vesting right to multi-employer plan participants.

Many of this country's multi-employer pension plans are significantly under funded by billions of dollars. This legislation targets those bade apples—the under funded plans. This bill addresses the problem with four provisions that are consistent with the pension reform for single employer pension plans that we passed in 1994 as part of the GATT legislation.

First, this bill would prohibit multi-employer plan trustees from increasing pension benefits unless a plan has a 95-percent ratio of assets to current liabilities attributable to employees and their beneficiaries. Pension plans would be required to operate with a balanced budget and could not run in the red as they do now.

Second, this bill would prohibit multi-employer trustees from granting a benefit increase in a multi-employer plan which satisfies the 95-percent ratio if the increase would reduce this ratio below 90 percent. In addition, should the ratio drop due to fluctuations in the market or other changes in the funding valuation, the trustees could not increase benefits again until they retain the 90-percent ratio. These ratios will allow multi-employer pension plans to operate at full funding yet maintain the discretion to rely on actuarial analysis in modifying benefit levels.

Third, multi-employer plans would be required to use a single, identified interest rate and mortality table assumptions in all calculations for all players. As in the single employer pension reform legislation in 1994, the interest rates and mortality tables must be standardized and should conform with the most recent data. As a result, these plans could not continue to use one rate when reporting to the Government and different rate when determining liability associated with under funding. This is the same commonsense approach that was applied to single employer pension plans when the GATT legislation was passed.

Finally, as did the GATT legislation, this bill would require that plan trustees provide notification of their financial status on annual basis to participating employees in easily understood terms. Once and for all participants and beneficiaries will begin to understand how secure there pension benefits really are because these interests rates more accurately predict the return on investment than current rates permitted for multi-employer plans. With a better understanding of the worth of their pension benefits workers can make informed decisions about their future retirement needs.

In the last Congress, we took significant and necessary steps to reform the

pension laws for retirement security for millions of American workers. Unfortunately, a large segment of the work force was left behind and is in need of similar protection. Union employees participating in multi-employer pension plans have been contributing hard earned dollars to these plans with the expectation of receiving \$2,000 to \$3,000 a month when they retire. They are not aware that, if their plan goes belly-up due to significant under funding, they could receive less than \$500 a month. This legislation will ensure that the pension benefits, union employees have worked so hard for and are depending on, will be there when they are ready to retire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

##### SECTION 101

Section 101 prohibits multiemployer pension plan trustees from increasing benefits unless the plan is operating with at least 95 percent funding. If a plan satisfies this minimum funding requirement, it may choose to increase benefits if the benefit increase would not reduce the funding levels to below 90 percent. The plan would then be required to reach 95 percent funding again before increasing benefits.

This section also requires multiemployer plans to use the interest rate assumptions and the mortality tables that were passed into law in the 1994 GATT legislation for single-employer pension plans. These interest rates more accurately predict the return on investment than the current rates permitted for multiemployer plans. Furthermore, the mortality tables currently relied on by multiemployer plans date back to 1971 while the GATT legislation required that single-employer plans rely on more current data. This section requires that multiemployer plans rely on the current mortality tables.

##### SECTION 102

Section 102 amends ERISA by modifying the anti-cutback rule contained in ERISA §204(g). This provision is necessary in order to revoke any trustee action which violates the other provisions of this bill.

##### SECTION 103

Section 103 requires multiemployer plan administrators to notify plan participants, beneficiaries and contributing employers of the plan's funded status and the limits of the PBGC's guarantee should the plan terminate while underfunded. The notice must be written in a manner which can be understood by the average plan participant. This provision duplicates the notice requirements for single-employer plans contained in the GATT legislation.

##### SECTION 201

Section 201 requires multiemployer plans to adopt the interest rate and mortality tables used by single-employer plans as mandated in the GATT legislation for all purposes. For a description of these interest rate and mortality table requirements, see Section 101 above.

##### SECTION 301

Section 301 provides employers the right to seek an injunction against a plan to prevent an impermissible benefit increase. The sole relief available to employers is an injunction against trustees to enforce the provisions contained in this bill.

## SECTION 302

Section 302 is modeled on ERISA Section 502(g)(1) and permits a court, in its discretion, to award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to either party in actions brought under Section 301. This Bill does not provide for either compensatory or punitive damages.

## SECTION 303

Section 303 expands the list of civil actions which may be brought by the PBGC to include section 101, 102, 103 and 201. The Bill gives the PBGC, and not the U.S. Department of Labor, the concurrent power of enforcement of the Bill's provisions because the PBGC is financially responsible for guaranteed benefits.

## SECTION 401

Section 401 conforms the vesting rules for multiemployer plans to the rules applicable to other qualified plans by requiring that a worker's accrued benefits be 100-percent vested no later than upon the participant's completion of 5 years of service rather than the current 10-year period.

## EFFECTIVE DATES

The effective dates for the first three titles in this Bill shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 1996. Section 401 would be effective for plan years beginning on or after the earlier of (1) the later of December 31, 1996, or the date on which the last collective bargaining agreements pursuant to which the plan is maintained terminates, or (2) January 1, 1999, with respect to participants within an hour of service after the effective date.●

By Mr. INHOFF (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1843. A bill to provide for the allocation of funds from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## MASS TRANSIT LEGISLATION

● Mr. INHOFF. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that attempts to level the playing field for transit donor States across the country. In addition to myself, Senators LOTT, THURMOND, THOMAS, JEFFORDS, and COCHRAN are all original cosponsors.

Federal transit dollars are distributed according to the Federal Transit Act as amended by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA]. Similar to highway dollars, transit dollars are collected at the gas pump and are distributed by both formula and discretionary grants.

States such as Oklahoma that do not receive back all of the revenues that they send to the Federal mass transit account are considered donor States. Unfortunately, these States are not getting nearly as much back in Federal funding as they contribute. My proposal is designed to address this critical transit problem. Each State that contributes \$45 million or less into the Federal mass transit account will be guaranteed to receive back no less than 80 percent of its apportionment.

States should be able to expect local dollars to be used for local transit needs. Oklahoma-generated revenues should be remitted back to Oklahoma to provide for improved public trans-

portation for Oklahomans, not urban mass transit systems in other States. This bill will put equity into the mass transit apportionment system by returning these locally generated dollars home.●

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1844. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to direct a study of the opportunities for enhanced water based recreation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE NATIONAL RECREATION LAKES STUDY ACT  
OF 1996

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this is an important time of the year for Americans: It is among the first weeks of the summer vacation and recreation season, and it is National Fishing Week.

Millions of Americans are either tuning their boat engines, tying flies, dusting off their hiking boots, squeezing into their bathing suits, or putting on their water skis. In short, we're ready to go, and the vacation rush is on. Many people got a jump start last week, heading to lakes or national parks. Being lucky enough to be in Alaska, I was able to steal a couple days myself. If you want to hear my big fish stories, ask me later.

This is also an important week for at least three other reasons: I am introducing legislation to help increase recreational opportunities on this Nation's lakes and rivers; the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources holds a hearing Tuesday on S. 1703, my legislation raising millions of dollars for our national parks; and the House and Senate conference is working to resolve the differences on the most important parks and conservation legislation in a decade.

Let's take a moment to take stock of some of this Nation's natural bounty and talk about a couple areas where we can take action to protect and enhance it. Let's start with the recreation lakes initiative.

The Recreation Roundtable recently reported that a body of water—a lake, river, or ocean—is the primary choice for 40 percent of Americans' recreational destination. Nearly 17 million boats are in use in this Nation, and sales of boats and boating goods are on the upswing. Fishing and the bragging rights that go along with it are two of Americans' favorite pastimes.

But, when it comes to our thousands of bodies of water, both natural and man made, are we using our resources as wisely as we should? Are we living up to our recreational potential? We probably are not.

In addition to the many natural lakes and rivers with which this Nation is blessed, we also have an enormous resource in man-made reservoirs built by Federal, State and local agencies, as well as private entities. For important practical, financial, and legal reasons, most public resources in these areas must first go to purposes such as flood

control, navigation, and water supply. But, even after meeting those requirements, there is a lot of untapped recreational potential in almost every State.

The recreation lakes initiative I am introducing today will reinvigorate the public-private partnership between States, the Federal Government, and private entities to make the most of our public, water-based recreational opportunities.

While this bill concerns public assets, the private sector plays a very important role. Did you know our national forest lands provide over one-half of all skiing in the United States without the Federal Government building one lift or one ski lodge? My legislation will help build a true partnership to make the recreation on or near our man-made lakes available to all Americans.

My legislation will kick-start this partnership by bringing together Federal agencies, State and local governments, and recreation users and providers to make specific recommendations about how we can use our vast untapped recreational potential. While protecting the integrity of our lakes and reservoirs for their primary purposes, they will be charged with finding ways to make them more available to Americans.

The prudent use of these resources will protect the environment, help local communities and decrease the demand for other, overburdened resources. It will also help bring days of joy to thousands of Americans who are brought in closer touch with the great outdoors.

Speaking of the great outdoors, I want to say a few words about our national parks. This week marks the beginning of the summer vacation season, and our national parks are a main destination.

From the majesty and colors of the Grand Canyon—to the excitement of Old Faithful—to the remote beauty of Alaska's national parks, millions of Americans are traveling thousands of miles to catch a glimpse of our natural heritage. While the beauty and excitement is still there, Americans are facing some unsightly problems when they reach their vacation destinations. For many years, the National Park Service has struggled with a growing maintenance backlog. Increased park use and the addition of more new parks have stretched Federal park dollars to the hilt. Now, with Federal funds already tight, the National Park Service's park maintenance backlog stands at \$4 billion.

The time has come to make needed repairs and to restore the luster to some of our crown jewels. We need an infusion of cash no Congress and no President could provide overnight. It is unfortunate some in this administration has chosen election-year rhetoric over substance to try and meet these needs. Federal funds can and will keep our parks open and running. But we need private funds—like those that

flowed in to restore the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island—to help pay for the backlog of repairs in our parks.

My legislation—introduced April 25 and scheduled for a hearing this Thursday—will generate \$100 million a year or more for our national parks.

It provides the National Park Foundation the means to collect funds from individuals, foundations, and corporations. It gives this official fundraising arm of the National Park Service the authority to engage in appropriate business relationships, similar to those already enjoyed by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the National Forest Foundation, and the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Rather than allowing movie executives, advertisers, and publishers to continue making millions off the intellectual property and assets of our parks for next to nothing, my bill will allow our parks to get something in return. It will provide a responsible way to reduce our National Park Service's long-term maintenance backlog.

Our natural and recreational assets must be conserved and enjoyed by Americans. As we enter the summer vacation months, we must take the extra steps needed to make this possible. These two bills—our recreation lakes initiative and my bill to provide \$100 million a year for maintenance of our national parks—are a good start.

We continue to work on park concessions and entrance fee reforms. A House-Senate conference committee also continues to meet to work out the details on my omnibus 60-plus item parks and conservation package. From the Selma to Montgomery National Historical Trail to the San Francisco Presidio to lands needed for the Winter Olympics, the beneficial effects of this legislation will be felt in every State.

As I stated, I am introducing legislation on a recreation lakes initiative and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the legislation be printed in the RECORD. I want to emphasize that the study mandated by this bill will rely on existing data and is designed to develop creative solutions to involve the private sector. We do not need an elaborate multiyear effort to produce volumes to gather dust on the shelves. What we need is a thoughtful exchange of views on how best to develop the recreational potential at our Federal, man-made lakes and reservoirs, without diminishing or adversely affecting the purposes for which those areas were established.

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

S. 1844

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Recreation Lakes Study Act of 1996".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Congress finds that the federal government, under the authority of the Reclama-

tion Act and other statutes, has developed man-made lakes and reservoirs that have become a powerful magnet for diverse recreational activities and that such activities contribute to the well-being of families and individuals and the economic viability of local communities. The Congress further finds that in order to further the purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the President should appoint an advisory commission to review the current and anticipated demand for recreational opportunities at federally-managed man-made lakes and reservoirs through creative partnerships involving federal, State and local governments and the private sector and to develop alternatives for enhanced recreational use of such facilities.

#### SEC. 3. COMMISSION.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (P.L. 88-578, 78 Stat. 897), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new section 13:

"SEC. 13. (a) The President shall appoint an advisory commission to review the opportunities for enhanced opportunities for water based recreation which shall submit a report to the President and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives within one year from the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) The members of the Commission shall include:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior, or his designee;

(2) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee;

(3) The Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, or his designee;

(4) The Secretary of Agriculture, or his designee;

(5) A person nominated by the National Governor's Association;

(6) Four persons familiar with the recreation and tourism industry, at least one of whom shall be familiar with the economics and financing of recreation related infrastructure.

"(c) The President shall appoint one member to serve as Chairman. Any vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties. The Secretary of the Interior shall provide all financial, administrative, and staffing requirements for the Commission, including office space, furnishings, and equipment. The heads of other federal agencies are authorized, at the request of the Commission, to provide such information or personnel, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, to the Commission as may be useful to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(d) The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That, to the maximum extent possible, the Commission shall use existing data and research. The Commission is authorized to use the United States mail in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

"(e) The report shall review the extent of water related recreation at federal man-made lakes and reservoirs and shall develop alternatives to enhance the opportunities for such use by the public. In developing the report, the Commission shall (1) review the extent to which recreation components identified in specific authorizations associated with individual federal man-made lakes and

reservoirs have been accomplished, (2) evaluate the feasibility of enhancing recreation opportunities at federally-managed lakes and reservoirs under existing statutes, (3) consider legislative changes that would enhance recreation opportunities consistent with and subject to the achievement of the authorized purposes of federal water projects, and (4) make recommendations on alternatives for enhanced recreation opportunities including, but not limited to, the establishment of a National Recreation Lake System under which specific lakes would receive national designation and which would be managed through innovative partnership-based agreements between federal agencies, State and local units of government, and the private sector. Any such alternatives shall be consistent with and subject to the authorized purposes for any man-made lakes and reservoirs and shall emphasize private sector initiatives in concert with State and local units of government."

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 814

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Marshall Plan and George Catlett Marshall.

S. 1233

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to assure equitable coverage and treatment of emergency services under health plans.

S. 1237

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1237, A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 1420

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1420, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

S. 1437

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to provide for an increase in funding for the conduct and support of diabetes-related research by the National Institutes of Health.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve safety at public railway-highway crossings, and for other purposes.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] 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 Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] 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.

S. 1612

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1612, a bill to provide for increased mandatory minimum sentences for criminals possessing firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 1735

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1735, a bill to establish the U.S. Tourism Organization as a nongovernmental entity for the purpose of promoting tourism in the United States.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to extend the act, and for other purposes.

S. 1836

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1836, a bill to designate a segment of the Clarion River, located in Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 52

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 52, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of victims of crimes.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 63

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 63, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress

that the Secretary of Agriculture should dispose of all remaining commodities in the disaster reserve maintained under the Agricultural Act of 1970 to relieve the distress of livestock producers whose ability to maintain livestock is adversely affected by the prolonged drought conditions existing in certain areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 257

At the request of Mr. FORD, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 257, a resolution to designate June 15, 1996, as "National Race for the Cure Day."

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

## DISASTER RESERVE SENSE-OF-THE-CONGRESS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

## KASSEBAUM AMENDMENT NO. 4042

Mr. BURNS (for Mrs. KASSEBAUM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) to express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should dispose of all remaining commodities in the disaster reserve maintained under the Agricultural Act of 1970 to relieve the distress of livestock producers whose ability to maintain livestock is adversely affected by the prolonged drought conditions existing in certain areas of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert "and other adverse weather" after "drought".

On page 2, line 9, strike "the prolonged drought" and insert "disaster conditions, such as prolonged drought or flooding".

## THE EUFAULA LAKE PROJECT ACT OF 1996

## NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 4043

Mr. BURNS (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1406) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Eufaula, OK, a parcel of land located at the Eufaula Lake project, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike the words "approximately 4" and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 12.5".

## NOTICE OF HEARING

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Aging, in conjunction with the Committee on Appropriations, will hold a

hearing on Wednesday, June 12, 1996, at 9:30 a.m., in room 138 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The hearing will discuss increasing funding for biomedical research.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, to consider the possible need for changes to the Commodity Exchange Act.

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

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, to conduct a hearing on S. 1815, the Securities Investment Promotion Act of 1996.

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

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, at 9:30 a.m.

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

## COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for an oversight hearing on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, which will begin at 10 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. The hearing is entitled "Implementation of the Small Business Agenda."

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

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5 at 9:00 a.m. to hold a hearing to discuss encouraging return to work in the SSI and DI Programs.

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

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHITE-WATER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, to conduct an executive session pursuant to Senate Resolution 120.