S. 1359. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the amount of recoupment from veteran's disability compensation that is required in the case of veterans who have received certain separation payments from the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURNS, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1361. A bill to provide for the appointment of 1 additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1362. A bill to promote the use of universal product members on claims forms used for reimbursement under the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAFEE:

S. 1363. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1364. A bill to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful Federal reports; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 1365. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERREY (for himself and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the 10 percent floor for deductible disaster losses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1367. A bill to amend the Act that authorized the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow use of the project distribution system to transport water from sources other than the project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1368. A bill to provide individuals with access to health information of which they are the subject, ensure personal privacy with respect to personal medical records and health care-related information, impose criminal and civil penalties for unauthorized use of personal health information, and to provide for the strong enforcement of these rights; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1369. A bill to provide for truancy prevention and reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. THOMAS):

S. Con. Res. 60. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of efforts to foster friendship and cooperation between the United States and Mongolia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. REID, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1359. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the amount of recoupment from veterans' disability compensation that is required in the case of veterans who have received certain separation payments from Department of Defense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

THE VETERANS' DISABILITY BENEFITS RELIEF ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Veterans' Disability Benefits Relief Act. This legislation would address an unfair provision that double taxes veterans who participate in military downsizing programs run by the Department of Defense [DOD].

Mr. President, since 1991, in an effort by the DOD to downsize the armed services, certain military personnel have been eligible for either the special separation benefit [SSB] or the voluntary separation incentive [VSI] program. However, SSB or VSI recipients who are subsequently diagnosed with a service-connected disability must offset the full SSB/VSI amount paid to that individual by withholding amounts that would be paid as disability compensation by the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA].

Additionally, veterans who participate in the DOD's downsizing by selecting an SSB lump sum payment or a VSI monthly annuity payment, are forced to pay back the full, pretax amount in disability compensation—offsetting money that the veteran would never see with or without a service-connected disability. This is a gross injustice to veterans by double taxing their hard-earned compensation.

My bill would ease this double taxation for all members who accept an SSB or VSI payment package and make these alterations retroactive to December 5, 1991. Thus, service members not able to receive payment concurrently since 1991 will be reimbursed for their lost compensation portion that was taxed. The cost of this bill was estimated by CBO to be only $195 million over 25 years. This is a fraction of a percentage of our annual spending on compensation and benefits for former military personnel. I urge Congress to correct this injustice to our Nation's veterans and provide these veterans with the proper compensation they deserve.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURNS, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE BORDER IMPROVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to address a problem that has been attracting significant concern not only in my State of Michigan, but also in many other northern border States as well as along the southern border. This bill, entitled ''The Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997,'' will also add desperately needed resources for border control and enforcement at the land borders.

I am proud to have a broad range of bipartisan support on this bill and to have as original cosponsors Senators KENNEDY, D'AMATO, LEAHY, GRAMS, DORGAN, COLLINS, MURRAY, BURNS, and SNOWE.

This legislation is needed to clarify the applicability of a small provision of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act—section 110 of that act. That section requires the Immigration and Naturalization Service to develop, by September 30, 1998, an automated entry and exit system to document the entry and departure of every alien arriving in and leaving the United States. While that may sound straightforward enough, the truth is that there could be disastrous consequences if this is not amended to conform with Congress' intent and to provide a sensible approach to automated entry-exit control.

The problem is that the term ''every alien'' could be interpreted to include Canadians who cross our northern land border—and in fact to include all aliens crossing the land borders and many aliens entering elsewhere who are currently exempt from filling out immigration forms. We could literally end up with intolerable backlogs and delays at the land borders and could end up creating a conflict with current documentary requirements, such as our practice of not requiring Canadians to present a passport, visa or border-crossing identification card to enter the United States for short-term visits.

The potential problems here are generating great concern. The United States Ambassador to Canada wrote to me on October 14, for example, that he

is deeply concerned about this issue and noted that ''section 110 is inconsistent with the concerted efforts the United States and Canada have made in recent years to improve and simplify cross-border traffic flows.'' The Canadian Ambassador to the United States expressed similar concerns to me when I met with him last month. I recently chaired a field hearing of the Immigration Subcommittee on this issue in Detroit, MI, at which elected officials and industry representatives testified about the unprecedented traffic congestion, decreased trade, lost business and jobs, and harm to America's international relations that could result from the full implementation of section 110 in its current form.

Mr. President, this provision was not intended by the law's authors to have the impact I just outlined. Our former colleague, Senator Alan Simpson, who preceded me as chairman of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, and Representative LAMAR SMITH, who is chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee, wrote in a letter last year to the Canadian Government that they ''did not intend to impose a new requirement for border crossing cards on Canadians who are not presently required to possess such documents.''

The INS appears to maintain, however, that the law as it stands does call for a record of each and every noncitizen entering or leaving the United States. When you look at the text of the statute, you can certainly see a basis for their view.

That is why I think the most sensible course here is simply to correct the statute. I should note that the administration shares our concern and has already requested that Congress correct section 110 and clarify that it should not apply along the land borders.

The full implementation of section 110 would create a nightmare at our land borders for several reasons. First, every alien could be required to fill out immigration forms and hand them to border inspectors. That would create added delays at entry points into the United States, which would be intolerable. Our land border crossings simply cannot support such added pressures.

A recent study by Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas points out that traffic congestion and delays at our land borders already create unneeded costs and inconvenience. What we need are increased resources at the land borders, not increased burdens and bureaucracy.

Second, every alien would likewise have to hand in forms when they leave the United States. Our immigration officials currently inspect only those entering the United States, and there are thus no inspection facilities at locations where people leave the country. This means that new inspections facilities would need to be built and that we would see significant increases in traffic on U.S. roads leaving the country.

This additional infrastructure could run into billions of dollars, but the precise cost estimates are not possible at this point since we do not know what technology could even make such an exit system feasible. Even as a simple fiscal matter, we should not be requiring the kind of investment that would be involved here without knowing what the payoff, if any, will be, particularly where an undeveloped and untested system is involved. Also, at many border crossings, particularly on bridges or in tunnels, there simply is not room to construct additional facilities.

The magnitude of these problems cannot be overstated. As just one example, take the northern border, with which I am most familiar.

In 1996 alone, over 116 million people entered the United States by land from Canada, over 52 million of whom were Canadians or United States lawful permanent residents. The new provision would require a stop on the U.S. side to record the exit of every one of those 52 million people. That is more than 140,000 every day; it is more than 6,000 every hour; and more than 100 every minute. And that is only in one direction. The inconvenience, the traffic, and delays will be staggering.

If uncorrected, section 110 will also have a devastating economic impact. The free flow of goods and services that are exchanged every day through the United States and Canada has provided both countries with enormous economic benefits. Trade and tourism between the two nations are worth $1 billion a day for the United States. Canada is not only the United States' largest trading partner, but the United States-Canadian trading relationship is the most extensive and profitable in the world.

My own State of Michigan has been an important beneficiary of that relationship. And 46 percent of the volume and 40.6 percent of the value of United States-Canada trade crosses the Michigan-Ontario border. Last year alone, exports to Canada generated over 72,000 jobs in key manufacturing industries in my State of Michigan and over $4.68 billion in value added for the State.

The United States automobile industry alone conducts 300 million dollars' worth of trade with Canada every day. New just in time delivery methods have made United States-Canadian border-crossings integral parts of our automobile assembly lines. A delivery of parts delayed by as little as 20 minutes can cause expensive assembly line shutdowns.

Tourism and travel industries would likewise suffer by the full implementation of section 110. People in Windsor, Canada who thought they would head to Detroit for a Tiger's baseball game or Red Wing's hockey game might think again and stay home—with their money.

Canadians might decide not to bother to see the American side of Niagara Falls, or not to go hiking or fishing in Maine. This would happen all across the northern border.

I am beginning to hear concerns from those along the southern border as well, and I believe that the impact of full implementation of section 110 there could be equally disastrous.

Congress did not intend to wreak such havoc on the borders. The fact is that these issues were simply not considered last Congress.

Section 110 was principally designed to make entry-exit control automated, so that the system would function better; it was not intended to expand documentary requirements and immigration bureaucracy into new and uncharted territory. A simple clarification of section 110 will take care of these problems. At the same time, we can take steps to improve inspections at our borders and to begin to take a sensible and longer term approach to automated entry-exit control.

Mr. President, my legislation is quite straightforward and contains three pieces.

First, it provides that section 110's requirement that the INS develop an automated entry-exit control system would not apply at the land borders, to U.S. lawful permanent residents, or to any aliens of foreign contiguous territory for whom the U.S. Attorney General and the Secretary of State have already waived visa requirements under existing statutory authority. This would maintain the status quo for lawful permanent residents and for a handful of our neighboring territories, including Canada, whose nationals do not pose a particular immigration threat and are already granted special status by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State.

As its second main provision, my legislation calls for a report on full automated entry-exit control. In my view, Congress should not expand entry-exit control into new territory until it has received a report on what that would mean.

The bottom line here is that we simply do not know whether such a fully implemented system is feasible, how much it will cost, whether the INS has the capacity and resources to use the data from such a system, and whether it might make more sense to devote our resources to going after the problem of visa overstayers in other ways.

Finally, my bill provides for increased personnel for border inspections by INS and Customs to address the backlogs and delays we already have on the border. For 3 years, it would increase INS inspectors at the land borders by 300 per year and Customs inspectors at the land borders by 150 per year.

Mr. President, our borders are already crowded. In 1993, nearly 9 million people traveled over the Ambassador Bridge, 6.4 million traveled through the Detroit-Windsor tunnel, and approximately 6.1 million crossed the Blue Water Bridge in Port Huron. Even without new controls, we have unacceptable delays at many points of our borders.

We should alleviate the problems we already have, not make them worse by

adding more controls and burdens. Even in the best case scenario, the new entry-exit controls might take an extra 2 minutes per border crosser to fulfill. That is almost 17 hours of delay for every hour's worth of traffic. It's just not practical. We must act to prevent it from happening and take action to address the delays already existing at our borders.

I would also like to note that placing new entry-exit control requirements on our border neighbors will do virtually nothing to catch people entering our country illegally. For that, we need to improve border inspections and increase resources there.

I do agree that automated entry-exit control certainly is needed to improve upon the INS's current system, which has a poor track record of providing data on visa overstayers. Having correct and usable data would be extremely helpful for a number of purposes; for example, to determine whether countries should remain in the visa waiver program and which countries pose particular visa overstay problems.

However, in my view, being able to use automated entry-exit control as a means of going after individual visa overstayers is a long way off. That is why we should be cautious in our approach.

We need to study this problem and consider some hard questions like what we will do down the road with all this data. Do we really think that the INS is currently capable of compiling and matching the data correctly or that INS has the resources to track down individuals based on this data? Do we want to be directing the INS to use its limited resources in this manner?

I recommend that for the time being we attack the visa overstayer problem by focussing on our current enforcement tools and by continuing the enforcement approach taken in last year's illegal immigration reform bill. I supported efforts there to increase the sanctions for visa overstayers and to increase the number of INS investigators looking into visa overstayers.

But before we burden the vast majority who do not present an enforcement problem and before we add inconveniences and costs to our own citizens, we should continue to study the options for broader automated entry-exit control.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this legislation quickly. Tomorrow, we will be having a hearing to consider this bill and these issues in the Immigration Subcommittee. Given the overwhelming support for this along the land borders and from the administration, there is no need to wait on such an important issue or to leave so many with uncertainty.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire 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. 1360

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 ''Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1221 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) SYSTEM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop an automated entry and exit control system that will—

''(A) collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States; and

''(B) enable the Attorney General to identify, through on-line searching procedures, lawfully admitted nonimmigrants who remain in the United States beyond the period authorized by the Attorney General.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The system under paragraph (1) shall not collect a record of arrival or departure—

''(A) at a land border of the United States for any alien;

''(B) for any alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; or

''(C) for any alien for whom the documentary requirements in section 212(a)(7)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act have been waived by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State under section 212(d)(4)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–546).

SEC. 3. REPORT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the feasibility of developing and implementing an automated entry-exit control system that would collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States, including departures and arrivals at the land borders of the United States.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Such report shall—

(1) assess the costs and feasibility of various means of operating such an automated entry-exit control system, including exploring—

(A) how, if the automated entry-exit control system were limited to certain aliens arriving at airports, departure records of those aliens could be collected when they depart through a land border or seaport; and

(B) the feasibility of the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, negotiating reciprocal agreements with the governments of contiguous countries to collect such information on behalf of the United States and share it in an acceptable automated format;

(2) consider the various means of developing such a system, including the use of pilot projects if appropriate, and assess which means would be most appropriate in which geographical regions;

(3) evaluate how such a system could be implemented without increasing border traffic congestion and border crossing delays and, if any such system would increase border crossing delays, evaluate to what extent such congestion or delays would increase; and

(4) estimate the length of time that would be required for any such system to be developed and implemented.

SEC. 4. INCREASED RESOURCES FOR BORDER CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) INCREASED NUMBER OF INS INSPECTORS AT THE LAND BORDERS.—The Attorney General in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 shall increase by not less than 300 the number of full-time inspectors assigned to active duty at the land borders of the United States by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, above the number of such positions for which funds were made available for the preceding fiscal year. Not less than one-half of the inspectors added under the preceding sentence in each fiscal year shall be assigned to the northern border of the United States.

(b) INCREASED NUMBER OF CUSTOMS INSPECTORS AT THE LAND BORDERS.—The Secretary of the Treasury in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 shall increase by not less than 150 the number of full-time inspectors assigned to active duty at the land borders of the United States by the Customs Service, above the number of such positions for which funds were made available for the preceding fiscal year. Not less than one-half of the inspectors added under the preceding sentence in each fiscal year shall be assigned to the northern border of the United States.

Mr. D'AMATO. I want to congratulate the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, Senator ABRAHAM, for focusing on this issue and am pleased to join him and my other colleagues in putting forth this legislation which is aimed at correcting deficiencies that exist in the current law.

Let me say I don't intend to repeat all of the arguments put forth by my colleagues. But I do want to point out, very clearly, there are a number of my colleagues who are concerned about the impact of implementation of this legislation.

We were given such assurances as it related to its enforcement—that there was no intent to impose various requirements that would actually stop people from Canada who were coming in on a daily basis—millions of people, millions. In New York, 2.7 million Canadians visit for at least 1 night. One bridge, the Peace Bridge, carries 80 million dollars' worth of goods and services between Canada and New York, my State. Mr. President, 80 million dollars' worth of merchandise a day.

It is estimated that if we impose this law that we will impose more time on inspections, which is now about 30 seconds per person, and make that at least 2 minutes a person. We will have traffic jams of 3, 4, 5 and 6 hours. We will cost American consumers hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. We will disrupt trade. We will create an absolute catastrophe at our borders.

Now, is that what we intend to do? If we really want to go after drug dealers, and that is what this intends to do, then let's go after them. We know who the cartel leaders are.

You are going to stop millions of people on a daily basis who are traveling

back and forth between Canada and the United States? That is not going to affect the drug trade. Who are we kidding?

The implementation of this would be costly because we are talking about $1 billion a day in trade. That is what we are talking about, $1 billion a day.

Senator Simpson, who was chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration last year, along with Congressman LAMAR SMITH, chairman of the House committee, in a letter that they wrote to the Canadian Ambassador, said that ''We did not intend to impose a new requirement for border crossing cards * * * on Canadians who are not presently required to possess such documents.''

Mr. President, this legislation authored by Senator ABRAHAM, and which I am very pleased to support, would exclude Canadians who are currently exempted, just like we told the Canadian Ambassador. So this legislation really keeps a commitment that was made to our friends, to our partners in Canada, and one in which I must say is absolutely vital to the interests of many, many communities.

Let me mention a number of communities who have said if this legislation is not amended, it would be disastrous: Buffalo, NY; Syracuse, NY; Onondaga County; Oswego County and Plattsburgh. I have to tell you, they have been absolutely aghast. These are just some of the communities who have written to me and expressed, by either way of their elected officials or by the various trade groups and representatives, that this would be catastrophic. I believe they are right.

This bill will stop problems before they are created—traffic jams never envisioned before, the flow of goods and services absolutely brought to a stop. I don't think we should wait for the problem to take place, nor do I think we can continue to abdicate our responsibility. As Senator ABRAHAM has pointed out quite eloquently, we have not gotten the kind of clarification necessary that would allow the normal intercourse of business between our two great countries. You can't jeopardize people's lives, the well-being of our communities and, indeed, our national prosperity. I am pleased to support this bill. I hope we can get Senator ABRAHAM speedy action on this. I intend to support Senator ABRAHAM in every way possible and I want to commend you for having brought this to the attention of the U.S. Congress and putting forth legislation in such a thoughtful way.

Last but not least, this legislation does something that is pretty important. It calls for increasing the number of Customs and INS inspectors and says at least half of them have to be placed on northern borders. While I understand that we have some tremendous problems on our southern borders dealing with the flow of drugs, we cannot underestimate the importance of continuing the process of commerce—in a manner which will continue to expand upon it and not impinge upon it.

I thank my colleague from Michigan for being so forthright on this. I hope we can get this legislation passed sooner rather than later.

To reiterate, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, Senator ABRAHAM and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator KENNEDY, to introduce the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997—a bill that will preserve the smooth and efficient trade and travel experienced between the United States and Canada.

A provision of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act has caused enormous trepidation among businesses and families living along the northern border of the United States and Canada. Several organizations have contacted me with their concern about section 110 of the 1996 act—a provision that requires ''every alien'' to display documents upon entry to or exit from the United States.

To put this problem into perspective, let me explain what implementation of section 110 would mean for New York State. Over 2.7 million Canadians visit New York each year for at least 1 night, spending over $400 million. Last year, my State's exports to Canada exceeded $9.5 billion and the first 6 months of 1997 has seen a rise in exports. The ties between the communities are strong and must not be disrupted.

The common council of the city of Plattsburgh has submitted a resolution indicating the threat to the strong relationship enjoyed by Canada and the United States—its economic, cultural, and social impact. The Greater Buffalo Partnership states that there are about 5,000 trucks moving goods through the port of Buffalo every day that will be subject to a time intensive document production under this provision. They conclude that ''this provision will cause 5-hour delays and jeopardize every business relying on just in time deliveries.''

This new requirement will cause unprecedented traffic jams at the border and chaos in the business and travel industry in northern New York.

Implementation of this border restriction would be costly for both American and Canadian business and tourism throughout both nations. Nationally, trade with Canada hovers near $1 billion a day and there has been up to 116 million people entered the United States from Canada in 1996. As bilateral trade grows every year, traffic congestion and back ups could be expected to last hours, translating into frustration and lost opportunities.

When Congress passed this law, there was no intent to impose this requirement on Canadians. As expressed by Senator Alan Simpson, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration last year, and Congressman LAMAR SMITH, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration, in a letter to the Canadian Ambassador, ''we did not intend to impose a new requirement for border crossing cards * * * on Canadians who are not presently required to possess such documents.''

This new legislation will exclude Canadians, who are currently exempted from documentary requirements, from having to register every arrival and departure at the United States border. Because of the tremendous burden of enforcement on our borders, the bill also authorizes an increase of at least 300 INS inspectors and 150 Customs inspectors each year.

There is a major problem brewing on our border with Canada. It's a problem that threatens vital trade and travel between our two countries. This bill will halt the problem, and allow our normal trade and tourism to continue successfully. I am proud to lead the effort to pass this important legislation.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, Minnesota and Michigan are two States that share a common border with Canada, and so I am very proud today to join my colleague, Senator ABRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee, as a cosponsor of his bill to ensure Canada will receive current treatment once the immigration law is implemented in 1998. There has been a great deal of concern, especially in Minnesota, as well, as to how the immigration law we passed last year will affect the northern U.S. border. Right now the fear is the law is being misinterpreted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Minnesota alone has about 817 miles of shared border with Canada and we share many interests with our northern neighbor—tourism, trade, and family visits among the most prevalent. In the last few years, passage back and forth over the Minnesota/Canadian border has been more open and free flowing, especially since the North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect. There were 116 million travelers entering the United States from Canada in 1996 over the land border. As our relationship with Canada is increasingly interwoven, we have sought a less restrictive access to each country.

The immigration bill last year was intended to focus on illegal aliens entering this country from Mexico and living in the United States illegally. The new law states that ''every alien'' entering and leaving the United States would have to register at all the borders—land, sea, and air. The Immigration and Naturalization Service was tasked with the effort to set up automated pilot sites along the border to discover the most effective way to implement this law, which was to become effective on September 30, 1998.

The INS was quietly going about establishing a pilot site on the New York State border when the reality sunk in. A flood of calls from constituents came into the offices of all of us serving in Canadian border states. Canadian citizens also registered opposition to this

new restriction. It became quite clear that no one had considered how the new law affected Canada. Current law already waives the document requirement for most Canadian nationals, but still requires certain citizens to register at border crossings. That system has worked. There have been very few problems at the northern border with drug trafficking and illegal aliens.

In an effort to resolve this situation, I have joined Senators ABRAHAM, D'AMATO, COLLINS, SNOWE, BURNS, JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, LEAHY, MOYNIHAN, and GRAHAM of Florida in a letter asking INS Commissioner Meissner for her interpretation of this law and how she expects to implement it. We have not had a response to date, but the INS' previous reaction to this issue indicates that every alien would include both Canadian nationals and American permanent residents—everyone crossing the border.

Therefore, we must make it very clear that Congress did not intend to impose additional documentary requirements on Canadian nationals; Senator ABRAHAM's bill will restore our intent. Our legislation, the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997, will not open the floodgates for illegal aliens to pass through—it will still require those who currently need documentation to continue to produce it and remain registered in a new INS system. This will allow the INS to keep track of that category of non-immigrant entering our country to ensure they leave when their visas expire. Senator ABRAHAM's bill will not unfairly treat our friends on the Canadian side that have been deemed not to need documentation—they will still be able to pass freely back and forth across the border.

But our bill will enable us to avoid the huge traffic jams and confusion which would no doubt occur if every alien was to be registered in and out of the United States. Such registration would discourage trade and visits to the United States. It would delay shipments of important industrial equipment, auto parts services and other shared ventures that have long thrived along the northern border. It will discourage the economic revival that northern Minnesotans are experiencing, helped by Canadian shoppers and tourists.

Mr. President, I do not believe Congress intended to create this new mandate. We sought to keep illegal aliens and illegal drugs out, not our trading partners and visiting consumers. Through the Abraham bill, we will still do that while keeping the door open to our neighbors from the north. The bill is good foreign policy, good public policy and good economic policy. We all will benefit while retaining our ability to keep track of nonimmigrants who enter our borders.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank Senator ABRAHAM for his leadership on this very important matter. I am aware that Senator ABRAHAM had a successful hearing on this issue recently in Michigan. Many Minnesotans, through letters, calls and personal appeals, have also showed their opposition to a potential crisis. I look forward to testifying before the Immigration Subcommittee hearing tomorrow and assisting my colleague from Michigan in his efforts to pass this bill before the 1998 implementation date. Again, this is an unacceptable burden on our Canadian neighbors and those who depend upon their free access that effects the economics of all border states.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join Senator ABRAHAM, chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, as a cosponsor of legislation to clarify the intent of Congress under section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. He has taken up this matter to clarify the intent of Congress and I appreciate his efforts and those of Senator KENNEDY to deal with this expeditiously.

The interest of North Dakota in this bill specifically relates to the impact of imposing section 110 entry-exit requirements on the land border between Canada and North Dakota. In September, I introduced legislation, S. 1212, to exempt Canadian nationals from the requirements of section 110. Senators CONRAD, MOYNIHAN, and LEVIN have joined me in cosponsoring the bill.

I have subsequently heard from small businesses not only in North Dakota, but from New York State, Michigan, and other States. They are very concerned that if Congress fails to take action to exempt Canadian nationals from the section 110 requirements it could have a devastating impact on their businesses.

In 1995, Canadian visitors spent nearly $200 million in North Dakota. That is one in every four total tourism dollars coming into the State of North Dakota. Grand Forks, ND, devastated by floods last spring, is seeing a return of Canadian weekend visitors. The Convention and Visitors Bureau there tells me that without the Canadian visitors—who shop there, and who stay in area motels—without the Canadian visitors Grand Forks may never see a full economic recovery. These visitors are terribly important to this city trying to make a comeback.

Ask any small business owner in northern North Dakota—or for that matter any northern border State. We should be talking about policies to encourage more Canadians to visit the United States. It is incumbent on the Senate and the House to act to exempt Canadian nationals from the requirements of section 110 and to send a signal that we welcome their business.

Mr. President, I commend Senator ABRAHAM for taking up this important issue at this time. I endorse the exemption of Canadian nationals from section 110 requirements, and I wholeheartedly support his efforts to authorize additional personnel for the northern border. The northern borders in particular have seen no growth in resources for some time now.

I encourage the committee to move expeditiously to bring this bill to the floor. To do so will reassure small business owners and small communities across the northern United States that we are looking out for their economic interests.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to support my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, in the introduction of the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997. This legislation will clarify a small provision of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, specifically section 110. Section 110 requires the Immigration and Naturalization Service to develop, by September 30, 1998, an automated entry and exit control system to document the entry and departure of 'every alien' arriving in and leaving the United States.

This section, if not amended, would pose great hardship to Montana, and to most border States. The current procedure allows Canadians to cross the United States-Canadian border without requiring them to present a passport, visa, or border-crossing identification card. This assists our communities, on both sides of the border, to expand their economic growth. A large portion of our economic life is derived from the business we have that comes from Canada, whether it be from travel, tourism, or regular trade. The free flow of goods and services that are exchanged every day through the United States and Canada has provided both countries with enormous economic benefits. If not amended, this could drop dramatically.

Congress did not intend to cause such a disruption of service when it passed the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. Section 110 was principally designed to make the current entry-exist control system automated—so that the system would function better; it was not intended to expand documentary requirements and bureaucracy. This legislation will take the steps needed to insure that the law is read properly. This bill would require that the Immigration and Naturalization Service to develop an automated entry-exit control system would not apply at the land borders, to U.S. lawful permanent residents or to any nationals of foreign contiguous territory from whom the Attorney General and the Secretary of State have already waived visa requirements.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will review this bill and understand the merits that it provides, not only for our border States, but also for the Nation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its swift passage.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of The Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997. This bill will ensure that Canadians and United States permanent residents are treated fairly and

appropriately and that the United States and Canada's long and friendly relationship regarding immigration issues is preserved.

We must preserve the integrity of our open border and ensure that no undue hassle, inconvenience, or burden is placed upon those who cross the United States-Canada border. Vermont and Canada share many traditions, and one that we all value is the free flow of trade and tourism. Ours is the longest open border in the world, and we should do nothing to change or endanger that relationship. On Vermont's border with Canada, commerce, tourism and other exchanges across the border are part of our way of life. A general store in Norton, VT, on the border has the separate cash registers at either end of the shop.

The Border Improvement Act will preserve the status quo for Canadians and Americans crossing the United States' northern border. It will ensure that tourists and trade continue to be able to freely cross the border, without additional documentation requirements. This bill will also guarantee that the over $1 billion in daily cross-border trade is not hindered in any way. The Border Improvement Act takes a more thoughtful approach to modifying U.S. immigration policies than last year's bill, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act [IIRIRA]. By requiring the Attorney General to thoroughly assess the potential cost and impact before implementing any sort of automated entry-exit monitoring system on the Nation's land borders, this bill ensures that any such system will be well planned and implemented. Finally, the Border Improvement Act will ensure adequate staffing on the northern border by requiring a substantial increase in the number of INS and Customs agents assigned to this region over the next 3 years.

I am particularly pleased to see that this bill has clear bipartisan support. Last year, I worked closely with Senator ABRAHAM to quash another ill-conceived proposed addition to the immigration bill—the implementation of border-crossing fees. We successfully defeated the fee proposal last year, but only after much debate and negotiation.

Unfortunately, we did not have the same opportunity to debate fully the provision in section 110 of the IIRIRA which mandates that the INS develop an automated entry and exit control system to track the arrival and departure of all aliens at all borders by next October.

The current language in section 110 of the IIRIRA, as agreed to in last would have a significant negative impact on trade and relations between the United States and Canada. By requiring an automated system for monitoring the entry and exit of all aliens, this provision would require that the INS and Customs agents stop each vehicle or individual entering or exiting the United States at all ports of entry. Canadians, United States permanent residents and many others who are not currently required to show documentation of their status would either have to carry some form of identification or fill out paperwork at the points of entry. This sort of tracking system would be enormously costly to implement along the northern border, especially since there is no current system or infrastructure to track the departure of citizens and others leaving the United States. Section 110, as currently worded, would also lead to excessive and costly traffic delays for those living and working near the border. These delays would surely have a negative impact on the $2.4 billion in goods and services shipped annually from Vermont to Canada and would likely reduce the $120 million per year which Canadians spend in Vermont.

This legislation has been crafted with input from the INS and representatives of the Canadian Government. By including the administration and our northern neighbor in the discussions, Senators ABRAHAM and KENNEDY have developed a remedy which is sure to be implemented smoothly. My cosponsorship of this bill reflects my ongoing concern about the negative impact the implementation of the current language in section 110 of the IIRIRA would have on the economy in my home State of Vermont, as well as in the other northern border States. While this remedy was being negotiated, I cosponsored an amendment on the floor and sent letters to Attorney General Reno and INS Commissioner Meissner requesting that a study be undertaken before any sort of automated entry-exit monitoring system be implemented. I am pleased that this bill has a similar provision. But, the Border Improvement Act goes one step further to protect our Canadian neighbors' rights to freely cross the border into the United States without facing needless traffic delays or unnecessary paperwork requirements.

I am pleased that Senator ABRAHAM has called a hearing tomorrow to discuss this bill and the negative impact the current law would have in so many of our States. At the hearing, we will hear the testimony of Bill Stenger, the president of the Jay Peak Ski Resort in Vermont which is situated only a few miles from the Canadian border. Mr. Stenger will testify to the disastrous effect any increased documentation requirements for Canadians would have on his business, and so many other United States businesses which are dependent on the preservation of free trade and travel across the Canadian border.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1361. A bill to provide for the appointment of 1 additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE WISCONSIN FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1997

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, to introduce the Wisconsin Federal Judgeship Act of 1997. This bill would create one additional Federal judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin and situate it in Green Bay, where a district court is crucially needed. Let me explain how the current system hurts—and how this additional judgeship will help—businesses, law enforcement agents, witnesses, victims, and individual litigants in northeastern Wisconsin.

First, the four full-time district court judges for the eastern district of Wisconsin currently preside in Milwaukee. Yet for most litigants and witnesses in northeastern Wisconsin, Milwaukee is well over 100 miles away. Thus, litigants and witnesses must incur substantial costs in traveling from northern Wisconsin to Milwaukee—costs in terms of time, money, resources, and effort. Indeed driving from Green Bay to Milwaukee takes nearly two hours each way. Add inclement weather or a departure point north of Green Bay—such as Oconto or Marinette—and the driving time alone often results in witnesses traveling for a far longer period of time than they actually spend testifying.

Second, Mr. President, as Attorney General Janet Reno recently noted before the Judiciary Committee, Federal crimes remain unacceptably high in northeastern Wisconsin. These crimes range from bank robbery and kidnaping to Medicare and Medicaid fraud. However, without the appropriate judicial resources, a crackdown on Federal crimes in the upper will be made enormously more difficult.

Third, many manufacturing and retail companies are located in northeastern Wisconsin. These companies often require a Federal court to litigate complex price-fixing, contract, and liability disputes with out-of-State businesses. But the sad truth is that many of these cases are never even filed—precisely because the northern part of the State lacks a Federal court. Mr. President, this hurts businesses not only in Wisconsin, but across the Nation.

Fourth, prosecuting cases on the Menominee Indian Reservation creates specific problems that alone justify having a Federal judge in Green Bay. Under current law, the Federal Government is required to prosecute all felonies committed by Indians that occur on the Menominee Reservation. The reservation's distance from the Federal prosecutors and courts—more than 150 miles—makes these prosecutions problematic. And because the Justice Department compensates attorneys, investigators, and sometimes witnesses for travel expenses, the existing system costs all of us. In addition, Mr. President, we saw juvenile crime rates on this reservation rise by 279 percent last year alone. Without an additional judge in Green Bay, the administration

of justice, as well as the public's pocketbook, will suffer enormously.

Fifth, Mr. President, the creation of an additional judgeship in the eastern district of Wisconsin is also clearly justified on the basis of caseload. I have commissioned the General Accounting Office to look at this issue and their report will be released early next year and which we expect will confirm our belief. However, based on standards already established by the Judicial Conference, the administrative and statistical arm of the Federal judiciary, an additional judgeship is clearly needed. In 1994, the Judicial Conference recommended the creation of additional Federal judgeships on the basis of weighted filings; that is, the total number of cases filed per judge modified by the average level of case complexity. In 1994, new positions were justified where a district's workload exceeded 430 weighted filings per judge. On this basis, the eastern district of Wisconsin clearly merits an additional judgeship: it tallied more than 435 weighted filings in 1993 and averaged 434 weighted filings per judge between 1991–93. In fact, though our bill would not add an additional judge in the western district of Wisconsin, we could make a strong case for doing so because the average weighted filings per judge in the western district was almost as high as in the eastern district.

Mr. President, our legislation in simple, effective, and straightforward. It creates an additional judgeship for the eastern district, requires that one judge hold court in Green Bay, and gives the chief judge of the eastern district the flexibility to designate which judge holds court there. And this legislation would increase the number of Federal district judges in Wisconsin for the first time since 1978. During that period, more than 252 new Federal district judgeships have been created nationwide, but not a single one in Wisconsin.

And don't take my word for it, Mr. President, ask the people who would be most affected: in 1994 each and every sheriff and district attorney in northeastern Wisconsin urged me to create a Federal district court in Green Bay. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from these law enforcement officials be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, Tom Schneider, also be included. This letter expresses the support of the entire Federal law enforcement community in Wisconsin—including the FBI, the DEA, and the BATF—for the legislation we are introducing. They needed this additional judicial resource in 1994, and certainly, Mr. President, that need has only increased over the last 3 years.

Perhaps most important, the people of Green Bay also agree on the need for an additional Federal judge, as the endorsement of our proposal by the Green Bay Chamber of Commerce demonstrates.

In conclusion, Mr. President, having a Federal judge in Green Bay will reduce costs and inconvenience while increasing judicial efficiency. But most important, it will help ensure that justice is more available and more affordable to the people of northeastern Wisconsin. As the courts are currently arranged, the northern portion of the eastern district is more remote from a Federal court than any other major population center, commercial or industrial, in the United States. For these sensible reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. We hope to enact this measure, either separately or as a part of an omnibus judgeship bill the Judiciary Committee may consider later this Congress.

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

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

S. 1361

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN.

(1) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Wisconsin Federal Judgeship Act of 1997''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

(c) TABLES.—In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, shall reflect the change in the total number of permanent district judgeships authorized under subsection (a), such table is amended by amending the item relating to Wisconsin to read as follows:

''*Wisconsin:*
''Eastern 5
''Western ..... 2''.

(d) HOLDING OF COURT.—The chief judge of the eastern district of Wisconsin shall designate 1 judge who shall hold court for such district in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

AUGUST 8, 1994.

U.S. Senator HERB KOHL,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KOHL: We are writing to urge your support for the creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay. The Eastern District of Wisconsin includes the 28 eastern-most counties from Forest and Florence Counties in the north to Kenosha and Walworth Counties in the south.

Green Bay is central to the northern part of the district which includes approximately one third of the district's population. Currently, all Federal District Judges hold court in Milwaukee.

A federal court in Green Bay would make federal proceedings much more accessible to the people of northern Wisconsin and would alleviate many problems for citizens and law enforcement. Travel time of 3 or 4 hours each way makes it difficult and expensive for witnesses and officers to go to court in Milwaukee. Citizen witnesses are often reluctant to travel back and forth to Milwaukee. It often takes a whole day of travel to come to court and testify for a few minutes. Any lengthy testimony requires an inconvenient and costly overnight stay in Milwaukee. Sending officers is costly and takes substantial amounts of travel time, thereby reducing the number of officers available on the street. Many cases are simply never referred to federal court because of this cost and inconvenience.

In some cases there is no alternative. For example, the Federal government has the obligation to prosecute all felony offenses committed by Indians on the Menominee Reservation. Yet the Reservation's distance from the Federal Courts and prosecutors in Milwaukee poses serious problems. Imagine the District Attorney of Milwaukee being located in Keshena or Green Bay or Marinette and trying to coordinate witness interviews, case preparation, and testimony.

As local law enforcement officials, we try to work closely with other local, state and federal agencies, and we believe establishing a Federal District Court in Green Bay will measurably enhance these efforts. Most important, a Federal Court in Green Bay will make these courts substantially more accessible to the citizens who live here.

We urge you to introduce and support legislation to create and fund an additional Federal District Court in Green Bay.

Gary Robert Bruno, Shawano and Menominee County District Attorney; Jay Conley, Oconto County District Attorney; John DesJardins, Outagamie County District Attorney; Douglas Drexler, Florence County District Attorney; Guy Dutcher, Waushara County District Attorney; E. James Fitz-Gerald, Manitowoc County District Attorney; Kenneth Kratz, Calumet County District Attorney; Jackson Main, Jr., Kewaunee County District Attorney; David Miron, Marinette County District Attorney; Joseph Paulus, Winnebago County District Attorney; Gary Schuster, Door County District Attorney; John Snider, Waupaca County District Attorney; Ralph Uttke, Langlade County District Attorney; Demetrio Verich, Forest County District Attorney; John Zakowski, Brown County District Attorney.

William Aschenbrener, Shawano County Sheriff; Charles Brann, Door County Sheriff; Todd Chaney, Kewaunee County Sheriff; Michael Donart, Brown County Sheriff; Patrick Fox, Waushara County Sheriff; Bradley Gehring, Outagamie County Sheriff; Daniel Gillis, Calumet County Sheriff; James Kanikula, Marinette County Sheriff; Norman Knoll, Forest County Sheriff; Thomas Kocourek, Manitowoc County Sheriff; Robert Kraus, Winnebago County Sheriff; William Mork, Waupaca County Sheriff; Jeffrey Rickaby, Florence County Sheriff; David Steger, Langlade County Sheriff; Kenneth Woodworth, Oconto County Sheriff.

Richard Awonhopay, Chief, Menominee Tribal Police; Richard Brey, Chief of Police, Manitowoc; Patrick Campbell, Chief of Police, Kaukauna; James Danforth, Chief of Police, Onelda Public Safety; Donald Forcey, Chief of Police, Neenah; David Gorski, Chief of Police, Appleton; Robert Langan, Chief of Police, Green Bay; Michael Lien, Chief of Police, Two Rivers; Mike Nordin, Chief of Police, Sturgeon Bay; Patrick Ravet, Chief of Police, Marinette; Robert Stanke, Chief of Police, Menasha; Don Thaves, Chief of Police, Shawano; James Thome, Chief of Police, Oshkosh.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, U.S. ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, WI, August 9, 1994.

To: The District Attorney's, Sheriffs and Police Chiefs Urging the Creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay.

From: Thomas P. Schneider, U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Thank you for your letter of August 8, 1994, urging the creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay. You point out a number of facts in your letter:

(1) Although ⅓ of the population of the Eastern District of Wisconsin is in the northern part of the district, all of the Federal District Courts are located in Milwaukee.

(2) A federal court in Green Bay would be more accessible to the people of northern Wisconsin. It would substantially reduce witness travel time and expenses, and it would make federal court more accessible and less costly for local law enforcement agencies.

(3) The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over most felonies committed on the Menominee Reservation, located approximately 3 hours from Milwaukee. The distance to Milwaukee is a particular problem for victims, witnesses, and officers from the Reservation.

I have discussed this proposal with the chiefs of the federal law enforcement agencies in the Eastern District of Wisconsin, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Drug Enforcement Administration, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Secret Service, U.S. Marshal, U.S. Customs Service, and Internal Revenue Service-Criminal Investigation Division. All express support for such a court and given additional reasons why it is needed.

Over the past several years, the FBI, DEA, and IRS have initiated a substantial number of investigations in the northern half of the district. In preparation for indictments and trials, and when needed to testify before the Grand Jury or in court, officers regularly travel to Milwaukee. Each trip requires 4 to 6 hours of round trip travel per day, plus the actual time in court. In other words, the agencies' already scarce resources are severely taxed. Several federal agencies report that many cases which are appropriate for prosecution are simply not charged federally because local law enforcement agencies do not have the resources to bring these cases and officers back and forth to Milwaukee.

Nevertheless, there have been a substantial number of successful federal investigations and prosecutions from the Fox Valley area and other parts of the Northern District of Wisconsin including major drug organizations, bank frauds, tax cases, and weapons cases.

It is interesting to note that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in the Eastern District of Wisconsin holds hearings in Green Bay, Manitowoc, and Oshkosh, all in the northern half of the district. For the past four years approximately 29% of all bankruptcy filings in the district were in these three locations.

In addition, we continue to prosecute most felonies committed on the Menominee Reservation. Yet, the Reservation's distance from the federal courts in Milwaukee poses serious problems. A federal court in Green Bay is critically important if the federal government is to live up to its moral and legal obligation to enforce the law on the Reservation.

In summary, I appreciate and understand your concerns and I join you in urging the certain of a Federal District Court in Green Bay.

THOMAS P. SCHNEIDER,
U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, in introducing the Wisconsin Federal Judgeship Act of 1997. I want to commend my colleague for his leadership and dedication on this very important matter.

Mr. President, the legislation being introduced will address a serious problem currently confronting the citizens of the eastern district of Wisconsin. At present, the eastern district of Wisconsin consists of four district court judges and two appellate judges, all of which sit in Milwaukee. However, the eastern district of Wisconsin is an expansive area which extends from Wisconsin's southern border with Illinois all the way to the north and the Great Lakes. Approximately one-third of the population of the eastern district of Wisconsin lives and works in the northern part of the district. While Milwaukee is centrally located for the majority of residents who reside in southeastern Wisconsin, the same cannot be said for the residents of my State which live in the northern portion of the district.

The Wisconsin Judgeship Act addresses this problem by placing a fifth district court judgeship in Green Bay which is centrally located in the northern portion of Wisconsin's eastern district. The simple fact of the matter is that at present access to the justice system is burdensome and expensive for the residents and for law enforcement of northeastern Wisconsin. In some instances, the travel time incurred by victims, witnesses, and law enforcement is as much as 3 or 4 hours each way, often longer depending upon the weather. In some cases, the cost, both in time and in scarce resources, may simply mean that legitimate cases are not being heard. Another troubling facet of this situation is that northeastern Wisconsin is home to the Menominee Indian Reservation. Because the Federal Government retains significant jurisdictional responsibility for cases arising on the reservation, the requirement that the cases be adjudicated in Milwaukee is particularly problematic in these cases. Based on these facts Mr. President, it is little wonder that this legislation has the strong support of law enforcement, both from police and prosecutors, from all across the eastern district of Wisconsin.

By placing a Federal judge in Green Bay, not only will the residents of the growing Fox River Valley have easier access to the court, but so too will those residents of my State which live in the north. Mr. President, I have long believed that access to the administration of justice is among the most important and fundamental rights that we as Americans retain. Ensuring access to the courthouse is one of the primary responsibilities that the Federal Government has to its citizens. As members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Senator KOHL and I see firsthand how important the timely administration of justice is to our Democratic Government. The inability to receive one's day in court because of geographic distance, as appears to be happening to some in my State, is unacceptable. This legislation will address that inequity and I look forward to working with Senator KOHL and other members of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate as this legislation moves forward.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1362. A bill to promote the use of universal product members on claim forms used for reimbursement under the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MEDICARE UNIVERSAL PRODUCT NUMBER ACT OF 1997

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BREAUX and myself, I am introducing legislation today to require the use of universal product numbers [UPNs] for all durable medical equipment [DME] Medicare purchases. The purpose of this legislation is to improve the Health Care Financing Administration's [HCFA] ability to track and to appropriately assess the value of the durable medical equipment it pays for under the Medicare Program. Very simply, our bill will ensure Medicare gets what it pays for.

According to an interim report by the General Accounting Office [GAO] and the Office of Inspector General's review of billing practices for specific medical supplies, the Medicare program is often paying greater than the market price for durable medical equipment and Medicare beneficiaries are not receiving the quality of care they should. HCFA currently does not require DME suppliers to identify specific products on their Medicare claims. Therefore it does not know for which products it is paying. HCFA's billing codes often cover a broad range of products of various types, qualities and market prices. For example, the GAO found that one Medicare billing code is used by the industry for more than 200 different urological catheters, with many of these products varying significantly in price, use, and quality.

Medicare's inability to accurately track and price medical equipment and supplies it purchases could be remedied with the use of product specific codes known as bar codes or universal product numbers [UPN's]. These codes are similar to the codes you see on products you purchase at the grocery store. Use of such bar codes is already being required by the Department of Defense and several large private sector purchasing groups. The industry strongly supports such an initiative as well. I am submitting several letters of endorsement for the record on behalf of the National Association of Medical Equipment Services and the Health Industry Distributors Association.

This bill represents a common-sense approach. It will improve the way Medicare monitors and reimburses suppliers for medical equipment and supplies. Patients will receive better care.

And the Federal Government will save money. I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this legislation which I am introducing today with my friend and colleague, Senator BREAUX.

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

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

S. 1362

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 ''Medicare Universal Product Number Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. UNIVERSAL PRODUCT NUMBERS ON CLAIMS FORMS FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) ACCOMMODATION OF UPNS ON MEDICARE ELECTRONIC CLAIMS FORMS.—Not later than February 1, 2000, all electronic claims forms developed or used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for reimbursement under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) pursuant to part C of title XI of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d et seq.) or any other law shall accommodate the use of universal product numbers (as defined in section 1897(a)(2) of that Act (as added by subsection (b))) for covered items (as defined in section 1834(a)(13) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(13))).

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.—Title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) (as amended by section 4015 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 337)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''USE OF UNIVERSAL PRODUCT NUMBERS

SEC. 1897. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED ITEM.—The term 'covered item' has the meaning given that term in section 1834(a)(13).

''(2) UNIVERSAL PRODUCT NUMBER.—The term 'universal product number' means a number that is—

''(A) affixed by the manufacturer to each individual covered item that uniquely identifies the item at each packaging level; and

''(B) based on commercially acceptable identification standards established by the Uniform Code Council—International Article Numbering System and the Health Industry Business Communication Council.

''(b) IN GENERAL.—No payment shall be made under this title for any claim for reimbursement for any covered item unless the claim contains the universal product number of the covered item.''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROCEDURES.—From the information obtained by the use of universal product numbers (as defined in section 1897(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 2(b))) on claims for reimbursement under the medicare program, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with interested parties, shall periodically review the covered items billed under the Health Care Financing Administration Common Procedure Coding System and adjust such coding system to ensure that functionally equivalent covered items are billed and reimbursed under the same codes.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to claims for reimbursement submitted on and after February 1, 2001.

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study on the results of the implementation of the provisions in subsections (a) and (c) of section 2 and the amendment to the Social Security Act in subsection (b) of that section.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to Congress that contains a detailed description of the results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a), together with the Secretary's recommendations regarding the use of universal product numbers (as defined in section 1897(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 2(b) of this Act)) and the use of data obtained from the use of such numbers.

HEALTH INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTORS ASSN.,
Alexandria VA., November 3, 1997.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: On behalf of the Health Industry Distributors Association (HIDA), I would like to applaud your support for the use of universal product number (UPNs) on Medical billings. HIDA is the national trade association of home care companies and medical products distribution firms. Created in 1902, HIDA represents over 600 companies with appropriately 2500 locations nationwide. HIDA Members provide value-added distribution services to virtually every hospital, physician's office, nursing facility, clinic, and other health care cities across the country, as well as to a growing number of home care patients.

HIDA has long supported the use of UPN's for medical products and supplies. UPNs provide a standard format for identifying each individual product. UPNs are a major enabling factor in the health industry's efforts to minimize fraudulent billings and automate the distribution process. The Department of Defense (DOD) has taken a leadership position in promoting the implementation of the industry standards of UPNs. As a part of their decision to use commercial medical products distributors, the DOD has mandated the use UPNs for all medical/surgical products delivered to DOD facilities.

HIDA believes that the Medicare Program could benefit greatly from the use of UPNs. By cross-referencing each UPN with the HCFA Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) and requiring the UPN on each claim for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics and supplies (DMEPOS), Medicare's ability to track utilization and combat fraud and abuse would be greatly enhanced. By using UPNs, the Medicare system would be able to correctly identify product utilization. As UPNs provide a unique, unambiguous means of identifying each item of DMEPOS on the market, Medicare would have a record of the exact product used by the beneficiary. Trends in product utilization and claims for ''suspicious'' items would be easily identifiable. HCPCS alone can not provide this information as many products of varying quality and cost are included in a single code.

In addition, problems with ''upcoding'' could be greatly reduced through the implementation of UPNs. Upcoding occurs when a beneficiary receives a product of lesser cost/quality than the HCPCS billed to Medicare. UPNs would correctly identify the specific item of DMEPOS, thereby making it impossible to misrepresent the cost and quality of the item. Importantly, by addressing the problem of upcoding, the Medicare Program would take great steps in assuring that beneficiaries receive the exact items of DMEPOS that they were intended to receive.

HIDA firmly believes that the Medicare Program and DMEPOS industry would benefit greatly from the use of UPNs. This standard would not only increase Medicare's understanding of what it pays for, but also assist in the effective administration of the Program. If HIDA can provide any further information or be of any assistance, please contact Ms. Erin H. Bush, Associate Director of Government Relations at (703) 838–6110.

Again, thank you for your interest in this important matter.

Sincerely.

CARA C. BACHENHEIMER,
Executive Director, Home Care and Long Term Care Market Groups.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR MEDICAL EQUIPMENT SERVICES,
Alexandria, VA, November 3, 1997.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging.

Hon. JOHN BREAUX,
U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging.

DEAR SENATORS GRASSLEY AND BREAUX: The National Association for Medical Equipment Services appreciates your October 27 letter requesting comment on your draft bill concerning use of uniform product number on home medical equipment. On behalf of our 1,200 member companies, NAMES is pleased to endorse this bill. We look forward to working with you as it proceeds through the legislative process. And, once enacted, we would hope the Administration would work with the industry to implement this law appropriately.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. COUGHLAN, CAE,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1364. A bill to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful Federal reports; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE FEDERAL REPORTS ELIMINATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to introduce legislation that would eliminate approximately 150 unnecessary reports that have been mandated by the Congress. All of these reports have been judged as unnecessary, wasteful, or redundant by each of the Federal agencies which have been required to produce them. I am also pleased to have the considerable assistance of the coauthor of this legislation, Senator LEVIN.

This proposal is intended to combat the growing problem of the thousands of mandatory reports that Congress has been imposing upon the executive branch over the last decade. Each year, Members of Congress continue to burden the executive branch agencies by mandating numerous reports. The price for the wasteful reports is extraordinarily high. Not only do they cost American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars each year, but they exhaust the often limited resources of the Federal agencies which have to meet these reporting requirements. Furthermore, the thousands of Federal employees who must work for months on these unnecessary reports could focus their energies to work on far more worthy ventures on behalf of taxpayers. They are a dubious use of taxpayers dollars and Government productivity.

Senator LEVIN and I began working on various aspects of eliminating and sunsetting unnecessary Federal reports

in 1993. We have both been long concerned about the vast amounts of public funds and valuable government personnel resources that are being wasted. Let me state just one instructive example of how reporting mandates drain public funds and departmental resources. The Department of Agriculture alone spent over $40 million in taxpayers money in 1993 to produce the 280 reports it was required to submit to the Congress that year. While many of these reports may provide vital information to the Congress and the public, it is undeniable that many others can and should be repealed in order to save taxpayer dollars and staff time. This is true for virtually every agency of the Federal Government.

In 1995, Senator LEVIN and I were able to successfully eliminate approximately 200 reports, and sunset several hundred others. However, since that time, the administration has highlighted 450 additional reports that they would like repealed. Here are a few examples of the type of reports I am talking about. Each year, the following are required to be sent to the Congress from Federal agencies: Report on the Elimination of Notice to Congress Regarding Waiver of Requirement for Use of Vegetable Ink in Lithographic Printing; Report on Canadian Acid Rain Control Program; and Report on Metal Casting Research and Development Activities.

I have asked OMB to calculate the total amount of public funds we would save if the unnecessary or redundant reporting requirements contained in this legislation are repealed, and I will provide my colleagues with their response. Considering that we currently have over a $5 trillion dollar Federal deficit, Mr. President, I'm sure that you would agree that our citizens would not support this egregious expenditure of hundreds of useless reports each and every year.

It is important to note that this reporting mandate problem continues to grow with each passing year. GAO determined several years ago that ''Congress imposes about 300 new requirements on Federal agencies each year.'' Prompt Senate action to authorize the elimination of wasteful reports in this proposal will be an important service to our constituents and these agencies. The staffing burdens and paper shuffling these outdated reporting mandates cause are of little real value to the important work of government. We should lighten the load of both overburdened taxpayers and the agencies involved by ending them now.

I would again like to thank Senator LEVIN for his hard work and dedication on this issue over the past few years. Furthermore, I must acknowledge the administration for its earnest support of this effort. Additionally, the proposed terminations were carefully reviewed and then approved by each respective committee chairman and ranking member. These reports represent the flagrant waste of taxpayers dollars and Government productivity.

It is clear that this bipartisan effort will put an end to a significant part of the unnecessary cycle of waste and misspent resources that these reports represent. The adoption of this legislation would be a strong contribution toward downsizing Government as the American people have repeatedly called upon us to do. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and remove the millstone of unnecessary and costly paperwork that Congress has hung around the neck of the Federal Government for too long.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MCCAIN in introducing the Federal Reports Elimination Act of 1997, which will eliminate or modify 187 outdated or unnecessary congressionally mandated reporting requirements. This legislation will reduce unnecessary paperwork generated, and staff time spent, in producing reports to Congress that are no longer relevant or useful.

Senator MCCAIN and I introduced and got enacted similar legislation in 1995, Public Law 104–66, the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995. In that legislation we eliminated or modified 207 congressionally mandated reporting requirements and placed a 4-year sunset on all other reports that were required to be made on an annual or otherwise regular basis. We also required in that legislation that the President include in the first annual budget submitted after the date of enactment of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 a list of the congressionally mandated reports that he has determined to be unnecessary or wasteful. The President provided a list of nearly 400 reports in the fiscal year 1997 budget along with comments on why the agencies involved felt the reporting requirements should be eliminated or modified. In many instances, the administration states, the reports are obsolete or contain duplicate information already conveyed to Congress in another report or publication.

For example, one report that is required of the Department of Agriculture asks the agency to provide to Congress a list of the advisory committee members, principal place of residence, persons or companies by whom they are employed, and other major sources of income. This information may be useful at the agency level, but is not significant to Congress. The administration's recommendation for elimination of this report stated that the ''preparation of this report is time consuming and may not be of particular interest to Congress. If the requirement for an annual report is deleted, the information contained in the report would still be available upon request.''

Another example of unnecessary reporting is the requirement to provide reports for programs that have never been funded. The Department of Energy was tasked to provide a biennial update to the National Advanced Materials Initiative Five-Year Program Plan in support of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, for which funds were never provided. The Department of Justice never received funding for a program that required the submission of a report to the Judiciary Committee on the security of State and local immigration and naturalization documents and any improvements that occurred as a result of the Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989. The Department of Transportation has never received funding for a requirement to study the effects of climatic conditions on the costs of highway construction and maintenance. The National Advisory Commission on Resource Conservation and Recovery for the Environmental Protection Agency is tasked with providing an interim report of its activities. This Commission was established and commissioned in 1981 and has never met nor received funding for its activities.

The Vice President's National Performance Review estimated that Congress requires executive branch agencies to prepare more than 5,300 reports each year. That number has increased dramatically from only 750 such reports required by Congress in 1970. The GAO reports that Congress imposes close to 300 new requirements on Federal agencies each year.

And preparation of these reports costs money. The Department of Agriculture estimated in 1993 that it spent more than $40 million in preparing 280 mandated reports.

In developing this bill, Senator MCCAIN and I wrote to the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant Senate committees and asked them to review the list of reports, under their jurisdiction, that the administration identified as no longer necessary or useful and, therefore, ready for elimination or modification. We wanted to be sure that the committees of jurisdiction concurred with the administration in their assessment of the lack of need for these reports. Many of the committees responded to the request. Those responses were generally supportive and some contained only a few changes to the administration's recommendations. Some committees identified reports under their jurisdiction which they wanted to retain because the information contained in the report is still of use to the committee. Those suggestions were incorporated into the bill so that the bill reflects only those reports for which there is general agreement about elimination or modification.

Senator MCCAIN and I are introducing this bipartisan legislation to reduce the paperwork burdens placed on Federal agencies, streamline the information that flows from these agencies to Congress, and ultimately save millions of taxpayer dollars. I hope we can act quickly on this legislation.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 1365. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the

reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

THE GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET MODIFICATION ACT OF 1997

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to me, very important to my constituents in Maryland, and very important to government workers and retirees across the Nation.

Today, I am introducing a bill to modify a harsh and heartless rule of government that is unfair and prevents current workers from enjoying the benefits of their hard work in their retirement. I want the middle class of this Nation to know that if you worked hard to become middle class you should stay middle class when you retire.

Under current law, there is something called the pension offset law. This is a harsh and unfair policy. Let me tell you why.

If you are a retired government worker, and you qualify for a spousal Social Security benefit based on your spouse's employment record, you may not receive what you qualify for. Because the pension offset law reduces or entirely eliminates a Social Security spousal benefit when the surviving spouse is eligible for a pension from a local, state, or federal government job that was not covered by Social Security.

This policy only applies to government workers, not private sector workers. Let me give you an example of two women, Helen and her sister Phyllis.

Helen is a retired Social Security benefits counselor who lives in Woodlawn, MD. Helen currently earns $600 a month from her Federal Government pension. She's also entitled to a $645 a month spousal benefit from Social Security based on her deceased husband's hard work as an auto mechanic. That's a combined monthly benefit of $1,245.

Phyllis is a retired bank teller also in Woodlawn, MD. She currently earns a pension of $600 a month from the bank. Like Helen, Phyllis is also entitled to a $645 a month spousal benefit from Social Security based on her husband's employment. He was an auto mechanic, too. In fact, he worked at the same shop as Helen's husband.

So, Phyllis is entitled to a total of $1,245 a month, the same as Helen. But, because of the pension offset law, Helen's spousal benefit is reduced by two-thirds of her government pension, or $400. So instead of $1,245 per month, she will only receive $845 per month.

This reduction in benefits only happens to Helen because she worked for the government. Phyllis will receive her full benefits because her pension is a private sector pension. I don't think that's right, and that's why I'm introducing this legislation.

The crucial thing about the Mikulski modification is that it guarantees a minimum benefit of $1,200. So, with the Mikulski modification to the pension offset, Helen is guaranteed at least $1,200 per month.

Let me tell you how it works. Helen's spousal benefit will be reduced only by two-thirds of the amount her combined monthly benefit exceeds $1,200. In her case, the amount of the offset would be two thirds of $45, or $30. That's a big difference from $400, and I think people like our Federal workers, teachers, and our firefighters deserve that big difference.

Why should earning a government pension penalize the surviving spouse? If a deceased spouse had a job covered by Social Security and paid into the Social Security system. That spouse expected his earned Social Security benefits would be there for his surviving spouse.

Most working men believe this and many working women are counting on their spousal benefits. But because of this harsh and heartless policy the spousal benefits will not be there, your spouse will not benefit from your hard work, and, chances are, you won't find out about it until your loved one is gone and you really need the money.

The Mikulski modification guarantees that the spouse will at least receive $1,200 in combined benefits. That Helen will receive the same amount as Phyllis.

I'm introducing this legislation, because these survivors deserve better than the reduced monthly benefits that the pension offset currently allows. They deserve to be rewarded for their hard work, not penalized for it.

Many workers affected by this offset policy are women, or clerical workers and bus drivers who are currently working and looking forward to a deserved retirement. These are people who worked hard as Federal employees, school teachers, or firefighters.

Frankly, I would repeal this policy all together. But, I realize that budget considerations make that unlikely. As a compromise, I hope we can agree that retirees who work hard should not have this offset applied until their combined monthly benefit exceeds $1,200.

In the few cases where retirees might have their benefits reduced by this policy change, my legislation will calculate their pension offset by the current method. I also have a provision in this legislation to index the minimum amount of $1,200 to inflation so retirees will see their minimum benefits increase as the cost of living increases.

I believe that people who work hard and play by the rules should not be penalized by arcane, legislative technicalities. That's why I'm introducing this bill today.

Representative WILLIAM JEFFERSON of Louisiana has introduced similar legislation in the House. I look forward to working with him to modify the harsh pension offset rule.

If the Federal Government is going to force government workers and retirees in Maryland and across the country to give up a portion of their spousal benefits, the retirees should at least receive a fair portion of their benefits.

I want to urge my Senate colleagues to join me in this effort and support my legislation to modify the Government pension offset.

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. 1365

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON REDUCTIONS IN BENEFITS FOR SPOUSES AND SURVIVING SPOUSES RECEIVING GOVERNMENT PENSIONS.

(a) WIFE'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(b)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(b)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and'' after ''two-thirds''; and

(2) by inserting ''exceeds the amount described in subsection (z) for such month,'' before ''if''.

(b) HUSBAND'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(c)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(c)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and'' after ''two-thirds of''; and

(2) by inserting ''exceeds the amount described in subsection (z) for such month,'' before ''if''.

(c) WIDOW'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(e)(7)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and'' after ''two-thirds of''; and

(2) by inserting ''exceeds the amount described in subsection (z) for such month,'' before ''if''.

(d) WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(f)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and'' after ''two-thirds of''; and

(2) by inserting ''exceeds the amount described in subsection (z) for such month,'' before ''if''.

(e) MOTHER'S AND FATHER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Section 202(g)(4)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(g)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the amount (if any) by which the sum of such benefit (before reduction under this paragraph) and'' after ''two-thirds of''; and

(2) by inserting ''exceeds the amount described in subsection (z) for such month,'' before ''if''.

(f) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—Section 202 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) The amount described in this subsection is, for months in each 12-month period beginning in December of 1997, and each succeeding calendar year, the greater of—

''(1) $1200; or

''(2) the amount applicable for months in the preceding 12-month period, increased by the cost-of-living adjustment for such period

determined for an annuity under section 8340 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to any other provision of law).''.

(g) LIMITATIONS ON REDUCTIONS IN BENEFITS.—Section 202 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402), as amended by subsection (f), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(aa) For any month after December 1997, in no event shall an individual receive a reduction in a benefit under subsection (b)(4)(A), (c)(2)(A), (e)(7)(A), (f)(2)(A), or (g)(4)(A) for the month that is more than the reduction in such benefit that would have applied for such month under such subsections as in effect on December 1, 1997.''.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 1 shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1997.

By Mr. KERREY (for himself and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the 10 percent floor for deductible disaster losses; to the Committee on Finance.

DISASTER RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, under current law, personal property damage is tax-deductible only to the extent that each loss is more than $100 and the total losses exceed 10 percent of income. Today, I am introducing legislation which would eliminate the 10-percent test for unreimbursed casualty losses resulting from a Presidentially declared disaster that occurs in 1997.

Just over a week ago, Nebraska was hit by a massive winter storm that dumped up to 20 inches of snow and 2½ inches of rain on our State unusually early in the season. As a result, Nebraskans have suffered massive damages, the extent of which we are only beginning to discover as the process of digging out begins. More than 175,000 lost electrical power, and many of them are still waiting for it to be restored. Thousands still lack phone service. About 85 percent of trees—still heavy with fall leaves—were damaged in Omaha alone.

Mr. President, changing this tax law won't shovel the snow, or restore all the phone and electrical service. But for the homeowner whose property was damaged by felled trees, or thousands of other Nebraskans who suffered losses in this storm, allowing them to deduct the full amount of those losses will provide a little breathing room as the long process of digging out—and rebuilding—begins. I hope we act on it soon.

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. 1366

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

SECTION 1. ELIMINATION OF 10 PERCENT FLOOR FOR DEDUCTIBLE DISASTER LOSSES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 165(h)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to net casualty loss allowed only to the extent it exceeds 10 percent of adjusted gross income) is amended by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following new clauses:

''(i) the amount of the personal casualty gains for the taxable year,

''(ii) the amount of the federally declared disaster losses for the taxable year (or, if lesser, the net casualty loss), plus

''(iii) the portion of the net casualty loss which is not deductible under clause (ii) but only to the extent such portion exceeds 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'net casualty loss' means the excess of personal casualty losses for the taxable year over personal casualty gains.''.

(b) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER LOSS DEFINED.—Section 165(h)(3) of such Code (defining personal casualty gain and personal casualty loss) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER LOSS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'federally declared disaster loss' means any personal casualty loss attributable to a disaster occurring during 1997 in an area subsequently determined by the President of the United States to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

''(ii) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Such term shall not include personal casualty losses to the extent such losses exceed $10,000 for the taxable year.'', and

(2) by striking ''OF PERSONAL CASUALTY GAIN AND PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSS'' in the heading.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 165(h)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''NET CASUALTY LOSS'' and inserting ''NET NONDISASTER CASUALTY LOSS''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to losses attributable to disasters occurring after December 31, 1996, including for purposes of determining the portion of such losses allowable in taxable years ending before such date pursuant to an election under section 165(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1367. A bill to amend the act that authorized the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow use of the project distribution system to transport water from sources other than the project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE CANADIAN RIVER MUNICIPAL WATER AUTHORITY ACT OF 1997

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would enable the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority in Texas to use the Canadian River Project's water distribution system to transport water from sources other than those envisioned when the project was conceived nearly 50 years ago.

The Canadian River Municipal Water Authority is a State agency which supplies water to over 500,000 citizens in 11 cities on the Texas high plains, including Lubbock and Amarillo. The water authority was created by the Texas Legislature which authorized it to contract with the Federal Government under Federal reclamation laws to build and develop the Canadian River Project, also known as Lake Meredith. While the operation and maintenance responsibilities of the project were transferred to the water authority, the Bureau of Reclamation retained the title and ownership of the project.

The quality and supply of water from the Canadian River Project has not met the expectations of either the Bureau of Reclamation or the residents of the Texas high plains. Not only is their insufficient water to provide adequately for the needs of the communities Lake Meredith serves, but the water has high levels of salt.

The Canadian River Municipal Water Authority has proposed to supplement the water in Lake Meredith with better quality groundwater from nearby aquifers. While this will not require any Federal funding, the Bureau of Reclamation has ill-conceived guidelines precluding nonproject water from flowing through their reservoirs or distribution systems.

The legislation I am introducing today would allow the use of the Canadian River Project water distribution system to transport better quality water from the nearby aquifers which are outside the originally defined project scope. An environmental review, as required by law, would be conducted and completed within 90 days of enactment of this legislation. Congressman MAC THORNBERRY has introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives.

The citizens of the Texas Panhandle have long suffered from insufficient water and poor water quality. The Bureau of Reclamation has worked with the water authority to develop a solution to the high salt content in the water. Local officials believe that one solution is to simply dilute the poor quality water with better quality water from the nearby aquifers.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation quickly to meet the long-term water needs of many Texas Panhandle residents.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1368. A bill to provide individuals with access to health information of which they are the subject, ensure personal privacy with respect to personal medical records and health care-related information, impose criminal and civil penalties for unauthorized use of personal health information, and to provide for the strong enforcement of these rights; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE MEDICAL RECORDS PRIVACY ACT OF 1997

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the time has come for Congress to enact a strong and effective federal law to protect the privacy of medical records.

To address this need, today, Senator KENNEDY and I are introducing the Medical Information Privacy and Security Act (MIPSA).

Americans strongly believe that their personal, private medical records

should be kept private. The time-honored ethics of the medical profession also reflect this principle. The physicians' oath of Hippocrates requires that medical information be kept ''as sacred as secrets.''

A guiding principle in drafting this legislation is that the movement to more a integrated system of health care in our country will only continue to be supported by the American people if they are assured that the personal privacy of their health care information is protected. In fact, without the confidence that one's personal privacy will be protected, many will be discouraged from seeking medical help.

I am encouraged that a variety of public policy and health professional organizations, across the political spectrum, are signaling their intentions to step forward to join forces with consumers during this debate.

For the American public, and for the Congress, this debate boils down to a fundamental question: Who controls our medical records, and how freely can others use them?

Many of us in this chamber quickly criticized the Social Security Administration and the IRS regarding the security of computer records. We blasted the IRS for allowing employees to randomly scan through our personal financial records.

If we are concerned about IRS employees looking at our tax records, should we not be concerned about the millions of employers, insurers, pharmaceutical companies, government agencies and others who have nearly unfettered access to the personal medical records of more than 250 million Americans?

All of us are health care consumers—every individual and every American family. As Congress works toward answering this question, the privacy interests of the American public will be at odds with powerful economic interests and with the penchant for large organizations and complex systems to control this kind of personal information. Well-funded and sharply focused special interests often win in a matchup like this.

Senator Bob Dole, the former majority leader of the Senate, put his finger on this problem when he observed that a ''compromise of privacy'' that sends information about health and treatment to a national data bank without a person's approval would be something that none of us would accept.

Unfortunately, this nightmare that Senator Dole envisioned is being brought to life by provisions insisted upon by the House in last year's health insurance portability bill that require a system of health care information exchanges by computers and through computer clearinghouses and data networks.

We are now confronted with the fact that the computerization of health care record provisions are going into effect in the next few months but we are still contemplating the delay of promulgating privacy protection until August of 1999, unless Congress acts sooner.

The Information Age opens the door to endless new possibilities and has empowered individuals with marvelous new tools and freedoms. But technology is our servant; we should not let it become our master. Unless we are vigilant, the Information Age can overwhelm our privacy rights before we even know it has happened.

I do not want advancing technology to lead to a loss of personal privacy and do not want the fear that confidentiality is being compromised to deter people from seeking medical treatment or stifle technological or scientific development.

The outlines of the challenge we face in stemming the erosion of medical privacy are already clear. Insurance companies have set up their Medical Information Bureau (MIB) which stores personal medical information on millions of Americans. M.I.B. may have personal information on all of us in Congress and our families.

Managed care companies, HMOs, drug companies, and hospitals are spending up to $15 billion a year on information technology to acquire and exchange vast amounts of medical information about Americans.

While this in and of itself may not be the issue—the question is how and why is it being collected and for what specific use is this information being used and do individuals know about this? Patients should be advised about the existence of data bases in which medical information concerning the patients is stored.

This information can be very useful for quality assurance, and to provide more cost effective health care. But I am not certain that the American public would agree with a recent Fortune magazine article which lauded a health insurer that poked through the individual medical records of clients to figure out who may be depressed and could benefit from the use of the antidepressant Prozac. Are we now encouraging replacing sound clinical judgment of doctors with health insurance clerks who look at records to determine whether you are not really suffering from a physical illness, but a mental illness?

Contrary to some, I believe that computerization can assure more privacy to individuals than the current system if my legislation is enacted. But if we do not act the increased potential for embarrassment and harassment is tremendous.

There are many more stories which highlight the problems that are out there due with the lack of privacy and security of individuals medical records, unfortunately so many other breaches of privacy are more subtle.

Singer Tammy Wynette entered the hospital in 1995 for a bile duct problem. She used a pseudonym, but a hospital staff member broke into her computerized medical records and sold the information to the press, supposedly for thousands of dollars. The sensational National Enquirer then erroneously reported that Wynette was near death and in need of a liver transplant.

A current Member of Congress had her medical records faxed to the New York Post on the eve of her primary. In 1994, she offered eloquent testimony before Congress detailing her ordeal.

In another example, an insurance agent advised a couple that they would be denied coverage for any more pregnancies since they had a 25 percent chance that their children would have a fatal disease.

In Florida, a state public health worker improperly brought home a computer disk with the names of 4,000 HIV positive patients. The disks were then sent to two Florida newspapers.

Medical privacy issues in today's world also take on international implications. Canada and the nations of Europe are taking concrete steps to protect the confidentiality of computerized medical records.

Our nation lags so far behind others in its protection of medical records that companies in Europe may not be allowed to send medical information to the United States electronically. European countries—through an EU privacy directive—are ensuring that private medical records are kept private. The EU prohibits the transfer of personal information from Europe to the U.S. if the EU finds U.S. privacy law inadequate. The implications for U.S. trade are staggering.

The legislation we are introducing today addresses the issues I have outlined to close the existing gaps in federal privacy law to cover personally identifiable health information.

MIPSA is broad in scope—it applies to medical records in whatever form—paper or electronic. It applies to each release of medical information—including re-releases. It comprehensively covers entities other than just health care providers and payers, such as life insurance companies, employers and marketers and others that may have access to sensitive personal health data.

It establishes a clear and enforceable right of privacy with respect all personally identifiable medical information including information regarding the results of genetic tests.

It gives individuals the right to inspect, copy and supplement their protected health information. Today, only 28 states grant this right.

It allows individuals to segregate portions of their medical records, such as mental health records, from broad viewing by individuals who are not directly involved in their care.

It gives individuals a civil right of action against anyone who misuses their personally identifiable health information. It establishes criminal and civil penalties that can be invoked if individually identifiable health information is knowingly or negligently misused.

It sets up a national office of health information privacy to aid consumers in learning about their rights and how they may seek recourse for violations of their rights.

It creates a set of rules and norms to govern the disclosure of personal health information and narrows the sharing of personal details within the health care system to the minimum necessary to provide care, allow for payment and to facilitate effective oversight. Special attention is paid to situations such as emergency medical care and public health requirements.

We have tried to accommodate legitimate oversight concerns so that we do not create unnecessary impediments to health care fraud investigations. Effective health care oversight is essential if our health care system is to function and fulfill its intended goals. Otherwise, we risk establishing a publicly-sanctioned playground for the unscrupulous. Health care is too important a public investment to be the subject of undetected fraud or abuse.

MIPSA also extends to all research facilities using personally identifiable information the current requirements met by federally funded researchers. I am troubled that research is viewed by some as an area where privacy rights should be sacrificed and consent not required for use of individually identifiable health information. If there are to be any exceptions in a federal medical privacy law for research using personally identifiable health information, the Congress and the American people need to understand better why this may be necessary. To address this concern our bill mandates an evaluation of the waiver of informed consent that is allowed under current regulations.

It does not preempt state laws that are more protective of privacy. This is consistent with all other federal civil rights and privacy laws.

It prohibits law enforcement agents from searching through medical records without a warrant. It does not limit law enforcement agents to gain information while in hot pursuit of a suspect.

I know that these are important matters about which many of us feel very strongly. It is never easy to legislate about privacy.

I invite other Members of Congress, federal agencies and outside interest groups to examine the legislation we have introduced today. This bill is a work in progress and we welcome any comments or suggestions to make improvements to this legislation.

I am pleased that my colleague from Vermont, the Chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator JEFFORDS, has already held two hearings this year on the issue of medical privacy. The clock, however, is ticking and other Members of Congress need to join us to move forward to pass strong and workable medical privacy legislation.

As policy makers, we must remember that the right to privacy is one of our most cherished freedoms—it is the right to be left alone and to choose what we will reveal of ourselves and what we will keep from others. Privacy is not a partisan issue and should not be made a political issue. It is too important.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1369. A bill to provide truancy prevention and reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE PREVENTION OF TRUANCY ACT OF 1997

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would help our communities respond to an increasingly serious problem in our country: truancy. Truancy is a dangerous and growing trend in our nation's schools. It not only prevents our children from receiving the education they need, but it is often the first warning of more serious problems to come. Truant students are at greater risk of falling into substance abuse, gangs, and violent behavior. Truancy is a gateway into all of these activities.

In the past ten years, truancy has increased by 67 percent. In 1994, courts formally processed 36,400 truancy cases. And in some inner city schools, absentee rates approach 50 percent. Fortunately, truancy is a solvable problem. Many communities have begun to set up early intervention programs—to reach out and prevent truancy before it leads to delinquency and criminal behavior. These programs are showing signs of success, as several towns have reported drops in daytime burglary rates of as much as 75 percent after instituting truancy prevention initiatives.

Unfortunately, implementing these programs has been a challenge. Truancy is considered an educational rather than a criminal issue, and, with growing classroom enrollments, many financially-strapped schools don't have the resources to adequately address this problem.

Today, I am introducing ''The Prevention of Truancy [PTA] Act of 1997'' whose goal is to promote anti-truancy partnerships between schools, parents, law enforcement agencies, and social service and youth organizations. This bill would provide $80 million in grant funding for the purpose of developing, implementing, or operating partnerships for the prevention and reduction of truancy. The partnerships would be administered by the Department of Education.

All of the partnership programs would be required to sanction students engaging in truancy, as well as provide incentives for parents to take responsibility for their children. These programs would also be evaluated for their effectiveness in preventing truancy, increasing school attendance, and reducing juvenile crime.

Truancy prevention programs produce long-term savings. By some estimates, truants cost this nation more than $240 billion in lost earnings and foregone taxes over their lifetimes. And billions more are spent on law enforcement, prisons, welfare, health care, and other social services for these individuals. Imagine what we could do with this money if we could keep our kids in school? Imagine how bright their futures could be? I hope my legislation will help communities build successful programs to prevent and reduce truancy so that one day we will realize these concrete savings and admire the accomplishments of the youth who benefitted from these programs.

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. 1369

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 ''Prevention of Truancy Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1994, courts in the United States formally processed 36,400 truancy cases, representing a 35 percent increase since 1990, and a 67 percent increase since 1985, in the formal processing of truancy cases;

(2) in 1993, among individuals aged 16 through 24, approximately 3,400,000,000 (11 percent of all individuals in this age group) had not completed high school and were not enrolled in school;

(3) the economic and social costs of providing for the increasing population of youth who are at risk of leaving or who have left the educational mainstream are an enormous drain on the resources of Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector;

(4) truancy is the first indicator that a young person is giving up and losing his or her way;

(5) students who become truant and eventually drop out of school put themselves at a long-term disadvantage in becoming productive citizens;

(6) high school drop-outs are two and one-half times more likely to be on welfare than high school graduates;

(7) high school drop-outs are almost twice as likely to be unemployed as high school graduates;

(8) in 1993, 17 percent of youth under age 18 who entered adult prisons had not completed grade school, one-fourth of such youth had completed 10th grade, and 2 percent of such youth had a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent;

(9) truancy contributes to increased use of the foster care and court systems;

(10) truancy is a gateway to crime, and high rates of truancy are linked to high daytime burglary rates and high vandalism rates;

(11) communities that have instituted truancy prevention programs have seen daytime burglary rates decline by as much as 75 percent; and

(12) truancy prevention and reduction programs result in significant increases in school attendance.

SEC. 3. GOALS.

The goals of this Act are to prevent and reduce truancy.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The terms ''elementary school''

and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given the terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) PARENT.—The term ''parent'' means the biological parent, adoptive parent, or legal guardian, of a child.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUANCY PREVENTION AND CRIME CONTROL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) DEMONSTRATIONS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall make grants to partnerships consisting of an elementary school or secondary school, a local law enforcement agency, and a social service and youth serving organization, for the purpose of developing, implementing, or operating projects for the prevention or reduction of truancy.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds under this section may be used for programs that prevent or reduce truancy, such as programs that use police officers or patrol officers to pick up truant students, return the students to school, or take the students to centers for assessment.

(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION.—Each partnership desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require. Each such application shall—

(1) contain a description of the proposed truancy prevention or reduction project to be established or improved with funds provided under this Act;

(2) specify the methods to be used to involve parents in truancy prevention or reduction activities;

(3) specify the types of sanctions that students will face for engaging in truant behavior;

(4) specify the incentives that will be used for parental responsibility;

(5) specify the types of initiatives, if any, that schools will develop to combat the underlying causes of truancy; and

(6) specify the linkages that will be made with local law enforcement agencies.

(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall give priority in awarding grants under this Act to partnerships—

(1) serving areas with concentrations of poverty, including urban and rural areas; and

(2) that meet any other criteria that the Secretary determines will contribute to the achievement of the goals of this Act.

SEC. 6. EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) PROJECT EVALUATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each partnership receiving a grant under this section shall—

(A) provide for the evaluation of the project assisted under this Act, which evaluation shall meet such conditions and standards as the Secretary may require; and

(B) submit to the Secretary reports, at such times, in such formats, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require.

(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A report submitted under subparagraph (1)(B) shall include information on and analysis of the effect of the project with respect to—

(A) prevention of or reduction in truancy;

(B) increased school attendance; and

(C) reduction in juvenile crime.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary, on the basis of the reports received under subsection (a), shall submit interim reports, and, not later than March 1, 2002, submit a final report, to Congress. Each report submitted under this subsection shall contain an assessment of the effectiveness of the projects assisted under this Act, and any recommendations for legislative action that the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

(1) $80,000,000 for fiscal year 1998; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 61

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] 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. 143

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissections performed for the treatment of breast cancer.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, relating to identity fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 766

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 766, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

S. 995

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] 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. 1067

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to prohibit United States military assistance and arms transfers to foreign governments that are undemocratic, do not adequately protect human rights, are engaged in acts of armed aggression, or are not fully participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to enhance the rights and protections for victims of crime.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to amend the general mining laws to provide a reasonable royalty from mineral activities on Federal lands, to specify reclamation requirements for mineral activities on Federal lands, to create a State program for the reclamation of abandoned hard rock mining sites on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 1222

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1222, a bill to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1283

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 1283, a bill to award Congressional gold medals to Jean Brown Trickey, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Melba Patillo Beals, Terrence Roberts, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Thelma Mothershed Wair, Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, and Jefferson Thomas, commonly referred collectively as the ''Little Rock Nine'' on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the integration of the Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 to preserve State and local authority to regulate the placement, construction, and modification of certain telecommunications facilites, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Republic of China should be admitted to multilateral economic institutions, including the International Monetary Fund