

Whereas the United States-flag vessels that carry reserved cargo provide quality jobs for seafarers of the United States; Whereas, according to the most recent statistics from the Maritime Administration, in 1990, cargo reservation programs generated \$2,400,000,000 in revenue to the United States fleet and accounted for one-third of all revenue from United States-flag foreign trade cargo;

Whereas the Maritime Administration has indicated that the total volume of cargoes moving under the programs subject to Federal cargo reservation laws is declining and will continue to decline;

Whereas, in 1970, Congress found that the degree of compliance by Federal agencies with the requirements of the cargo reservation laws was chaotic, uneven, and varied from agency to agency;

Whereas, to ensure maximum compliance by all agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws, Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-469) to centralize monitoring and compliance authority for all cargo reservation programs in the Maritime Administration;

Whereas, notwithstanding section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)), and the purpose and policy of the Federal cargo reservation programs, compliance by Federal agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws continues to be uneven;

Whereas the Maritime Administrator cited the limited enforcement powers of the Maritime Administration with respect to Federal agencies that fail to comply with section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)) and other Federal cargo reservation laws; and

Whereas the Maritime Administrator recommended that Congress grant the maritime Administration the authority to settle any cargo reservation disputes that may arise between a ship operator and a Federal agency; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) each Federal agency should administer programs of the Federal agency that are subject to Federal cargo reservation laws (including regulations of the Maritime Administration) to ensure that such programs are, to the maximum extent practicable, in compliance with the intent and purpose of such cargo reservation laws; and

(2) the Maritime Administration should closely and strictly monitor any cargo that is subject to such cargo reservation laws.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the law of the land, specifically section (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declares that the United States shall have a merchant marine sufficient, among other things, to:

Carry a substantial portion of our international waterborne Commerce; and to serve as a fourth arm of defense in time of war and national emergency.

The importance of these requirements has been dramatically illustrated by the vital role of our merchant marine in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, during operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and most recently in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia.

While the privately owned and operated U.S. flag merchant marine has performed so magnificently and effectively in times of crisis, it has also made extraordinary efforts to ensure that a substantial portion of commercial cargo bound to and from the United

States moves on U.S. bottoms. Given the chronic overtonnaging in international shipping, cut-throat competition, and the competitive edge our trading partners give their national flags, this has not been easy. In addition to competition with subsidized foreign carriers, U.S.-flag carriers are forced to compete with flag of convenience carriers. Over two-thirds of the international vessels operating in commerce are operating under flags of convenience. Flag of convenience registries include such major maritime powers as Panama, Liberia, the Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu. These registries only require their vessel owners to pay registration fees, and ship-owners are not required to pay tax on revenues earned, nor do employees have to pay income tax, and the ship-owner has little or no obligation to comply with the nation's law.

Nevertheless, if our commercial fleet is to continue to be an effective auxiliary in times of war or national emergency, it must first be commercially viable in times of peace. Otherwise, there will be no merchant fleet when the need arises.

I think we all would agree that there is a substantial national interest in promoting our merchant fleet. I think, also, that we would all agree that U.S. national security and economic security interests should not be held hostage for lack of U.S.-controlled sealift assets. Given the increasing diminution of the flag fleets of our NATO allies it will be more important in the future to sustain a viable U.S.-flag presence. Indeed, several laws of our land recognize that national interest and spell out specifically how the U.S. Government is to go about promoting it. Federal laws require that all U.S. military cargo, cargo purchased with all loan funds and guarantees from the Eximbank, 75 percent of concessionary agricultural, and at least 50 percent of all other international ocean borne cargo generated directly or indirectly by the Federal Government, be carried on U.S. flag vessels. The alarming news is that according to Maritime Administration [MarAd] the total volume of cargo moving under these programs is declining and will continue to do so.

According to a report by Nathan Associates, Inc., the 1992 economic impact of cargo preference for the United States is 40,000 direct, indirect, and induced jobs, \$2.2 billion in direct, indirect, and induced household earnings, \$354 million in direct, indirect, and induced Federal personal and business income tax revenues—\$1.20 for every dollar of Government outlay on cargo preference, and \$1.2 billion in foreign exchange.

It is, therefore, imperative that U.S. flag vessels carry every ton of cargo which these programs and the law intend them to carry. This brings me to the reason for the resolution I am introducing today. There are two substantial problems which threaten the viability of these programs and, there-

fore, the viability of our merchant fleet.

Several agencies administering cargo reservation programs continue to do their almighty best to evade the spirit and letter of the reservation laws, that is, find the law inapplicable to a particular program, or employ other loopholes.

Because of this problem of evasion and uneven confidence, the Congress amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 to centralize monitoring and compliance authority for all cargo reservation programs in MarAd. Nevertheless, the problem remains. Critics of MarAd maintain the agency is too timid, and does not discharge its obligation aggressively. MarAd, on the other hand, says it has limited enforcement powers over those Government agencies which are not in compliance.

In light of recent proposals to consolidate the Department of Transportation's operating divisions, I believe it is more important than ever for the Congress to reiterate its support for our cargo reservation laws, so that their administration and enforcement will not suffer from any departmental reorganization.

Mr. President, the resolution I am submitting today merely expresses the sense of the Senate that all of these Federal agencies do what they are supposed to be doing now, under existing law.

SENATE RESOLUTION 25—RELATIVE TO THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Ms. SNOWE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 25

Whereas the youth of America face more difficult challenges than ever before, with the lure of gangs, drugs, alcohol, and sex increasing the potential for irresponsible behavior and violence at ever earlier ages;

Whereas all too often the media focuses on negative stories about America's youth;

Whereas many young Americans have made extraordinary contributions to their communities and to their country;

Whereas 10-year old Samantha Smith of Manchester, Maine, wrote to Chairman Yuri Andropov of the Soviet Union in 1982 urging peace at the height of the Cold War;

Whereas Samantha was invited by Chairman Andropov to visit the Soviet Union the following year and became widely recognized as a spokesperson for the cause of peace until her death in a plane crash in 1985; and

Whereas America's young people need positive role models from among their peers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service should issue a series of postage stamps highlighting the extraordinary achievements of young Americans and that a stamp honoring Samantha Smith of Manchester, Maine, should be the first in this series.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to submit a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the U.S. Postal Service should issue a series of postage stamps honoring

young Americans for their extraordinary achievements.

It is an unfortunate reality today that America's young people face more difficult challenges than ever before. The lure of gangs, drugs, alcohol, and sex increases the potential for irresponsible behavior and violence at ever earlier ages. On a daily basis, young people are exposed to a confusing array of messages and sometimes dubious role models. And even the best-intentioned working parents find it hard to spend the kind of quality time with their children that would help them sort through these pervasive influences. All too often, the media focuses on negative stories about America's young people.

Yet, there are many examples of exceptional young Americans who have risen above these challenges to accomplish extraordinary things for their community and for their country. Samantha Smith, who lived in Manchester, ME, is a prime example. In 1982, at the age of 10, Samantha wrote a letter to Chairman Yuri Andropov of the Soviet Union urging peace at the height of the cold war. As a result, she was invited by the Soviet leader to visit his country the following year. Samantha's trip received worldwide attention, and the schoolgirl became widely recognized as a spokesperson for peace and international understanding. Tragically, Samantha's life was cut short in 1985 in a fatal plane crash when she was only 13.

Other young Americans have demonstrated the same kind of initiative and vision which Samantha embodied. The youth of our country need to be aware of these positive role models from among their own age group. I am, therefore, introducing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution today calling upon the U.S. Postal Service to issue a series of stamps recognizing young Americans, starting with Samantha Smith, for the extraordinary contributions they have made.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FAMILY FRIENDLY WORKPLACE ACT

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 4, the Family Friendly Workplace Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure. By amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, this act would provide employees with flexible work schedules, and increase their choices and options for their time at work and quality time with their families. Ensuring that such opportunities are provided to our workers, better known as mothers and fathers, can only serve to strengthening our American families.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 63 percent of mother and father households now see both parents working outside of the home. Moreover, 76 percent of mothers with

school-age children now work. That is why we must take action now to help employees balance the demands of work and family lives. I believe the Family Friendly Workplace Act is an important first step in helping our Nation's working parents do just that.

In 1993, the President signed the Family and Medical Leave Act into law. While well intended, the Federal Government took a 13-page law and transformed it into 300 pages of regulations. It then became a true administrative nightmare. Instead of targeting employees with choices and options for their work schedules, the President decided instead to target employers with a mandated mound of paperwork. To make matters worse, the President announced during the 1996 campaign his intention to expand the Family and Medical Leave Act by forcing employers to provide school activity and community leave for their employees. Such misguided mandates resurrect the words of Abraham Lincoln who said, "You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer." As lawmakers, we have the ability to prevent this Nation from traveling further down the road of federally mandated workplace conditions. By passing the Family Friendly Workplace Act, we will avoid the creation of an environment littered with friction and litigation and embrace mutual cooperation and respect.

Wage payers are not heartless and cruel reincarnations of Ebenezer Scrooge. Having played the wage payer role for over 26 years, I take great offense when employers are characterized as being the bad guys. The majority of employers cherish their most valuable assets—their employees. It is truly misleading and deceptive for anyone to say otherwise. For without the employee, management will ultimately have no staff, no profits—and no business. Watching out for employees is just good business.

As an alternative to employer mandates, this legislation would provide compensatory time off that would allow employers to offer and employees to choose to use compensatory time for school and family activities and a whole range of other personal reasons—without getting the Government involved in certifying and documenting these events. The President's expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act would require employees to get certification for taking time off to attend a child's soccer match, piano recital, or even a meeting with a school teacher. Under this bill, employees have the right to choose compensatory time instead of cash wages at a rate not less than 1½ hours of each hour of overtime worked. Employees would be able to accrue up to 240 hours annually and have the opportunity to cash-out their accrued hours at least once a year. That's a lot of time we should be spending with our children—an investment in our future.

Federal employees have enjoyed flexible work schedules, chock full of

choices and options, since 1978. Legislation that amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is long overdue. We appear to have no confidence in private sector employees' ability to make rational decisions on how to spend their time.

I have been blessed with a wife and three wonderful children. Like many who place value in time shared with family, I believe that such moments are a priceless commodity that can never be replaced—or regained—once lost. At a time when our society clings to every fiber of family life, I can see no better way for Congress and the President to express our support for the American family than by passing and then urging the President to sign into law, S. 4, the Family Friendly Workplace Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in giving employees the opportunity to balance their work and family obligations.

I yield the floor. •

THE FLOOD OF 1996

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, while people in Washington and around the country celebrated the Presidential inauguration this past weekend, people in New York State observed the 1-year anniversary of an event of a very different kind—one of the worst natural disasters we have ever faced. In New York, especially upstate New York, January 19, 1996, will forever be known as the day the waters came.

A combination of severe thunderstorms and melting snow led to one of the worst floods in our State's history. Forty-one of the State's 62 counties were declared disaster areas. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, damages were greater than \$100 million. My home county, Delaware, was the hardest hit; bridges were washed away, homes were ruined, roads were destroyed, fields were inundated, and entire villages were left under water. Six of the eleven fatalities caused by the flood were in Delaware County.

Over the past year, the people of New York have tried to rebuild their homes and their lives. Our towns, villages, and counties have tried to rebuild their roads and municipal facilities. FEMA and the State Emergency Management Office, or SEMO, have been there to help, but it has not been easy. The flood of January 19 was not the only one of the year. It came just 2 weeks after the great blizzard of 1996. Then in October, the New York City area was hit by a severe flood, and only a month later, large parts of upstate New York were flooded again. Although not as severe as the January floods, heavy rains again caused damages in several areas of the State, especially Clinton and Essex Counties in the northeast corner, and once again, Delaware County was hit.

Ask any local official in upstate New York what they will remember most