

The President, at the same time, has made a counteroffer, as I understand it, and has proposed some changes in the Medicare Program, which would achieve savings of \$116 billion over the same period of time. The Republican proposals would have achieved savings of almost \$170 billion.

Let us say, OK, Mr. President, have it your way for the short term. Let us introduce the President's proposed changes in the Medicare Program. Let us accept his proposals for changes and cuts in the Medicare Program and enact them next week, or the week following. If the reconciliation bill from the Budget Committee's resolution is vetoed by the President or not supported by the Democrats in that area of the budget, let us isolate the Medicare Program changes and enact some changes.

I suggest, let us enact the President's proposed changes and cuts in the program and, at the same time, establish a commission—which the President has recommended, the trustees have recommended in their report, including Secretary Shalala, Secretary Reich, Secretary Rubin, and others, who serve on that trustee panel—to recommend long-term changes in the Medicare Program that would ensure its solvency and protect the benefits for the older citizens in our society over the long term.

I do not see anything wrong with that. As a matter of fact, I have been suggesting that that be considered as an alternative. If Congress and the President cannot agree on what changes ought to be made, get a commission together, much like the Base Closure Commission, or the Social Security Commission, which was formed in 1983 and chaired by Alan Greenspan. It made recommendations to save the Social Security trust fund from bankruptcy, and Congress and the President agreed at that time to accept the recommendation of that commission and implement it.

That ought to be a part of this legislation—that we establish that commission, agree to implement its recommendations, and have a vote on it. If you do not want to implement them, vote no; be against everything. But we have to come to terms with the reality of the situation. The longer we wait, the harder the solution is going to be and the more sacrifices that are going to have to be made by everybody—the taxpayers. If we do not make these changes, do you know what is going to happen? Pretty soon, you are going to see the taxes on the employers and employees to fund this program being increased—and by substantial sums.

Now, the older population is getting older and, thank goodness, medical science is wonderful and it is giving us all opportunities for longer lives. But coming with that, too, are added expenses, as you get older, for medical care. Our senior citizens confront the reality every day of this terrible fear, and that is that they will not have the funds, they will not have access to the care they need to enjoy the longevity that they now have, compliments of medical science, good nutrition, and the advances that we have made for good health in our society.

So I say that it is time to stop the partisan politics. Let us quit throwing rocks at each other across the aisle, blaming each other for not getting anything done. I am prepared to say, as a Member of the Republican leadership in the Senate, OK, Mr. President, let us enact your proposal.

I am going to introduce a bill next week, and I hope there will be Senators on both sides of the aisle who will say, OK, let us go along with this suggestion as an alternative to what we have been getting. And what we have been getting is nothing—gridlock, confrontation, yelling at each other, people get-

ting red in the face, and nothing getting done.

I think the American people are fed up with that kind of politics, fed up with that kind of Government. I am fed up with it. It is time to change. We ought to do it now—before it is too late. •

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax incentives for exporting jobs outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### TAX INCENTIVE ELIMINATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to address the continuing loss of U.S. manufacturing jobs by introducing a bill to eliminate tax incentives for companies to export such jobs.

For too many years and in too many cases, we have seen U.S. manufacturers shut down business in the United States, lay off workers, and set up shop overseas. Although the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not maintain statistics on the export of United States jobs, we learned at a hearing of my Governmental Affairs Subcommittee 3 years ago that at least 200 United States plants had moved to Mexico alone over the previous decade.

A company's decision to move its operations overseas is usually an economic decision, based on factors like the availability of cheap labor and unregulated access to natural resources. While I wish that some U.S. companies would exercise better citizenship and recognize an ongoing responsibility to their long-time employees as well as their shareholders, I know that the Federal Government cannot force them to do so.

However, there is no reason why the U.S. taxpayers should be subsidizing companies that choose to move their operations overseas. Yet that is what we have been doing. When a U.S. company decides to shut down a plant in the United States and move its operations overseas, we reward them—through the Tax Code—for the decision.

Last year, I joined Senator DORGAN and others to introduce a bill—S. 1355—addressing one provision of the Tax Code which provides such a subsidy. The Dorgan bill would eliminate the ability of companies who move their operations overseas to defer the payment of Federal income tax on the profits from those operations.

Today, I am introducing a bill to address two more provisions of the Tax Code which provide taxpayer subsidies to companies that move their operations overseas.

First, section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code permits a deduction for “all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business.” This provision has been interpreted to allow a deduction for moving expenses in the case of a company that moves part or all of its operations overseas, as long as the company continues to sell its product in the United

States and can argue that the overseas operations are related to the U.S. source income. As a result, the U.S. taxpayers are underwriting the moving expenses of companies who choose to move capital equipment previously used in U.S. operations, and the associated jobs overseas.

My bill would reverse this policy by prohibiting a company from deducting the cost of transporting capital equipment previously used in U.S. operations overseas when it is in the process of closing or downsizing U.S. plants. Because the export of such capital equipment and the associated jobs is more likely to reduce U.S.-source income than to increase it, this provision is entirely consistent with the intent of section 162 to permit the deduction of ordinary and necessary business expenses incurred in connection with such income.

Second, section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code allows a company to avoid paying capital gains taxes on its capital assets, if these assets are moved overseas and included in an active business in a corporate reorganization. Because no capital gains tax is paid at the time of the reorganization, and because the U.S. loses jurisdiction over the assets after they are shipped overseas, the company is able to avoid the tax altogether. The company is able to obtain an unwarranted tax advantage by transferring appreciated assets to a corporation that is not subject to U.S. residence jurisdiction—and the taxpayers are left paying yet another subsidy to companies that choose to move their operations overseas.

My bill would reverse this policy by eliminating the active business exception in section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code and subjecting corporate assets to the capital gains tax at the time they are transferred overseas in any reorganization.

Mr. President, some companies may still choose to overlook their responsibility as citizens and the needs of their long-timer employees by moving jobs overseas, but we should not be subsidizing such decisions.

By WELLSTONE:

S. 1929. A bill to extend the authority for the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Projects for fiscal years 1997 through 1999, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### THE HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROJECTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, to save a unique, highly effective and invaluable program that assists homeless veterans to find employment, I am today introducing a bill that would reauthorize the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Projects [HVRP] for 3 years.

This bill is identical to S. 1257 which I introduced last year after this low-cost program—funded at just over \$5 million annually—had been zeroed out in the rescissions bill. With the invaluable help of my distinguished colleague, Senator SIMPSON, chairman of

the Veterans' Affairs Committee—a committee I am proud and honored to serve on—we managed to keep HVRP alive by authorizing a 1-year extension through the end of fiscal year 1996, at the same time authorizing an expenditure of \$10 million. Unfortunately, for reasons I can't fathom, no funds were appropriated for HVRP for fiscal year 1996. While HVRP was partially revived in February 1996 when the Departments of Labor and Housing and Urban Development [HUD] each provided \$1.3 million in discretionary funds to renew and support projects in cold weather areas of the Nation, the President's budget for fiscal year 1997 contains no funding for HVRP.

I am frankly appalled and puzzled that this exceptionally cost-effective program which has done so much to help America's homeless veterans for the past 7 years, continues to face extraordinary difficulties and may not survive. The only possible explanation there is for the trials and tribulations of HVRP is that because it is such a modestly funded national program with annual appropriations ranging from \$1.366 million to \$5.055 million, it falls beneath the threshold of visibility of the Senate, which is accustomed to focusing on programs with price tags of hundreds of millions of dollars or more.

When I sought to have the Veterans' Committee accept the 3-year extension of HVRP I proposed in S. 1257, I was told that only a 1-year authorization could be approved because not enough was known about the program, but that a committee hearing would be held early this year to inform Members about the program. Unfortunately, it now appears unlikely that hearings on HVRP will be scheduled.

It is a pity that this exceptionally worthwhile program has such a low profile in this Chamber, because I'm confident that if my colleagues knew more about HVRP, there would be overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle for keeping this program alive and funded adequately.

Mr. President, permit me to describe the daunting problems HVRP seeks to address, its outstanding accomplishments, and its methods of operation.

On any given night, it has been estimated that between 250,000 and 280,000 veterans are homeless. And, as the Disabled American Veterans [DAV] testified before a House Committee, DOD projects a reduction of 250,000 active military personnel through the year 2000. DAV stressed that many "at best will have 'soft' transferable skills," particularly those trained in combat arms, concluding that while it's unknown "how many of them will end up in the unemployment or soup kitchen line \* \* \* we believe they are at risk."

In effect we are being told that up to one-third of America's homeless are veterans and the number could well increase. Mr. President, in the face of this situation which can only be described as a national disgrace, HVRP, administered by the Labor Depart-

ment's Veterans Employment and Training Service [VETS] is the only employment assistance program dedicated to homeless veterans. And, as Preston Taylor, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veteran Employment and Training has emphasized, unemployment, not the lack of affordable housing, is the main cause of homelessness among veterans.

Permit me to briefly list some of HVRP's strengths and accomplishments:

It is one of the most successful job placement programs in the Federal Government.

Since its inception it has placed 13,000 veterans in jobs at a cost of approximately \$1,500 per placement.

HVRP grantees build complementary relationships with VA, JTPA, and other programs—they do not duplicate any other services.

A unique aspect of HVRP is to utilize formerly homeless veterans who know how to approach and win the confidence and trust of other homeless veterans; they go into the streets, shelters, soup kitchens, and other places and tell them HVRP and other available services.

HVRP provides grants to community based groups that employ flexible and innovative approaches to assist homeless, unemployed veterans to reenter the work force. Let me repeat—grants to community-based groups, not funding to some large impersonal Federal bureaucracy that some of my colleagues like to lambaste. This is precisely the kind of low-cost, locally focused, and result-oriented program that all of my colleagues, regardless of ideology or party should be able to support without reservation.

The program is employment-focused, recognizing that homeless veterans need to become self-supporting to obtain permanent shelter. HVRP local grantees provide homeless veterans with a variety of services designed to maximize their chances of finding permanent jobs, including job counseling, resume preparation, on-the-job training, and instructions in job search techniques. The HVRP program, in collaboration with other service providers, effectively addresses the six major problems hampering homeless veterans seeking to reenter the job market: lack of transitional housing; inadequate substance abuse treatment; transportation problems; lack of job skills; depressed local labor markets; and resistance to hiring the homeless.

In conclusion I want to make two points: First that the modest sums saved by eliminating HVRP will quickly be offset by the high costs of providing public assistance to the veterans who will remain homeless due to the lack of a permanent, paying job.

Second, and more important, I was deeply moved recently by a letter I received from a disabled Vietnam veteran in Minnesota whom I'd spoken to on the phone and thanked for his service to our country. He mentioned that

he'd always felt he'd been left in Vietnam, but that after our talk he felt that he'd at last been brought home. Fortunately, there are many Vietnam veterans who feel they have now come home again. But for some Vietnam and other veterans, the only homes they know are the streets and homeless shelters. To eliminate HVRP, the one program that could give them a job and permit them to escape the miseries and indignities of hopelessness so that they too could feel that they had at last come home, would be shameful.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and ensuring that HVRP receives the funding it needs to continue its invaluable work.

Mr. President, I ask that a statement of HVRP of Ronald W. Drach, National Employment Director, DAV, before the Subcommittee on Education, Employment and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, April 18, 1996, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. And I ask unanimous consent that an article by Sid Daniels, Director, National Employment Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, entitled "Sun Sets on Homeless Vets Program," appearing in the Washington Action Reporter, October 1995, also be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

S. 1929

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

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROJECTS.—Section 738(e)(1) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11448(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1997.

"(F) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

"(G) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999."

(b) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 739(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11449(a)) is amended by striking out "the fiscal years 1994 and 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years 1994 through 1999".

(c) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 741 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11450) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1997" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1999".

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF RONALD W. DRACH BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, APRIL 18, 1996

#### HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, homeless veterans continue to be a major concern. On any given night, it has been estimated that between 250,000 and 280,000 veterans are homeless. Several years ago, the Department of Labor initiated an outreach project for homeless veterans in an attempt to provide needed employment and training services. This program is known as HVRP. Regrettably, funding for this program in FY 1995 was rescinded. For FY 1996, both the House and Senate authorized an expenditure of \$10 million, but the monies were never appropriated. The President's budget

for FY 1997 does not request any funding for HVRP.

Mr. Chairman, homelessness among veterans is now a chronic problem. When we testified on this issue in 1992, it was estimated that between 150,000 and 250,000 veterans were homeless on any given night. As indicated, that number now is estimated to be between 250,000 and 280,000. We mentioned earlier in this testimony that DoD projects a reduction of approximately 250,000 active military members a year through the year 2000. Many of these individuals at best will have "soft" transferable skills. Many—particularly those trained in combat arms—will have no skills recognized by employers as transferable to the civilian labor market. How many of them will end up in the unemployment or soup kitchen line is unknown, but we believe they are at risk. Last week several economic forecasters predicted an increase in inflation. This will only add to the problem.

The HVRP program has a history of providing meaningful assistance to our nation's homeless veterans. It is a program that primarily focuses on job training and employment assistance. Perhaps the most unique thing about HVRP is that a multi-disciplinary approach is taken to solving the problems of homeless veterans. It is not enough to say DVOPs or LVERs can do the job alone, because all too often the services needed cannot be provided by that individual. Because homeless veterans require very labor-intensive services, HVRP must be continued.

We would like to commend Assistant Secretary Preston Taylor at DOL for his insight into this problem. Mr. Taylor saw the need, particularly in cold weather states, and identified \$1.3 million of discretionary monies available to him through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). However, before he committed those monies, he received an agreement from Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development Andrew Cuomo at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for matching funds. We would like to compliment and thank Assistant Secretary Cuomo for his interest in addressing the needs of homeless veterans.

While on the subject of Assistant Secretary Cuomo, we would like to note that the DAV has been critical of HUD in the past for its lack of attention and interest in homeless veterans. However, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to report that in addition to the \$1.3 million targeted specifically for homeless veterans, Assistant Secretary Cuomo's office has reached out to the veterans' community in an effort to communicate with veterans' service delivery systems throughout the country to make them aware of the existence of funding availability from HUD for homeless projects. Additionally, Assistant Secretary Cuomo has:

Announced the creation of the HUD Veteran Resource Center—This center is designed to provide important information about the full range of resources and initiatives available from HUD. The Resource Center can be contacted through a toll free number (1-800-998-9999, Ext. 5475, Contact: David Schultz).

Appointed a combat-disabled veteran to head the Resource Center. The first mission will be outreach to veterans' community groups as well as veterans' service organizations regarding the "1996 Homeless Assistance SuperNOFA (Notice of Funding Availability)."

Established an outreach effort to us and is providing information on events and technical assistance to those interested in applying for HUD funding. The type of outreach is unprecedented at HUD.

Agreed in February of this year to help DOL by providing \$1.3 million for HVRP.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that HUD working together with Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS) will make a significant difference in the lives of many homeless veterans. However, we believe that funding must be made available to continue the good work that has been accomplished thus far through HVRP. Since the program started in 1987, 30,000 homeless veterans have been helped in some way and 13,000 were actually placed in jobs.

Assistant Secretary Taylor should also be applauded for his efforts in contacting every state governor asking for their assistance to bridge the gap after the loss of HVRP funding.

#### SUN SETS ON HOMELESS VETS PROGRAM (By Sid Daniels, Director)

In its recent budget cutting, Congress eliminated the funding for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Projects (HVRP) program after Sept. 30, 1995. Consequently, all 30 projects throughout the country serving homeless veterans closed down their operations on Oct. 1, 1995.

HVRP was established by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 and was administered by Labor's Veterans Employment and Training Service (VETS). The emphasis on helping homeless veterans get and retain jobs was enhanced by linking with other providers, such as veterans affairs offices and medical facilities, Job Training Partnership Act entities and social service agencies.

They offered access to benefits, substance abuse treatment, job training, transitional housing and other services needed to stabilize the homeless veteran. And they removed such barriers to employment as lack of clothing, medical care and job skills.

HVRP used veterans who had experienced homelessness themselves to reach out to homeless veterans. They went into the streets, shelters, soup kitchens, and other places to encourage homeless veterans to take advantage of available services and advised them of the HVRP program. The goal was to get homeless veterans off the street and into gainful employment, with emphasis on long-term job retention.

An important characteristic of homeless veterans, is their underutilization of existing services, benefits, and entitlements which could help them obtain employment and reintegration into mainstream society.

A unique aspect of HVRP was the use of formerly homeless veterans who knew how to approach and win the confidence and trust of other homeless veterans.

HVRP programs provided participation data and survey information, which indicated that unemployment, not lack of affordable housing, was the chief cause of homelessness.

Now, this is all gone.●

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 607

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU] was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify the liability of certain recycling transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado

[Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation) to the products of Romania.

S. 1701

At the request of Mr. PELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1701, a bill to end the use of steel jaw leghold traps on animals in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1786

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources to carry out a demonstration project to provide the Department of Veterans Affairs with reimbursement from the medicare program for health care services provided to certain medicare-eligible veterans.

S. 1811

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1811, a bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property" to confirm and clarify the authority and responsibility of the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to promote and carry out shore protection projects, including beach nourishment projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1873, a bill to amend the National Environmental Education Act to extend the programs under the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to limit the liability of certain nonprofit organizations that are providers of prosthetic devices, and for other purposes.

S. 1892

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1892, a bill to reward States for collecting Medicaid funds expended on tobacco-related illnesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill entitled the "Mollie Beattie Alaska Wilderness Area Act".

## AMENDMENT NO. 4112

At the request of Mr. HELMS the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4112 proposed to S. 1745, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4367

At the request of Mr. NUNN the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4367 proposed to S. 1745, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 275—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AFGHANISTAN

Mr. BROWN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. RES. 275

Whereas, prior to 1979, Afghanistan was a peaceful, united country;

Whereas, the successful fight of the brave men and women of Afghanistan resisting the Soviet invasion and occupation of 1979–1989 was a significant element in the dissolution of the Soviet empire;

Whereas, the dissolution of the Soviet empire brought freedom to the nations of central and eastern Europe as well as to the nations of central Asia;

Whereas, although many years after the Soviet withdrawal, Afghanistan does not enjoy the peace it has earned;

Whereas, the United Nations can play a unique and important role in bringing an end to the conflict in Afghanistan;

Whereas, recent meetings between members of Congress and the representatives of the major Afghan factions indicate a significant desire on the part of all parties to achieve a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Afghanistan and the establishment of an effective government that represents the interests of the Afghan people;

Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The courageous people of Afghanistan have earned the world's respect and support for their epic struggle against the forces of communism;

(2) Resolving the continuing conflict in Afghanistan and alleviating the accompanying humanitarian distress of the Afghan people should be a top priority of the United States;

(3) Outside interference and the provision of arms and military supplies to the warring parties should be halted;

(4) A unique moment in the Afghan civil war exists where all major factions are searching for a peaceful solution to the conflict;

(5) The United States should urge the United Nations to move quickly to appoint a special envoy to Afghanistan who will act

aggressively to assist the Afghans to achieve a solution to the conflict acceptable to the Afghan people;

(6) The United Nations should work to create the conditions for a continuing dialogue among the Afghan factions.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

## THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

## MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 4387

Mr. MCCAIN proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1745) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to maximize the amount of equipment provided to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the authority contained in Section 540 of the Foreign Operations Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–107), the price of the transferred equipment shall not exceed the lowest level at which the same or similar equipment has been transferred to any other country under any other U.S. government program.

## FEINGOLD (AND KOHL) AMENDMENT NO. 4388

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1745, supra; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

### SEC. 223. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF F/A-18E/F AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

(a) REPORT ON PROGRAM.—Not later than March 30, 1997, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the F/A-18E/F aircraft program.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report shall contain the following:

(1) A review of the F/A-18E/F aircraft program.

(2) An analysis and estimate of the production costs of the program for the total number of aircraft realistically expected to be procured at each of three annual production rates as follows:

(A) 18 aircraft.

(B) 24 aircraft.

(C) 36 aircraft.

(3) A comparison of the cost and benefits of the program with the costs and benefits of the F/A-18C/D aircraft program taking into account the operational combat effectiveness of the aircraft.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS PENDING TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT.—No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the procurement of F/A-18E/F aircraft before the date that is 90 days after the date on which the congressional defense committees receive the report required under subsection (a).

## EXON AMENDMENT NO. 4389

Mr. NUNN (for Mr. EXON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1745, supra; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

### SEC. 368. AUTHORITY OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD TO PROVIDE CERTAIN SERVICES AT LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Nebraska Air National Guard may provide fire protection services and rescue services relating to aircraft at Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebraska, on behalf of the Lincoln Municipal Airport Authority, Lincoln, Nebraska.

(b) AGREEMENT.—The Nebraska Air National Guard may not provide services under subsection (a) until the Nebraska Air National Guard and the authority enter into an agreement under which the authority reimburses the Nebraska Air National Guard for the cost of the services provided.

(c) CONDITIONS.—These services may only be provided to the extent that the provision of such services does not adversely affect the military preparedness of the Armed Forces.

## ROBB AMENDMENT NO. 4390

Mr. NUNN (for Mr. ROBB) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1745, supra; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

### SEC. 1014. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION AND APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY EQUIPMENT NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE BUDGET REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FOR CERTAIN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

It is the sense of Congress that—  
(1) to the maximum extent practicable, each House of Congress should consider the authorization of appropriation, and appropriation, of funds for the procurement of military equipment only if the procurement is included—

(A) in the budget request of the President for the Department of Defense; or

(B) in a supplemental request list provided to the congressional defense committees, upon request of such committees, by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, by the military departments, by the National Guard Bureau, or by the officials responsible for the administration of the Reserves;

(2) the recommendations for procurement in a defense authorization bill or a defense appropriations bill reported to the Senate or the House of Representatives which reflect a change from the budget request referred to in paragraph (1)(A) should be accompanied in the committee report relating to the bill by a justification of the national security interest addressed by the change;

(3) the recommendations for military construction projects in a defense authorization bill or a defense appropriations bill reported to the Senate or the House of Representatives which reflect a change from such a budget request should be accompanied by a justification in the committee report relating to the bill of the national security interest addressed by the change; and

(4) the recommendations for procurement of military equipment, or for military construction projects, in a conference report of the committee on conference to resolve the differences between the two Houses relating to a defense authorization bill or a defense appropriations bill which recommendations reflect a change from the original recommendation of the applicable committee to