

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles Vincent Serio, of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Joaquin L. G. Salas, of Guam, to be United States Marshal for the District of Guam and concurrently United States Marshal for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands for the term of four years.

Jose Gerardo Troncoso, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

Kenneth Ray McFerran, of Arkansas, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Arkansas for the term of four years.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1310. A bill to provide market transition assistance for tobacco producers, tobacco industry workers, and their communities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. D'AMATO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. MACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. INOUE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. REED):

S. 1311. A bill to impose certain sanctions on foreign persons who transfer items contributing to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

S. 1312. A bill to save lives and prevent injuries to children in motor vehicles through an improved national, State, and local child protection program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. FORD):

S. Res. 138. A resolution authorizing expenditures for consultants by the Committee on Rules and Administration; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DODD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr.

WELLSTONE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. INOUE):

S. Res. 139. A resolution to designate April 24, 1998, as "National Child Care Professional's Day", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. HOLLINGS AND Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1310. A bill to provide market transition assistance for tobacco producers, tobacco industry workers, and their communities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE LONG-TERM ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FOR
FARMERS ACT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on June 20, the attorneys general of several States emerged from a Washington hotel conference room to announce a proposed national tobacco settlement. The announcement sent Washington spin doctors to work, pronouncing the defeat of public enemy number one—the tobacco industry. Press release after press release painted a picture of fat cat tobacco executives, rich at the expense of public health, finally being called to account.

But this picture of tobacco is not what I see when I go home to Kentucky. There I see hard-working farmers trying to make an honest living off a crop that has helped hundreds of communities in my State thrive for centuries.

Maybe you've forgotten about the farmer. That wouldn't surprise me. They weren't in the room during the tobacco negotiations. They were not included in the final settlement, and to date, the only plan that mentions them would put them out of business.

Mr. President, it is as if the thousands of men and women who have been the bedrock of hundreds of communities simply no longer have any value.

Sixty thousand farm families produce tobacco in 119 of 120 counties in my State. While tobacco uses only 1 to 2 percent of their acreage, it produces 20 to 25 percent of their farm income. Along with these farm families are tens of thousands of workers who warehouse, process and manufacture tobacco. They all live in communities where every tobacco dollar has a multiplier effect on the local economy, rolling over three to four times.

And they're the reason I am here today.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join several of my colleagues in introducing legislation which addresses the needs of tobacco farmers, tobacco workers, and their communities and should provide the framework for taking care of them in any comprehensive legislation.

First and foremost, "taking care of them" means protecting the tobacco program.

Opponents of the program claim they're not attacking farmers, but

with the program goes stability, with the program goes the small family farmer, and with the program goes hundreds of small rural communities.

Mr. President, the program is the key to preventing fence row to fence row production.

It is the key to keeping tobacco prices high.

And it is the key to keeping tobacco production in the hands of small family farms and keeping rural communities alive.

Without the program, look for cheap cigarettes, look for the size of farms—at the very least—to triple in size. Look for family farms to go out of business, and look for the rural communities they sustain, to shut down.

What are the benefits of killing the program? For hard-working family farmers there simply are none.

That is why killing the program is a nonstarter. And even though criticisms are based either on misconceptions or misrepresentations of the program, we're willing to address them by covering all these costs with our legislation. But make no mistake, we're not willing to eliminate the program.

The legislation we're introducing today follows the principles every one of my colleagues went on record supporting in a September 9 Sense of the Senate amendment. We all agreed that tobacco growers should be fairly compensated as part of any Federal legislation to implement the tobacco settlement. We all agreed tobacco growing communities should be provided sufficient resources to adjust to the economic impact of any settlement legislation. We all agreed compensation to farmers and their communities should come from funds provided within the parameters of the national settlement, as paid by tobacco manufacturers. And we all agreed the tobacco program should be maintained and operated at no net cost to the taxpayer.

These four simple principles will mean the difference between a productive future for tobacco farmers and a "for sale" sign up at the end of the driveway—the difference between communities where a farmer's children stay to raise their children and a ghost town.

At the core of the legislation is the establishment of a Tobacco Community Revitalization Trust Fund. The trust fund will provide compensation for farmers, investment funds for communities, and education and retraining funds, all within the parameters of the tobacco program and the national tobacco settlement dollar figure.

First, the fund will provide tobacco quota holders with "Payments for Lost Tobacco Quota" based on the drop in the amount of tobacco they can grow. The national tobacco settlement could cause consumption to drop substantially, which would translate into deep cuts in each farm's tobacco quota and each farmer's income. Under our bill, quota holders will receive \$4 per pound per year for every pound by which the

quota drops below their base quota. A maximum lifetime limit on payments will be set for quota holders at 8 times the number of pounds in their base quota. Those who lease quota or grow tobacco as a tenant farmer will receive \$2 per pound, with a life time cap of \$4 per pound.

Second, the trust fund will make payments to cover all administrative costs associated with the production of tobacco. This will include salaries at USDA to administer the tobacco program, and any shortfall in the provision of crop insurance for tobacco farmers. This should finally put a stop to false claims that tobacco growers receive subsidies from the Federal Government.

Third, the trust fund will provide Farmer Opportunity grants for higher education. Tobacco farmers and their dependents will be eligible for higher education grants of up to \$1,700 per year—which is the current average size of a Pell grant—to attend a university, community college, vocational school, or other recognized institution. Academic eligibility standards will be modeled after Pell grants, including requirements that students maintain satisfactory progress toward the completion of their degree, and maintain at least a C average. Funding will be provided to cover up to 25,000 individuals from tobacco farm families.

Mr. President, the tobacco program has long meant the difference between whether a family can afford to send their children to college or whether their education stops after grade 12. We need to do everything we can to preserve a farm family's ability to provide their children with access to higher education opportunities.

Fourth, the fund will provide benefits to displaced workers from tobacco warehousing, processing, and manufacturing operations. This program is modeled after the NAFTA Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for Displaced Workers. Under these provisions, workers who lose their jobs can receive tobacco readjustment allowances, employment services, job training, job search allowances, and relocation allowances, all of which are modeled after the NAFTA benefits and services.

And fifth, the fund will provide economic development assistance to tobacco growing communities hit hard by the national tobacco settlement.

The economic development fund will begin at \$400 million per year minus the amount used for administrative costs of the tobacco program, distributed through block grants to tobacco growing States.

States can use the funding to provide several types of assistance including rural business enterprise grants, farm ownership loans, activities which create farm and off-farm employment, activities which expand infrastructure facilities, and services which help diversify local economies, long-term business technical assistance, grants to ag-

ricultural organizations to help tobacco growers find supplemental agricultural activities, and activities which create or expand locally owned value-added agricultural processing and marketing operations.

Providing stability, preserving traditions, keeping farms in the hands of families, protecting hundreds of communities, Mr. President, I believe this legislation will give tobacco farmers, tobacco industry workers and tobacco growing communities the resources to deal with the national tobacco settlement likely to impact them.

With the tobacco program completely funded by tobacco growers or the industry itself, antitobacco advocates can no longer take aim at the farmer under the pretense of fiscal responsibility. And with a sense of stability and predictability, farmers can begin to prepare for the future in a responsible and thoughtful way.

I plan on sharing this proposal with my colleagues involved in writing comprehensive legislative proposals to implement the national tobacco settlement, but I hope all my colleagues interested in this issue and interested in preserving a farming tradition will take a close look at this program so that we can move forward in helping tobacco farm families and their communities.

Mr. President, we have not just singled out the farmer. We have included the total community, from education to job opportunity, whatever it might be, so we have taken in the whole community. I am very pleased with the hard work and support that has been given to me by Senator MCCONNELL, Senator FAIRCLOTH, Senator HELMS, and others to make this introduction so important today.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise as an original cosponsor of this bill, the LEAF Act. I want to thank Senator FORD for the hard work and the leadership role he has taken over his years in the Senate on this bill and in support of the tobacco industry as a whole and, especially, the farmers involved in it.

There has been a lot of talk on this floor about farmers. Everyone is against tobacco, but they are for farmers. Everyone pledges to help the farmers. This bill is a blueprint for that help. This plan offers assistance to the tobacco community across North Carolina, Kentucky, and the entire producing area, including Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. These people are the men and women in tobacco fields and cigarette factories and their communities.

There are 18,000 tobacco farmers in North Carolina and thousands more throughout the Southeast. The farmers of my State collect more than \$1 billion in receipts each year from tobacco alone. That is a big number, but it is spread over many small farms. Everyone in Washington talks about the small farmer, the family farm, but North Carolina is the State of small

farms. The average farm size in North Carolina is just 159 acres, one-third of the national average, which is 469 acres. It is difficult at best to make a living on a small farm. Tobacco kept these people alive on small farming operations over the last 60 years. Tobacco produces roughly \$1,200 an acre in net profit. There isn't anything else they can plant that comes close to this, even remotely close. Tobacco keeps the family farm together, and, Mr. President, it keeps the family on the farm. That is why we are here with this bill and the reason I am here this morning.

The impact of this proposed tobacco settlement would throw thousands of small farmers off their land and immediately into bankruptcy. It is up to us to step up and to help them through this transition.

I have talked about farmers so far and only farmers, but the economic impact of tobacco and this proposed settlement is not limited to farmers. There are 20,000 working people in factories across North Carolina manufacturing tobacco products. They pay mortgages, buy groceries and struggle to meet tuition bills. They are simply middle-class American people. However, tobacco is their livelihood, and Congress has set its sights on destroying their livelihood. That is simply what has happened here.

The entire tobacco sector employs 100,000 people in North Carolina. That is \$7 billion in business in the State. It is 8 percent of the work force and represents a lot of families. I am here to attempt to stand up for these people.

Next year the Congress will take up an agreement that deals a real blow to the livelihood of these thousands of people. Tobacco production is expected to drop significantly under the proposed agreement. The farmers and factory workers are in the cross hairs of the tobacco settlement, and whether the antitobacco crowd is aiming at them or not, they are the ones who are going to be hit. This bill tells them that Congress will try to lessen the effects on the innocent parties, the hard-working men and women in the tobacco fields and on the factory floor.

Senator FORD explained these transition payments to farmers. The Freedom to Farm Act moved farmers to an unregulated market and included substantial transition payments to assist them through this change. However, there was nothing in that bill designed to cut production of corn, wheat or any other crop. This proposed tobacco settlement takes aim at this crop, however, so the transition payments are a necessity.

The amount of money in this bill for the farmers and factory workers is modest compared to the amount of money that others seeking from the settlement. Somewhere in the neighborhood of \$28 billion would be involved in Senator FORD's bill. Now, it might interest you to know that the hundreds of trial lawyers involved in this potential settlement expect to receive up to

\$45 billion, almost two times as much as we are asking for the more than 150,000 people effected by this settlement.

The farmers face a situation where the Government will target their crop and cut its production. We need the transition money. How many people, farmers or not, could stand a quick reduction of 30 percent of their income due to the intended actions of the Federal Government? That is simply what we are talking about here—reducing the tobacco farmer's income by 30 percent. This bill is about the future of communities and literally big sections of our State. The bill includes farm opportunity scholarships to allow the farmers and their children additional educational opportunities. It also provides for rural development to enable these communities to survive the transition. This bill tells farmers that Congress is not leaving them without any options for the future. It tells them the rhetoric against tobacco is not really against them. At this moment they believe that it is and have every reason to think so.

This bill is a chance to back up all the rhetoric about being against tobacco but for farmers. If we are for farmers, we will pass this bill. I hope my colleagues will join me, Senator FORD, Senator MCCONNELL, and Senator HELMS in support of this bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank Senator FORD for his important work and his leadership on this issue. It is so vital to the State we jointly represent.

I am pleased to be on the floor of the Senate today to talk about an industry that has played an integral role in our country's history and continues to shape the cultural and economic landscape of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The industry, of course, is tobacco. And for the next few minutes I want to discuss tobacco and the shifting political terrain that will affect the 136,000 farmers who produce this agricultural commodity.

This summer a group of States attorneys general, representatives of the major tobacco companies, and public health officials negotiated an agreement that would limit the companies' legal liability in exchange for their promise to help reduce smoking and compensate States for past damages caused by use of their product. This agreement obviously must be passed by the Congress and signed by the President to have the force of law, and that process is now what best could be described as in its initial stages.

To my deep disappointment, tobacco farmers were not included in these negotiations. They had no seat at the table. Not surprisingly, there is not a single penny in this \$368 billion pool of money for tobacco farmers, even though they will be the ones most directly impacted by the agreement. On the other hand, the agreement allows for the compensation of well-heeled sporting enterprises such as auto rac-

ing and rodeos in the event they lose sponsorship dollars but not a penny goes to the hard-working tobacco farmers who may well be driven off their family farms because of an agreement to which they were not a party.

Today, along with Senator FORD, the principal craftsman of this bill, Senator HELMS and Senator FAIRCLOTH, I propose to right that wrong by supporting a package that will provide for these farmers' well-being. Today, my colleagues and I are introducing the Long-term Economic Assistance for Farmers Act, what we call the LEAF Act, which creates an umbrella "Tobacco Community Revitalization Fund." The fund, to be paid for from moneys within the existing \$368-billion settlement, will stabilize the incomes of tobacco farmers by providing payments for lost tobacco quota to tobacco quota holders, tenants and those who lease quota. Quota holders who produce their own tobacco will be paid \$4 a pound in any given year for every pound their quota falls behind their average 1994-1966 quota level. In the case of leased tobacco and tenant farmers, payments will be \$2 a pound.

A portion of the fund will also be used for Tobacco Community Economic Development Grants which will help transition tobacco dependent communities to a more diversified economic base. The economic development grants will be used for costs incidental to the tobacco program, economic development grants to States, farmer opportunity grants for education and training, and assistance for displaced tobacco industry workers.

Mr. President, most agree that tobacco farmers and their communities should not bear the brunt of the agreement's dislocating effects. For instance, Minority Leader DASCHLE has said that "We need to address some of the concerns that were not addressed in the agreement * * * especially those dealing with small farmers." The President himself has said, "Any tobacco legislation must protect tobacco farmers and their communities." Even tobacco's most committed foes such as former FDA Commissioner David Kessler recognize that, as he put it, "farmers should not be left out" of the agreement. The LEAF Act does provide for farmers. It provides compensation for reduced quota to owners and those who produce the tobacco. It provides opportunities for tobacco farmers to diversify their crops. It provides economic stability for small tobacco farmers and their tobacco communities. It provides education and training opportunities for tobacco farmers and their dependents. It keeps farmers like mine in Kentucky in the business of producing this legal agricultural commodity.

So, Mr. President, I rise in support of the LEAF Act. I thank Senator FORD for his leadership and tireless efforts to protect our tobacco growers and their communities. I believe Senator FORD's bill provides the best alternative for our growers.

Having said that, I realize we face an uphill battle. Today's political environment for tobacco interests is darkened mightily. In today's Senate, outrageously unfair amendments that deny basic crop insurance to tobacco farmers are only narrowly defeated. The ceaseless assault on tobacco has left the tobacco grower imperiled. In this context it may be difficult to sustain the political support necessary to enact all of the bill's provisions. I personally will fight for the Ford package, but I also will be cognizant of political reality. It is my fervent hope that we can incorporate the LEAF Act into any settlement legislation.

If that is not achievable, I will not be discouraged from pursuing alternative ways to best provide tobacco farmers' needs.

Finally, Mr. President, as Congress discusses the proposed tobacco settlement, I urge my colleagues to remember that our decisions will not affect some nameless, faceless machine. Rather, our actions here will bear directly on thousands of hard-working tobacco farmers, men and women who pay their taxes, go to church, raise their families, and do their best to provide for future generations. We owe it to them to ensure that today's changes in the tobacco culture leave them with a stable future as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD. Let me thank my colleagues for their remarks. One of the things that we have to take into consideration is that this bill is a bill that looks not only to the farmer but to his family, his children for education, and economic development in the community. I hope people understand, I hope my colleagues understand, that this bill incorporates payment for everything, even the shortfall in the crop insurance. So there should not be these so-called cheap shots, as my colleague from Kentucky explained, as it relates to the tobacco farmer, under this proposal. If you take a look, I would hope Senators will understand that. We have worked very hard putting this package together and hopefully it will be accepted within the parameters of any agreement.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I too am pleased to be an original cosponsor of Senator FORD's bill, titled the Long-term Economic Assistance for Farmers Act (S. 1310). The able senior Senator from Kentucky is to be commended for offering this legislation.

Mr. President, as farmers and rural communities in tobacco-growing States come to terms with the national tobacco settlement, this bill will address some of the needs sure to arise during this critical economic adjustment period. I believe this legislation is a good starting point for helping these farmers, their families, and their communities.

Obviously, it is too much to hope that everybody affected by the settlement will be satisfied with every provision in this bill, but it is important

that we begin to take steps to ensure farmers the same stability and predictability that the tobacco companies sought when they negotiated the national tobacco settlement.

Mr. President, let me make it clear that—and I believe Senator FORD and all other supporters of this legislation agree—that this is only a starting point. It may be—after consultation with growers, companies and other affected parties—that only minor changes in this legislation need to be made. Or, it may be—that a significant overhaul in our approach to this issue is needed.

Whatever the future holds, of this tobacco growers may be assured: I will do everything proper in my power to protect their interests. I have often been criticized for standing up for the livelihoods of tobacco farmers—and I suppose I will be criticized many times more in the future. Let the critics proceed, but I shall never retreat from my convictions that the hard-working families deserve to be recognized for the good citizens and splendid families that they are.

So, Mr. President, again I commend my friend from Kentucky, Mr. FORD, for his tireless effort to protect tobacco farmers, and I am honored to stand with him once again.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. D'AMATO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. MACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. INOUE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. REED):

S. 1311. A bill to impose certain sanctions on foreign persons who transfer items contributing to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS
ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1997. I am pleased to be joined in this bipartisan effort by Senator LIEBERMAN, as well as Senators MCCONNELL, REID, D'AMATO, BOXER, COVERDELL, HELMS, DURBIN, MCCAIN, BROWNBAC, BENNETT, CAMPBELL, FEINGOLD, MACK, SHELBY, WYDEN, HUTCHINSON, FEINSTEIN, HOLLINGS, MIKULSKI, NICKLES, CLELAND, INOUE, DORGAN, and BRYAN.

This is very important legislation which addresses a serious threat, in my opinion, to American security: Iran's relentless efforts to acquire ballistic missile technology. There is no doubt that Iran is the major proliferation danger in the world today. Iran is committed to developing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the means to deliver them.

The consequences of Iran's ballistic missile development would be disastrous. Iran actively supports terrorist groups around the world. Earlier this year, a German court found Iran's intelligence services responsible for assassinations on German soil. There is a very real possibility that Iran was behind the murder of 19 Americans in the Khobar Towers bombing on June 25, 1996.

News reports now indicate that Iran is developing two missiles with ranges of 800 or more than 1,200 miles. Such missiles would be able to reach American forces stationed in the Persian Gulf. They would be able to reach Israel. They would be able to reach our NATO ally, Turkey. They would be able to reach all the way into Central Europe, as a matter of fact.

The terrorist regime in Iran has already demonstrated its willingness and ability to use bombings and hit squads to support its radical agenda in the Middle East and in Europe. We cannot sit back and allow Tehran to acquire ballistic missile capability that could hit even more targets with the push of a button, possibly even with nuclear warheads.

This administration's track record on dealing with Iran is not encouraging. We are always anxious to work with the administration in these important foreign policy issues. In 1995, with great fanfare, the administration announced it was strongly opposed to the sale of Russian nuclear reactors to Iran and the issue would be handled in the commission headed by Vice President GORE and Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin. In the intervening 2 years there has been no progress in halting that sale, or sales of this type.

In 1995 the administration gave a green light to Iranian extremists who gained a foothold in Europe by arming the Bosnian Government. The residue of that green light still affects the situation in Bosnia today. So, there are problems, obviously, in this area.

When the news reports in the Washington Times over the last month indicated that there were very serious concerns about Russian support for Iran's missile technology programs, many of us on Capitol Hill looked for action. Vice President GORE, we were told, would raise the issue with the Prime Minister when he was in Russia, but the response that he received apparently was to call the news report "stupid" and "not worthy of comment."

I think, after consultation with the administration, that this legislation is necessary because not enough has been done to address this Iranian missile development. I believe it is clear that existing United States law has been broken by Russian entities. Emissaries have gone to Moscow, information has been shared. Yet, no sanctions action has been taken by the administration.

This legislation is necessary because it is time to act. Many have recently expressed concern about Congress imposing "unilateral" sanctions. My re-

sponse is that Congress will step into a vacuum and take unilateral action when inadequate action is being taken in other areas.

The legislation is quite simple. It requires the President to report in 30 days, and every 180 days thereafter, on entities that have transferred or attempted to transfer goods, technology, technical assistance or facilities that contribute to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop or produce ballistic missiles.

The legislation requires three sanctions on any such entities: No export of American arms, no export of restricted dual-use items, and no American Government assistance. So it is a targeted sanction, aimed at the entities involved in these actions.

Congress has established with successive administrations, special criteria in existing law for each of these three things. Our legislation simply says if you help Iran acquire ballistic missile capability, you will not get arms, controlled exports, or taxpayer-financed aid.

Similar bipartisan legislation is being introduced in the House today. I refer back to my opening remarks. There are already, I believe some 26 Senators who are cosponsoring on both sides of the aisle, from all regions of the country and all philosophical spectrums.

I hope the Senate will take action on this legislation before the end of the session. Certainly, it will provide, hopefully, some additional impetus for the administration to aggressively address this issue. A number of changes have been made in the legislation to meet policy and legal concerns of the administration, and I hope the administration will see the merits of imposing these serious and rapid sanctions on entities which aid Iran's efforts to threaten American forces and American allies.

We cannot stand mute. We cannot ignore this very serious matter. We will continue to work with the administration and support any aggressive efforts that they care to use. But after serious consideration, and after consultation particularly with Senator LIEBERMAN, I thought it was important that we go ahead and introduce this legislation today, and explain why we are doing it.

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

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

S. 1311

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 "Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. REPORTS ON MISSILE PROLIFERATION TO IRAN.

(a) REPORTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), at the times specified in subsection (b), the President shall submit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee

on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report identifying every foreign person with respect to whom there is credible evidence indicating that that person, on or after August 8, 1995—

(1) transferred goods or technology, or provided technical assistance or facilities, that contributed to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles; or

(2) attempted to transfer goods or technology, or attempted to provide technical assistance or facilities, that would have contributed to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles.

(b) **TIMING OF REPORTS.**—The reports under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, not later than 180 days after such date of enactment, not later than 360 days after such date of enactment, and annually thereafter.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR PERSONS PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED OR SANCTIONED OR SUBJECT TO WAIVER.**—Any person who—

(1) was identified in a previous report submitted pursuant to subsection (a);

(2) has engaged in a transfer or transaction that was the basis for the imposition of sanctions with respect to that person pursuant to section 73 of the Arms Export Control Act or section 1604 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992; or

(3) may have engaged in a transfer or transaction, or made an attempt, that was the subject of a waiver pursuant to section 4, is not required to be identified on account of that same transfer, transaction, or attempt, in any report thereafter submitted pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS.**—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall be imposed on—

(A) any foreign person identified under subsection (a)(1) of section 2 in a report submitted pursuant to that section; and

(B) any foreign person identified under subsection (a)(2) of section 2 in a report submitted pursuant to that section, if that person has been identified in that report or a previous report as having made at least 1 other attempt described in subsection (a)(2) of that section.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF SANCTIONS.**—The sanctions shall be effective—

(A) 30 days after the date on which the report triggering the sanction is submitted, if the report is submitted on or before the date required by section 2(b);

(B) 30 days after the date required by section 2(b) for submitting the report, if the report triggering the sanction is submitted within 30 days after that date; and

(C) immediately after the report triggering the sanction is submitted, if that report is submitted more than 30 days after the date required by section 2(b).

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF SANCTIONS.**—The sanctions referred to in subsection (a) that are to be imposed on a foreign person described in that subsection are the following:

(1) **ARMS EXPORT SANCTION.**—For a period of not less than 2 years, the United States Government shall not sell to that person any item on the United States Munitions List as of August 8, 1995, and shall terminate sales to that person of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act.

(2) **DUAL USE SANCTION.**—For a period of not less than 2 years, the authorities of section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 shall be used to prohibit the export of any goods or technology on the control list established pursuant to section 5(c)(1) of that Act to that person.

(3) **UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.**—For a period of not less than 2 years, the United States Government shall not provide any assistance in the form of grants, loans, credits, guarantees, or otherwise, to that person.

SEC. 4. WAIVER.

The President may waive the imposition of any sanction that otherwise would be required to be imposed pursuant to section 3 on any foreign person 15 days after the President determines and reports to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that, on the basis of information provided by the person, or otherwise obtained by the President, the President is persuaded that the person did not, on or after August 8, 1995—

(1) transfer goods or technology, or provide technical assistance or facilities, that contributed to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles; or

(2) attempt on more than one occasion to transfer goods or technology, or to provide technical assistance or facilities, that would have contributed to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ACTIONS BY GOVERNMENT OF PRIMARY JURISDICTION.

As part of each report submitted pursuant to section 2, the President shall include the following information with respect to each person identified in that report:

(1) A statement regarding whether the government of primary jurisdiction over that person was aware of the activities that were the basis for the identification of that individual in the report.

(2) If the government of primary jurisdiction was not aware of the activities that were the basis for the identification of that individual in the report, an explanation of the reasons why the United States Government did not inform that government of those activities.

(3) If the government of primary jurisdiction was aware of the activities that were the basis for the identification of that individual in the report, a description of the efforts, if any, undertaken by that government to prevent those activities, and an assessment of the effectiveness of those efforts, including an explanation of why those efforts failed.

(4) If the government of primary jurisdiction was aware of the activities that were the basis for the identification of that individual in the report and failed to undertake effective efforts to prevent those activities, a description of any sanctions that have been imposed on that government by the United States Government because of such failure.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **GOVERNMENT OF PRIMARY JURISDICTION.**—The term "government of primary jurisdiction" means the government under whose laws a foreign person is organized, or the government of the place where a foreign person is headquartered or habitually resides.

(2) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term "foreign person" means a natural person as well as a corporation, business association, partnership, society, trust, any other nongovernmental entity, organization, or group, and any governmental entity operating as a business enterprise, and any successor or subsidiary of any such entity that is organized, headquartered, or habitually resides outside the United States.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend and colleague Senator LOTT, and the other cosponsors, in offering this bill which ad-

resses what I believe is one of the most serious and urgent national security threats facing this country. Ballistic missiles in the hands of a nation that has been our most implacable foe in the recent past and that has been the single most intransigent supporter of terrorism against this Nation and our allies should fill any right thinking person anywhere with the most profound fear and concern. Indeed, we here in this body have often expressed our concern. We have given the administration the tools to address this problem, specifically in the Arms Export Control Act and in the Iran-Iraq Sanctions Act. Regrettably, our concern and these tools have not yet resolved this threat. In fact, it is widely and reliably reported that persons in Russia continue to provide both technology and assistance to Iran such that Iran may be now only 8 months from acquiring ballistic missiles that could be combined with weapons of mass destruction to threaten United States forces and our allies and friends in the Middle East. And soon after that, our forces and allies throughout Europe.

This would be a profound change in the balance of power in the region, and strike a serious, perhaps fatal blow to our ability to contain Iran until it becomes a responsible member of the community of nations. It would allow Iran to threaten friendly Arab states, making it harder for them to cooperate with the United States. It would raise the risks to U.S. military forces in the region. And it would threaten the free flow of oil in this critical region, which could create crises in places far from the Persian Gulf.

We must act to try to prevent this from happening. We must tell Russia in no uncertain terms that we are serious, and that the time for slow progress in shutting off Russian assistance is past.

Many of us are aware that the degree of government control over dangerous technology in the former Soviet Union has eroded considerably. While trying to remedy this potentially frightful situation, the Russian Government must contend with other pressing internal issues. The results are that persons or groups within Russia have had the latitude to transfer technology to rogue states such as Iran.

We have the opportunity as well as the obligation to stand up, be counted, and take reasonable steps to deter this type of potentially cataclysmic activity. While we cannot expect to prevent all such technology transfers to rogue states, we do have the ability to check the flow of it through sanctions aimed at persons engaged in such activity. We also are able and must take appropriate action against those governments that condone such activity, whether they are organizing and abetting such transfer or merely looking the other way when their citizens engage in these activities.

For many years, the United States and the few other members of the mis- sile club of nations could be reasonably

assured that these missiles armed with nuclear weapons would not be used. That was because the leaders of these nations were generally reasoned individuals who shared many of the same goals. As this technology has spread to other countries—and continues to expand at an alarming rate—some of the leaders share very different views on methods to solve confrontation. We have to actively guard against these weapons becoming available to what most of the world considers to be unstable states governed by leaders whose thinking is outside the mainstream.

We have been engaged in dialogue across a wide spectrum with our friends and allies in trying to prevent this from happening. As I mentioned earlier, the prospect of a nuclear capable, militarily powerful Iran armed with ballistic missiles, is clearly not in our national interests. Our efforts at putting controls on the flow of technology to rogue states have been laudable, but the sieve has been leaking.

The sanctions we are proposing will further stop the diffusion of technology and lead toward a more stable Middle East. I fully support this effort because it will help prevent further technology transfer into an area that has seen several major wars in the last thirty years and that remains a region of vital national interest not only to us but to most of the industrial world.

In closing, I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks to Senator LOTT for his leadership in this matter. This is an important step toward a safer world.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the subject of the transfer of sensitive missile, weapons of mass destruction, and advanced conventional weapons technology to Iran is far more complicated than most of us would like to admit. As neighbors in a volatile region, Russia and Iran have a long history of mutual antipathy alternating with periods of intense cooperation. The official atheism of the former Soviet Union was anathema to the Islamic tenets of revolutionary Iran. The former enjoyed the benefits of a sizable buffer between Russia proper and the Persian kingdom-turned-fundamentalist regime.

With the disintegration of the U.S.S.R. and the emergence of independent Islamic governments along its southern frontier, Russia no longer enjoys the security it once maintained. Certainly, the absence of the kind of domestic and foreign security apparatus characteristic of its totalitarian past has exacerbated the problem of stemming Islamic influence, and Russia has sought to maintain an active military role in the region to prevent the spread of such influence, as well as of the kind of fighting that ravaged Tajikistan for years. The state of its economy, combined with its desire to maintain the best possible relations with Iran, have led Russia to pursue policies thoroughly inimical to vital United States interests in the Middle East.

Herein lies the problem. It is in the interests of the United States for Russia to develop economically, obviously through free market mechanisms. It is in Russia's interest to have access to Iranian oil, to the revenue generated by sales to Teheran of whatever the latter will buy, and to be able to maintain cordial relations with a regime that possesses, albeit less so since its presidential election, the wherewithal to destabilize the region. Consequently, any decision to impose sanctions on Russia for its sale of missile and other advanced weapons technologies to Iran understandably should come only after an extraordinarily cautious appraisal of the potential ramifications of doing so.

I stand before the Senate today to state as emphatically as I can that such sanctions must be imposed. While news reports of missile technology sales, in violation of both the 1987 Missile Technology Control Regime and the 1992 Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act, have appeared in great numbers over the past several months, the problem clearly has history going back years that the administration continues to ignore at our and our allies peril. Were the problem not one of such duration, the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act, of which I was a principal sponsor along with then-Senator AL GORE, would not have been necessary 5 years ago. Were the problem a recent manifestation of Iranian ambitions and Russian inability or unwillingness to control the flow of militarily sensitive technologies, I would be willing to respect the administration's prerogative in the conduct of United States foreign policy.

Such, however, is not the case. Developments involving Russia and Iran—and I am not intending to ignore China, simply focusing on a more immediate and larger scale problem of the moment—are indicative of a more systemic problem not conducive to quiet diplomacy and seemingly endless patience. The Teheran Times boasted in November 1995 of Russia's intransigence in the face of United States efforts at dissuading it from providing Iran with nuclear technology. Earlier that year, Russia's Minister for Atomic Energy, Viktor Mikhailov, spoke of his Government's intention to sell Iran a centrifuge for the enrichment of used nuclear fuel. More recently, reports of contracts being signed between Russian companies and research institutes—organizations with which the Government maintains an integral relationship—for the provision of missile components, including guidance systems, laser equipment, wind tunnels for the testing of warheads and missiles, and militarily sensitive materials like tungsten-coated graphite, all illuminate a problem of enormous magnitude that, Moscow's protestations notwithstanding, nevertheless reflect minimal effort on that government's part to impede the flow of such technology to Iran.

Russia sees its economic interests as lying very much in closer relations with Iran. Pipelines transporting Caspian Sea oil and natural gas present Russia with potential revenue in the hundreds of millions of dollars, should it prevail in dictating future pipeline routes. Iran's announcement last year of a joint shipping venture with Russia similarly illuminated the depth of the growing economic relationship between the two countries. The economic importance of Iran to Russia and Russia's lack of viable exports other than the very weapon systems that threaten United States interests in the Middle East have created a dilemma, but one with which we must come to grips.

Moscow, similarly, must confront the implications of its actions or inactions with respect to the transfer of militarily sensitive technology. It clearly places enormous economic importance on its relationship with Iran, but it needs to be reminded that it fails within the range of the very missiles it is helping Iran to develop. Russia may, in the end, find itself selling Teheran the rope with which to hang itself.

The administration must comply with existing United States laws. It must take Russia to task, in the form of economic sanctions, for the continuing problem of missile technology transfer to Iran. Russia must be made to see that its economic well-being does not lie with transactions that threaten United States interests. Russia desperately wants recognition as a major global player despite its inability to influence events militarily or economically far beyond its borders. When the United States, Germany, or Japan coughs, much of the industrialized world catches cold. When Russia coughs, Moscow catches cold. If Russia wants to see the Group of Seven be permanently enlarged by one, it must accept that its economic future lies with the democracies of North America, Europe, and Asia—not with rogue regimes that seek to threaten the interests of those nations.

The Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act mandates sanctions against both foreign companies and governments for the transfer of missile, chemical, biological and nuclear weapon technologies as well as advanced conventional systems. It further provides for discretionary sanctions. Russia has thoroughly violated the act, as well as the MTCR. Not only has it transferred to Iran missile and nuclear technology, it has sold to Teheran advanced surface-to-air missile systems, three Kilo-class attack submarines with which Iran fully intends to assert its control over the vital Strait of Hormuz, modern T-72 main battle tanks, and MiG-29 fighter and Su-24 strike aircraft. If the cumulative effect of these weapon sales does not violate both the MTCR and the Iran-Iraq Act, then nothing does. And, Mr. President, as a principal sponsor of the latter legislation, I can personally attest that, irrespective of administration determinations constructed to suit its policy preferences,

these transfers from Russia do violate both the letter and the intent of the law.

The administration must act on this issue of utmost importance to United States national security interests. The Middle East lies at the center of our National Security Strategy and the force structure exercises that repeatedly postulate the likelihood of future conflict in that strife-torn region. The administration has not presented to Congress any reason, compelling or otherwise, for its refusal to abide by Public Law 102-484 and the MTCR. Congress must demand that it do so, or impose sanctions accordingly. Its failure to do so is inexcusable. The ramifications of that failure will be serious indeed, and the costs will inevitably be paid in American blood.

That is why we are introducing legislation to toughen existing statutes by making the imposition of sanctions more certain and requiring that the administration report to Congress information on weapons sales that will better enable the legislative branch of Government to determine for itself whether past failures to impose sanctions have been warranted. Governments must be held accountable when entities within their borders act dangerously irresponsible.

The administration must comply with the law, or sacrifice its role in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy in one of the most important regions of the world.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Iran Missile Proliferation Act of 1997, introduced by Senators LIEBERMAN and LOTT. This legislation is critically needed because of dangerous recent developments in the Middle East, namely disturbing reports that indicate Iran is acquiring terrifying weapons of mass destruction at an alarming pace.

Iran has become the most serious threat to stability in the Middle East and is rapidly developing the means to strike Israel. Very recently, Israeli and American intelligence have discovered that, due largely to technology obtained from Russia, Iran may soon have the capability to begin assembling and testing ballistic missiles capable of reaching Israel and other vital targets in the Middle East.

Russian companies are providing Iran with crucial technologies, including wind tunnels for the design of missiles, lasers, and special materials for missile construction. There are even reports of over 9,000 Russian advisers working in Iran on a variety of military projects, and Iran earlier this year tested a Soviet-designed rocket engine.

Iran, one of America's foremost self-proclaimed enemies, has been linked to numerous anti-Israel terrorist attacks ranging from taking hostages and hijacking airlines to carrying out assassinations and bombings. These incidents include the taking of more than 30 Western hostages in Lebanon from 1984 through 1992, the bombings of the

United States Embassy and the French-United States Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983 and the Buenos Aires terrorist attacks on the Israeli Embassy in 1992 and on the Argentine Jewish communal building in 1994. An Iranian ballistic missile capability would have enormous strategic repercussions for the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Iran possesses chemical weapons, and quite possibly could be only a few years away from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Clearly, the United States must adopt a stronger approach toward Russia. To its credit, the administration has tried every diplomatic effort with Russia. Vice President GORE and other senior officials have addressed this issue at the most senior levels of the Russian Government, including with President Yeltsin and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, but these efforts have met with little success. Further discussions are set for November, however, and I believe Congress must act now to enact a more forceful policy which will ensure Russian cooperation.

The Lott-Lieberman legislation requires the President to submit a report to Congress 30 days after enactment, providing a list of the entities that have been implicated in the transfer or attempted transfer of goods, technology, or technical assistance that has contributed to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles. Highly targeted sanctions will be imposed on these entities 30 days after the submission of the report, unless the President waives them under limited circumstances.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital measure which takes concrete steps to halt the spread of ballistic missile technology to Iran and to preserve peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. BENNETT. I am pleased to join with the Distinguished Majority Leader in sponsoring S. 1311 regarding arms sales to Iran. This is very critical legislation. If the relevant governments cannot regain control over their weapons sellers, Iran will have a ballistic missile capability within months instead of years.

Mr. President, on Tuesday, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright told me, "Dealing with proliferation is the highest priority item of this administration." In the national security field, she has the right sense of priority. And certainly, Iran is the leading problem country.

The legislation we are introducing today calls on the administration to report on which foreign entities are contributing to Iran's missile ambitions. For example, the Washington Times has recently reported on a number of important Russian organizations involved in this trade. Special metals and associated technology are said to be involved. If necessary, sanctions against the named entities will be imposed.

I hope sanctions will not be necessary. I have some confidence that

foreign government leaders will fulfill their commitments. But it may become necessary. We already know Iran has a chemical warfare capability and we suspect it has nuclear and germ warfare ambitions. We cannot allow a sponsor of state terrorism like Iran to obtain a ballistic missile delivery system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the October 20, 1997, issue of the Washington Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

RUSSIA SELLS IRAN MISSILE METALS

(By Bill Gertz)

A secret Russian production center completed a deal with Iran late last month to supply high-strength steel and special foil for Iran's long-range missile program. The Washington Times has learned.

According to a classified United States intelligence report, the Russian Scientific and Production Center Inor concluded an agreement in late September to provide an Iranian factory with four special metal alloys used in long-range missiles.

The report contradicts assurances made by Russian officials only days before the report that Russia had no involvement with the Iranian missile program.

The report, labeled "secret," says a two-month effort by Inor to market four alloys to Iran's Instrumentation Factories Plan, part of the Iranian Defense Industries Organization, has "borne fruit" with the Iranian agreement to buy the material.

"With an eye to establishing a long-term business relationship, the Russian firm offered to give the Iranian firm a discount on the total value of the invoice," the report states.

The deal, worked out between Inor Director L.P. Chromova and the Iranian factory director identified as A. Asgharzadeh, amounted to \$48,000 for 620 kilograms of alloy, plus several hundred dollars in shipping and packaging costs.

Efforts to locate and contact Inor were unsuccessful, and a U.S. official said details about the facility are known only to the CIA.

A CIA spokesman declined to comment. The deal includes Inor's offer to provide "thermal treatment" for the alloys "so that the Iranians could process the material themselves," the report said.

The Iranians have bought 240 kilograms of the high-strength steel alloy known as "21HKMT" for \$24,000, the report said. The steel will be sent in bars that U.S. officials say the Iranians will shape for missile-casing material.

The remaining materials are alloy foil designated by Inor as "49K2F," "CUBE2" and "5ON" that are being sold in sheets 0.2 millimeter and 0.4 millimeter thick.

The special foil is used to shield guidance equipment in missiles—material that is needed only for longer-range missiles.

"This gets into the whole business of the longer-range ballistic missiles that they are seeking to develop," said one Clinton administration official familiar with the issue. "There are a number of countries that are very, very concerned about these Shahab-3 and Shahab-4 missiles."

During meetings with Vice President Al Gore in Moscow Sept. 19 and 20, senior Russian officials, including Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Victor Chernomyrdin, provided the administration with "commitments" that Russia is not assisting Iran's missile program, according to a senior White House official.

Asked if the administration believes those commitments have halted the missile trade, the senior officials said: "The answer is, we are not satisfied. We're still concerned about ongoing activities."

The official declined to comment on the Inor case, but said, "to the extent that we see activities going on that we think are contrary to the assurances we've gotten from the Russians, we are making an effort to bring that to their attention and asking them to follow up."

One official said "21HKMT" is a specialty steel that Iran does not produce. The steel is a key material used by North Korea and Iran for missiles, but it is not controlled under the 31-nation Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).

The Clinton administration has sought to add the alloy to the MTCR control list, but those efforts have been blocked by Russia and France, the official said.

Inor is one of several Russian scientific and production centers identified by U.S. intelligence agencies as being involved in Iran's development of a liquid-fuel missile similar in design to North Korea's Nodong missile.

In 1996, Inor prepared several contracts with Iran's Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group, which is in charge of Iran's liquid-fuel missile program. Inor brokered deals to supply the Iranians with laser equipment, special mirrors used in missile testing, maraging steel used in missile casings and composite graphite-tungsten material.

Russia's Central Aerohydrodynamic Institute has been helping Iran build a wind tunnel.

The Times disclosed last month that several Russian entities were involved in Iran's program to build two derivatives of the Nodong missile, the Shahab-3 and Shahab-4, that will be fielded within three years.

According to an Israeli military intelligence report provided to the CIA and the Pentagon in January, the Iranians have worked closely with the Russian Space Agency; Rosvoorouzhnie, the Russian government arms-export agency; the Bauman Institute; the missile manufacturer NPO Trud; a firm called Polyus and other institutes.

The Israeli intelligence report identified Yuri Koptev, head of the Russian Space Agency, as being connected to the project. Mr. Koptev is Mr. Yeltsin's representative in talks with the United States on the issue.

Asked about Mr. Koptev's role in the Iranian program, the senior White House official said Mr. Koptev was "irate" during the meetings in Moscow and felt disclosure of his role was "an unfair slam."

The official said Mr. Koptev has been helpful in seeking to resolve U.S. concerns.

Mr. Koptev told U.S. officials attending the Moscow meeting that he did not want U.S. aid to the Russian space program to "collapse" because of U.S. opposition to the Russia-Iran cooperation, which Mr. Koptev described as "important in my world, but a secondary issue," the official said.

The official said he believes the Shahab-3 is "within Iran's basic technical capabilities." For the Shahab-4, "I think the Iranians are more heavily dependent on external, and in particular, Russian, assistance" to field the system.

By Mr. ABRAHAM.

S. 1312. A bill to save lives and prevent injuries to children in motor vehicles through an improved national, State, and local child protection program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE CHILD PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation designed

to increase the awareness and education of parents and public safety professionals with respect to the proper use and installation of child safety seats.

This legislation, the Child Passenger Protection Act of 1997, is nearly identical to legislation introduced in the other Chamber earlier this year by the gentlewoman from Maryland, Representative MORELLA. It would make \$7.5 million [i.e., seven point five million] dollars available to the Secretary of Transportation in each of the next two fiscal years—FY '98 and '99—for the purpose of assisting State highway agencies, police departments, and child passenger safety organizations in setting up and promoting such programs.

To receive funding under this bill, a program must focus on preventing death and injury to children under the age of 5 years old. The program must educate the public about all aspects of the proper installation of child restraints using seat belt hardware and other supplemental hardware or modification devices. The program must also educate the public with respect to the appropriate child restraint design selection and placement as well as harness threading and harness adjustment. Finally, the program must train and retrain child passenger safety professionals, police officers, fire and emergency medical personnel, and other educators concerning all aspects of child restraint use.

As the parents of three children under the age of 5, all of whom still ride in child car safety seats, my wife and I can attest to the fact that these considerations require a great deal of attention. My wife Jane serves as Honorary Chairperson of the Detroit SAFE KIDS Coalition and has been deeply involved in the issue of car seat safety for some time, along with a number of other child protection advocacy issues. This past Labor Day, I was the sponsor of a Senate resolution that provided permission to the National SAFE KIDS Coalition to use the Capitol Building grounds for the kickoff event of the National SAFE KIDS Buckle Up Campaign. The entire Abraham family participated in this event. Our family has filmed Public Service Announcements on this issue for the National SAFE KIDS Campaign and we are planning to sponsor and to participate in car seat safety check events in the coming months back in Michigan.

Based on our shared experience, I can assure my colleagues that there is often tremendous confusion among both parents and public safety personnel when it comes to the proper selection, installation and use of child restraint devices in motor vehicles. Results from regional child restraint clinics demonstrated between 70 and 90 percent of child restraints are incorrectly installed or otherwise misused, which is often caused by the complication and wide variety in seat belt and child restraint designs. And while there are several public-private partnership pro-

grams which exist that focus on the dangers of air bags and the proper placement of children in cars equipped with air bags, many of these programs fall short of specifically educating parents and public safety officials on the proper methods for installing and using child safety seats.

It is my hope that we can focus the country's attention on this serious problem and, in the process, prevent needless death and injury among young children. While this legislation alone will by no means solve the problem, I believe it is a positive step towards better educating parents and public safety officials on this important public safety issue.

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

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

S. 1312

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 "Child Passenger Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The annual losses in the United States from motor vehicle collisions are estimated to exceed 800 deaths and 80,000 injuries to children under the age of 5.

(2) It is estimated that properly used child restraints in motor vehicles can reduce the chance of serious or fatal injury in a motor vehicle collision—

(A) by a factor of 69 percent with respect to infants; and

(B) by a factor of 47 percent with respect to children under the age of 5.

(3) Some of the most common seating position designs that have emerged in motor vehicles during the last decade make secure installation of child restraints difficult and, in some circumstances, impossible.

(4) Results from regional child restraint clinics demonstrated that 70 to 90 percent of child restraints are improperly installed or otherwise misused and the improper installation or other misuse is largely attributable to the complication and wide variations in seat belt and child restraint designs.

(5) There is an immediate need to expand the availability of national, State, and local child restraint education programs and supporting resources and materials to assist agencies and associated organizations in carrying out effective public education concerning child restraints.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CHILD RESTRAINT EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term "child restraint education program" includes a publication, audiovisual presentation, demonstration, or computerized child restraint education program.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 4. CHILD PASSENGER EDUCATION.

(a) AWARDS.—The Secretary may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements

with, and may make grants to, State highway agencies and child passenger safety organizations that are recognized for their experience to obtain and distribute national, State, and local child restraint education programs and supporting educational materials.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to an agency or organization under a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under subsection (a) shall be used to implement child restraint programs that—

(1) are designed to prevent deaths and injuries to children under the age of 5; and

(2) educate the public concerning—

(A) all aspects of the proper installation of child restraints using standard seatbelt hardware, supplemental hardware and modification devices (if needed), including special installation techniques; and

(B) appropriate child restraint design selection and placement and in harness threading and harness adjustment; and

(3) train and retrain child passenger safety professionals, police officers, fire and emergency medical personnel, and other educators concerning all aspects of child restraint use.

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—An agency or organization that receives funds made available to the agency or organization under a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under subsection (a) shall, in carrying out subsection (b)—

(1) use not more than 25 percent of those funds to support nationwide child restraint education programs that are in operation at the time that the funds are made available;

(2) use not more than 25 percent of those funds to support State child restraint education programs that are in operation at the time that the funds are made available; and

(3) use at least 50 percent of those funds to implement national, State, and local child restraint education programs that are not in operation at the time that the funds are made available.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—To enter into a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant agreement under section 4(a), the appropriate official of an agency or organization described in that section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate official of each agency or organization that enters into a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant agreement under section 4(a) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary, an annual report for the period covered by the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant agreement.

(2) REPORTS.—A report described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) contain such information as the Secretary may require; and

(B) at a minimum, describe the program activities undertaken with the funds made available under the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant agreement, including—

(i) any child restraint education program that has been developed directly or indirectly by the agency or organization and the target population of that program;

(ii) support materials for such a program that have been obtained by that agency or organization and the method by which the agency or organization distributed those materials; and

(iii) any initiatives undertaken by the agency or organization to develop public-private partnerships to secure non-Federal support for the development and distribution of child restraint education programs and materials.

SEC. 6. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare, and submit to Congress, a report on the implementation of this Act that includes a description of the programs undertaken and materials developed and distributed by the agencies and organizations that receive funds under section 4(a).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For the purpose of carrying out section 4, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation \$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, of which not more than \$350,000 may be spent in any fiscal year for administrative costs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 61

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 61, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend eligibility for veterans' burial benefits, funeral benefits, and related benefits for veterans of certain service in the United States merchant marine during World War II.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to expedite State reviews of criminal records of applicants for private security officer employment, and for other purposes.

S. 263

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 263, a bill to prohibit the import, export, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, acquisition, and receipt of bear viscera or products that contain or claim to contain bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals.

S. 537

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the mammography quality standards program.

S. 766

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 766, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contra-

ceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

S. 927

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] were added as cosponsors of S. 927, a bill to reauthorize the Sea Grant Program.

S. 943

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] were added as cosponsors of S. 943, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation accidents.

S. 990

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 990, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging.

S. 995

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 995, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain interstate conduct relating to exotic animals.

S. 1096

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1096, a bill to restructure the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1124

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1124, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 1153, a bill to promote food safety through continuation of the Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database program operated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify that records of arrival or departure are not required to be collected for purposes of the automated entry-exit control system developed under 110 of such Act for Canadians who are not otherwise required to possess a visa,