

in the United States; considered and agreed to.

# STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1210. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the geologic formation known as the Valles Caldera currently managed by the Baca Land and Cattle Co., and to provide for an effective management program for this resource within the Department of Agriculture, and consistent land management to protect the watershed of the Bandelier National Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## VALLE GRANDE VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION LEGISLATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this bill that I have just sent to the desk, in my view, gives us a chance in this Congress to grasp a historic opportunity to make a real difference for the American people for generations to come.

Most Americans can name various geologic treasures and places of wonder within our land. Places like Diamond Head in Hawaii, the Sawtooth Mountains in Idaho, the Grand Canyon in Arizona, and Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado readily come to mind because our people have access to them. However, there is a place in New Mexico that rivals these areas in splendor and yet, few people know about, or fully appreciate its significance. It is called the Valles Caldera.

The Valles Caldera is one of the world's greatest volcanic features. A large circular crater 12-15 miles in diameter, the views from the rim are awe inspiring. As one looks across the vast green valleys and mountains that now sit within the ring of the caldera, and realizes that they are all merely the cooled workings of a resurgent lava dome, one is struck by the sheer magnitude of the natural forces that created the Jemez Mountains in north central New Mexico.

The explosions that created the caldera, some 1.2 million years ago, ejected over 100 cubic miles of earth, rock, and lava. It is estimated that if the original mountain had come to a peak that it would have been taller than Mount Everest.

However very few people, even in New Mexico, have ever been on this land. Since 1860, it has been in private ownership. At that time it was granted by the United States to the heirs of Don Luis Maria Cabeza de Vaca as part of a settlement of Spanish land grant claims under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and has since been known as the Baca Land & Cattle Company.

It has passed through several owners since 1860, and about once in a generation the United States has tried to purchase the land. The first time was in the 1930's. Again, in the 1960's the late former Senator from New Mexico, Clinton P. Anderson tried to negotiate a deal for the land. Finally in 1980, the owner of the land, James "Pat"

Dunigan, was in negotiations with the Government to sell the land when he died a premature death. Now, his family has come forward and said they would like to fulfill his dream of seeing this land move into public ownership.

Mr. President, this is an opportunity that we cannot let pass us by. In 1993, the Forest Service completed a study of this land which lays out the tremendous value it could have within public ownership:

First, the Valles Caldera is the classic example of a resurgent lava dome. The study of its features has helped geologists to understand volcanic processes throughout the world;

Second, the recreation potential is enormous. Hiking, camping, cross-country skiing, photography, horse back riding, hunting, and fishing are obvious possibilities.

The headwaters of the Jemez and San Antonio rivers are located on this land, and represent some of the best trout fishing streams in New Mexico. There are nearly 27 miles of trout streams on the ranch, most of which meander through grass meadows perfect for fly fishing.

Also over 6,000 elk live on this land, making it ideal for hunting.

Perhaps the most unique features of this land are the seven enormous open grassland valleys that are tailor made for horseback riding.

Third, finally, and perhaps most important, this land has been well preserved. Through careful management of their grazing land, selective timbering, and the use of proscribed fire, the current owners have maintained the caldera as an ecological jewel. With over 65,000 acres of conifer forests mixed with aspen, gamble oak, and broken rock known as felsenmeer, and 30,000 acres of lush grasslands, the Caldera supports an abundance of wildlife, including black bears and cougars.

Mr. President, words are a poor substitute for seeing this land, and although pictures cannot convey its grandeur, they may provide my colleagues with a sense of it:

First, to give people a sense of location, here is a map of north central New Mexico. To the south is Albuquerque and then Santa Fe above it. You'll notice that the Baca Ranch is nestled between the Santa Fe National Forest, and Bandelier National Monument, which many members of the public have visited.

Second, here is a satellite photo of the volcano. The black outline represents the Baca Ranch, approximately 95,000 acres. For perspective, on the right side of this photo is Los Alamos, NM, and just below it is the Bandelier National Monument. This large yellow spot on the bottom right corner of the caldera rim is known as the Valle Grande. It is the only part of the Ranch that most people have seen because state highway 4 comes through on the side, but it is only one of seven valleys on the property.

Third, here's a picture of the Valle Grande, it's about 4 miles wide and 6 miles long covering over 17,000 acres.

Fourth, and here is the upper Jemez river which originates and meanders through the Valle Grande.

Fifth, finally, here is a picture of the Valle Toledo the third largest valley on the property, about 4,000 acres.

Mr. President, the legislation I'm introducing today does two things: it gives the Forest Service the authority to start negotiating for the purchase of this land in good faith by authorizing appropriations, land exchanges, and the acceptance of donations; and it rationalizes the boundaries between the Santa Fe National Forest and Bandelier National Monument for consistent management of their respective watersheds.

Acquiring land of this quality and magnitude will not be cheap or easy. It will take a lot of work on the part of this body and our counterparts on the House, and on the part of the administration. However, if we don't close this deal this time, I'm not sure the American people will ever forgive us. Although the Dunigan's have been great stewards of the land, they want to sell it. Who knows how future owners may use this land.

When Senator Anderson tried to acquire this land for the United States 35 years ago, we could have bought this land for less than \$5 million. Now the costs will be much much greater, and if it is ever subdivided, the costs will go up exponentially.

Mr. President, I know that many people will want to argue about the management of this land. There are many, many uses that this land could be put to, but I would caution my colleagues that now is not the time to argue over future use. Let's worry about how we will acquire the land first. Management options can be worked out later.

I think it will take additional time before a full management plan can be put in place for the property. It would be an exercise in futility for us to try to work all of that out before we move to take advantage of this historic opportunity.

Mr. President, I understand that there is support for this effort to bring this property into public ownership by others in the delegation. I very much want to work with them and with people in the administration to see this happen. It is a very important initiative and a very important goal for us to pursue in the second session of this Congress. So I hope very much that we can make progress on it.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 1212. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify that records of arrival or departure are not required to be collected for purposes of the automated entry-exit control system developed under 110 of such act for Canadians who are not otherwise required to possess a visa, passport, or border crossing identification card; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT CLARIFICATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, approximately 1 year ago the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act became law.

Next year at this time, September 30, 1998, section 110 of this act will be implemented and will adversely—and unintentionally—affect our neighbors in Canada. Section 110 requires the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] to develop an automated entry and exit system for the purpose of documenting the entry and departure of every alien arriving and leaving the United States. The United States has never had such an alien departure management system.

Unfortunately, section 110 as enacted fails to recognize the decades-long practice of not requiring most Canadian nationals to fill out INS documents—referred to as “I-94s” at the border.

In a December 18, 1996 letter to the Ambassador of Canada at the time, Raymond Chretien, Senator Alan Simpson, and Representative LAMAR SMITH, the chairmen of the Senate and the House Judiciary Subcommittees on Immigration, respectively, indicated to Ambassador Chretien that it was not the intention of the Judiciary Committee to impose any new requirements for border crossing cards—so-called I-94s—on Canadians who are not presently required to possess such documents.

The legislation which I am introducing today—which was introduced in the House on September 16 by Congressman JOHN LAFALCE of New York—would simply clarify the intent of Congress by exempting from the section 110 provisions of the act Canadian nationals who are not now required by law to possess a visa, passport, or border-crossing identification card to enter the United States.

There is no logical reason to inhibit the flow of traffic between the United States and Canada. If the committee's intention is not clarified, and section 110 is implemented at the Canadian border, congestion would become intolerable.

According to U.S. Customs, the port in Pembina, ND, saw 963,665 individuals cross into North Dakota in fiscal year 1996, averaging 2,640 people a day. Customs estimates that if the entry/exit system had to be implemented on the Canadian border, providing the agent to spend just 1 minute per person entering it would take two customs workers a nonstop daily shift of 22 hours to process them.

An estimated 116 million persons cross into the United States at all land points on the Canadian border. Of these, 76 million are Canadian or United States permanent residents. More than \$1 billion in goods and services trade crosses the United States/Canadian border each day. I urge the Judiciary Committee to consider soon mine or other legislation to clarify the intent of the 1996 act.

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. 1212

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

**SECTION 1. EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS FROM ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL SYSTEM.**

(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 records 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) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.—The system under paragraph (1) shall not collect a record of arrival or departure for an alien—

“(A) who is—

“(i) a Canadian national; or

“(ii) an alien having a common nationality with Canadian nationals and who has his or her residence in Canada; and

“(B) who is not otherwise required by law to be in possession, for purposes of establishing eligibility for admission into the United States, of—

“(i) a visa;

“(ii) a passport; or

“(iii) a border crossing identification card.”.

(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 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-546).

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself,  
Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KERRY, Ms.  
SNOWE, Mr. INOUE, Mr.  
BREAUX, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KENNEDY,  
Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BIDEN,  
Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. AKAKA,  
and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1213. A bill to establish a National Ocean Council, a Commission on Ocean Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

**THE OCEANS ACT OF 1997**

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Oceans Act of 1997. I am pleased to be joined in this endeavor by Senators STEVENS, KERRY, SNOWE, BREAUX, MCCAIN, INOUE, KENNEDY, BOXER, BIDEN, LAUTENBERG, AKAKA, and MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, plainly and simply, this bill calls for a plan of action for the 21st century to explore, protect, and use our oceans and coasts.

This is not the first time we have faced the need for a national ocean policy. Three decades ago, our Nation roared into space, investing tens of billions of dollars to investigate the Moon and the Sea of Tranquility. During that golden era of science, some of us

also recognized the importance of exploring the seas on our own planet. In 1966, Congress enacted the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act in order to define national objectives and programs with respect to the oceans. That legislation laid the foundation for U.S. ocean and coastal policy and programs and has guided their development for three decades. I was elected to the Senate just 3 months after the 1966 act was enacted into law, but I am pleased that both Senators INOUE and KENNEDY, the two cosponsors of the 1966 act still serving in the Senate, have agreed to join me today in introducing the Oceans Act.

One of the central elements of the 1966 act was establishment of a Presidential commission to develop a plan for national action in the oceans and atmosphere. Dr. Julius A. Stratton, a former president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and then-chairman of the Ford Foundation, led the Commission on an unprecedented, and since unreplicated, investigation of this Nation's relationship with the oceans and the atmosphere. The Stratton Commission and its congressional advisers—including Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Norris Cotton—worked together in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, the Commission was established and carried out its mandate in the Democratic administration of Lyndon Johnson and saw its findings implemented by the Republicans under President Richard Nixon. With a staff of 35 people, the commissioners heard and consulted over 1,000 people, visited every coastal area of this country, and submitted some 126 recommendations in a 1969 report to Congress entitled “Our Nation and the Sea.” Those recommendations led directly to the creation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in 1970, laid the groundwork for enactment of the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] in 1972, and established priorities for Federal ocean activities that have guided this Nation for almost 30 years.

While the Stratton Commission performed its job with vision and integrity, the world has changed since 1966. Today, half of the U.S. population lives within 50 miles of our shores and more than 30 percent of the gross domestic product is generated in the coastal zone. Ocean and coastal resources once considered inexhaustible are severely depleted, and wetlands and other marine habitats are threatened by pollution and human activities. In addition, the U.S. regulatory and legal framework has developed over the years with the passage of a number of statutes in addition to CZMA. These include the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, and the

Oil Pollution Act. Finally, the United Nations has declared 1998 to be the International Year of the Ocean, focusing global attention on the state of the world's oceans. In short, it is time to reexamine our Nation's relationship to the sea.

The Oceans Act is vital to the continued health of the oceans and prosperity of our coasts. It is patterned after and would replace the 1966 act. Like that act, it is comprised of three major elements:

First, the bill calls for development and implementation of a coherent national ocean and coastal policy to conserve and sustainably use fisheries and other ocean and coastal resources, protect the marine environment and human safety, explore ocean frontiers, create marine technologies and economic opportunities, and preserve U.S. leadership on ocean and coastal issues.

Second, the bill establishes a 15-member Commission, similar to the Stratton Commission, to examine ocean and coastal activities and report within 18 months on recommendations for a national policy. Commission members would be appointed by the President and the Congress. In developing its recommendations, the Commission would assess Federal programs and funding priorities, ocean-related infrastructure requirements, conflicts among marine users, and technological opportunities. The bill authorizes appropriations of \$6 million over 2 years to support Commission activities.

Third, the bill creates a high-level Federal interagency Council that is chaired by the Secretary of Commerce and includes the heads of the Departments of Navy, State, Transportation, and the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the National Economic Council. This new Council will advise the President and serve as a forum for developing and implementing an ocean and coastal policy, will provide for coordination of Federal budgets and programs, and will work with non-Federal and international organizations.

By establishing an action plan for ocean and coastal activities, the Oceans Act should contribute substantially to national goals and objectives in the areas of education and research, economic development, and public safety. With respect to education and research, our view of the oceans 30 years ago was based on a remarkably small amount of information. When Jack Kennedy was in the White House, we were just beginning to develop the capability for exploring the oceans, and the driving factor was the military need to hide our submarines from the Soviets during the cold war. What we knew of the oceans at that time was based as much on what fishermen brought up in their nets as it was on reliable scientific investigation.

Today, we still have explored only a tiny fraction of the sea, but with the use of new technologies what we have found is truly incredible. For example, hydrothermal vents, hot water geysers on the deep ocean floor, were discovered just 20 years ago by oceanographers trying to understand the formation of the earth's crust. Now this discovery has led to the identification of nearly 300 new types of marine animals with untold pharmaceutical and biomedical potential.

Many of our marine research efforts could have profound impacts on our economic well-being. For example, research on coastal ocean currents and other processes that affect shoreline erosion is critical to effective management of the shoreline. Oceanographers are working with Federal, State, and local managers to use this new understanding in protecting beachfront property and the lives of those who reside and work in coastal communities.

Development of underwater cameras and sonar, begun in the 1940's for the U.S. Navy, has led to major strides not only for military uses, but for marine archaeologists and scientists exploring unknown stretches of sea floor. Consumers have benefited from the technology now used in video cameras. Sonar has broad applications in both the military and commercial sector.

Finally, marine biotechnology research is thought to be one of the greatest remaining technological and industrial frontiers. Among the opportunities which it may offer are to: restore and protect marine ecosystems; monitor human health and treat disease; increase food supplies through aquaculture; enhance seafood safety and quality; provide new types and sources of industrial materials and processes; and understand biological and geochemical processes in the world ocean.

In addition to the economic opportunities offered by our marine research investment, traditional marine activities play an important role in our national economic outlook. Ninety-five percent of our international trade is shipped on the ocean and each year products valued at more than \$220 billion are shipped within the United States via the water. In 1996, commercial fishermen in the United States landed almost 10 billion pounds of fish with a value of \$3.5 billion. Their fishing-related activities contributed over \$42 billion to the U.S. economy. During the same period, marine anglers contributed another \$20 billion. Travel and tourism also contribute over \$700 billion to our economy, much of which is generated in coastal areas. Last year, in South Carolina alone, the total impact of tourism in coastal areas was almost \$6 billion. With a sound national ocean and coastal policy and effective marine resource management, these numbers have nowhere to go but up.

With respect to public safety, it is particularly important to develop ocean and coastal priorities that re-

flect the changes we have seen in recent years. Before World War II, most of the U.S. shoreline was sparsely populated. There were long, wild stretches of coast, dotted with an occasional port city, fishing village, or sleepy resort. Most barrier islands had few residents or were uninhabited. After the war, people began pouring in, and coastal development began a period of explosive growth. In my State of South Carolina, our beaches attract millions of visitors every year, and more and more people are choosing to move to the coast—making the coastal counties the fastest growing ones in the State. Seventeen of the 20 fastest growing states in the Nation are coastal states—which compounds the situation that the most densely populated regions already border the ocean. With population growth comes the demand for highways, shopping centers, schools, and sewers that permanently alter the landscape. If people are to continue to live and work on the coast, we must do a better job of planning how we impact the very regions in which we all want to live.

There is no better example of how our ocean and coastal policies affect public safety, than to look at the effects of hurricanes. Throughout the 1920's, hurricanes killed 2,122 Americans while causing about \$1.8 billion in property damages. By contrast, in the first 5 years of the 1990's, hurricanes killed 111 Americans, and resulted in damages of about \$35 billion. While we have made notable advances in early warning and evacuation systems to protect human lives, the risk of property loss continues to escalate and coastal inhabitants are more vulnerable to major storms than they ever have been. In 1989, Hurricane Hugo came ashore in South Carolina, leaving more than \$6 billion in damages. Of that total from Hugo, the Federal Government paid out more than \$2.8 billion in disaster assistance and more than \$400 million from the National Flood Insurance Program. The payments from private insurance companies were equally staggering. In 1992, Hurricane Andrew struck southern Florida and slammed into low-lying areas of Louisiana, forever changing the lives of more than a quarter of a million people and causing an estimated \$25 to \$30 billion in damage. Hurricanes demonstrate that the human desire to live near the oceans and along the coast comes with both a responsibility and a cost.

The oceans are part of our culture, part of our heritage, part of our economy, and part of our future. Therefore, we need to be smart about ocean policy—we need the best minds to come together and take a look at what the real challenges are. It is not enough to sit back and assume the role of caretakers. We must be proactive and develop a plan for the future.

Mr. President, Members who doubt the need for this legislation need only pick up a newspaper and they will be

face to face with pressing ocean and coastal issues: fish covered with lesions in the Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina; a powerful El Nino brewing in the Pacific; condemnation of vacation homes as the beaches beneath them erode; U.S. ships held hostage over fishing disputes; and the list could go on. Deciding how to manage these problems and use the seas is one of the most complicated tasks we can tackle. There are no boundaries at sea, no national borders with fences and checkpoints. The resources of the sea are a common heritage, shared by all. While our coastal waters are governed by the United States for all of us, there are few rules on the high seas and progress relies primarily on international cooperation.

The United Nations has declared 1998 to be the Year of the Ocean. One reason for launching the International Year of the Ocean is to wake up the governments and the public so we pay adequate attention to the need to protect the marine environment and to ensure a healthy ocean. This is an unprecedented opportunity to celebrate and enhance what has been accomplished in understanding and managing the ocean.

The Stratton Commission stated in 1969: "How fully and wisely the United States uses the sea in the decades ahead will affect profoundly its security, its economy, its ability to meet increasing demands for food and raw materials, its position and influence in the world community, and the quality of the environment in which its people live." Those words are as true today as they were 30 years ago.

Mr. President, it is time to look toward the next 30 years. This bill offers us the vision and understanding needed to establish sound ocean and coastal policies for the 21st century. I thank the cosponsors of the legislation for joining with me in recognizing its significance and trust that this body will work quickly to enact it into law. 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. 1213

*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 "Ocean Act of 1997".

#### SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS; PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Covering more than two-thirds of the Earth's surface, the oceans and Great Lakes play a critical role in the global water cycle and in regulating climate, sustain a large part of Earth's biodiversity, provide an important source of food and a wealth of other natural products, act as a frontier to scientific exploration, are critical to national security, and provide a vital means of transportation. The coasts, transition between land and open ocean, are regions of remarkably high biological productivity, contribute

more than 30 percent of the Gross Domestic Product, and are of considerable importance for recreation, waste disposal, and mineral exploration.

(2) Ocean and coastal resources are susceptible to change as a direct and indirect result of human activities, and such changes can significantly impact the ability of the oceans and Great Lakes to provide the benefits upon which the Nation depends. Changes in ocean and coastal processes could affect global climate patterns, marine productivity and biodiversity, environmental quality, national security, economic competitiveness, availability of energy, vulnerability to natural hazards, and transportation safety and efficiency.

(3) Ocean and coastal resources are not infinite, and human pressure on them is increasing. One half of the Nation's population lives within 50 miles of the coast, ocean and coastal resources once considered inexhaustible are now threatened with depletion, and if population trends continue as expected, pressure on and conflicting demands for ocean and coastal resources will increase further as will vulnerability to coastal hazards.

(4) Marine technologies hold tremendous promise for expanding the range and increasing the utility of products from the oceans and Great Lakes, improving the stewardship of ocean and coastal resources, and contributing to business and manufacturing innovations and the creation of new jobs.

(5) Marine research has uncovered the link between oceanic and atmospheric processes and improved understanding of world climate patterns and forecasts. Important new advances, including availability of military technology, have made feasible the exploration of large areas of the ocean which were inaccessible several years ago. In designating 1998 as "The Year of the Ocean", the United Nations highlights the value of increasing our knowledge of the oceans.

(6) It has been 30 years since the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources (known as the Stratton Commission) conducted a comprehensive examination of ocean and coastal activities that led to enactment of major legislation and the establishment of key oceanic and atmospheric institutions.

(7) A review of existing activities is essential to respond to the changes that have occurred over the past three decades and to develop an effective new policy for the twenty-first century to conserve and use sustainable ocean and coastal resources, protect the marine environment, explore ocean frontiers, protect human safety, and create marine technologies and economic opportunities.

(8) While significant Federal ocean and coastal programs are underway, those programs would benefit from a coherent national ocean and coastal policy that reflects the need for cost-effective allocation of fiscal resources, improved interagency coordination, and strengthened partnerships with State, private, and international entities engaged in ocean and coastal activities.

(b) PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.—The purpose of this Act is to develop and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national policy with respect to ocean and coastal activities that will assist the Nation in meeting the following objectives:

(1) The protection of life and property against natural and manmade hazards.

(2) Responsible stewardship, including use, of fishery resources and other ocean and coastal resources.

(3) The protection of the marine environment and prevention of marine pollution.

(4) The enhancement of marine-related commerce, transportation, and national security, and the resolution of conflicts among users of the marine environment.

(5) The expansion of human knowledge of the marine environment including the role of the oceans in climate and global environmental change and the advancement of education and training in fields related to ocean and coastal activities.

(6) The continued investment in and development and improvement of the capabilities, performance, use, and efficiency of technologies for use in ocean and coastal activities.

(7) Close cooperation among all government agencies and departments to ensure—

(A) coherent regulation of ocean and coastal activities;

(B) availability and appropriate allocation of Federal funding, personnel, facilities, and equipment for such activities; and

(C) cost-effective and efficient operation of Federal departments, agencies, and programs involved in ocean and coastal activities.

(8) The preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in ocean and coastal activities, and, when it is in the national interest, the cooperation by the United States with other nations and international organizations in ocean and coastal activities.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Commission on Ocean Policy.

(2) The term "Council" means the National Ocean Council.

(3) The term "marine research" means scientific exploration, including basic science, engineering, mapping, surveying, monitoring, assessment, and information management, of the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes—

(A) to describe and advance understanding of—

(i) the role of the oceans, coasts and Great Lakes in weather and climate, natural hazards, and the processes that regulate the marine environment; and

(ii) the manner in which such role, processes, and environment are affected by human actions;

(B) for the conservation, management and sustainable use of living and nonliving resources; and

(C) to develop and implement new technologies related to sustainable use of the marine environment.

(4) The term "marine environment" includes—

(A) the oceans, including coastal and offshore waters and the adjacent shore lands;

(B) the continental shelf;

(C) the Great Lakes; and

(D) the ocean and coastal resources thereof.

(5) The term "ocean and coastal activities" includes activities related to marine research, fisheries and other ocean and coastal resource stewardship and use, marine aquaculture, energy and mineral resource extraction, national security, marine transportation, recreation and tourism, waste management, pollution mitigation and prevention, and natural hazard reduction.

(6) The term "ocean and coastal resource" means, with respect to the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes, any living or non-living natural resource (including all forms of animal and plant life found in the marine environment, habitat, biodiversity, water quality, minerals, oil, and gas) and any significant historic, cultural or aesthetic resource.

#### SEC. 4. NATIONAL OCEAN AND COASTAL POLICY.

(a) EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES.—The President, with the assistance of the Council and the advice of the Commission, shall—

(1) develop and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national policy with respect to ocean and coastal activities; and

(2) with regard to Federal agencies and departments—

(A) review significant ocean and coastal activities, including plans, priorities, accomplishments, and infrastructure requirements;

(B) plan and implement an integrated and cost-effective program of ocean and coastal activities including, but not limited to, marine research, stewardship of ocean and coastal resources, protection of the marine environment, maritime transportation safety and efficiency, the marine aspects of national security, marine recreation and tourism, and marine aspects of weather, climate, and natural hazards;

(C) designate responsibility for funding and conducting ocean and coastal activities; and

(D) ensure cooperation and resolve differences arising from laws and regulations applicable to ocean and coastal activities which result in conflicts among participants in such activities.

(b) COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION.—In carrying out responsibilities under this Act, the President and the Council may use such staff, interagency, and advisory arrangements as they find necessary and appropriate and shall consult with non-Federal organizations and individuals involved in ocean and coastal activities.

#### SEC. 5. NATIONAL OCEAN COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish a National Ocean Council which shall consist of—

(1) the Secretary of Commerce, who shall be Chairman of the Council;

(2) the Secretary of the Navy;

(3) the Secretary of State;

(4) the Secretary of Transportation;

(5) the Secretary of the Interior;

(6) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(7) the Director of the National Science Foundation;

(8) the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy;

(9) the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality;

(10) the Chairman of the National Economic Council;

(11) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(12) such other Federal officers and officials as the President considers appropriate.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) The President or the Chairman of the Council may from time to time designate one of the members of the Council to preside over meetings of the Council during the absence or unavailability of such Chairman.

(2) Each member of the Council may designate an officer of his or her agency or department appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate to serve on the Council as an alternate in the event of the unavoidable absence of such member.

(3) An executive secretary shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Council, with the approval of the Council. The executive secretary shall be a permanent employee of one of the agencies or departments represented on the Council and shall remain in the employ of such agency or department.

(4) For the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Council, each Federal agency or department represented on the Council shall furnish necessary assistance to the Council. Such assistance may include—

(A) detailing employees to the Council to perform such functions, consistent with the purposes of this section, as the Chairman of the Council may assign to them; and

(B) undertaking, upon request of the Chairman of the Council, such special studies for the Council as are necessary to carry out its functions.

(5) The Chairman of the Council shall have the authority to make personnel decisions

regarding any employees detailed to the Council.

(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall—

(1) serve as the forum for developing an ocean and coastal policy and program, taking into consideration the Commission report, and for overseeing implementation of such policy and program;

(2) improve coordination and cooperation, and eliminate duplication, among Federal agencies and departments with respect to ocean and coastal activities;

(3) work with academic, State, industry, public interest, and other groups involved in ocean and coastal activities to provide for periodic review of the Nation's ocean and coastal policy;

(4) cooperate with the Secretary of State in—

(A) providing representation at international meetings and conferences on ocean and coastal activities in which the United States participates; and

(B) coordinating the Federal activities of the United States with programs of other nations; and

(5) report at least biennially on Federal ocean and coastal programs, priorities, and accomplishments and provide budgetary advice as specified in section 7.

#### SEC. 6. COMMISSION ON OCEAN POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) The President shall, within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, establish a Commission on Ocean Policy. The Commission shall be composed of 15 members including individuals drawn from Federal and State governments, industry, academic and technical institutions, and public interest organizations involved with ocean and coastal activities. Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission as follows:

(A) 7 shall be appointed by the President of the United States, no more than 3 of whom may be from the executive branch of the Government.

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate in consultation with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consultation with the Chairman of the House Committee on Resources and the Chairman of the House Committee on Science.

(E) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives in consultation with the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Resources and the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Science.

(2) CHAIRMAN.—The President shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from Among such 15 members.

(3) ADVISORY MEMBERS TO THE COMMISSION.—The President shall appoint 4 advisory members from among the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives as follows:

(A) Two Members, one from each party, selected from the Senate.

(B) Two Members, one from each party, selected from the House of Representatives.

(b) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress on a comprehensive national ocean and coastal policy to carry out the purpose and objectives of this Act. In developing the findings and recommendations of the report, the Commission shall—

(1) review and suggest any necessary modifications to United States laws, regulations,

and practices necessary to define and implement such policy;

(2) assess the condition and adequacy of investment in existing and planned facilities and equipment associated with ocean and coastal activities including human resources, vessels, computers, satellites, and other appropriate technologies and platforms;

(3) review existing and planned ocean and coastal activities of Federal agencies and departments, assess the contribution of such activities to development of an integrated long-range program for marine research, ocean and coastal resource management, and protection of the marine environment, and identify any such activities in need of reform to improve efficiency and effectiveness;

(4) examine and suggest mechanisms to address the interrelationships among ocean and coastal activities, the legal and regulatory framework in which they occur, and their inter-connected and cumulative effects on the marine environment, ocean and coastal resources, and marine productivity and biodiversity;

(5) review the known and anticipated demands for ocean and coastal resources, including an examination of opportunities and limitations with respect to the use of ocean and coastal resources within the exclusive economic zone, projected impacts in coastal areas, and the adequacy of existing efforts to manage such use and minimize user conflicts;

(6) evaluate relationships among Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector for planning and carrying out ocean and coastal activities and address the most appropriate division of responsibility for such activities;

(7) identify opportunities for the development of or investment in new products, technologies, or markets that could contribute to the objectives of this Act;

(8) consider the relationship of the ocean and coastal policy of the United States to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and other international agreements, and actions available to the United States to effect collaborations between the United States and other nations, including the development of cooperative international programs for marine research, protection of the marine environment, and ocean and coastal resource management; and

(9) engage in any other preparatory work deemed necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission pursuant to this Act.

(c) DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN.—In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Chairman of the Commission shall be responsible for—

(1) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among staff personnel and their continuing supervision; and

(2) the use and expenditures of funds available to the Commission.

(d) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government, or whose compensation is not precluded by a State, local, or Native American tribal government position, shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate payable for Level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(e) STAFF.—

(1) The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and

regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director who is knowledgeable in administrative management and ocean and coastal policy and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment and termination of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(2) The executive director shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate payable for Level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The Chairman may fix the compensation of other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for such personnel may not exceed the rate payable for GS-15, step 7, of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

(3) Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal Agency shall detail appropriate personnel of the agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions under this Act. Federal Government employees detailed to the Commission shall serve without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(4) The Commission may accept and use the services of volunteers serving without compensation, and to reimburse volunteers for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code. Except for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, a volunteer under this section may not be considered to be an employee of the United States for any purpose.

(5) The Commission is authorized to procure the temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate payable for GS-15, step 7, of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public, except when the Chairman of the Commission or a majority of the members of the Commission determine that the meeting or any portion of it may be closed to the public. Interested persons shall be permitted to appear at open meetings and present oral or written statements on the subject matter of the meeting. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to any person appearing before it.

(2) All open meetings of the Commission shall be preceded by timely public notice in the Federal Register of the time, place, and subject to the meeting.

(3) Minutes of each meeting shall be kept and shall contain a record of the people present, a description of the discussion that occurred, and copies of all statements filed. Subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the minutes and records of all meetings and other documents that were made available to or prepared for the Commission shall be available for public inspection and copying at a single location in the offices of the Commission.

(4) The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to the Commission.

(g) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—

(1) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any Federal agency or depart-

ment any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. Each such agency or department is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission, upon the request of the Chairman of the Commission.

(2) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(3) The General Services Administration shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis the administrative support services that the Commission may request.

(4) The Commission may enter into contracts with Federal and State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties. The Commission may purchase and contract without regard to section 303 of the Federal Property and Administration Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253), section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416), and section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637), pertaining to competition and publication requirements, and may arrange for printing without regard to the provisions of title 44, United States Code. The contracting authority of the Commission under this Act is effective only to the extent that appropriations are available for contracting purposes.

(h) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit to the President, via the Council, and to the Congress not later than 18 months after the establishment of the Commission, a final report of its findings and recommendations. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after it has submitted its final report.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to support the activities of the Commission a total of \$6,000,000 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. Any sums appropriated shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

SEC. 7. REPORT AND BUDGET COORDINATION.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning in January, 1999, the President, through the Council, shall transmit to the Congress biennially a report, which shall include—

(1) a comprehensive description of the ocean and coastal activities and related accomplishments of all agencies and departments of the United States during the preceding two fiscal years; and

(2) an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of the purpose and objectives of this Act. Reports made under this section shall contain such recommendations for legislation as the President may consider necessary or desirable.

(b) BUDGET COORDINATION.—

(1) Each year the Council shall provide general guidance to each Federal agency or department involved in ocean or coastal activities with respect to the preparation of requests for appropriations.

(2) Working in conjunction with the Council, each agency or department involved in such activities shall include with its annual request for appropriations a report which—

(A) identifies significant elements of the proposed agency or department budget relating to ocean and coastal activities; and

(B) specifies how each such element contributes to the implementation of a national ocean and coastal policy.

(3) Each agency or department that submits a report under paragraph (1) shall submit such report simultaneously to the Council.

(4) The President shall, in a timely fashion, provide the Council with an opportunity to review and comment on the budget estimate of each such agency or department.

(5) The President shall identify in each annual budget submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, those elements of agency or department budget that contribute to the implementation of a national ocean and coastal policy.

SEC. 8. REPEAL OF 1966 STATUTE.

The Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is repealed.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of Senator HOLLINGS' bill to require a wholesale review of the Nation's oceans and coastal policies to prepare for the 21st century. We have not done this since the 1960's, and the time has come.

The bill has three important components: First, it calls for the development of a coherent national ocean and coastal policy; second, it establishes a 15-member commission similar to the Stratton Commission to make recommendations within 18 months on this national ocean and coastal policy; and third, it creates an interagency council of all the Federal agencies involved in oceans and coastal matters, chaired by the Secretary of Commerce, to coordinate the implementation of the national policy.

I applaud Senator HOLLINGS for developing this legislation. As has been pointed out, over half of the U.S. population lives within 50 miles of our shores. In my State, the oceans employ more people in the private sector than any other industry. The demands on our oceans and coastal resources continues to grow, and we must be prepared to meet these demands in the 21st century.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today to support the efforts of my esteemed colleagues, particularly the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and to cosponsor the Oceans Act of 1997. I have great respect for Senators HOLLINGS and STEVENS and their stewardship of our ocean and coastal resources.

Since the day I first arrived in the Senate nearly 12 years ago, I have worked hard to address the many challenges confronting our common ocean and coastal resources. I have led this effort principally through my participation and leadership on the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and particularly as ranking member on the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee and as cochair of its predecessor, the national ocean policy study [NOPS].

Over the last 25 years, Congress has worked to develop innovative policy solutions to enable the long-term protection, conservation, utilization, and management of our vulnerable marine resources. We have acted to ensure strong coastal economies in Massachusetts and a clean, healthy coastal environment from the Gulf of Maine to the Gulf of Alaska.

In that vein therefore, I believe that it is time for us, like the Stratton Commission did over 30 years ago, to

take an inventory of where our Nation has been and where we are going regarding the great responsibility of stewardship of our coastal resources. The Oceans Act of 1997 will provide the framework for that effort.

The bill contains three major provisions. First, it calls for development of a national ocean and coastal policy to provide for protection from natural hazards, stewardship of fisheries and coastal resources, protection of the marine environment, enhanced marine transportation and security, continued investment in marine technologies, ocean monitoring and exploration, Government cooperation and coordination, and continued U.S. international leadership. Second, it establishes a Commission on Ocean Policy to complete an 18-month examination and evaluation of ocean and coastal activities and provide recommendations for national policy. Third, it creates an interagency National Ocean Council, headed by the Secretary of Commerce to advise the President and serve as a forum for developing and implementing ocean and coastal policy programs, designate funding responsibilities, provide coordination of Federal budgets, and work with non-Federal organizations to periodically review the Nation's ocean and coastal policy.

The time for this legislation is now, the world population will double to over 10 billion by the middle of the next century. Today over 50 percent of world population resides in coastal areas. The United States and its insular areas have more than 95,000 miles of coastline and the offshore U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone [EEZ] encompasses more than 3.4 million square miles, nearly equal to the land area of the United States.

Over the last 30 years the coastal area populations have increased from 80 to over 110 million and is projected to reach 127 million by 2010. If these trends continue, much heavier demands will be placed on ocean and coastal resources, that is, need for food from the sea for world protein requirements and energy and mineral production from offshore deposits. Ocean threats from this vast expansion include; sewage, chemical, and garbage disposal, runoff from agricultural and forested lands, exploitation of fisheries resources, development of energy and mineral resources, and coastal infrastructure development. Moreover, recent years have yielded a degradation of coastal water quality, loss of wetlands, closure of beach and recreational areas, pollution of fishery and shellfish management resources that diminish the resource base, contaminate seafood, and endanger human health. In fact over 70 percent of U.S. commercial and recreational fish and shellfish depend on estuaries at some point in their life cycle.

Toxic chemicals and sewage dumped have contaminated the Nation's harbors and waterways. More than 20,000 combined sewer overflows [CSO's], sew-

ers that combine storm water and sanitary flows empty directly into rivers and coastal waters. In 1992 heavy rains and flooding caused severe CSO overflows in Los Angeles which forced the temporary closing of over 70 miles of adjacent coastal areas. Coastal area real estate development has accelerated to the point that over 50 percent of annual U.S. residential construction during the past two decades has occurred in coastal areas. This trend is expected to continue and is expected to stress coastal ecosystems even further mostly in California and Florida, two of the Nation's most productive coastal areas. This also increases risk to life and property due to hurricanes and other major storms. For example the price tag for Hurricane Andrew, one of the largest storms in history, was estimated to be \$25 to \$30 billion. Further sea level rise from global warming will exacerbate this already growing problem.

Further, as the world population grows, we will become more and more dependent on food from the sea. Since 1977 total fish harvest from the EEZ increased more than 325 percent to a peak of 6.65 billion pounds annually in 1986-88, but has subsequently declined—only 6.32 in 1993. Alaska pollock and Gulf of Mexico shrimp were the leading fisheries in 1993. Imported seafood comprised 57 percent of U.S. consumption during 1996, a 3 percent increase from 1995.

Many problems exist however in the way we manage the world's fisheries. A Time magazine article of August 11, 1997, on the world overfishing problem, stated that "fish of all kinds are being hauled from the sea faster than they can reproduce." We addressed many of those concerns with the passage of "Sustainable Fisheries Act" last year. With a focus on overfishing, we established National goals to rebuild most currently overfished stocks in 10 years, provided for the protection of fish habitats and Pacific Insular Areas, established a by-catch reduction program, and encouraged the development of underutilized species.

However, more can be done, particularly on an international level. Fish stocks migrate across jurisdictions. Nations approach fisheries conservation and manage differently. Development of conservation objectives of nations harvesting common fish stocks often clash, and overcapitalized fleets are over-harvesting the available resources in many areas.

Again, much work remains and we must be vigilant in our duty to preserve and protect the oceans and coastal resources as we start the next century.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS, in the introduction of the Oceans Act of 1997. This bill will establish a commission like the Stratton Commission of 1966 to review the many ocean and coastal issues facing the

United States, and to develop a comprehensive, coordinated, national ocean and coastal policy.

Prior to introduction, I raised a few concerns with Senator HOLLINGS on some provisions of the draft bill. Basically, I had recommended some language that made it clear that as we develop a new ocean and coastal policy for the Nation, we keep in mind the facts that our fiscal resources are limited, and that our Federal investments in ocean and coastal resources must be spent efficiently and wisely. I also raised some concerns about the fact that the original draft had the President appointing all of the members of this important commission.

Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS has graciously agreed to make some changes to the bill pursuant to my recommendations. For instance, the bill now authorizes the Congress to appoint more than half of the commission members, and the commission is directed to identify opportunities to reform Federal ocean programs to improve efficiency and effectiveness. I commend Senator HOLLINGS for his willingness to work with me and other Republican Senators before introduction of the bill. After introduction, I look forward to working with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, a Senator who worked on the original Stratton Commission bill 30 years ago and who is a true champion of ocean protection, in the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee on any further refinements along these lines that might be constructive.

Again, I thank Senator HOLLINGS and commend him upon introduction of this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to join as a sponsor of the Oceans Act of 1997. Our goal in this legislation is to deal more effectively with one of the most important aspects of our overall policy for the environment—our efforts to preserve and protect our management ocean and coastal resources.

I commend Senator HOLLINGS for his leadership on this important legislation.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 1214. A bill to amend the Line-Item Veto Act of 1996 to eliminate the requirement that a Federal budget deficit must exist in order for the President to use the line-item veto authority; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that if one committee reports, the other committee have 30 days to report or be discharged.

LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN THE LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that will strengthen the recently enacted line-item veto.

Currently, the line-item veto can only be exercised by the President

when there is a deficit. This legislation would eliminate that restriction and provide for line-item veto authority whether there is a deficit or a surplus.

Mr. President, the purpose of the line-item veto should be to reduce wasteful Government programs, as well as reduce deficits.

Last year the Congress approved legislation that granted the President line-item veto authority beginning in 1997. The Congress did this out of principle. Members did not wait to see which candidate won the election before deciding whether to grant the new authority, and in August history was made when President Clinton became the first President to exercise the line-item veto.

While some Members of Congress may not agree with the specific provisions that the President selected to line-item veto, the important point is that any President should have this power as a check on narrow special interest spending and tax provisions. If Congress wishes to restore a vetoed provision it can do so with the requisite two-thirds vote.

I have long been a supporter of line-item veto authority for the President. In my view it will serve as a powerful check on Congress' ability to load up bills with wasteful provisions.

I think it is safe to say that the President's use of the line-item veto has created an environment in which narrow spending and tax provisions are going to be scrutinized much more carefully before they are loaded onto legislation.

I recognize that there have been court challenges concerning the constitutionality of the statutory line-item veto. I believe that this authority is constitutional and I certainly hope that the Supreme Court comes down on that side. However, this issue is important enough that we should amend the Constitution if necessary. That is why earlier this year I introduced a line-item veto constitutional amendment.

Today, however we should focus on the line-item veto that is before us and look for ways to improve that law. That is the purpose of this legislation.

In the last several years our economy has been very healthy and tax revenues have come in at much higher levels than previously forecast. This has created a situation where we may actually see a budget surplus at some point in the next several years. Does this mean we should rescind the line-item veto authority we have given the President? Of course not, but that would be the result as the law was drafted in 1996.

My view is that the line-item veto should be used in both deficit and surplus times. While we may have some surplus years on the horizon, it is clear that without entitlement reform massive deficits will return just after the turn of the century. This means that we must be constantly working to eliminate wasteful Government programs. A line-item veto is one way to help do that.

Mr. President, I cast my vote for a permanent line-item veto. The President and Congress cannot afford to take a vacation from the battle against wasteful Government programs.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 1215. A bill to prohibit spending Federal education funds on national testing; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### NATIONAL TESTING LEGISLATION

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to prohibit the Federal Government from developing and/or imposing new national individualized tests on students across the country.

During his State of the Union Address this year, President Clinton announced his intentions to establish national tests for students in fourth grade reading and eighth grade mathematics. Without waiting for congressional authority, the Department of Education surged ahead and began development of uniform national tests, with plans to administer them starting in 1999. In August, the Department announced the award of a \$13 million contract for its national testing initiative, and plans to spend an estimated \$50.6 million under the contract from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2001, including \$12.3 million for fiscal year 1998.

In response, Representative BILL GOODLING, chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, offered an amendment in the House which prohibits the expenditure of fiscal year 1998 funds for a new national testing program. While the Senate failed to consider fully and vote on the Goodling approach during its debate of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, the House embraced the Goodling amendment, approving it by a resounding vote of 295 to 125.

The House vote sends a clear and strong signal that Congress should prohibit Federal funds for national testing in education. In fact, the alliance of members from both sides of the political spectrum demonstrates the universal concern that the administration's proposal is besieged by problems. Here are just a few of the many reasons why national tests should be opposed:

First, education experts such as Dr. Donald J. Senese, former Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement during the Reagan administration, warn that national testing will lead to a national curriculum.

Second, Lynne Cheney, former chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities, reminds us that Federal efforts to set standards and tests have been disastrous. She points to the politically correct Federal history standards and the English-language arts standards, which were such an ill-considered muddle that even the Clinton Department of Education cut off funding for them after having spent more than \$1 million in taxpayer funds.

Third, the proposed math test is steeped in the new, unproven whole math or fuzzy math philosophy, which encourages students to rely on calculators, discourages basic math skills, and has resulted in declines in math performance. For example, the median percentile computation scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills taken by more than 37,000 DODDS students one year after the Defense Department introduced whole math dropped 9 points for third graders, 12 for fourth graders, 11 for fifth graders, 10 for sixth graders, 10 for seventh graders, and 4 for eighth graders.

Finally, Federal testing takes away local control and parental involvement. The Federal Government should not impose its will on school boards, parents, and teachers about the education of their children. Rather, education should be controlled by school boards in local communities, where parents have the greatest opportunity to be involved in the education of their child, by participating in the development of school curriculum and testing. After all, research confirms that parental involvement is the single most important element in educating our children.

Mr. President, the big losers from national tests will be students, parents, teachers, and local school boards. Once Federal exams are in place, teachers and schools will teach the test. In other words, they will change their classes to fit the Federal tests, in order to get higher scores. Textbooks and instructional materials will follow suit, even in areas that attempt to avoid national tests. As a result, Washington bureaucrats who design the tests will shape local curriculum decisions. National control of curriculum is absolutely unacceptable to me. Once the Federal Government is using tests to shape curriculum, parental control through local school boards will be doomed.

Who should control local education? I believe our schools should remain under the control of parents, teachers, and school boards, in cooperation with the States. The flawed whole math approach which brought major losses in computation test scores demonstrates the central threat in national control: When the bureaucrats make a mistake, everybody pays, from coast to coast.

Parents are looking to Congress to protect their right and their ability to shape the education of their children. A national testing system would deprive parents of this vital opportunity. As Members of Congress, we can show our support for education by saying "no" to national testing and "yes" to parental control of their children's learning.

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. 1215

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

**SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON NATIONAL TESTING.**

Part C of the General Education Provision Act (20 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"SEC. 447. PROHIBITION ON NATIONAL TESTING.**

"(a) GENERAL PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, funds provided to the Department or for an applicable program may not be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) The National Assessment of Educational Progress carried out under section 411 of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 9010).

"(2) The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)."

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of Olga Gorgiladze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**PRIVATE RELIEF LEGISLATION**

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today that will grant permanent residency in the United States to Olga Gorgiladze.

I serve as the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that has jurisdiction and oversight over both the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Executive Office for Immigration Review. I can tell you that with respect to Mrs. Gorgiladze's case—they have missed the mark. They have done this woman an injustice. It is a wrong that this Senate and this Congress should make right.

Olga Gorgiladze's case is a special situation that involves the turmoil and changes that came with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union. In September 1991, Mrs. Gorgiladze came to the United States to stay with her lifelong friend, Marilyn Hodgson. Three months later the Soviet Union was dissolved and civil and ethnic war broke out in Georgia, the Soviet Republic where Mrs. Gorgiladze's husband was from. She applied for asylum in this country in March 1992. INS and the Executive Office of Immigration Review finally got to her case in late 1995 and turned down her request. They instructed Mrs. Gorgiladze to obtain Georgian citizenship and to leave for that country. The irony, of course, is that Olga Gorgiladze is not now and never has been a Georgian citizen. In fact, quite the contrary she fears for her safety should she be forced to go to that nation. She loves the United States. She loves our democratic society that protects freedom of speech and religion. Most importantly, she feels safe in a nation that has racial and ethnic diversity. The reality is that Olga Gorgiladze wants to become an American, not a Georgian citizen.

Olga Gorgiladze is not even ethnically Georgian. She is half Chinese and half Russian. She was born in

China in 1940 to a Russian father and a Chinese mother. Her father was a naval officer in the Tsarist navy and fought against the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution. Her mother met Mrs. Gorgiladze's father in Shanghai where he had fled after the war. Olga grew up in China, speaking Chinese. But, once again in 1954, her family had to flee another violent Communist takeover—and her father moved the family back to the Soviet Union. They were sent to work on the undeveloped desert lands of Kazakhstan. In 1959, after her father died of cancer she was given permission by the Soviet authorities to move to Sukhami, Georgia, near the Russian border.

In 1971, Olga graduated from the Teachers College of Foreign Languages where she majored in English. However, she was denied a teaching position because preference was given to Georgians. She finally got a job as a part-time teacher at the college from which she graduated, but was later fired when all classes for Russian speaking groups were terminated. Despite her advanced education—equivalent to a masters degree in this country—she has continually been forced to take low-paying clerk positions because of discrimination against her as a non-Georgian. Other discriminations displayed against her included housing which is controlled by the state and purchasing of food and supplies.

Since 1991, the Caucasus nations have been plagued by ethnic strife and warfare. We have all watched the violence and bloodshed in the Abkhazia region of Georgia, between Armenia and Azerbaijan in Nagorno-Karabakh, and the war in Chechnya. Less well televised is the hostility and persecution of outsiders and ethnic minorities. In Georgia, there is hostility to anything or anyone affiliated with Russia. As a woman who looks Chinese, speaks only Russian and English, Olga Gorgiladze has been subject to countless incidents of verbal, physical, and mental abuse. Mrs. Gorgiladze does not and cannot blend into the Georgian population. She has been beaten, spit on, verbally and physically abused. Her safety and livelihood have always felt threatened every minute of every day while living in Georgia. For example, while riding the bus, Mrs. Gorgiladze has been beaten and threatened with knives, chains, and various other weapons.

Her husband of 25 years, Malkhaz Gorgiladze, stayed in Georgia and warned Olga of the dangers posed to her if she returned to that country. He encouraged her to seek asylum in the United States and collected evidence for her hearing. He especially worked to document police inactivity and the Georgian officials' complicity in attacks on non-Georgians by violent nationalist groups. The police warned him to stop his efforts. Malkhaz Gorgiladze began to receive anonymous phone calls and threats and warnings to stop criticizing the police. In 1996, while returning home from a New

Year's Eve gathering, his car was rammed by a Georgian police car and Olga's husband was killed.

When asked by the immigration judges at Justice, our State Department reported that Georgia is in a state of cease-fire and everybody is getting along with each other. Further, the Justice Department conjectured that if the Georgian police wanted Olga's husband killed, they would have used means other than an auto accident involving a police car. The INS and immigration judges down there at the Justice Department have used this information and conclusions to deny Mrs. Gorgiladze's request for asylum. Yet, there were numerous letters and affidavits by witnesses regarding Malkhaz Gorgiladze's murder. And, in Georgia, the ultranationalists blame non-Georgians, and in particular blame Russians, for all their misfortunes and lack of economic development. Friends and relatives of Olga Gorgiladze have warned her that she should not return. They tell her that she will never be able to get a job and always will be an outcast. They say she will be considered a traitor. And, Malkhaz will not be there to try and defend her as in the past. In short, they fear for her safety, as do I.

Mrs. Gorgiladze's case is truly heart-wrenching. And, here is a woman I might add—that has worked for the last 5 years at MCI Customer Service Representative International Department and turned around and paid her taxes to the State of Virginia and the U.S. Government. In my view, she has been an outstanding resident in our Nation who serves as an example of the American dream. She has never broken any law and has never been on welfare or asked the Government for handouts. She has followed the immigration rules every step of the way. She is what America is all about. What astonishes me is why the Justice Department would want to deport this 57-year-old woman.

Mr. President, I have served in the U.S. Senate over 30 years. Every now and then we get an opportunity to stand up for someone who the Federal bureaucracy has mistreated. This is one of those times. Olga Gorgiladze's situation has touched me. Since her friend brought the case to my attention, I can't stop thinking about how unfair it seems. I've sat in Senate hearing after hearing on the Immigration and Naturalization Service asking why action is not taken to deport illegal aliens who got into this country through deception. I have listened to this administration try to explain how in 1996 they naturalized thousands of aliens with criminal backgrounds. And, I find it astonishing, these very same Justice immigration judges have ruled in separate cases that homosexuality per se does constitute a legitimate claim for asylum. But, in this case we have a woman who came to the United States legally, who is not and never has been a citizen of Georgia, who had her husband killed by

Georgian authorities, who legitimately fears for her safety if sent there, who has complied with all the United States immigration laws, and who has paid her own way and has not been a burden to taxpayers in this country—and this is who the Justice Department wants to deny asylum and deport? Maybe I should forgo this bill and simply tell Olga to pretend that she is homosexual. This is injustice. This is just simply wrong.

Mr. President, I am introducing this bill today because the system is not working. I believe that Olga Gorgiladze has legitimate reasons to fear being deported to Georgia. She is not Georgian and does not belong in that country. It is ludicrous for the United States Government to be ordering her to apply for Georgian citizenship. What she has demonstrated is that she does belong in this country. In her case the system has failed and I think it is incumbent upon the United States Senate to put things right. I am pleased to sponsor this bill. I intend to work with the Judiciary Committee, with Senators ABRAHAM, KENNEDY, HATCH, and LEAHY, to ensure that Mrs. Olga Gorgiladze is permitted to remain in the United States.

By Mr. KERREY.

S. 1218. A bill to assure the integrity of information, transportation, and telecommunications upon the arrival of the year 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### THE MILLENNIUM ACT

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, one of the challenges of the 21st century is already upon us. It is commonly known as the year 2000 computer problem or the millennium bug. At issue is a programming technique that could lead to the malfunction of computer systems worldwide on January 1, 2000. It is essential that government, business, and personal computer users take adequate steps to fix this problem in advance of December 31, 1999, to ensure that cyberspace enters the next millennium without a hitch.

During the early years of computing, computer storage space was incredibly expensive. Storage space that costs only 10 cents per megabyte today, cost \$36 per megabyte in 1972. In an effort to reduce storage costs, computer programmers commonly programmed date information using only two digits to indicate the year. For example, 1999 would be programmed as 99. This clever space saving trick saved computer users millions of dollars and became industry practice because programmers believed that by the time the year 2000 arrived any code they were working on would be obsolete and out of service. Unfortunately, the conventional wisdom was wrong and many computer systems still use these programs. Computers and computer software programmed in this fashion may misinterpret the year 2000 as 1900. This electronic confusion could lead to serious

malfunction or collapse of computers and computer networks around the world.

Date information plays a significant role in almost all computer applications developed over the last 30 years. The year 2000 problem has many practical implications from the relatively benign to the very serious. Credit cards may be read as invalid, traffic lights may not operate, 99 years of bank records could be destroyed or the Nation's air traffic control systems could fail. The list of possible failures is nearly endless and can be found in systems used by the government, the business community, and personal computer users worldwide. Personal computers are less susceptible to the problem and in most cases can be quickly fixed. However, business and government leaders should be working night and day to ensure that the computer systems the country depends on are reprogrammed to correctly recognize the date in time for the arrival of New Year's Day 2000.

The time and financial commitment necessary to replace the problematic date code is stunning. The Gartner Group estimates that costs could exceed \$600 billion. Newsweek magazine points out that this sum is enough to fund a year's worth of education costs, preschool through graduate school. Correcting the problem is technically simple, however in order to find the date information the entire program must be manually scanned line for line. Often, the programs are written in the outdated COBAL programming language and finding programmers skilled in older languages to solve the problem is very difficult because the demand for their services is sky rocketing. After a competent technician is hired and they have analyzed the code and made the necessary changes, the programs must go through a time consuming testing phase. In sum, it is a very complex task and it is quickly becoming too late to begin the reprogramming process.

Many companies and government offices have already taken steps to avert this problem and are well on their way to making their systems year 2000 compliant. Unfortunately, many others have not addressed the problem and the time needed to analyze, modify, and test the code used by these entities is quickly slipping away. I am very concerned that further delays will leave the government and many private companies unprepared to carry out normal transactions in the early days of the next century. In order to address this problem, I have joined Senator MOYNIHAN as a cosponsor of S. 22. S. 22 would create a commission that would be required to report to the President, by July 3, 1997, with proposals for new procedures or regulations to address the year 2000 computer problem for systems of Federal, State, and local governments and would make recommendations for funding levels that might be needed to address this problem.

In addition I am introducing a bill today that would instruct the Federal Communications Commission to initiate a proceeding to determine the integrity of the telecommunications networks as the year 2000 arrives. It also requires the National Institute of Standards and Technology to review the risks to personal computers and requires the Department of Transportation to assure that transportation safety is not compromised.

Inconvenience can be tolerated, but every effort must be taken to assure that the health and safety of humans and the security and integrity of networks and data are not compromised by what we know to be a significant weakness in our computer networks and software.

In conclusion, I am also very concerned by reports that small and midsize businesses are experiencing difficulty in determining if their computer systems are year 2000 compliant because some third-party systems vendors are not forthcoming with information about their products. An already difficult task is further complicated by uncooperative third party vendors who fail to help these companies understand how the year 2000 problem could affect their businesses. These companies have a responsibility to provide their customers with the information they need to make their systems year 2000 compliant.

There is still time to act and prevent dangerous disruptions in computer, transportation and computer networks and the loss of valuable data. If the private and public sector does that, then Americans can party, and not panic when the clock strikes midnight on New Year's eve 1999. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1218

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be referred to as the "Millennium Act."

#### SEC. 101. TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS.

(a) The Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a proceeding to evaluate the potential dangers to the nation's telecommunications networks from to software and systems which are unable to effectively toll the passage of time from December 31, 1999 to January 1, 2000.

(b) The Commission shall make necessary and appropriate regulatory changes within their jurisdiction to ensure the integrity of the nation's telecommunications networks.

#### SEC. 102. PERSONAL COMPUTERS.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology shall evaluate the potential risks to information stored on personal computers from to software and systems which are unable to effectively toll the passage of time from December 31, 1999 to January 1, 2000 and shall take necessary and appropriate actions within its jurisdiction to propose solutions and inform the public.

#### SEC. 103. TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS.

The Secretary of Transportation shall initiate a comprehensive plan to assure that

computer hardware and software in transportation systems which are unable to effectively toll the passage of time from December 31, 1999 to January 1, 2000 do not create a safety risk to transportation workers and the general public. Should a risk to safety be identified, the Department shall take necessary and appropriate measures to assure safety and inform the public of such risks.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 22, a bill to establish a bipartisan national commission to address the year 2000 computer problem.

S. 67

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 67, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of research on breast cancer.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to improve the criminal law relating to fraud against consumers.

S. 830

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 830, a bill 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.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 850, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to make it unlawful for any stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer to transfer or market nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, non-repairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 941

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 941, a bill to promote the utilization of marine ferry and high-speed marine ferry services.

S. 1069

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] were added as cosponsors of S. 1069, a bill entitled the "National Discovery Trails Act of 1997".

S. 1100

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1100, a bill to amend the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, the legislation approving such covenant, and for other purposes.

S. 1105

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1105, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a sound budgetary mechanism for financing health and death benefits of retired coal miners while ensuring the long-term fiscal health and solvency of such benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to provide for the establishment of demonstration projects designed to determine the social, civic, psychological, and economic effects of providing to individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, and to determine the extent to which an asset based policy may be used to enable individuals and families with limited means to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

S. 1115

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1115, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve one-call notification process, and for other purposes.

S. 1180

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] were added as cosponsors of S. 1180, a bill to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act.

S. 1194

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1194, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify the right of Medicare beneficiaries to enter into private contracts with physicians and other health care professionals for the provision of health services for which no payment is sought under the Medicare program.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 51

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regard-

ing elections for the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 96

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 96, a resolution proclaiming the week of March 15 through March 21, 1998, as "National Safe Place Week."

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 123—HONORING THE MEMORY OF FORMER PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR LORET MILLER RUPPE

Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 123

Whereas the Members of the Senate were greatly saddened by the death of Loret Miller Ruppe, the longest-serving Director of the Peace Corps; and

Whereas Loret Miller Ruppe's inspirational vision, dedication, and leadership (1) revitalized the Peace Corps as she began or revived programs in Sri Lanka, Haiti, Burundi, Guinea-Bissau, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, and the Cape Verde Islands; (2) energized a new generation of Americans to accept the challenge of serving in the Corps; (3) refocused the Corps on its mission of development to achieve world peace; and (4) did a great service to America and to the millions of the world's citizens touched by her efforts: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That (a) the Senate recognizes and acknowledges the achievements and contributions of the longest-serving Director of the Peace Corps, Loret Miller Ruppe, and the volunteers she inspired, not only for their service in other countries but also in their own communities.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the President should honor the memory of the Peace Corps' great leader Loret Miller Ruppe and reaffirm the commitment of the United States to international peace and understanding.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 124—RELATIVE TO AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. GRAMS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 124

Whereas, the Khmer Rouge recently staged a show trial of Pol Pot, the reputed leader of the Khmer Rouge during the Cambodian genocide;

Whereas, the Khmer Rouge have been promoting their National Solidarity Party and proclaiming their support for "liberal democracy" as a means to legitimate their role in Cambodian politics;

Whereas, while the Khmer Rouge have been weakened since the Paris Peace Accords of 1991, they remain a key source of violence in Cambodia;