

projects to improve the safety, security, capacity, and efficiency of the U.S. aviation system.

FAA research and development activities help to provide the advancements and innovations that are needed to keep the U.S. aviation system the best in the world. Our nation's ability to have a strong aviation-related research and development program directly impacts our success in the global market and our standard of living.

This legislation authorizes the funding needed for ongoing or planned FAA RE&D projects that will provide important benefits for the U.S. aviation system and its users. The FAA RE&D program will fund projects to determine how limited airport and airspace capacity can meet ever increasing demands, how aviation security can be improved, and how flight safety concerns can be addressed.

As my colleagues know, I have been particularly concerned about ensuring that the FAA has an adequate level of funding for security research and development. The threat of terrorism against the United States has increased and aviation is, and will remain, an attractive terrorist target. That is why this legislation provides \$54 million for security technology research and development. This figure represents almost one-fourth of the total authorized funding level, and is \$10 million above the appropriations level.

Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman Senator GORTON, Senator FORD, and I have worked hard with the FAA and our colleagues in the House to craft legislation that can provide the FAA with the funding it needs for critical research and development projects, while also being mindful of our tight federal budget. I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, when TWA flight 800 exploded over the coast of Long Island on July 17, 1997, 230 people perished. They left behind people who loved and cared about them. They left a void in many people's lives. When a USAirways jet crashed in Charlotte in July 1994, 37 people died, including many from my State. The pain and suffering those families suffered is heart-breaking.

H.R. 1271, the FAA Research, Engineering, and Development Authorization Act of 1997, authorizes more than 4450 million to conduct basic aviation safety research, with one primary goal—to reduce the likelihood that another family will lose a loved one in an aviation accident.

When we talk about safety, it all begins with two factors—leadership and research. The U.S. today is the world's leader in aviation safety. However, that is not enough. We must maintain that leadership and continue to pursue the best means to avoid aviation disasters.

Over the last several years, we have stressed the need to improve security.

New machines continue to be tested and improved. This bill furthers that process. We also must remain vigilant about other areas to improve safety, like controlled flight into terrain and human factors. All too often an accident is a function of a human error. The error can be the result of technology design or human judgment. Research remains the key to making adjustments so that our families do not have to experience what the families of TWA flight 800 or the USAirways Charlotte flight had to endure.

The bill also recognizes that we must work with our colleges and technical schools to develop programs to meet challenges of the future. Our Nation's aircraft maintenance program will be changing. Our air traffic control workforce and maintenance workforce will be changing with the new equipment scheduled to be installed over the next 5 years. We must remain ahead of the technological curve—working with the schools will facilitate our preparation for change. The administration knows this and has worked with me to address that issue.

We worked hard with the administration on this bill, and it is my understanding that they support the bill. In the area of security, for example, the fiscal year 1998 Transportation Appropriations Act provided \$44.225 million. The authorization in H.R. 1271 is more than \$11 million more, an amount which will give the FAA flexibility to move funds from one account to another, should it be necessary.

I understand that the FAA may request additional funding for fiscal year 1999 to further its modernization efforts. In addition, more funding for security may be requested, and we will need to consider those requests, if made.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the technical amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1638) was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute, as amended, be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the title amendment be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the record.

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

The bill (H.R. 1271), as amended, was read a third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A Bill to authorize the Federal Aviation Administration's research, engineering, and

development programs for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes.

JOHN N. GRIESEMER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1254, and further that the Senate 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 (H.R. 1254) to designate the United States Post Office building located at 1919 West Bennett Street in Springfield, Missouri, as the "John N. Griesemer Post Office Building."

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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 1254) was read a third time and passed.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY FOR THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2979, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will read the report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2979) to authorize acquisition of certain real property for the Library of Congress, 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. FORD. Mr. President, the legislation before us would authorize the Architect of the Capitol to accept a gift of approximately 41 acres of property and buildings in Culpeper, Virginia for use by the Library of Congress as a national audiovisual conservation center. The purchase price of this facility is \$5.5 million. The private foundation which has offered to purchase this property and donate it for the Library's use has also agreed to provide the Library with an additional \$4.5 million for the renovation of this property, making a total gift of \$10 million. The renovations to the property will be made by the Architect of the Capitol, as approved by the appropriate oversight and appropriations committees.

The Library's film collection is currently stored in several Library or government-leased sites. With this gift,

the Library intends to consolidate the storage of its audio-visual collection, specifically its acetate film collection. However, the facility at Culpeper cannot currently house the nitrate-based film collection. While I will not object to passage of this legislation, I am concerned by both the manner in which the Library presented this issue to Congress and by a number of precedent-setting issues this gift raises which have not been fully aired.

It is my understanding that the Library first identified the Culpeper property as a potential site for storage of a portion of its film collection several years ago. And yet, this legislation before us today was shared with my office only last week, and was introduced in the House and Senate over the weekend. While it is not unusual this time of year to see legislation flying past the Congress on its way to the White House for signature, this measure raises a number of concerns that should, and could, have been fully debated by those who ultimately will be responsible to the taxpayer for the cost of its maintenance and upkeep in the years to come.

First, and most importantly, is the issue of whether the government, particularly the Library, should be in the business of acquiring real estate. It is rather ironic that this is being proposed at a time when the leadership in the Congress is calling for privatization of many legislative branch functions and the sale of certain legislative branch properties. It is particularly true of this property which includes about 41 acres, but insufficient buildings and improvements to house all of the Library's audiovisual collection. I don't want to assume what the Library plans to do with all this property, but I got a pretty good idea by reading the study the Library commissioned from Abacus Technology Corporation.

The current buildings on the Culpeper property can house only the acetate film collection. In order to consolidate the nitrate film collection at the Culpeper site, the Abacus study recommends constructing new buildings to house the nitrate collection. And how much would such facilities cost? Over \$16 million over the next 4 years. But a hefty building and expansion program is not all that is planned for these 41 acres. The Abacus study describes the Library's vision with regard to this audiovisual center as offering, subject to the approval of Congress, a cost-effective conservation service for other libraries and archives. Whether this will require additional buildings or is included in the Abacus cost estimates already is not disclosed.

A second concern that this issue raises is the ultimate cost to the taxpayer of accepting this gift. According to the Abacus study, the total cost for renovating, maintaining and expanding the Culpeper property over the 25 year life cycle of the facility is \$47 million. Other alternatives identified by Abacus and the Library range from about \$54

million to \$86 million. However, the Abacus study does not include cost estimates for the Architect of the Capitol for the on-going maintenance and repair of the 41 acres of grounds and buildings that would now be owned by the government.

Thirdly, as currently structured, it is not clear how this property and facilities will be managed. By statute, the Architect of the Capitol is responsible for only the structural work on buildings and grounds of Library property, including the maintenance and care of the grounds and certain mechanical equipment. Since this site is over 70 miles away from Washington, it may require that the Architect physically locate maintenance personnel there. But the Architect will not manage these 41 acres and buildings—that will now be the responsibility of the Library—hardly a task they have much experience with. Moreover, as my colleagues know, the Library has its own security force. Presumably, this facility will also need to be secure. However, in recent years, there have been discussions about the possibility of transferring certain exterior security functions of the Library security force to the Capitol Police. I'm not sure I want our Capitol police responsible for taking care of the security of 41 acres in Culpeper.

I appreciate the pressure the Librarian feels to raise private funds to provide core Library functions. However, any gift that the Librarian solicits ultimately becomes the responsibility of the American taxpayers. Before we saddle them with the maintenance, upkeep, and overhead of additional federal buildings and prime real estate, there should be an opportunity to fully air these issues. Changes I sought in this legislation will do that, even if after the fact.

Being from Kentucky, I know better than to look a gift horse in the mouth. But being from west Kentucky, which is hog country, I also know a pig-in-a-poke when I see it. The Library may not be asking the American taxpayers to accept a pig-in-a-poke, but with all the unanswered questions, this Culpeper property is pretty darn close to it. I'll be sticking close to the farm over the next year, and as provided by this legislation, will be looking for answers to these questions before approving improvements and expansions on this gift.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The bill (H.R. 2979) was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATIVE TO GERMAN REPARATIONS TO HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 138, S. Con. Res. 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) expressing the sense of the Congress that the German government should expand and simplify its reparations system, provide reparations to Holocaust survivors in Eastern and Central Europe, and set up a fund to help cover the medical expenses of Holocaust survivors.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the German Government has long recognized its moral obligation to assist the survivors of the Holocaust. The landmark reparations agreements of the early 1950's between the West German Government and Jewish groups were predicated on this simple premise. Yet, as years go by, it has become increasingly apparent that a large number of survivors, particularly those living in Eastern and Central Europe, were excluded from these agreements and are now being denied assistance on the flimsiest of technical grounds. As a result, in July Senators GRAHAM, HATCH, and DODD joined me in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution 39. I am pleased that the Senate will take up this important issue today.

The need for such legislation was reinforced only last week. On November 5, Judge Heinz Sonnenberger in Germany upheld just 1 of 22 claims made by a group of Jewish women seeking payment for their work as slave laborers at Auschwitz. The other claims were dismissed by the judge on the grounds that the women had already received compensation under Germany's Federal Compensation Law. This decision represents the German Government's intractable attitude toward survivors of Nazi slave labor, however, it also presents a small window of hope for the survivors of slave labor who until now have been denied compensation by the German Government.

The German Government has continually dealt with the survivors of Nazi persecution in a heartless, bureaucratic manner, basing its decisions on technical questions and eschewing a moral obligation to aid all survivors regardless of past compensation, current financial status, or amount of pain suffered. This practice stands in sharp contrast to the generous disability pensions paid by the German Government to former members of the Waffen-SS and their families. Until