

save consumers of imports and exporters trading to Japan, millions of dollars, and the FMC deserves praise for hanging tough in what was undeniably a tense situation.

While we were not able to address all concerns about our new ocean shipping deregulation proposal I would like to elaborate on the progress that has been made toward ultimate Senate passage of legislation. I would also like to thank Senators HUTCHISON, LOTT and GORTON for their efforts on this bill. Additionally, the following staffers spent many hours meeting with the affected members of the shipping public and listening to their concerns about our proposal and I would like to personally thank Jim Sartucci and Carl Bentzel of the Commerce Committee staff, Carl Biersack of Senator LOTT's staff, Jeanne Bumpus of Senator GORTON's staff, Amy Henderson of Senator HUTCHISON's staff as well as my own staffers, Mark Ashby and Paul DeVeau.

S. 414, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act, and the proposed amendment to the committee reported bill, attempt to balance the competing interests of those affected by international ocean shipping practices. One of the major obstacles to change in this area was the need to provide additional service contract flexibility and confidentiality, while balancing the need to continue oversight of contract practices to ensure against anti-competitive practices immunized from our antitrust laws. I think the contracting proposal embodied in S. 414 adequately balances these competing considerations. The bill transfers the requirements of providing service and price information to the private sector, and will allow the private sector to perform functions that had heretofore been provided by the Government. The bill broadens the authority of the FMC to provide statutory exemptions, and reforms the licensing and bonding requirements for ocean shipping intermediaries.

Importantly, the bill does not change the structure of the Federal Maritime Commission. The FMC is a small agency with a annual budget of about \$14 million. When you subtract penalties and fines collected over the past 7 years, the annual cost of agency operations is less than \$7 million. All told, the agency is a bargain to the U.S. taxpayer as it oversees the shipping practices of over \$500 billion in maritime trade. The U.S. public accrues an added benefit when the FMC is able to break down trade barriers that cost importers and exporters millions in additional costs, as recently occurred when the FMC challenged restrictive Japanese port practices.

The FMC is an independent regulatory agency that is not accountable to the direction of the administration. Independence allows the FMC to maintain a more aggressive and objective posture when it comes to the consideration of eliminating foreign trade barriers.

S. 414 also provides some additional protection to longshoremen who work

at U.S. ports. The concerns expressed by U.S. ports and port-related labor interests revolved around reductions in the transparency afforded to shipping contracts, and the potential abuse that could occur as a result of carrier antitrust immune contract actions. In order to address the concerns of longshoremen who have contracts for longshore and stevedoring services, S. 414 sets up a mechanism to allow the longshoremen to request information relevant to the enforcement of collective bargaining agreements.

It is my feeling that we have before us a package of needed shipping reforms that will allow us to move ahead, and I look forward to passing this bill in the next session of Congress.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be considered read a third time and passed, as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table and that any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1636) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 927), as amended, was passed.

#### DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "PRINCE NOVA"

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1349 and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1349) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Prince Nova*, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1349) was passed, as follows:

S. 1349

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

#### SECTION 1. DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL PRINCE NOVA.

(a) DOCUMENTATION AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of

Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel PRINCE NOVA (Canadian registration number 320804).

(b) EXPIRATION OF CERTIFICATE.—A certificate of documentation issued for the vessel under subsection (a) shall expire unless—

(1) the vessel undergoes conversion, reconstruction, repair, rebuilding, or retrofitting in a shipyard located in the United States;

(2) the cost of that conversion, reconstruction, repair, rebuilding, or retrofitting is not less than the greater of—

(A) 3 times the purchase value of the vessel before the conversion, reconstruction, repair, rebuilding, or retrofitting; or

(B) \$4,200,000; and

(3) not less than an average of \$1,000,000 is spent annually in a shipyard located in the United States for conversion, reconstruction, repair, rebuilding, or retrofitting of the vessel until the total amount of the cost required under paragraph (2) is spent.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

#### NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise to express my profound disappointment in the action the President took on November 1 of this year when he used his veto pen to line-item veto \$900,000 from the VA-HUD appropriations bill. This money was set aside for the final planning and design of a new national veterans cemetery to be built at Fort Sill in Lawton, OK. While I am disappointed, I know my disappointment pales in comparison to the shock and frustration that the veterans of Oklahoma and their families have expressed to me and my staff regarding the President's action.

The shock and frustration expressed by veterans living in Oklahoma who have selflessly served our country and their families comes because the President's veto will further delay a national cemetery that has been in one stage of planning or another since 1987 when the Department of Veteran Affairs stated its intention to build a new national cemetery in Oklahoma.

I hope my colleagues will bear with me as I review what the veterans of Oklahoma and their families have gone through over the past 10 years.

Efforts to establish a national veterans cemetery in central Oklahoma date back to 1987. That year the Department of Veterans Affairs, in a report to Congress, identified central Oklahoma as an area in need of a national veterans cemetery because of Oklahoma's large veterans population and an official acknowledgment that the Fort Gibson cemetery in eastern Oklahoma would soon be full. The Oklahoma congressional delegation did not make this determination, Oklahoma's large veteran

population did not make this determination the VA made this determination.

The VA then embarked on a 4-year selection process and narrowed the potential cemetery sites to three: Fort Reno, Edmond, and Guthrie. The Congress, in accordance with the 1987 report, appropriated \$250,000 in fiscal year 1991 for the purpose of conducting an environmental impact statement on these three sites to determine which site best met the needs of our veterans and was suitable for construction of a cemetery.

In late 1993, the VA officially announced Fort Reno as its preferred site, and Congress, in 1994, appropriated another \$250,000 for the initial planning and design stages of the cemetery. Unfortunately, in that same year a land dispute arose over the Fort Reno site. After a year of trying to work out an agreement on the property at Fort Reno no resolution could be found.

On January 23, 1995, the VA issued a press release announcing that it was no longer committed to the Fort Reno site because the land dispute could not be resolved. In that same press release Jesse Brown, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, made the following statement:

I am reiterating VA's commitment to provide a new national cemetery for the veterans of this region. We will look for other potential sites and expedite the selection decision.

Thankfully, another piece of property was soon found at Fort Sill that could be used for a cemetery, and true to Secretary Brown's statement the process was expedited.

The VA, using money left over from the initial environmental impact statement, conducted another study of the piece of property identified as a potential cemetery site at Fort Sill. The second environmental impact statement was completed on the property at Fort Sill and it was deemed suitable for a cemetery.

Again, acting on the VA's commitment of 1987 to build a national veterans cemetery which was reiterated in January 1995, by Secretary Brown, the Congress adopted an amendment that I offered to the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill that called for the transfer of that property at Fort Sill for the establishment of a new national veterans cemetery.

I recently spoke to the Army and was informed that this land transfer is progressing very well and ought to be complete by mid-January of 1998—that's about two months away.

This year I worked with my good friend, Senator BOND, chairman of the VA-HUD appropriations subcommittee, to include \$900,000 for the final planning and design of the cemetery. It was included in the bill that was passed by the Senate and included in the conference report.

As I stated earlier, about a week ago, the President used his veto pen to line-item veto this project. This project was the only VA project that was line-item vetoed this year.

Besides being disappointed at the President's action, I don't understand it. The cemetery project is completely within the budget agreement that was hammered out this year. The cemetery project was identified by the VA as a project it wanted.

I do want to let the administration and the veterans of Oklahoma know that I am committed to this project and I intend to work with the administration and the VA to see that the veterans of Oklahoma get a new national veterans cemetery in a timely fashion. Ten years has already been a long time to wait. The veterans of Oklahoma and their families have endured much as they served our country, I intend to see to it that the establishment of a new national veterans cemetery does not become yet another test of that endurance.

Mr. President, I believe the President made a mistake. He made a mistake in several items that were vetoed in the MilCon bill and he made a mistake in this case. The VA had made a commitment to build this cemetery. The veterans who served our country so well are entitled to be buried in a national veterans' cemetery. The Veterans' Department said maybe the new cemetery in Oklahoma should be a State cemetery. However, the veterans of Oklahoma have stated they want to be buried in a national veterans' cemetery, and I am committed to that. I know the veterans of Oklahoma are committed to that. We have had a commitment from this administration and this administration should not renege on it. They should not go back on their word to the veterans of Oklahoma, as evidenced by the President's veto. I think it was a mistake.

It just so happens the President does not have a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. I will be meeting with the Acting Secretary and the President's nominee to be Secretary and hopefully we will come to an understanding very quickly that this is a commitment that will be completed. We need to uphold the commitment we made to the veterans of Oklahoma that we will have a national cemetery built.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2159

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, may proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2159, the foreign operations bill. I further ask consent there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form, and immediately following that debate or yielding back of time the conference report be considered as adopted and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 12 noon under the same terms as previously agreed to.

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

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### FAST TRACK

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, because the proposal for fast-track trade authority was not adopted, there have been a good many columns and commentators evaluating why fast track failed. I wanted to comment about that just a bit today. It is interesting. Even though the political pathologists for this legislation—the journalists, and the beltway insiders—have picked the fast track carcass clean, they still missed the cause of death.

The eulogies I read have no relationship to the deceased. Fast track didn't die because of unions and union opposition to fast track. Fast track didn't die because the President didn't have the strength to get it through the Congress. Fast track didn't die because our country doesn't want to engage in international trade. Fast track died because this country is deeply divided on trade issues. There is not a consensus in this country at this point on the issue of international trade. Instead of a national dialogue on trade we have at least a half dozen or more monologues on trade.

What people miss when they evaluate what happened to fast track is the deep concern that this country has not done well in international trade, especially in our trade agreements. This did not matter very much during the first 25 years after the Second World War. We could make virtually any agreement with anybody and provide significant concessions under the guise of foreign policy and we could still win the trade competition with one hand tied behind our backs. We could do that because we were bigger, better, stronger, better prepared, and better able. Thus, trade policy was largely foreign policy.

During the first 25 years after the Second World War, our incomes continued to rise in this country despite the fact that our trade policy was largely foreign policy. However, the second 25 years have told a different story, and we now face tougher and shrewder competition from countries that are very able to compete with us. And our trade policy must be more realistic and must be a trade policy that recognizes more the needs of this country.

Will Rogers said something, probably 70 years ago, that speaks to our trade policy concerns. I gave an approximate quote of that here on the floor the other day. He describes the concern people have about trade, yes, even