support as this one does. It is costing millions of dollars to comply with the ridiculous delays from FDA, and the American people are being deprived of medicines and devices that should be approved much quicker. Some of them are just impossible to explain.

I hope that we can complete action this week.

I appreciate the efforts and the leadership of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HARKIN. If the leader will yield, I have a question.

So we are not having a cloture vote at 10 a.m. Was there a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that I missed before I came onto the floor?

Mr. LOTT. No. There was no unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HARKIN. Are we not voting at 10 o'clock?

Mr. LOTT. We have a Senator that is unavoidably detained that really is anxious to be present on that vote. We are trying to accommodate his schedule, as I know the Senator from Iowa would want us to do. We are working with the managers of both this bill and Interior appropriations and the interested Senators to see when we might have that vote. We would at some point try to enter into an agreement as to when it would be.

Mr. HARKIN. Are we going on the FDA bill?

Mr. LOTT. We will talk about it for a little while. But at 10 o'clock we will advise Members whether we are going to have a vote, or when we are deferring it to.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under the previous order, leader time is reserved.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 830, with the time until 10 a.m. to be equally divided.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 830) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

MODIFIED COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT NO. 1130

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, we are here to discuss yet again the need for cloture on S. 830, the FDA Modernization and Accounting Act. We have already had 14 hours of floor debate on this measure and we have not yet discussed this amendment. This will be the second time that cloture has been voted on regarding this measure. The first vote was 89 to 5 to invoke cloture. The Senate has spoken. And, yet, we are here to repeat ourselves again and again.

My colleagues have already heard repeatedly from both sides of the aisle about the strong bipartisan commitment to crafting this measure, about the months of negotiations, deliberation and collaboration with the administration, the minority, and outside groups. Literally dozens of accommodations have been made and agreements reached. No one disputes that this is a good bill. No one should dispute that we have moved forward, or that we should move forward, with our debate on the remaining issues. Now we should move forward on that debate.

This measure accomplishes two very important objectives. First, it modernizes the way that the Food and Drug Administration accomplishes its mission. It streamlines the review and approval process for medical devices, pharmaceutical, and biological products. In so doing, it helps to ensure that the best and safest medical technology available in the world would be available to the American people. In so doing, it helps ensure that the best medical technology jobs will continue to be available for the American people.

Second, this measure authorizes the Prescription Drug User Fee Act—or PDUFA, as it is known. Everyone agrees that PDUFA has been immensely successful in helping FDA do its job better and more efficiently.

Mr. President, congressional authorization for PDUFA expires in 15 days. At the end of September this successful and innovative program will be at serious risk. It is the height of irony that a program like PDUFA that was designed to reduce delay at the FDA is now at risk of becoming bogged-down in a procedural delay on the Senate floor.

I would argue that the time for delay is over, and that the time for the Senate to do its work it was sent here to do is now.

Almost 50 amendments have been filed on this measure. And, frankly, virtually all of them are nongermane, or they have been worked out, or they can be worked out. A single provision remains that may require some extended debate, and we should move to its consideration and an up-or-down vote on it as soon as possible.

Last week we spent almost 15 hours talking about uniformity for cosmetics. We have an agreement on that provision, thanks to the efforts of Senator GREGG.

I say that we should move on. I say we complete this debate, and finish this measure, and let's vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend and colleague, the majority leader, the fact of the matter is by the votes that we had last week requiring that we have some opportunity to examine a very important provision—and that is the preemption of various States' ability to protect their public—we have seen a rather dramatic change in the language of the provision that will continue to permit the States to protect their public. That was very important for the protection of the American public. I know that there are some people around here who want to see the trains run on time. But some of us—not only those of us here but the National Governors' Conference, the public health organizations, the women's network organizations that deal with women's health issues—a wide range of consumers believe, quite deeply, that we are absolutely within our rights to make sure that this provision was offered and changed, and we did so. And, by doing so, the public health interest is preserved.

Now here we are on the floor of the U.S. Senate the morning after having seen the headlines from two national journals—yesterday in the Wall Street Journal, talking about a particular prescription drug called fen/phen, that had been moved through, rushed through the FDA. It has been linked to everything from brain damage in animals to primary pulmonary hypertension; a rare but fatal lung disease; millions of Americans tried the drugs to slim down; some 60 million people worldwide were estimated to have taken the drug; the straw that broke the camel's back was a heart valve problem which now has been widely recognized.

Here is an item in the Washington Post. Two diet drugs are pulled off the market. Why? Because the products were used for purposes for which the drug was not approved.

We are talking about an identical provision in this body with regard to medical devices—the use of the medical device for purposes for which it has not been approved.

We have seen the whole world being awakened to this particular health problem. Some of us are trying to making sure that we don't have headlines like this in 3 months, 4 months, or 6 months with regard to the medical device issue. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. President, I would just point out that there are about six little words that, if the majority would be willing to accept, would move us right ahead, and get us very short time agreements on the other elements.

Let me just point out. Mr. President, there are the two provisions with regard to medical devices—one they call class II—devices which represent about 5 percent of the devices. Those are the new devices.

In the language of this bill, it says, whether or not there is reasonable assurance of safety effectiveness, if the proposed labeling is neither false nor misleading.

''Neither false nor misleading,'' that is in regard to class III devices. But, if you look at class I and II devices with regard to the representations that are made involving the FDA, there is no such language.

If the majority will take the language that we propose for class III and apply that to class I and II, we will call this cloture vote off. What person in the United States of America wants to permit medical devices to be approved if we cannot have agreement by the manufacturers that their statements to the FDA reflect the true uses for the devices?

My goodness, are we in that big of a hurry? That is why this issue is important. Now, the majority leader says we have just one more item. We are glad to deal with this issue, and we have offered compromise language to deal with it. It is of vital importance and we will have a chance later to discuss the health hazards associated with it. The medical device industry, which has been enormously cooperative in working out other provisions on this, had refused to go along with our proposed language. Medical device labeling has important health implications.

You can rush this through and say the rest of the bill is fine. It is fine. Senator JEFFORDS and his Republican colleagues deserve great credit. My Democratic colleagues deserve great credit. But do we have to be reminded again that the FDA has the responsibility for the protection of the public health. If we do, we don't need to look any father than reading this mornings newspapers. All we are saying is let's not do with medical devices what was done with regard to these diet medicines. I think that is an important health matter. So do the overwhelming majority of patient coalitions and public health coalitions.

If the industry wants to debate that, we are going to take the time to debate it. If there are Members on the floor of the U.S. Senate who want to take the position that we don't need this change in the bill language on medical device regulation, let them make that case on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Because that is the case they are going to have to make, because the amendment has been filed. If the majority indicates they will accept that, that's all fine and well. Our amendment will ensure that FDA is able to comprehensively examine the safety of medical devices. We will move through this legislation very rapidly indeed. But this is one Senator who is not prepared to roll over on that issue. We will have the opportunity during the course of this morning or this afternoon or tonight or tomorrow, or however long it takes, to go through the various instances where medical device labeling could pose an important and significant public health threat, a threat to the American people.

There may be those who do not think this is an important issue. I believe the overwhelming majority of the American public will think so. As they are reading their papers this morning and listening to those who say, let's rush this bill on through, I would think some Americans would say, let's take another look at what we have in this legislation, particularly with regard to the medical device provisions.

Mr. President, with all respect to my friend and colleague, we have talked about this. Senator DURBIN has talked about sections 404 and 406. This particular issue is the key issue.

If we can get the language in the bill ensuring that we will not permit the medical device industry to restrict the FDA's ability to make a full study of medical device safety, I think we would move ahead with the legislation.

I withhold the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I must answer that charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. To inflame this issue into being one of false information and filing of misleading information is totally incorrect. The issue here is not that. The issue here, on each of these medical devices, is whether or not they must file every conceivable, possible use that FDA thinks might be made of it. FDA should focus rather on the use that it is intended for or any other use that the manufacturers know it will be intended for. There is nothing involving false or misleading information. That, of course, is under the control of the FDA and that would be a serious matter with the FDA. It could, and should deny approval of a device where a manufacturer deliberately files false and misleading information.

Let us set the record straight. Manufacturers cannot file false and misleading language. To raise that as the issue is to really differ from what the important issue is, and that is how long do Americans have to wait to get access to important, new medical devices. In Europe it takes much less time and it is much more expeditiously handled. We can have the same kind of treatment here while ensuring that they are safe and effective for their intended use. For any device that is intended for a particular use and it is known by doctors to be effective for another use, that's fine. That is the practice of medicine. Doctors sometimes find other, valuable uses for medical devices. That is how medical practice and innovation proceeds—and we don't want the Federal Government telling doctors how to practice medicine.

But for the manufacturer to search out every conceivable use and then to study every conceivable possible use ends up in delays of these devices coming onto the market. That means that Americans, doctors and patients, are unable to utilize medical innovations that are more readily available in Europe. So I wish we would get away from making this into a ''false and misleading language'' filing. There is no such issue here as that. The question is how much right does the FDA have to require a manufacturer to understand and get involved with the practice of medicine where some other use might be made. That is the issue.

I think there are ways we can solve this, but not just by raising it to the issue of emotionalism. That is not the solution here. There is no problem having false or misleading information filed on a medical device approval application, because that is against the law. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 2 minutes 32 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield the remaining time to the Senator from Iowa. I think we will have more time later.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. Let me agree with Senator KENNEDY on this issue. The stories in the paper this morning ought to alarm us all about the need to proceed very cautiously and very carefully about what we are doing. I spent a lot of time looking at devices. I had amendments on the bill itself, when it was in committee, on devices. The FDA has the authority now, if a device is used for a certain purpose, to make sure that there are not misleading or false advertising proposals. But when they want to use the device for a purpose for which it is not intended, there is nothing in the bill to prohibit that. That is what we are talking about, and I think we have to proceed very cautiously and carefully here.

Mr. President, I did want to talk about another issue. I thank Senator JEFFORDS and Senator KENNEDY for their hard work and leadership on this bill. I think we all agree we need some reform of FDA. I have been in favor of that. We need to streamline the processes. I agree with Senator JEFFORDS in that regard. There are many positive provisions in this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1137 TO MODIFIED COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT NO. 1130

(Purpose: To establish within the National Institutes of Health an agency to be known as the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed, however, that an essential element was not included. A major goal of FDA reform was to include access to medical innovations without compromising public safety. I have an amendment, amendment No. 1137, which speaks to that. I would like to call up that amendment at this time and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DASCHLE, and Ms.

MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 1137 to modified committee substitute amendment No. 1130.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be in order, notwithstanding any vote on cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I reserve the right to object. What is the regular order here with respect to amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are in order to both the substitute and the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. At this time, prior to cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments may be called up prior to the cloture vote.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this is cosponsored by a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, Senators HATCH, DASCHLE, MIKULSKI, myself, and a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I don't believe it is going to be objected to.

However, we are facing the problem of cloture. That's why I asked for unanimous consent. I am sorry the manager of the bill would not allow this amendment to be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont controls the remaining time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 5 minutes 26 seconds remaining.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield the remaining time to Senator COATS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I don't need all the 5 minutes. I would be happy to yield back to the Senator from Vermont to wrap up before the cloture vote. It is unfortunate that we are in this position again. We had a substantially bipartisan, overwhelming vote to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed. I believe the vote was 89 to 5. I think that indicates a very broad level of support for the need to move forward with this legislation that was 2½ years in the making. There is obviously a widespread, general consensus that FDA reform is necessary to provide better protection for the health and safety of Americans and to provide access to drugs and devices that Americans have been denied due to delays at FDA. We are trying to expedite that process. We are trying to bring in expertise from outside to help FDA, whether it is through the tax that is levied on prescription drug companies that goes to hire additional workers and provide additional resources for FDA, or whether it is for outside agencies, certified by FDA, to help them in the process of reviewing this tremendous backlog of applications for health-improving, and in many cases lifesaving, devices and drugs.

What we are trying to do here is give FDA the kind of support and resources it needs, along with a pretty good shove in the right direction, to bring our agency up to world class standards and up to the task of effectively dealing with this exciting explosion of technology through which the American people can reap great benefits.

I regret once again we have to go to a cloture vote. We just ran into a problem here, procedurally, with the amendment, the Senator from Iowa fearing that cloture would cut off his ability to offer a relevant amendment under cloture. I would say to the Senator from Iowa, none of us really wants to go to cloture. But in order to move this bill forward, it appears that we have to invoke cloture once again.

I know under the rules of cloture, it limits the amendments as to relevancy. No one in favor of FDA reform wants to keep going through this process of invoking cloture, but unfortunately we have to do it in order to move the bill forward.

Again, 2½ years in the making, there were extensive hearings in the Labor Committee, efforts on a bipartisan basis to resolve problems and disputes, votes in committee, negotiations postcommittee action, 30-some concessions or modifications in response to concerns that were raised postcommittee on this. So, none of us here supporting and promoting the movement forward of this legislation is trying to delay anything. We are just trying to expedite it. Nor are we trying to say, ''Our way or no way.'' There has been extensive negotiation, extensive accommodation, extensive work to move this bill forward in any way that we possibly can.

So I urge my colleagues, as we did a week or so ago, I urge my colleagues to vote with us on cloture. We have no other choice, other than lengthy debate over items and issues that have been discussed over and over and over and voted on and negotiated. Clearly, we know where the Members of the U.S. Senate stand, both Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives. There is about as widespread support for this reform bill as any major legislation that has come before the Senate as long as I have been in here, for 9 years. It is time to move forward. Regretfully, we have to do it once again with a cloture motion.

I urge my colleagues to help us move this very needed and very important legislation the next step forward.

I yield back any remaining time I have to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as to the Senator from Iowa, I apologize that we are in an awkward situation this morning. I have assured him that we will have a hearing in October on NIH with respect to alternative forms of medicine. I look forward to that because I agree with him on that issue.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled cloture vote be postponed to occur at 12:15 p.m. today, and further, that second-degree amendments may be filed up to 10 a.m. this morning. I further ask consent that following debate this morning regarding the FDA reform bill, the Senate resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill until the cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not object to moving the vote to 12:15 today. I understand the leader wants to get to the Interior appropriations bill. I do not want to unduly delay that provision. However, it says under the proposal, ''I ask consent that following the debate this morning regarding the FDA reform bill, that the Senate resume * * *.'' We would like to have at least a limited period of time. I know the Senator from Iowa wanted to speak. I was wondering if we can at least get a half hour debate on the FDA reform bill before finishing. It says here, ''I further ask consent that following the debate this morning,'' I was wondering whether ''following the debate'' could go until 10:30?

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I reserve the right to object since an additional proposal has been made here. Can I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts exactly what he is proposing to add here?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Iowa wanted to be heard on a matter. I wanted to speak just briefly to clarify the record. I was wondering if we can divide that time between now and 10:30—we took up some of the time between 9:30 and 10 for debate and discussion—and then go to Interior.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, we are moving at this time to accommodate one of our Senators who has a health problem right now. It does disrupt the whole schedule. We have work we need to do on Interior appropriations. If we delay it further and then come back to it and have to go off it at 12:15, it just confuses and complicates the whole process.

We have asked the managers of the Interior appropriations bill—now we have interrupted them—to come to the floor. They are scheduled to be on the floor. I know the Senator from Iowa is working to try and get an amendment included. I feel confident that will be done at some point. At this time, I have to object to the expansion of the unanimous consent request that was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts and support the request that was made by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, under those circumstances and to accommodate the Member, I will not press this, although I do think we will have an opportunity to address these issues later in the morning.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Interior appropriations bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Ashcroft amendment No. 1188 (to committee amendment beginning on page 96, line 12 through page 97, line 8) to eliminate funding for programs and activities carried out by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, just so we will be clear what we have agreed to, Senator GORTON and the other manager of the bill will be here to, again, further debate amendments on the Interior appropriations bill. They have been good partners on this appropriations bill and have worked out some of the areas where there have been disagreements, but there will be amendments and, I presume, votes throughout the day on a number of issues, including the National Endowment for the Arts issue, perhaps on some mining issues. I understand perhaps the Senator from Arkansas has an amendment.

But we need to make progress on the Interior appropriations bill because we hope to finish it tonight or tomorrow and then go to FDA at some point. I hope we can work out a reasonable agreement where we can complete the debate on the Food and Drug Administration reform bill, and we hope to then pretty quickly, either late this week or early next week, go to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. That would be the 13th and last appropriations bill that we would have to deal with this session, and then we could focus the rest of next week and the next week on adopting conference reports to the appropriations bills. We will need to move them very quickly. It will be my intent to try and hold time and focus on getting those conference reports agreed to.

I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators as we try to accommodate one of our most beloved Senators who has a problem this morning, and we will begin with the Interior appropriations momentarily. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are now on the Interior appropriations bill once again. I believe that the first vote on that bill will be on the Ashcroft-Helms amendment to strike the appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts. There has been discussion of several other amendments relating to that endowment. I believe it appropriate to continue that debate until the cloture vote at noon. I know that the majority leader hopes, and I hope, that shortly after we get back on the Interior appropriations bill, after our FDA vote, that we will begin to vote on amendments relating to the National Endowment for the Arts. In any event, that is the subject at the present time. I invite all Members who are interested in any of the amendments on the National Endowment for the Arts to come to the floor and speak on that subject between now and noon.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, is time controlled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to rise in support of the bill which has been brought forth by the Senator from Washington. I think he has done an extraordinary job in developing this appropriations language in this bill relative to the Interior and various departments which the Interior impacts. I especially want to thank him for his sensitivity relative to the Northeast.

There is a different view in this country between the Northeast and the West on a number of issues that involve land conservation and the question especially of protecting lands, public lands. In the Northeast, especially in northern New England, we are still struggling with the fact that we would like to protect some additional lands. We have a spectacular place called the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire, and it is the most visited national forest in the country. In fact, it receives more visitors per year than Yellowstone, which is a national park. It is under tremendous pressures from popular use because it is so close to the megalopolis of New York, Boston, and Washington.

It is an extraordinary place, but to maintain it and to maintain its character, it requires that we continue to address some of the inholding issues around the national forest, and the Senator from the West has been sensitive to the Senators from the East on this point. I thank very much the Senator from Washington for his sensitivity in allowing us to go forward in this bill and complete the purchase of a very critical piece of land called Lake Tarleton in New Hampshire.

In addition, he has assisted us in a number of other areas in this bill, and I thank him for it.

I also want to talk about a position that has been brought forward in this bill relative to the National Endowment for the Arts, because I think the Senator from Washington has reached the appropriate balance in the language which he has put in this bill relative to the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts, as we all know, has been a lightning rod of controversy, especially on the House side, less so on our side of the aisle, because of some of the things that the Endowment over the years has funded, which have been mistakes, to say the least.

But the fact is that there is a role, in my opinion, it is a limited role, but there is a role for the Federal Government and for State governments in the area of assisting the arts in this country.

Arts are an expression of the culture of a country or a nation, an expression of the attitude, personality, and the strength of a nation. The ability to have a vibrant arts community in a nation is critical, I believe, to the good health and the good education of a nation.

The Federal role, in participating in this, should be one of an incubator. The Federal role should be one as the starter of the initiatives. And the dollars which are put in this bill for the purposes of assisting the NEA and the Humanities Council are just that—they are startup dollars.

Essentially, these dollars multiply two times, three times, sometimes five times their basic number.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The Senator explained some, I think, valid points concerning the role of our Government support for the arts. My question concerns the very, very high administrative costs that the National Endowment has experienced, approaching 20 cents on the dollar in administration, and the fact that the distribution of the funds from the National Endowment have gone primarily to very few cities in the country. In fact, I think one-third of all of the direct grants go to six cities in the United States. And the fact is that the Whitney Museum in