

Nancy Reagan and Ronald Reagan did and George and Barbara Bush to tell the young people of today why it is so destructive for them to begin this path of doing drugs, I think he could be enormously helpful. He could be so powerful in his appeal and reach to these young people.

So instead of obfuscating the issue and accusing others of making too big a deal out of it, as they did with Speaker GINGRICH, I think they ought to try to focus on what they can do to help. It would be a tremendous benefit if they would do that. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

#### CULTIVATING THE FUTURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a wise man once said that what is honored in a society is cultivated there. In other words, what a society believes is important and respects, it will teach its children and demand in its public life. I have been concerned in the last few days by what it seems to me that we are honoring in our society. And I am concerned because of that about what we may be cultivating for the future.

I am concerned about what we have learned in the past few days and weeks about the attitudes the Clinton White House has about security clearances and security procedures in general. I am also concerned about drug use, respect for privacy, and regard for simple facts straightforwardly presented. I am concerned about what attitudes on these issues, coming from the Nation's first household, are communicating to the public. I am particularly troubled about the White House's seemingly cavalier attitude about drug use and about the message that this careless viewpoint is sending.

Based on reporting in the Washington Post, "The Secret Service in 1993 balked at granting permanent passes to about a dozen people in the Clinton White House because of concerns about recent use of illegal drugs that in some instances included crack cocaine or hallucinogens. . . ." But this is not all. The problem was evidently so serious as to require the unprecedented step of establishing a special drug-testing program in the White House. We have heard that this involves only a few people. But then we also heard from the same White House that there were only a few unauthorized FBI files. That story had to be revised several times as the numbers grew. Perhaps that will not happen here, but the numbers are not really the issue.

What is of concern is the principle. In the files case, one file improperly obtained, illegally reviewed, and carelessly kept was too many. In any normal operation, the person responsible for this chain of slipshod management would be identified, fired, and, if a crime was committed, prosecuted. In the present case, however, the White House not only does not know who was

responsible, they cannot or will not figure out who hired him. Based on this White House's public assertions about hiring practices in the world's most important household, Rosy the Bag Lady could have moved locations from Lafayette Park into the West Wing, gotten a White House pass, and set up shop with no one the wiser.

As in the files case, it is the principle that matters in the White House's attitude about drug use. It is what actions there say publicly about what is honored and what should be cultivated. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that a President who did not inhale should see no problem in hiring known drug users to sit on the world's most visible front porch. But what is of more concern than this peculiar tolerance is the response of the President's spokesman to the issue. Let me quote his remarks. "I was a kid in the 1970's," he said. "You know, did I smoke a joint from time to time?"

Of course, I did." Of course? There is a lot of consequence in that "of course." As Mr. Bennett, the country's first drug czar noted, that "of course" is very disturbing. Mr. Bennett asks a very important question: "What exactly did Mr. McCurry mean by 'of course'? That every young person used drugs in the 1970's? Or that it was no big deal?" In either case, as Mr. Bennett notes, the President's spokesman is wrong. He not only has the facts wrong, he has now put the White House behind the notion that drugs are no big deal.

Mr. McCurry's words are very revealing. They are dismissive of the idea that drug use is of any serious concern. They indicate an indifference to the realities of drug use. And, for a White House whose clearest competency is in message management, it shows a remarkable ignorance of the importance of using the bully pulpit of Presidency to send a clear, antidrug message. We need to remind ourselves that Mr. McCurry did not make these remarks in private. He is no babe in the woods. He did not get trapped. He did not speak out thinking that the microphones were turned off. Mr. McCurry made these remarks to the press as the chief spokesman for the President of the United States. Say what you will, his remarks are now an indelible part of the public record. So too, are the White House's attitudes to drug use revealed here.

I am sure that in the next few days we will have more clarifications about the position. I am sure that these clarifications will include the typical accusations that discussion of the issue at all is just partisan politics. But, what remains is a public demonstration about how this White House thinks about drugs. It reflects a casualness about the drug problem that is communicated to the public. It is a communication that, frankly, concerns me a great deal.

On a number of occasions I have raised my concern on this floor about

the dramatic rise in teenage drug abuse. If there are any of my colleagues who have not acquainted themselves with the realities of what is happening with kids and drugs today, I urge them to take a look at the facts. I think that what they will find will disturb them. In brief, by whatever standard you use or reporting system that we currently have to tell us about drug use, teenage use is on the rise.

In the last several years, after more than a decade of decline, we are seeing returning drug use that is wiping out all the gains that we had made. What is just as alarming, teenage attitudes about the dangers of drug use are also changing for the worse. Today's kids see drugs as far less of a problem than did kids just a few years ago. Even worse, drug use today is starting even earlier. We are now seeing the problem affect 11 and 12 year olds. Unless you believe that drug legalization for kids is a realistic option or a responsible policy, then you cannot ignore what is happening under our very noses, in our homes, schools, backyards, and front porches.

In this context, do you think that remarks like the President's or Mr. McCurry's do not matter? Let us not kid ourselves about kids. What the White House says publicly is one of the ways we communicate lessons about what we honor and should cultivate. That the White House understands this is clear from what it has to say on other issues. On this issue, however, the message is anything but clear.

In March of this year, I co-chaired a Senate-House Task Force on National Drug Policy. Bob Dole and NEWT GINGRICH established the task force to take a look at the problem and recommend solutions. The report from that effort documents not only the present trend in drug use among kids, but the policies or lack of policies by the Clinton administration to deal with the problem. I invite all of my colleagues, the press, and the public to take a look at what the task force learned. It is sobering.

One of the essential findings of the report, which is hardly new, was that the bully pulpit for sending messages about what is right and wrong, good and bad, must be central to any drug policy. As the report notes, we must be consistent in our message. We must have words and deeds that are complementary not contradictory.

Democrats and Republicans over the last several years, however, have repeatedly noted that the administration, and particularly the President, have been virtually silent on the drug issue. The only serious pronouncements that anyone here or elsewhere likely remembers about this administration's drug policy was the President's remark that he didn't inhale. That and the repeated public statements by the Surgeon General of the United States calling for consideration of drug legalization. Except for these less than inspiring remarks, the drug issue simply disappeared in the first

3 years of the administration. Like the drug czar's office, it was benched. For this administration, drug policy was not just the least valued player. It was traded to a farm team and hustled out of town under a blanket of silence.

Now, in an election year, when the drug use numbers are bad and getting worse, we have seen a new public posture by the administration on drugs. We have a new drug czar—more power to him—and we have had a few presidential sound bites and backdrops. I am sure that none of these actions have anything to do with politics. But, we have seen also other things that leave a more lasting impression, particularly in young minds. Particularly, what we have seen disseminated to the public is the knowledge that “of course, I used drugs” and “I didn't inhale” are the hallmarks of this White House. As Mr. Bennett noted, policy follows attitude. It is not hard to understand the administration's policies with attitudes like those coming from the White House.

Recently, a music group with the unlikely name of Smashing Pumpkins lost one of its lead performers to a drug overdose. In recent years, such deaths of celebrities have become a common occurrence, another reminder of the 1960's culture born again. So serious has the problem become that record companies and managers are looking to institute drug programs to help prevent these losses. In the case of Smashing Pumpkins, they fired one of the band members who was involved in drugs along with the young man who died. Evidently, drug use in this case was grounds for dismissal. I wish that this White House understood the message here. That tolerating drug use, even former drug use, sends a dangerous message.

If we learn from the bully pulpit of the Presidency about what we should honor and cultivate in our national life, then I am concerned about what recent events tell us. I am concerned that we seem to have replaced “Just Say No” with a muddled message. I am concerned that this garbled text is sending the wrong signals, is reinforcing the wrong attitudes. Perhaps it is no coincidence, then, that calls for legalization of drugs are now more vocal and well-financed than at any time since the 1960's. It is perhaps why, we see initiatives on the ballot in California and Arizona that would legalize marijuana. It is perhaps why one of the largest financiers of drug legalization is a White House confidante. It is perhaps not just coincidence that the drugs-are-good-for-you message is back in movies, music, and on TV. It is perhaps why we see a White House where the Colombian drug lords can number employees as some of their former clients.

I worry about what we seem to be honoring and what we may cultivate as a consequence.

Mr. GORTON. Would the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. COVERDELL. I certainly will be more than pleased to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. It seems to me, Mr. President—and I ask for the comments of the Senator from Georgia on this—that during the course of this last half-hour or so, there have been perhaps five different, but related, themes. I wonder if my understanding is accurate.

The first, and in a sense the most immediate, is the way in which the White House responds to any kind of criticism, very frequently with nasty personal attack.

The second, which is one step above that and perhaps triggers the first, is the indifference in the administration itself to the question of drugs and of security and the like, you know, by the people who serve the administration.

The third, it seems to me, is the drug policy of the administration. I think the Senator from Georgia has already spoken to that question—less money, fewer people, less attention.

The fourth is as the Senator from Arizona just said, the use or nonuse of the magnificent platform that any President of the United States has to speak to matters which are of deep concern to the American people or which create grave social problems or challenges to the American people. And the question as to whether or not any particular President pays any attention to that subject.

But I think each of those, in my view at least, leads to the final question. And that is, what impact is the plague of drugs imposing on the American people? Is the use of illegal substances rising or falling at any given level? And particularly, is this use rising or falling among young people, first becoming conscious of the world around them? And is that increase in use—quite clearly that is the case at the present time—attributable at least in part to what society, through its leaders, through its President, says or does not say, says or implies by an action or nonaction in connection with this drug use?

I think if you start from No. 1, attacking anyone who attacks them, second, an indifference to personal health, security or drug use, third, the amount of money and attention paid in budgets, fourth, the use or more particularly the nonuse of that bully pulpit in the Presidency, that fifth and most important consequence is almost an inevitable consequence, is it not? Is it not very difficult to make the case that these are unrelated phenomena, with the fact of increased drug use, the fact of a more serious problem in society today? Is it not connected with this indifference in money, in attitude, and the like on the part of the executive leaders of our Nation?

Mr. COVERDELL. First, I commend the Senator from Washington in his usual fashion of framing issues so well. But I think there is no conclusion one could reach but that these five points

you allude to are inextricably connected and have resulted in a new drug epidemic in the United States, period.

I say to the Senator from Washington, from my own point of view, I have been surprised that a change in public policy, which occurred when this administration took office, could result in these kinds of changes so quickly. I would have thought these changes might have taken a decade to have the impact. It has been a revelation to me that within months you began to see a trend of less use of drugs turn completely around and now turn into something that is a devastating phenomenon in our country.

I will say one other thing and then go back to the Senator from Washington. On your fourth point, the use of the pulpit, so to speak, I would say that is even more serious than has been characterized. Not only has it not been used, but to the extent it has been used, it is the wrong message.

First of all, there is too much silence. Second, we had an Attorney General arguing for legalization in this administration. Third, we had statements, like press secretary McCurry and the President himself when he said, “Well, I didn't inhale.” These are all cavalier tones that suggest a lack of seriousness about the issue. That is why I believe it is not just the trend lines have reversed, but they have dramatically reversed. And the damage is of epidemic proportions. And 12 years have virtually been cashiered because of the link between these five points, but particularly Nos. 4 and 5.

Mr. GORTON. I think the Senator from Georgia makes a good point. I would like to share this reflection with him and hear his views on the subject. I believe sometimes we have these problems by a misuse of terms. And in this connection, a few years back, when drug policy was a higher order of priority, we had what was, I think, misnamed as a “war on drugs,” sincerely carried out by men and women who felt that drugs were a plague on our society creating a tremendous amount of crime, social dislocation, wasted lives. But the implication, when they used that term, was that it somehow or other could have been won permanently and decisively.

I believe that we made the same mistake a generation ago when we began a war against poverty with the same implications. Just set up a few programs and you will get rid of the circumstance. Perhaps, it has occurred to me, that this began because we have had truly wars where they have a beginning, middle, and an end, whether it was World War II, at one level, or even a half-a-century-long cold war. It is over. We have had a definitive triumph.

When one Presidential administration starts a war on poverty or, more particularly in this case, a war on drugs, and then the next administration discovers the real truth, that this is a struggle that begins over again in the minds of every young person in the

first, second, third, or eighth grade and, in fact, has never definitively been won in the minds of an individual who may have started on some form of drug and then gotten off but is a life-long process in the lives of every single individual, then that administration tends to lose its sense of focus or even its sense of caring, because each administration wants something else that it can be definitively responsible for.

Do we not have a situation here in which we had a significant degree of success over a period of 4, 8, or 12 years, which one other administration by diligent effort could continue, could lose no ground, maybe by tremendous effort could maybe even make a few gains, but knew it could not win the way you win World War II, so the administration just lost interest in it. There were just a lot of other things it wanted to do.

Have we all not suffered? And this is the most important part of the question, have we not all suffered as a result, because the implication made that we have gotten this far, we do not have to do anything to at least keep it the status quo. But as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, in 4 years you can lose all the ground you gained in 12. Is that not essentially what we have done as a result of this administration's indifference to the problem?

Mr. COVERDELL. The Senator has raised several very, very crucial questions and sort of a constructive criticism which I might need to take to heart. First, we have not lost all the ground; we have just lost a lot of it. If unchecked, we will lose it all.

I do not know that I agree that it was strictly a function of interest level. I believe there are people in our country, and some of them are in this administration, like former Surgeon General Elders, who believes the construction of the struggle was wrong. I believe that they believed rehabilitation is more important than interdiction, so there are some philosophical differences here.

We now have the results of the interdiction law enforcement and education. It cut it in half. The new idea, empirically, has failed, because it has doubled, but we still have people in this administration who do not agree with the war on drugs.

Now, the last point I make, the war on drugs, I think the Senator makes a very valid point that it is not something to ever be won or lost. I have called it a war on drugs, of late, because of the level, separate from usage in the United States.

The fact is, we have come into an era where drug cartels with their enormous capacity of resources and sophistication, in my judgment, have put democracies in the hemisphere at stake. When the President of Mexico turns to me and says, "The single greatest threat to my public are the drug cartels," that raises it to a new level. I think there is a war in the hemisphere to gain control of this circumstance so

that it does not threaten fragile and small democracies—some of them rather large. I draw that distinction and separate the two.

The Senator is absolutely correct, this is an issue for which society has always and will always struggle. Maybe it is improper to characterize it as a war. That is a duty. It is a duty of one civilization to those that follow. From time to time, I argue, there are incidents—and we are in one—where there is a configuration where we really are in a very adversarial struggle with a force that is capable of undoing society. I do believe the hemisphere is confronted with that at this point.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the clarity of his thought and for his dedication to a cause which is of vital importance to the future of our country and society.

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the thoughts of the Senator from Washington. As always, the Senator brings great clarity and poignancy to issues of importance to our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by former drug czar William Bennett.

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

BENNETT CRITICIZES MCCURRY AND WHITE  
HOUSE DRUG POLICY

WASHINGTON, DC, July 18, 1996.—Today, Empower America co-director and former Bush "drug czar" William J. Bennett released the following statement:

Yesterday we learned from interviews with Secret Service agents (released by a House committee) that background investigations on White House employees found that more than 40 had used drugs; a few dozen showed drug usage had been within the last five years; and that among those few dozen people were individuals who had used cocaine, crack cocaine and hallucinogens. We learned, too, that the Secret Service initially rejected White House passes to an unspecified number of White House employees because they were considered a security risk—a recommendation which apparently was unacceptable to the Clinton administration. Instead, the administration opted for a far more lenient policy—a twice-per-year surprise drug test. These are very disturbing revelations—but ones which do not seem to trouble the Clinton administration at all.

I have also read the transcripts of Mike McCurry's July 17th press briefing in which he stated that "of course" he used illegal drugs during the 1970s. What exactly did Mr. McCurry mean by "of course"? That every young person used drugs in the 1970s? Or that it was no big deal? Why didn't Mr. McCurry show any regret for having used illegal drugs? Mr. McCurry is wrong on all counts—and he should admit that he was wrong.

These revelations by Secret Service agents, combined with Mr. McCurry's comments are, I think, emblematic of the Clinton administration's cavalier and indifferent attitude toward illegal drug use. The Clinton administration doesn't seem to care about this issue. They seem unwilling to take a strong and unambiguous stand against drug use. And this nation is now paying a very heavy price for the Clinton administration's indifference, in terms of wrecked and lost lives.

Mr. McCurry's comments are of course not helpful. But neither are they surprising. After all, President Clinton's record on fighting illegal drug use is abysmal. It is worth pointing out that this is not a partisan opinion. Democratic Senator Joe Biden has been a strong critic of the administration's anti-drug efforts. And it was Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel who said this about the Clinton administration: "I've been in Congress over two decades, and I have never, never, never found any administration that's been so silent on this great challenge [illegal drug use] to the American people."

Consider the record under Bill Clinton's watch: drug use among high school seniors has risen steadily since he took office. The number of 12- to 17-year-olds using marijuana has almost doubled. Methamphetamine emergency room cases are up over 300 percent. LSD use has reached the highest rate since record-keeping started in 1975. Drug-related emergency room admissions are at record levels. And these trends have occurred after real progress was made against drug use in the mid-1980s and early 1990s.

But there is more involved here than a failure of public policy. The Clinton administration suffers from moral diffidence on this issue. Policy follows attitude. In 1991, when asked about his past drug use, Mr. Clinton declared that he had never "broken any drug law." A year later, he admitted that when he was in England, he had experimented with marijuana but he said, "I didn't like it. I didn't inhale it, and never tried it again." Later, when asked whether he would inhale if he had to do it over again, he answered, to laughter: "Sure, if I could. I tried before."

Then there is President Clinton's former Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, who had been one of this administration's most vocal voices on drugs and who had favorable words about drug legalization. And of course now we have Mr. McCurry's comments.

During the 1980s, Nancy Reagan was ridiculed for her "Just Say No" campaign. But it turns out that "Just Say No" is far more effective than "I didn't inhale" or an attitude of "of course I used illegal drugs."

I realize that Mr. McCurry, a skilled press secretary, was simply reflecting the attitude of the President and his administration. But I would be interested in the answer to two questions: first, what does General Barry McCaffrey think about Mr. McCurry's comments and the underlying attitude they expressed? And second, does President Clinton have any objection if a person who has used cocaine, crack cocaine or hallucinogenic drugs during the past five years is working in his administration? Is there any kind of recent (pre-White House) drug use or drug activity that would disqualify somebody from joining the Clinton administration? Perhaps the president could clarify what his policy is on these matters.

On the issue of fighting illegal drugs—like so many other issues of national importance—the American people deserve better from their president.

Mr. COVERDELL. I will take just a minute to read from this statement from William Bennett:

Yesterday we learned from interviews with Secret Service agents that background investigations on White House employees found that more than 40 had used drugs; a few dozen showed drug usage—

I have always wondered what that remark means; what is "a few dozen"? It sounds an awful lot like 40.

... a few dozen showed drug usage has been within the last 5 years; and that among those few dozen people were individuals who

had used cocaine, crack cocaine and hallucinogens.

It goes on: "These revelations by Secret Service agents, combined with Mr. McCurry's comments," which we have all talked about earlier, "are, I think, emblematic of the Clinton administration's cavalier and indifferent attitude toward illegal drug use. The Clinton administration does not seem to care about this issue. They seem unwilling to take a strong and unambiguous stand against drug use. And this Nation is now paying a very heavy price for the Clinton administration's indifference in terms of wrecked and lost lives."

This is the point I want to underscore over and over. We are not talking about just reciting numbers of increase, et cetera. We are talking about some kid in your family, somebody that lives next door, somebody you work with, that you know and care about. Every one of these 2 million new families that are experiencing drug use in their family are just like somebody we know, or they may be somebody we know.

It is time for the White House to put the bully pulpit to work, calling on our youth across this land to be knowledgeable and understanding of the fact that drugs will ruin their lives and forever change their futures.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it was on Friday, February 23, 1996, that the Federal debt broke the \$5 trillion sound barrier for the first time in history. The records show that on that day, at the close of business, the debt stood at \$5,017,056,630,040.53.

Twenty years earlier, in 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$629 billion, after the first 200 years of America's history, including two world wars. The total 1976 Federal debt, I repeat, stood at \$629 billion.

Then the big spenders really went to work and the interest on the Federal debt really began to take off—and, presto, during the past 2 decades the Federal debt has soared into the stratosphere, increasing by more than \$4 trillion in 2 decades—from 1976 to 1996.

So, Mr. President, as of the close of business Friday, July 26, the Federal debt stood—down-to-the-penny—at \$5,181,675,045,058.46. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,525.25 as his or her share of that debt.

This enormous debt is a festering, escalating burden on all citizens and especially it is jeopardizing the liberty of our children and grandchildren. As Jefferson once warned, "to preserve [our] independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." Isn't it about time that Congress heeded the wise words of the author of the Declaration of Independence?

#### JONES ACT WAIVERS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be immediately discharged from further consideration of the following bills: S. 1924 and S. 1933.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of these bills, and the following bills on the legislative calendar, en bloc: Calendar Order Nos. 76 through 90, 308 through 328, 478 through 482, and 519 through 538.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be deemed read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider all actions be deemed made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. I note at this point these measures are Jones Act Waivers, and they have all been cleared by the Democratic leadership.

#### CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL "DAMN YANKEE"

The bill (S. 1924) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel *Damn Yankee*, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 1924

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding sections 12106, 12107, and 12108 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), as applicable on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsements for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel DAMN YANKEE (vessel number 263611).

#### CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR CERTAIN VESSELS

The bill (S. 1933) to authorize a certificate of documentation for certain vessels, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 1933

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

#### SECTION 1. CERTIFICATES OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and sections 12106 through 12108 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation

with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for each of the following vessels:

(1) The vessel RELENTLESS, United States official number 287008.

(2) The vessel TECUMSEH, United States official number 668633.

(3) The vessel POLICY MAKER III, United States official number 569223.

(4) The vessel QUIET SQUAW, United States official number 998717.

#### CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL "BAGGER"

The bill (S. 84) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel *Bagger*, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 84

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

#### SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding sections 12106 through 12108 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel BAGGER, hull identification number 3121125, and State of Hawaii registration number HA1809E.

#### CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL "L.R. BEATTIE"

The bill (S. 172) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation for the vessel *L.R. Beattie*, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 172

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

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding sections 12106, 12107, and 12108 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), as applicable on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation for the vessel L. R. BEATTIE, United States official number 904161.

#### CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL "SHAMROCK V"

The bill (S. 212) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Shamrock V*, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 212

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding sections 12106, 12107, and 12108 of title 46, United States Code, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), as applicable on the date of enactment