and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special rule for long existing home health agencies with partial fiscal year 1994 cost reports in calculating the per beneficiary limits under the interim payment system for such agencies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1064. A bill to provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1065. A bill to authorize negotiation for the accession of Chile to the North American Free Trade Agreement, to provide for Fast Track Consideration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1066. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 1067. A bill to promote the adoption of children with special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1068. A bill to provide for health, education, and welfare of children under 6 years of age; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1069. A bill to provide economic security and safety for battered women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. KYL, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. 1070. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to wait for completion of a National Academy of Sciences study before promulgating a standard, regulation or guideline on ergonomics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1071. A bill to designate the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory as the Center of Excellence for Environmental Stewardship of the Department of Energy Land, and establish the Natural Resources Institute within the Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1072. A bill to make certain technical and other corrections relating to the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143 note; 112 Stat. 3486 et seq.); to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 1073. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to ensure that United States industry is consulted with respect to all aspects of the WTO dispute settlement process; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KYL, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. Res. 103. A resolution concerning the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special rule for long existing home health agencies with partial fiscal year 1994 cost reports in calculating the per beneficiary limits under the interim payment system for such agencies; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE HOME HEALTH TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS LEGISLATION

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would make a technical correction to a provision of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that is causing great unfairness to long-established home health agencies and their patients. It would provide for a special rule for long-existing home health agencies that have been classified as ''new'' home health agencies for purposes of the Interim Payment System (IPS) simply because they happened to change the ending date of their fiscal year, and, as a consequence, do not have a full 12-month cost reporting period in federal fiscal year 1994.

Under the complicated formula for the Medicare Interim Payment System for home health agencies, Medicare determines a limit for most established agencies using a formula that recognizes the agency's historical costs and blends them, in a proportion of 75 percent to 25 percent, with regional norms. For new home health agencies without a historic record of cost reports, the per-beneficiary limit is set at the national median.

In defining the difference between new and existing agencies, the Administration focused on fiscal year 1994 and established a general rule that the national median per-beneficiary limit would apply to ''new providers and providers without a 12-month reporting period ending in fiscal year 1994.'' Congress did, however, specifically exclude from the ''new'' category any home health agency that had changed its name or corporate structure.

Nevertheless, one of the home health agencies in my State —Hancock County HomeCare—has been classified as a ''new'' home health agency, even though it has been serving the people of rural Down East Maine for more than 60 years. I am sure that there are other long-standing home health agencies across the country that have found themselves in a similar situation as a consequence of this provision.

Hancock County HomeCare is a division of Blue Hill Memorial Hospital, a charitable, tax-exempt hospital. Hancock County HomeCare emerged as a result of a merger of the hospital with the Four Town Nursing Service and Bar Harbor Public Health Nursing, both non-profit home health agencies that have provided uninterrupted service to residents of Hancock County, Maine for more than 60 years. The unified agency, which provides skilled home nursing and therapies to residents of 36 towns, has been part of Blue Hill Memorial Hospital since 1981.

Despite its 60-year history of service to the community, Hancock County HomeCare has been classified as a ''new'' agency simply because it happened to change the ending date of its fiscal year during 1994, when Blue Hill Memorial and its affiliate changed theirs. Solely because it changed its fiscal year from a period ending June 30 to a period ending March 31, this 60-year old agency is being treated as a new agency by HCFA. Given the care taken by Congress to exclude name changes and corporate structure changes from the definition of a ''new'' agency, I simply do not believe that it was our intent to visit radically different treatment upon an agency that simply changed its financial reporting practices, but otherwise has a continuous history of operation and is fully able to provide 12 months of reliable data in accordance with Medicare cost reporting requirements.

I believe that the statute gives the Health Care Financing Administration sufficient discretion to deal with this situation administratively. Unfortunately, however, HCFA does not agree with that interpretation and insists that further legislative action is necessary if Hancock County HomeCare is to be considered an ''old'' agency for purposes of the Interim Payment System.

The legislation that I am introducing today to clarify the law was prepared with technical assistance from HCFA. Essentially, the bill would provide for a special rule for home care agencies that were in existence and had an active Medicare provider number prior to fiscal year 1980, but which had less than a 12-month cost reporting period in fiscal year 1994 because the agency changed the end date of its cost reporting period in that year. For these agencies, Medicare could, upon the request of the agency, use the agency's partial-year cost report from fiscal year 1994 to

determine the agency-specific portion of the per beneficiary limit. As a consequence, the agency could then be treated as an ''old'' agency for purposes of the Interim Payment System.

Mr. President, this legislation is simply a technical correction to address a specific problem that Congress clearly did not intend to create when it enacted the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The legislation is narrowly drafted and, in all likelihood, will not affect more than a few home health agencies, but it will make a critical difference in the ability of those agencies to continue to serve their elderly clients.

Home health agencies across the country, however, are experiencing acute financial problems due to other problems with a critically-flawed payment system that effectively penalizes our most cost-efficient agencies. These agencies are finding it increasingly difficult to cope with cash-flow problems, which inhibit their ability to deliver much-needed care. As many as twenty organizations in Maine have either closed or are no longer providing home care services because their reimbursement levels under Medicare fell so far short of their actual operating costs. Other agencies are laying off staff or are declining to accept new patients with more serious health problems. The real losers in this situation are our seniors, since cuts of this magnitude cannot be sustained without ultimately affecting patient care.

Moreover, these payment problems have been exacerbated by a number of new regulatory requirements imposed by HCFA, including the implementation of OASIS, sequential billing, medical review, and IPS overpayment recoupment. I will soon be introducing legislation to provide some relief for these beleaguered home health agencies and also plan to hold a hearing next month in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations to examine the combined effect that these payment reductions coupled with the multiple new regulatory requirements have had on home health agencies' ability to meet their patients' needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation providing a special rule for long-existing home health agencies with partial fiscal year 1994 cost reports be included in the RECORD.

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

S. 1063

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL RULE FOR LONG EXISTING HOME HEALTH AGENCIES WITH PARTIAL FISCAL YEAR 1994 COST REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(v)(1)(L) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(x)(I) If requested by an applicable agency, the limitation under clause (v) shall be determined for such agency by substituting in subclause (I) of that clause 'the reasonable costs (including nonroutine medical supplies) for the agency's cost report for the most recent partial cost reporting period ending in fiscal year 1994' for 'the reasonable costs (including nonroutine medical supplies) for the agency's 12-month cost reporting period ending during fiscal year 1994'.

''(II) In this clause, the term 'applicable agency' means an agency that—

''(aa) was in existence prior to fiscal year 1980;

''(bb) had an active medicare provider number prior to such date; and

''(cc) had less than a 12-month cost reporting period ending in fiscal year 1994 because such agency changed the end date of its cost reporting period during fiscal year 1994.

''(III) The limitation determined for an applicable agency pursuant to this clause shall be excluded from any calculation under this subparagraph of—

''(aa) a standardized regional average of costs; or

''(bb) a national median of limits.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1064. A bill to provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY SITE ACT OF 1999

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is not an exaggeration to say that Washington, DC possesses one of the highest concentrations of museums, art galleries, research institutions, monuments, and memorials to be found anywhere in the world. This is a city where we chronicle our history, honor our heroes, and introduce people from around the world to the ''American experience''.

Each year millions of people travel to Washington to visit the many attractions that are located within the capital city. Some of the most popular destinations for visitors are the many excellent museums and galleries, located where individuals are able to gain a knowledge and perspective about the United States that they may not have possessed before their trip to Washington.

Sadly, one aspect of American history which is not told very well is that of the United States Army. While many of the museums in the Capital area address military history in general terms, the region lacks a museum dedicated solely to the purpose of telling the story of our Army. This absence is a discredit to those interested in American history as the story of our Army is the story of our Nation, and quite obviously the reverse is true. It is also a discredit to the millions who have served as soldiers, theirs is a story well worth telling to others.

The United States is a Nation born of battle, as a matter of fact, the Army is older than our country. The Army was formed in 1775, while the United States was formed in 1776. At every critical juncture of the history of the United States, we find the brave soldiers of the Army. Whether it was earning our freedom from a colonial power; the mapping expedition of Lewis & Clark; the westward expansion of the nation; the Civil War, where the Army fought to maintain the unity of the young nation; the World Wars where we battled to preserve global peace; the Cold War where the Army stood vigilant against the expansionist desires of communist countries; in the Persian Gulf chasing a petty dictator and bully out of Kuwait; spearheading humanitarian relief efforts in any number of countries; or enforcing a fragile peace in Bosnia, the soldiers of our Army were there, doing their duty. Certainly this is a story worthy of chronicling through a museum, and the time has come to build such a facility.

What I propose is not new. Over the past two decades, many sites have been suggested and most are unsatisfactory because they have unrealistic development requirements, because their locations are unsuitable for such an esteemed building, or they lacked an appropriate Army setting. Since 1983, the process of choosing a site for the Army Museum has been a long and cumbersome undertaking. A site selection committee was organized and it developed a list of seventeen criteria which any candidate site is required to possess before it was to be selected as home to the Army Museum. Among other requirements, these criteria required such things as: an area permitting movement of large vehicles for exhibits and tractor trailer trucks for shipments; commanding an aesthetically pleasing vista; positive impact on the environment; closeness to public transportation; closeness to a Washington Tourmobile route; convenience to Fort Myer for support by the 3d Infantry—The Old Guard; accessibility by private automobile; adequate parking for 150 staff and official visitors; adequate parking for a portion of the 1,000,000 visitors-a-year that will not use public transportation; food service for staff and visitors; an area that is low in crime and is safe for staff and visitors; suitable space—at least 300,000 square feet—for construction; a low water table; good drainage; no history of flooding; and, suitability for subterranean construction.

Since 1984, more than 60 sites have been studied, yet only a handful have been worthy of any serious consideration.

The most prominent recent site suggestions have included Carlisle, Pennsylvania, the Washington Navy Yard, the ''Marriott property'' in northern Virginia, and Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Three of these sites clearly have characteristics which are directly contrary to the established criteria for site selection. The extraordinary distance of Carlisle from Washington speaks for itself. The ''Marriott property'' was carefully studied numerous times, and though it was the Army's first choice, it was always determined that the site was too small and that the cost of the

property too high. The suggestion that the Army locate its museum in Washington's Navy Yard is also directly contrary to prerequisites for site selection. The Washington Navy Yard is situated in a difficult to get to part of the District, on the Anacostia River, as well as on a precarious 50-year flood plain. Because this area floods so often, a ''Washington Navy Yard Army Museum''—I will repeat this awkward location—a ''Washington Navy Yard Army Museum'', might well suffer the embarrassment of being closed due to flooding. Furthermore, the Navy Yard is simply too small to allow the construction of a facility that can chronicle the more than 225-year history of the Army. From even before the first blueprint is drawn, architects and historians trying to create a museum that will be recognized as a world-class facility for the study of the American Army and military history will be limited by the lack of space available at the Navy Yard. Secondly, the Navy Yard is situated in a part of the District of Columbia well off the circuit that visitors travel when they come to Washington. The Navy Yard abuts a residential district with narrow streets which means it will be confusing for people to drive there, streets will be congested with traffic, and there will be a lack of parking for cars and tour buses. Additionally, the Navy Yard has become less military in character and more of a patchwork home to various government offices. To locate the Army Museum in an old Navy yard, which sometimes may be under water, would send a clear signal to visitors that choosing a home to their history was nothing more than an afterthought. Finally, it is simply not appropriate to have a museum chronicling the history of the Army at a Navy facility. The Army museum belongs on an Army installation.

As an interesting footnote, the April 27, 1999 issue of the Washington Post carried an article about the search for a new location to house the headquarters for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms and reported that a site on New York Avenue seemed to be the first choice. It mentioned that another site in the District had previously been considered as the new home of the BATF, that of the Southeast Federal Center, ''. . . a huge development envisioned for the Anacostia River waterfront south of Capitol Hill, next to the Washington Navy Yard.'' Not surprisingly, the article also reported that BATF had resisted that option because it was considered—and I quote—''. . .too remote''. If the Navy Yard is too remote a site for the BATF, how is it any more convenient for the Army Museum or those hundreds of thousands of people who will visit it every year?

In 1991, the Deputy Secretary of Defense directed that the site searches include the Mount Vernon Corridor as a possible location for the Army Museum. Fort Belvoir quickly became a very attractive location. Fort Belvoir offers a 48-acre site; it is only five minutes from Interstate 95, which is traveled by more than 300 million vehicles each year; it is only three minutes from the Fairfax County Parkway; it is served by Metro Bus; and Richmond Highway is next to the main gate of Fort Belvoir.

Beyond its ideal location, Fort Belvoir is also a winner historically. It is on a portion of General George Washington's properties when he was Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army. It is located on the historical heritage trail of the Mount Vernon Estate, Woodlawn Plantation, Pohick Church, and Gunston Hall. Situating the Army Museum at Fort Belvoir is a natural tie to a long established military and historic installation that has already been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission to be used for community activities, which includes museums, as a part of the Fort Belvoir Master Plan. The Fort Belvoir site meets all 17 criteria originally established by the Army. With the Marine Corps planning to build its heritage center at nearby Quantico, these two facilities would most certainly complement each other.

Indeed, the planned Marine Corps museum is an excellent example of a carefully contemplated facility that not only will capture the rich history of that service, but make the complex an attractive tourist destination. The Marines' heritage complex will be 460,000 square feet and will include a museum, a welcome center, an IMAX theater, a conference center, and a hotel. Clearly, the Marine Corps has come-up with a winning equation for a facility that will tell the story of that service and the Army should be allowed to do the same. Placing the Army Museum at the Navy Yard will not only inhibit efforts to present the history of the Army, but it will also force the establishment of a museum that is inferior and not all that it can be. Finally, co-locating the Army and Marine museums in the same geographic area would create a military history ''zone'', so to speak, and greatly increase the number of visitors that will take time to stop at both museums to learn more about our armed services and the valuable contributions they have made to the nation.

Mr. President, we have been trying to find a suitable site for the Army Museum since 1983. While I find it hard to believe that it should take 16-years to identify a suitable site, I am willing to concede that we should spare no effort in making certain that we find the perfect place to locate the Army Museum. I fear that citizens would hesitate visiting the Navy Yard if designated as the home for the Army Museum. Simply put, Fort Belvoir enjoys every advantage over the Navy Yard, the Marriott property, Carlisle Barracks, or any other site, as a place to build the Army Museum.

The bill I am introducing today names Fort Belvoir as the site for the Army Museum. Fort Belvoir is the best location in the Washington area to host the Army Museum. Army veterans want to remember and show their contribution to history in an Army setting and culture in which they themselves once served. Fort Belvoir is the perfect place to do this and it qualifies on every criterion established in 1983 by the Army's Site Selection Committee. Fort Belvoir is Army and should host Army history. Therefore, I ask that my colleagues support this bill and bring the 16-year search for a home for the Army Museum to a close by selecting a worthy home for one of this nation's greatest institutions.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1817, ''A morsel of genuine history is a thing so rare as to be always valuable.'' I am pleased to see that the National U.S. Army Museum is a task for this Congress at the beginning of a new century, at a time when all Americans are proud of their nation's accomplishments and those who made it all possible. I am absolutely concerned that all our veterans are honored and honored appropriately. Every year, Army veterans bring their families to Washington and are disappointed that no museum exists as a tribute to their service and sacrifice. Time is running out for many Army veterans, especially those of World War II. I urge my colleagues to review this important piece of legislation and support its passage. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1064

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 ''National Museum of the United States Army Site Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

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

(1) The Nation does not have adequate knowledge edge of the role of the Army in the development and protection of the United States.

(2) The Army, the oldest United States military service, lacks a primary museum with public exhibition space and is in dire need of a permanent facility to house and display its historical artifacts.

(3) Such a museum would serve to enhance the preservation, study, and interpretation of Army historical artifacts.

(4) Many Army artifacts of historical significance and national interest which are currently unavailable for public display would be exhibited in such a museum.

(5) While the Smithsonian Institution would be able to assist the Army in developing programs of presentations relating to the mission, values, and heritage of the Army, such a museum would be more appropriate institution for such programs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide for a permanent site for a museum to serve as the National Museum of the United States Army;

(2) to ensure the preservation, maintenance, and interpretation of the artifacts and history collected by such museum;

(3) to enhance the knowledge of the American people to the role of the Army in United States history; and

(4) to provide a facility for the public display of the artifacts and history of the Army.

SEC. 3. LOCATION OF NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

The Secretary of the Army shall provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1065. A bill to authorize negotiation for the accession of Chile to the North American Free Trade Agreement, to provide for Fast Track Consideration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

CHILE FAST TRACK ACT OF 1999

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, nearly five years ago, a bipartisan majority of this body ratified the North American Free Trade Agreement. Since then the promises of new jobs, increased exports, lower tariffs and a cleaner environment have all come true. In other words, Mr. President, NAFTA has succeeded despite the predictions of some that America could not compete in today's global economy.

With the success of NAFTA as a backdrop, it is now time to move forward and expand the free trade zone to other countries in our hemisphere. To help accomplish that important goal, I am introducing legislation today which will authorize and enable the President to move forward with negotiations on a free trade agreement with Chile.

Chile, Mr. President, is surely worthy of membership in NAFTA. In fact, Chile already signed a free trade agreement with Canada in 1996. Today, the Chilean economy is growing at a healthy annual rate of more than 7 percent. Chile is noted for its concern for preserving the environment and has put in place environmental protections that are laudable. Chile's fiscal house is in order as evidenced by a balanced budget, strong currency, strong foreign reserves and continued inflows of foreign capital, including significant direct investment.

Chile has already embraced the ideals of free trade. Last January, the Chilean tariff on goods from countries with which Chile does not yet have a free trade agreement fell from 11 percent to 10 percent. That tariff is scheduled to continue to fall gradually to 6 percent in 2003. While some goods are still assessed at a higher rate, the United States does a brisk export business to Chile, sending approximately $4.5 billion in American goods to that South American nation. That represents 25 percent of Chile's imports. That $4.5 billion in exports represents thousands of American jobs across the nation. Furthermore, the United States currently runs a trade surplus of nearly $3 billion per year.

Our firm belief in the importance of democracy continues to drive our foreign policy. After seventeen years of dictatorship, Chile returned to the family of democratic nations following the 1988 plebiscite. Today, the President and the legislature are both popularly elected and the Chilean armed forces effectively carry out their responsibilities as spelled out in Chile's Constitution. American investment and trade can play a critical role in building on Chile's political and economic successes.

It is unrealistic to think that the President will be able to negotiate a free trade agreement without fast track authority. Nor should we ask Chilean authorities to conduct negotiations under such circumstances. Therefore, the bill I am introducing today will provide him with a limited fast track authority which will apply only to this specific treaty. I believe that fast track is key to enabling the President to negotiate the most advantageous trade agreements, and should therefore be re-authorized. At this point, however, there are stumbling blocks we must surmount before generic fast track can be re-authorized. Those stumbling blocks should not be allowed to stand in the way of free trade with Chile.

Naysayers claim that free trade prompts American business to move overseas and costs American workers their jobs. They will tell you that America, the nation with the largest and strongest economy, the best workers and the greatest track record of innovation cannot compete with other nations.

Mr. President, the past five and a half years since we ratified NAFTA have proven them wrong. Today, tariffs are down and exports are up. The environment in North America is cleaner. Most importantly, NAFTA has created 600,000 new American jobs all across the nation.

The successes of NAFTA are an indication of the potential broader free trade agreements hold for our economy. Furthermore, trade and economic relationships foster American influence and support our foreign policy. In other words, Mr. President, this bill represents new American jobs in every state in the nation, a stronger American economy and greater American influence in our own Hemisphere. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.●

BY Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1066. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act to 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

CARBON CYCLE AND AGRICUTURAL BEST PRACTICES RESEARCH ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President I rise today to introduce an important component to further the scientific understanding of the earth's role as it relates to the environment, specifically the carbon cycle. What sparked my interest in introducing a carbon cycle research bill was a 1998 finding by academic and federal researchers that the North American continent from 1988 to 1992 absorbed an equivalent amount of the carbon dioxide emitted from fossil fuel emissions during the same time. Scientists know it happened, but cannot pinpoint the mechanisms of the process. Although you cannot watch carbon dioxide move into soil, you can see soil with high levels of carbon like river bottomland that has rich dark soil. Naturally, the question arises of how agriculture supplements this natural process.

By introducing this bill, it is my intention to follow through on the advice of climate scientists that there is a need for more research because the carbon cycle issue is complex. The bill makes sure that USDA is researching voluntary agricultural best practices such as conservation tillage, buffer strips, the Conservation Reserve Program, and new technology like precision sprayers that have multiple environmental benefits.

These voluntary agricultural best practices increase soil carbon levels also tend to reduce soil erosion, reduce fuel costs for producers, improve soil fertility, and increase production. It's a win win win. Nonetheless, there are agencies and individuals with agendas that believe agriculture is a source of greenhouse gas emissions and do not care about the multitude of benefits accruing from production agriculture. Therefore, we must arm agriculture with sound science on the carbon cycle.

This bill is intended to give producers and policymakers better understanding of the link between the carbon cycle and voluntary best practices. It authorizes USDA to conduct basic research on the mechanics of carbon being stored in soil and applied research to fine tune voluntary agricultural practices to increase the storage of carbon in soils. Furthermore, research will be helpful in finding out if agriculture can be a tool to solve the challenge of climate change.

I also want to make clear that this is a research bill. It has nothing to do with trading carbon credits or setting up a scheme for early action rewards if the Protocol becomes effective. The whole point of this bill is that there needs to be an understanding of the science and examining methods to meet the challenge of climate change without an international treaty. This bill compliments other legislation, such as Mr. MURKOWSKI'S bill, that calls for increased energy efficiency research.

The bill taps into USDA's broad research capabilities as it relates to production techniques and soil databases, but I have also incorporated state-of-the-art research tools including satellite-based technology. Satellite based

remote sensing is becoming more useful as an agricultural production component. Right now, satellites measure the greening up of wheat during spring months, making more precise estimates of wheat harvests. In discussions with remote sensing leaders at the University of Kansas, remote sensing has a role in providing the ''big picture'' as it relates to what agriculture is doing as it relates to the carbon cycle, such as mapping vegetation and estimating the amount of carbon it can store in soil.

Because of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's initial research that shows the North American Continent is a net carbon sink, I have included bill language to use air monitors to study the regional interaction of carbon dioxide. For instance, measure the movement of air from Denver to Kansas City. If the carbon dioxide level is lower in Kansas City than Denver, Kansas agriculture and land is absorbing carbon. With this data, scientists can start looking at specific ag practices.

It is my hope that the Senate can enact this legislation to be proactive in meeting the climate challenge, encouraging voluntary agricultural best practices and technology that have multiple benefits. This is a strategy that is based on commonsense, not suggestions made by the International Panel on Climate Change that would halt production agriculture as we know it. Producers can use technology to feed a troubled and hungry world, plus absorb carbon dioxide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1066

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 ''Carbon Cycle and Agricultural Best Practices Research Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) agricultural producers in the United States—

(A) have, in good faith, participated in mandatory and voluntary conservation programs, the successes of which are unseen by the general public, to preserve natural resources; and

(B) have a personal stake in ensuring that the air, water, and soil of the United States are productive since agricultural productivity directly affects—

(i) the economic success of agricultural producers; and

(ii) the production of food and fiber for developing and developed nations;

(2) in addition to providing food and fiber, agriculture serves an environmental role by providing benefits to air, soil, and water through agricultural best practices;

(3) those conservation programs and Federal land provide the United States with an enormous potential to increase the quantity of carbon stored in agricultural land and commodities through the carbon cycle;

(4) according to the Climate Modeling and Diagnostics Laboratory of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, North American soils, crops, rangelands, and forests absorbed an equivalent quantity of carbon dioxide emitted from fossil fuel combustion as part of the natural carbon cycle from 1988 through 1992;

(5) the estimated quantity of carbon stored in world soils is more than twice the carbon in living vegetation or in the atmosphere;

(6) agricultural best practices can increase the quantity of carbon stored in farm soils, crops, and rangeland;

(7) although there is a tremendous quantity of carbon stored in soil that supports agricultural operations in the United States, the quantity of carbon stored in soil may be increased by using a strategy that would benefit the environment without implementing a United Nations-sponsored climate change protocol or treaty;

(8) Federal research is needed to identify—

(A) the agricultural best practices that supplement the natural carbon cycle; and

(B) Federal conservation programs that can be altered to increase the environmental benefits provided by the natural carbon cycle;

(9) increasing soil organic carbon is widely recognized as a means of increasing agricultural production and meeting the growing domestic and international food consumption needs with a positive environmental benefit;

(10) agricultural best practices include the more efficient use of agriculture inputs and equipment; and

(11) tax credits should be offered in order to facilitate the widespread use of more efficient agriculture inputs and equipment and to increase environmental benefits.

SEC. 3. AGRICULTURAL BEST PRACTICES.

Title XIV of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subtitle N—Carbon Cycle and Agricultural Best Practices

''SEC. 1490. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) AGRICULTURAL BEST PRACTICE.—The term 'agricultural best practice' means a voluntary practice used by 1 or more agricultural producers to manage a farm or ranch that has a beneficial or minimal impact on the environment, including—

''(A) crop residue management;

''(B) soil erosion management;

''(C) nutrient management;

''(D) remote sensing;

''(E) precision agriculture;

''(F) integrated pest management;

''(G) animal waste management;

''(H) cover crop management;

''(I) water quality and utilization management;

''(J) grazing and range management;

''(K) wetland management;

''(L) buffer strip use; and

''(M) tree planting.

''(2) CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—The term 'conservation program' means a program established under—

''(A) subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830 et seq.);

''(B) section 401 or 402 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201, 2202);

''(C) section 3 or 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1003, 1006a); or

''(D) any other provision of law that authorizes the Secretary to make payments or provide other assistance to agricultural producers to promote conservation.

''SEC. 1491. CARBON CYCLE AND AGRICULTURAL BEST PRACTICES RESEARCH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Agriculture shall be the lead agency with respect to any agricultural soil carbon research conducted by the Federal Government.

''(b) RESEARCH SERVICES.—

''(1) AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE.—The Secretary, acting through the Agricultural Research Service, shall collaborate with other Federal agencies to develop data and conduct research addressing soil carbon balance and storage, making special efforts to—

''(A) determine the effects of management and conservation on carbon storage in cropland and grazing land;

''(B) evaluate the long-term impact of tillage and residue management systems on the accumulation of organic carbon;

''(C) study the transfer of organic carbon to soil; and

''(D) study carbon storage of commodities.

''(2) NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE.—

''(A) RESEARCH MISSIONS.—The research missions of the Secretary, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, include—

''(i) the development of a soil carbon database to—

''(I) provide online access to information about soil carbon potential in a format that facilitates the use of the database in making land management decisions; and

''(II) allow additional and more refined data to be linked to similar databases containing information on forests and rangeland;

''(ii) the conversion to an electronic format and linkage to the national soil database described in clause (i) of county-level soil surveys and State-level soil maps;

''(iii) updating of State-level soil maps;

''(iv) the linkage, for information purposes only, of soil information to other soil and land use databases; and

''(v) the completion of evaluations, such as field validation and calibration, of modeling, remote sensing, and statistical inventory approaches to carbon stock assessments related to land management practices and agronomic systems at the field, regional, and national levels.

''(B) UNIT OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, shall disseminate a national basic unit of information for an assessment of the carbon storage potential of soils in the United States.

''(3) ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Economic Research Service, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that analyzes the impact of the financial health of the farm economy of the United States under the Kyoto Protocol and other international agreements under the Framework Convention on Climate Change—

''(A) with and without market mechanisms (including whether the mechanisms are permits for emissions and whether the permits are issued by allocation, auction, or otherwise);

''(B) with and without the participation of developing countries;

''(C) with and without carbon sinks; and

''(D) with respect to the imposition of traditional command and control measures.

''(c) CONSORTIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate not more than 2 carbon cycle and agricultural best practices research consortia.

''(2) SELECTION.—The consortia designated by the Secretary shall be selected in a competitive manner by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

''(3) DUTIES.—The consortia shall—

''(A) identify, develop, and evaluate agricultural best practices using partnerships composed of Federal, State, or private entities and the Department of Agriculture, including the Agricultural Research Service;

''(B) develop necessary computer models to predict and assess the carbon cycle, as well as other priorities requested by the Secretary and the heads of other Federal agencies;

''(C) estimate and develop mechanisms to measure carbon levels made available as a result of voluntary Federal conservation programs, private and Federal forests, and other land uses; and

''(D) develop outreach programs, in coordination with extension services, to share information on carbon cycle and agricultural best practices that is useful to agricultural producers.

''(4) CONSORTIA PARTICIPANTS.—The participants in the consortia may include—

''(A) land-grant colleges and universities;

''(B) State geological surveys;

''(C) research centers of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

''(D) other Federal agencies;

''(E) representatives of agricultural businesses and organizations; and

''(F) representatives of the private sector.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002.

''(d) PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall promote voluntary agricultural best practices that take into account soil organic matter dynamics, carbon cycle, ecology, and soil organisms that will lead to the more effective use of soil resources to—

''(1) enhance the carbon cycle;

''(2) improve soil quality;

''(3) increase the use of renewable resources; and

''(4) overcome unfavorable physical soil properties.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report that describes programs that are or will be conducted by the Secretary, through land-grant colleges and universities, to provide to agricultural producers the results of research conducted on agricultural best practices, including the results of—

''(1) research;

''(2) future research plans;

''(3) consultations with appropriate scientific organizations;

''(4) proposed extension outreach activities; and

''(5) findings of scientific peer review under section 103(d)(1) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(d)(1)).

''SEC. 1492. CARBON CYCLE REMOTE SENSING TECHNOLOGY.

''(a) CARBON CYCLE REMOTE SENSING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall develop a carbon cycle remote sensing technology program—

''(A) to provide, on a near-continual basis, a real-time and comprehensive view of vegetation conditions; and

''(B) to assess and model agricultural carbon sequestration.

''(2) USE OF CENTERS.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall use regional earth science application centers to conduct research under this section.

''(3) RESEARCHED AREAS.—The areas that shall be the subjects of research conducted under this section include—

''(A) the mapping of carbon-sequestering land use and land cover;

''(B) the monitoring of changes in land cover and management

''(C) new systems for the remote sensing of soil carbon; and

''(D) regional-scale carbon sequestration estimation.

''(b) REGIONAL EARTH SCIENCE APPLICATION CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall carry out this section through the Regional Earth Science Application Center located at the University of Kansas (referred to in this section as the 'Center'), if the Center enters into a partnership with a land-grant college or university.

''(2) DUTIES OF CENTER.—The Center shall serve as a research facility and clearinghouse for satellite data, software, research, and related information with respect to remote sensing research conducted under this section.

''(3) USE OF CENTER.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall use the Center for carrying out remote sensing research relating to agricultural best practices.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2002.

''SEC. 1493. CONSERVATION PREMIUM PAYMENTS.

''In addition to payments that are made by the Secretary to producers under conservation programs, the Secretary may offer conservation premium payments to producers that are participating in the conservation programs to compensate the producers for allowing researchers to scientifically analyze, and collect information with respect to, agricultural best practices that are carried out by the producers as part of conservation projects and activities that are funded, in whole or in part, by the Federal Government.

''SEC. 1494. ASSISTANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL BEST PRACTICES AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS UNDER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to assistance that is provided by the Secretary to producers under conservation programs, the Secretary, on request of the producers, shall provide education through extension activities and technical and financial assistance to producers that are participating in the conservation programs to assist the producers in planning, designing, and installing agricultural best practices and natural resource management plans established under the conservation programs.

''(b) INFORMATION TO DEVELOPING NATIONS.—The Secretary shall disseminate to developing nations information on agricultural best practices and natural resource management plans that—

''(1) provide crucial agricultural benefits for soil and water quality; and

''(2) increase production.

''SEC. 1495. CARBON CYCLE RESEARCH MONITORING SYSTEM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the United States Global Change Research Program, may establish a nationwide carbon cycle monitoring system (referred to in this section as the 'monitoring system') to research the flux of carbon between soil, air, and water.

''(b) PURPOSE OF SYSTEM.—The monitoring system shall focus on locating network monitors on or near agricultural best practices that are—

''(1) undertaken voluntarily;

''(2) undertaken through a conservation program of the Department of Agriculture;

''(3) implemented as part of a program or activity of the Department of Agriculture; or

''(4) identified by the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

''(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to ensure that research goals of programs established by the Federal Government related to carbon monitoring are met through the monitoring system.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle $10,000,000.''.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 1067. A bill to promote the adoption of children with special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

THE ADOPTION EQUALITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Adoption Equality Act of 1999. I would like to thank Senator CHAFEE for his leadership on behalf of vulnerable children, including our bipartisan work on this legislation. He joins me today as an original co-sponsor of this legislation as do Senators DEWINE, COLLINS, LEVIN, LANDRIEU, MOYNIHAN, BREAUX, KERREY, DORGAN, CONRAD, INOUYE, DURBIN and TORRICELLI. Work on this legislation is based on the bipartisan work of the Senate coalition that supported the 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act.

A unique bipartisan coalition formed in 1997 worked hard to forge consensus on the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (ASFA). This law, for the first time ever, establishes that a child's health and safety must be paramount when any decisions are made regarding children in the abuse and neglect system. While this law was the most sweeping and comprehensive piece of child welfare legislation passed in over a decade, more work needs to be done to truly achieve the goals promoted in the Act of safety, stability and permanence for all abused and neglected children. Senator CHAFEE and I and all of the other co-sponsors I have named committed ourselves to continuing that work and that is why we are here today.

Throughout the process of developing the Adoption Act we heard about the challenging circumstances facing children described as having ''special needs''. These include children who are

the most difficult to place into permanent homes, often due to their age, disability or status as part of a group of siblings needing to be placed together. I spent time learning about the special needs children in my own state of West Virginia. Prior to the passage of ASFA, there were 870 children, most with special needs, awaiting adoption in West Virginia. Today, I am proud to report that this number has been reduced to 621. The dedication of our state adoption staff, when combined with the incentives and focus on permanence provided in ASFA have successfully effected the placement of nearly a third of the waiting children.

One of the most significant provisions of ASFA was the assurance of ongoing health care coverage for all children with special needs who move from foster care to adoption. The Adoption Equality Act is an essential second step in this ongoing process. This important legislation will promote and increase adoptions by making all children with special needs eligible for Federal adoption subsidy. The bill is designed to ''level the playing field'' by ensuring that all children with special needs, and the loving families who adopt them, have the support they need to grow and develop.

Current law provides for the payment of federal adoption subsidies to families who adopt only those special needs children whose biological family would have been qualified for welfare benefits under the old 1996 AFDC standards. Federal adoption subsidy payments provide essential income support to help families finance the daily costs of raising these special children (food, clothing) and also special services (equipment, therapy, tutoring, etc.). Federal adoption subsidies are a vital link in securing adoptive homes for special needs children who by definition would not be adopted without support.

Under current law, a child's eligibility for these important benefits is dependent on the income of his or her biological parents even though these parents' legal rights to the child have been terminated, and these are the parents who either abused or neglected the child. This is, simply, wrong. The Adoption Equality Act will eliminate this anomaly in Federal law by making all special needs children eligible for Federal adoption subsidies.

First, the bill removes the requirement that an income eligibility determination be made in regard to the child's biological parents, whom the child is leaving, thereby allowing Federal adoption subsidy to be paid to all families who adopt children who meet the definition of special needs.

Second, the bill gives States flexibility in determining their own criteria, which may, but need not, include judicial determination, to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the safety or welfare of the child, as well as their own definition of which of the children in their state are children with special needs.

Third, the bill requires that states re-invest the monies they save as a result of this bill back into their state child abuse and neglect programs.

When we talk about how to help abused and neglected children in this country, many complex questions are raised about what constitutes best policy, and how Federal tax dollars should be spent. Yet, at the heart of it all are the children who desperately want a family to call their own, and the families who want to adopt them. The lack of adequate financial resources to support these adoptions is often the only barrier that stands between an abused child and a safe, loving and permanent home. With the numbers of abused and neglected children rising dramatically—in West Virginia alone child abuse reports have doubled—from 13,000 in 1986 to over 26,000 in 1996—we need to remove every barrier in our efforts to make a difference. A West Virginia family recently told me:

I knew we had enough love to give a child with special needs—even siblings. But could we afford it? More children means more of everything. This obstacle was removed through the adoption subsidy program and we now have four children in our lives. Our lives have truly changed. Special needs for us was a very special way to adopt a waiting child.

Federal adoption subsidies are designed to encourage adoption of children with special needs—those children who have the hardest time finding permanent, adoptive families. It is an absurd policy to discriminate against thousands of children with special needs based upon the income of their biological (and often abusive) parents. It is time to create a Federal policy that levels the playing field and gives all children with special needs an equal and fair chance at being adopted.

I am confident that the Adoption Equality Act will do just that, and at the same time, with the re-investment requirement, states should have the incentive to make additional improvements in their child welfare systems. These will be valuable steps in our efforts to be more able to effectively address the needs of our Nation's most vulnerable children. I urge my colleagues join us in co-sponsoring and passing this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a brief fact sheet be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1067

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 ''Adoption Equality Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PROMOTION OF ADOPTION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 473(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2)(A) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), a child meets the requirements of this paragraph if such child—

''(i)(I) at the time of termination of parental rights was in the care of a public or licensed private child placement agency or Indian tribal organization pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement, relinquishment, or involuntary removal of the child from the home, and the State has determined, pursuant to criteria established by the State (which may, but need not, include a judicial determination), that continuation in the home would be contrary to the safety or welfare of such child;

''(II) meets all medical or disability requirements of title XVI with respect to eligibility for supplemental security income benefits; or

''(III) was residing in a foster family home or child care institution with the child's minor parent (pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement, relinquishment, or involuntary removal of the child from the home, and the State has determined, pursuant to criteria established by the State (which may, but need not, include judicial determination), that continuation in the home would be contrary to the safety or welfare of such child); and

''(ii) has been determined by the State, pursuant to subsection (c), to be a child with special needs, which needs shall be considered by the State, together with the circumstances of the adopting parents, in determining the amount of any payments to be made to the adopting parents.

''(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (7), a child who is not a citizen or resident of the United States and who meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this paragraph for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

''(C) A child who meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), who was determined eligible for adoption assistance payments under this part with respect to a prior adoption (or who would have been determined eligible for such payments had the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 been in effect at the time that such determination would have been made), and who is available for adoption because the prior adoption has been dissolved and the parental rights of the adoptive parents have been terminated or because the child's adoptive parents have died, shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this paragraph for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii).''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Section 473(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, no payment may be made to parents with respect to any child that—

''(i) would be considered a child with special needs under subsection (c);

''(ii) is not a citizen or resident of the United States; and

''(iii) was adopted outside of the United States or was brought into the United States for the purpose of being adopted.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as prohibiting payments under this part for a child described in subparagraph (A) that is placed in foster care subsequent to the failure, as determined by the State, of the initial adoption of such child by the parents described in such subparagraph.''.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF STATE SAVINGS.—Section 473(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)), as amended by subsection (b), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) A State shall spend an amount equal to the amount of savings (if any) in State expenditures under this part resulting from the application of paragraph (2) on and after the

effective date of the amendment to such paragraph made by section 2(a) of the Adoption Equality Act of 1999 to provide to children or families any service (including post-adoption services) that may be provided under this part or part B.''.

(d) DETERMINATION OF A CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 473(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) For purposes of this section, a child shall not be considered a child with special needs unless—

''(1)(A) the State has determined, pursuant to a criteria established by the State (which may or may not include a judicial determination), that the child cannot or should not be returned to the home of his parents; or

''(B) the child meets all medical or disability requirements of title XVI with respect to eligibility for supplemental security income benefits; and

''(2) the State has determined—

''(A) that there exists with respect to the child a specific factor or condition (such as ethnic background, age, or membership in a minority or sibling group, or the presence of factors such as medical conditions or physical, mental, or emotional handicaps) because of which it is reasonable to conclude that the child cannot be placed with adoptive parents without providing adoption assistance under this section and medical assistance under title XIX; and

''(B) that except where it would be against the best interests of the child because of such factors as the existence of significant emotional ties with prospective adoptive parents while in the care of such parents as a foster child, a reasonable, but unsuccessful, effort has been made to place the child with appropriate adoptive parents without providing adoption assistance under this section or medical assistance under title XIX.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, TITLE IV, PART E—FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE, FACT SHEET AND EXPLANATION, ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, SECTION 473

PRESENT LAW

Current law provides for the payment of federal adoption subsidies to families who adopt ''special needs'' children whose biological family would have been qualified for welfare benefits under the old 1996 AFDC standards. Federal adoption subsidy payments provide essential income support to help families finance the daily costs of raising these special children (food, clothing) and also special services (equipment, therapy, tutoring, etc.). Federal adoption subsidies are a vital link in securing adoptive homes for special needs children who by definition would not be adopted without support.

Under current law, a child's eligibility for these important benefits is dependent on the income of his or her biological parents even though these parents' legal rights to the child have been terminated, and these are the parents who either abused or neglected the child.

Current law also allows for the payment of federal adoption subsidies to families who adopt a ''special needs'' child who meets all the requirements of title XVI with respect to eligibility for supplemental security income benefits (SSI), again, linking a child's eligibility for subsidy to the income and assets of the biological parents as well as to the child's disability.

Current law defines a child with special needs, as a child who has a specific factor or condition (such as ethnic background, age, or membership in a minority or sibling group, or the presence of factors such as medical conditions or physical, mental, or emotional handicaps) because of which it is reasonable to conclude that such child cannot be placed with adoptive parents without providing adoption assistance under this section and medical assistance under title XIX, and that except where it would be against the best interests of the child because of such factors as the existence of significant emotional ties with prospective adoptive parents while in the care of such parents as a foster child, a reasonable, but unsuccessful, effort has been made to place the child with appropriate adoptive parents without providing adoption assistance under this section or medical assistance under title XIX.

Under current law, the amount of payments to be made are determined through an agreement between the adoptive parents and the State or local agency. This agreement takes into account both the special needs of the child and the circumstances of the adopting parents. It may be periodically adjusted, and can continue to be paid until the child reaches the age of 18 (or 21 if the child has a physical or mental handicap which warrants that the payments continue). The amount of payment may never exceed the amount that would be paid as a foster care maintenance payment if the same child had remained in foster care.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISION

This bill makes all special needs children eligible for Federal adoption subsidies by ''delinking'' a child's eligibility from the archaic AFDC guidelines, or other income-eligibility determinations that would be based upon the income of the biological parents, whom the child is leaving.

First, the bill removes the requirement that an income eligibility determination be made in regard to the child's biological parents, thereby allowing Federal adoption subsidy to be paid to all families who adopt children who meet the definition of special needs.

The bill does NOT change the definition of special needs as described above. Nor does this bill change the method by which the payment amount is determined.

Second, the bill gives States flexibility in determining their own criteria, which may, but need not, include judicial determination, to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the safety or welfare of the child.

Third, the bill allows for Federal adoption subsidy to be paid to families who adopt special needs children who meet the medical/disability requirements, without requiring that they, or their biological parents, meet the income standards, of title XVI with respect to supplemental security income benefits.

Fourth, the bill requires that states re-invest the monies they save as a result of this bill back into their state child abuse and neglect programs.

REASON FOR CHANGE

Federal adoption subsidies are designed to encourage adoption of children with special needs—those children who have the hardest time finding permanent, adoptive families. It is an absurd policy to discriminate against thousands of children with special needs based upon the income of their biological (and often abusive) parents. It is time to create a Federal policy that levels the playing field and gives all children with special needs an equal and fair chance at being adopted.

The proposed changes will do just that. They are designed to remove a significant barrier to the adoption of these children by making all special needs children eligible for Federal adoption subsidies, regardless of income of the biological (and often abusive) parents whom they are leaving.

At the same time, with the re-investment requirement, states should have the incentive to make additional improvements in their child welfare systems.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1068. A bill to provide for health, education, and welfare of children under 6 years of age; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

● Mr. KERRY. Mr President, in the aftermath of the tragic school shootings in Littleton, and in this debate here in the Senate about juvenile justice, we've heard a great deal about efforts to keep guns out of the hands of violent students, we've heard about efforts to try juvenile offenders as adults, about stiffer sentences, about so many answers to the problem of kids who have run out of second and third chances—kids who are violent, kids who are committing crimes, children who are a danger to themselves and a danger to those around him. Mr. President, I was a prosecutor in Massachusetts before I entered elected office. I've seen these violent teenagers and young people come to court, and Mr. President let me tell you there is nothing more tragic than seeing these children who—in too many cases—have a jail cell in their future not far down the road, children who have done what is, at times, irreparable harm to their communities.

And Mr. President, I keep asking myself, why is it we only start to care about these kids at that point—after the violence, after the arrest, after the damage has been done, when it may be too late—when we could have started intervening in our kids' lives early on, before it was too late. Mr. President, we can't say that we're having a real debate about juvenile justice if we're not talking about early childhood development efforts.

The truth is that early intervention can have a powerful effect on reducing government welfare, health, criminal justice, and education expenditures in the long run. By taking steps now we can reduce later destructive behavior such as dropping out of school, drug use, and criminal acts like the ones we have seen in Littleton and Jonesboro.

A study of the High/Scope Foundation's Perry Preschool found that at-risk toddlers who received pre-schooling and a weekly home visit reduced the risk that these children would grow up to become chronic law breakers by a startling 80 percent. The Syracuse University Family Development Study showed that providing quality early-childhood programs to families until children reached age five reduces the children's risk of delinquency ten years later by 90 percent. It's no wonder that

a recent survey of police chiefs found that nine out of ten said that ''America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more'' in these early intervention programs.

Let me tell you about the Early Childhood Initiative (ECI) in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania—an innovative program which helps low-income children from birth to age five become successful, productive adults by enrolling them in high quality, neighborhood-based early care and education programs ranging from Head Start, center-based child care, home-based child care, and school readiness programs. ECI draws on everything that's right about Allegheny County—the strengths of its communities—neighborhood decision-making, parent involvement, and quality measurement. Parents and community groups decide if they want to participate and they come together and develop a proposal tailored for the community. Regular review programs ensure quality programming and cost-effectiveness. We're talking about local control getting results locally: 19,000 pre-school aged children from low-income families, 10,000 of which were not enrolled in any child care or education program. By the year 2000, through funding supplied by ECI, approximately 75% of these under-served pre-schoolers will be reached. Early evaluations show that enrolled children are achieving at rates equivalent to their middle income peers. And as we know, without this leveling of the playing field, low-income children are at a greater risk of encountering the juvenile justice system. That's a real difference.

These kinds of programs are successful because children's experiences during their early years of life lay the foundation for their future development. But in too many places in this country our failure to provide young children what they need during these crucial early years has long-term consequences and costs for America.

Recent Scientific evidence conclusively demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development will result in tremendous benefits for children, families, and our nation. The electrical activity of brain cells actually changes the physical structure of the brain itself. Without a stimulating environment, the baby's brain suffers. At birth, a baby's brain contains 100 billion neurons, roughly as many nerve cells as there are stars in the Milky Way. But the wiring pattern between these neurons develops over time. Children who play very little or are rarely touched develop brains 20 to 30 percent smaller than normal for their age.

Mr. President, reversing these problems later in life is far more difficult and costly. We know that—if it wasn't so much harder, we wouldn't be having this difficult debate in the Senate. Well I think it's time we talked about giving our kids the right start in their lives they need to be healthy, to be successful, to mature in a way that doesn't lead to at-risk and disruptive behavior and violence down the road.

We should stop and consider what's really at stake here. Poverty seriously impairs young children's language development, math skills, IQ scores, and their later school completion. Poor young children also are at heightened risk of infant mortality, anemia, and stunted growth. Of the 12 million children under the age of three in the United States today, three million—25 percent—live in poverty. Three out of five mothers with children under three work, but one study found that 40 percent of the facilities at child care centers serving infants provided care of such poor quality as to actually jeopardize children's health, safety, or development. In more than half of the states, one out of every four children between 19 months and three years of age is not fully immunized against common childhood diseases. Children who are not immunized are more likely to contract preventable diseases, which can cause long-term harm. Children younger than three make up 27 percent of the one million children who are determined to be abused or neglected each year. Of the 1,200 children who died from abuse and neglect in 1995, 85 percent were younger than five and 45 percent were younger than one.

Literally the future of millions of young people is at stake here. Literally, that's what we're talking about. But is it reflected in the investments we make here in the Senate? I would, respectfully, say no—not nearly enough Mr. President.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, our government expenditure patterns are inverse to the most important early development period for human beings. Although we know that early investment can dramatically reduce later remedial and social costs, currently our nation spends no more than $35 billion over five years on federal programs for at-risk or delinquent youth and child welfare programs.

That is a course we need to change, Mr. President. We need to start talking in a serious and a thoughtful way—through a bipartisan approach—about making a difference in the lives of our children before they're put at risk. We need to accept the truth that we can do a lot more to help our kids grow up healthy with promising futures in an early childhood development center, in a classroom, and in a doctor's office than we can in a courtroom or in a jail cell.

Mr. President, these questions need to be a part of this juvenile justice debate, but they're not being included to the extent to which they should. My colleague KIT BOND and I are introducing our Early Childhood Development Act to move us forward in a bipartisan way towards that discussion—and towards actions we can take to provide meaningful intervention in the lives of all of our children. KIT BOND and I are appreciative of the deep support we've found for this legislation, evident in the co-sponsorship of the Kerry-Bond bill by Senator HOLLINGS, Senator JOHNSON, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LEVIN, Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator WELLSTONE, and my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BOB TORRICELLI. We are looking forward to working with all of you, from both sides of the aisle, to make that debate on the Kerry-Bond bill a productive one, a debate that leads to the kind of actions we know can make the difference in addressing violence ten years before it starts, in getting all our children off to the right start towards full and productive lives.●

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the ''Early Childhood Development Act of 1999'' with my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY.

Through this legislation, we are seeking to support families with the youngest children to find the early childhood education and quality child care programs that can help those families and parents provide the supportive, stimulating environment we all know their children need.

Recent research shows that the first few years of life are an absolutely crucial developmental period for each child with a significant bearing on future prospects. During this time, infant brain development occurs more rapidly than previously thought, and the sensations and experiences of this time go a long way toward shaping that baby's mind in a way that has long-lasting effects on all aspects of the child's life.

And parents and family are really the key to this development. Early, positive interaction with parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and other adults plays a critical role.

Here's what's going on during these amazing early years that in so many ways are crucial to each child. At birth, a baby's brain contains 100 billion neurons, roughly as many nerve cells as there are stars in the Milky Way. But the wiring pattern between these neurons develops over time. Most things happening in the surrounding world—such as a mother's caress, a father's voice, even playing with a brother or sister—helps this wiring pattern expand and connect. A baby with a stimulating environment will make these connections at a tremendous rate. However, infants and children who play very little or are rarely touched or stimulated develop brains that can be 20 to 30 percent smaller than normal for their age.

Really we shouldn't be surprised that parents have known instinctively for generations some of these basic truths that science is just now figuring out. Most parents just know that babies need to be hugged, caressed, and spoken to.

Of course, the types of interaction that can most enhance a child's development change as the baby's body and mind grow. The types of behavior that are so instinctual for the youngest babies may not be quite so obvious for

two- and three-year-olds. Raising a child is perhaps the most important thing any of us will do, but it is also one of the most complicated.

And parents today also face a variety of stresses and problems that were unheard of a generation ago. In many families, both parents work. Whether by choice or by necessity, many parents may not be able to read mountains of books and articles about parenting and child development to keep perfectly up-to-date on what types of experiences are most appropriate for their child at his or her particular stage of development. They also must try to find good child care and good environments where their children can be stimulated and educated while they work. Simply put, most parents can probably use a little help.

Many communities across the country have developed successful early childhood development programs to meet these needs. Most of the programs work with parents to help them understand their child's development and to discuss ways to help further develop the little baby's potential. Others simply provide basic child care and an exciting learning environment for children of parents who both have to work.

In a report released in 1998, the prestigious RAND Corporation reviewed early childhood programs like these and found that they provide higher-risk children with both short- and long-run benefits. These benefits include enhanced development of both the mind and the child's ability to interact with others, they include improvement in educational outcomes, and they include a long-term increase in self-sufficiency through finding jobs and staying off government programs.

Of course, it's no mystery to many people from Missouri that this type of program can be successful. In Missouri, we are both proud and lucky to be the home of Parents as Teachers. This tremendous initiative is an early childhood parent education program that has been designed to empower all parents to giver their young child the best possible start in life. Expanding Parents as Teachers to a statewide program was perhaps my proudest accomplishment when I was Missouri's Governor.

With additional resources, these programs could be expanded and enhanced to improve the opportunities for many more infants and young children. And we have found that all children can benefit from these programs. Economically successful, two-income families can benefit from early childhood programs just as much as a single-parent family with a mother seeking work opportunities.

The legislation that Senator KERRY and I are introducing will support families by building on local initiatives like Parents as Teachers that have already been proven successful in working with families as they raise their infants and toddlers. The bill will help improve and expand these successful programs, of which there are numerous other examples, such as programs sponsored by the United Way, Boys and Girls Clubs, as well as state initiatives such as ''Success by Six'' in Massachusetts and Vermont and the ''Early Childhood Initiative'' in Pennsylvania.

The bill will provide federal funds to states to begin or expand local initiatives to provide early childhood education, parent education, and family support. The bill will also expand quality child care programs for families, especially infant care. Best of all, we propose to do this with no federal mandates, and few federal guidelines.

Many of our society's problems, such as the high school dropout rate, drug and tobacco use, and juvenile crime can be traced in part to inadequate child care and early childhood development opportunities. Increasingly, research is showing us that a child's social and intellectual development as well as there likelihood to become involved in these types of difficulties is deeply rooted in the early interaction and nurturing a child receives in his or her early years.

Ultimately, it is important to remember that the likelihood of a child growing up in a healthy, nurturing environment is the primary responsibility of his or her parents and family. Government cannot and should not become a substitute for parents and families, but we can help them become stronger by equipping them with the resources to meet the everyday challenges of parenting.●

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1069. A bill to provide economic security and safety for battered women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

BATTERED WOMEN'S ECONOMIC SECURITY AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today, I am joined by Senator MURRAY and Senator SCHUMER in introducing the Battered Women's Economic Security Act. Battered women face tremendous economic barriers when they leave their abusive relationships and set out to make a new life for themselves and their children. Our bill addresses the numerous and critical issues that victims of domestic violence face as they try to escape the violence in their lives.

I know that Senator MURRAY joins me in applauding Senator BIDEN's efforts in crafting legislation to reauthorize the programs in the Violence Against Women Act. As I and many of my colleagues have heard from folks back home, these programs have provided invaluable and life saving resources to battered women and their families. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of the bipartisan bill that Senator BIDEN has developed to build on the success of VAWA I and expand those programs.

As a result of VAWA I, we now have an infrastructure in place that helps the community respond to this violence. VAWA provides the resources to enable local law enforcement and the courts prosecute those who batter women. And many other programs are now in place to help women leave their abusers.

But, when a woman does take the initial step to leave her abuser and seek help, she is beginning a journey that is filled with obstacles, largest of which are economic. All to often battered women stay with their abuser because of the economic support he provides for her and her children. Now that we have begun to build an infrastructure that provides for the initial immediate needs of shelter and legal services, we need to look at the bigger picture. We must provide economic supports that allow battered women to provide for themselves and their children, and keep them safe after they leave temporary shelters. That is the reason Senator MURRAY and I are introducing the Battered Women's Economic Security Act.

The Battered Women's Economic Security Act addresses the economic obstacles women who are victims of domestic violence face when trying to leave their abuser. For example, finding affordable and safe housing is critical for all battered women and their children, but particularly for low-income women. A 1998 report funded by the Ford Foundation found that of all homeless women and children, 50 percent of them are fleeing domestic violence. Let me say that again, half of all homeless women and children leave their home because the violence there threatens their lives.

Not only are over half of homeless women fleeing violence, but too many of them do not find shelter that they need. A report from the U.S. Conference of Mayors found that homeless shelters are finding an increasing need for women and children. Of that growing need, 1 out of every 3 families that shows up at a homeless shelter is turned away, and ends up on the street for the night.

It is simply unacceptable for us to allow women and children, who are fleeing violence, to be turned out into the streets. When are we as a society going to stand up and say no more? Without safe shelter, women and their children will continue to stay in violent relationships because at least they have a roof over their heads. Such a situation is shameful in such a prosperous country as our own, and in such a booming economy as this one.

Our bill makes sure that money goes directly to shelters for victims of domestic violence so that the people who are directly involved with helping battered women can help them find new housing. We also made sure that our bill provided resources to find that new housing by boosting the McKinney Homeless Act to provide funding for battered women and their children.

Anyone who has known someone fleeing a violent relationship or has talked

to advocates knows that safe shelter and housing are the first and immediate needs. But women cannot stay in shelters or transitional housing indefinitely. Women also need to find work to keep them on that path to independence and safety. Our bill protects women in the workplace so that they can keep their job and continue to deal with the multitude of issues that arise when a woman flees a violent relationship.

All too often, domestic violence follows women to work. According to recent studies, between 24 and 30 percent of women surveyed had lost their job, due at least in part, to domestic violence. Many victims lose their jobs because of their batterer's disruptive behavior. Many miss work because they are beaten. Others miss work because their abusers force them to stay home.

Many companies are poorly educated about the impact of domestic violence on women at work. Employers may fail to grant sufficient time off to attend civil or criminal legal proceedings or for safety planning. Some battered women find themselves penalized by their abuser's actions when employers dismiss or otherwise sanction employees once they learn they are in an abusive relationship One study found that 96% of the women who were working while involved in an abusive relationship had problems at work. Problems run the gamut from being late to missing work to having difficulty performing their job. More than 50 percent of these women reported being reprimanded at work for such problems and more than a ⅓ of them said they had lost their jobs as a result.

Our bill allows women to use the Family and Medical Leave Act to take time off to deal with the problems arising from leaving a violent relationship. Women need to deal with the court and legal system when they file for protective orders. Many times women need counseling for themselves and their children to support them as they establish a life separate from their batterers. Allowing women to use the FMLA to take this necessary time off will help women become more productive workers and give then the financial independence they need to begin a new, violence free life.

Not only do we need to provide women with the flexibility that they need, but need to ensure that their rights are protected should they unfairly lose their job. This bill prohibits discrimination against an employee based on her status or experience as a victim of domestic violence. It recognizes that we need not only policies that prohibit discrimination, but teeth to give those policies some bite. Our bill would give women the legal means to challenge any discrimination they may have faced as a result of being a victim of domestic violence.

As many of you know, we are still struggling to get all sectors of society to understand that domestic violence affects all aspects of a battered woman's life. Too many times women who have applied for health insurance are denied or charge exorbitant rates when insurance companies find out that they are victims of domestic violence. This is outrageous! Insurance discrimination penalizes victims of domestic violence for the actions of their abusers. Our bill makes sure that this form of discrimination will not be allowed.

VAWA I took the first step in dedicating federal resources to addressing the domestic violence crisis, but its focus is law enforcement and emergency response. We need to go to the next level to truly end violence against women. We need to address their economic needs and problems. I believe our legislation meets this test and will eliminate many of the economic barriers that trap women and children in violent homes and relationships.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

BATTERED WOMEN'S ECONOMIC SECURITY AND SAFETY ACT OF 1999—LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

TITLE I.—DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Subtitle A. Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Victims' Housing.—Makes funding available for supportive housing services through the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, including rental assistance to victims trying to establish permanent housing safe from the batterer.

Subtitle B. Full Faith and Credit for Protection Orders.—Clarifies VAWA's full faith and credit provisions to ensure meaningful enforcement by states and tribes; provides grants to states and Tribes to improve enforcement and record keeping.

Subtitle C. Victims of Abuse Insurance Protection.—Prohibits discrimination in issuing and administering insurance policies to victims of domestic violence with uniform protection from insurance discrimination.

Subtitle D. Access to Safety and Advocacy.—Issues grants to provide legal assistance, lay advocacy and referral services to victims of domestic violence who have inadequate access to sufficient financial resources for appropriate legal assistance; includes set-aside for tribes.

Subtitle E. Battered Women's Shelters and Services.—Amends the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to authorize $1 billion to battered women's shelters over the next five years; includes additional oversight and review; caps spending for training and technical assistance by State coalitions with the remaining money to go to domestic violence programs; adds new proposals for training and technical assistance; allots money for tribal domestic violence coalitions.).

Subtitle F. Battered Immigrant Women's Economic Security and Safety—Addresses gaps, errors and oversights in current legislation that impede battered immigrant women's ability to flee violent relationships and survive economically; ensures that battered immigrants with pending immigration applications are able to access public benefits, Food Stamps, SSI, housing, work permits, and immigration relief.

TITLE II. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND THE WORKPLACE

Subtitle A. National Clearinghouse on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault and the Workplace Grant.—Establishes clearinghouse and resource center to give information and assistance to businesses, employers and labor organizations in their efforts to develop and implement responses to assist victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Subtitle B. Victims' Employment Rights.—Prohibits employers from taking adverse job actions against an employee because they are the victims of domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking.

Subtitle C. Workplace Violence Against Women Prevention Tax Credit.—Provides tax credit to businesses implementing workplace safety programs to combat violence against women.

Subtitle D. Employment Protection for Battered Women.—Ensures eligibility for unemployment compensation to women separated from their jobs due to circumstances directly resulting from domestic violence; requires employers who already provide leave to employees to allow employees to use that leave for the purpose of dealing with domestic violence and its aftermath; allows women to use their family and medical leave or existing leave under state law or a private benefits program to deal with domestic abuse, including going to the doctor for domestic violence injuries, seeking legal remedies, attending court hearings, seeking orders of protection and meeting with a lawyer; provides for training of personnel involved in assessing unemployment claims based on domestic violence.

TITLE III.—PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNDER PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Section 301. Waivers for Victims of Domestic Violence under the TANF Program.—Finds that Congressional intent of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 was to allow states to take the effects of domestic violence into consideration by allowing good cause, temporary waivers of the requirements of the program for victims of domestic violence; places no numerical limits upon States in the granting of good cause waivers; provides that individuals granted good cause waivers shall not be included in the participation rate for purposes of applying limitations or imposing penalties on the States; allows for Secretarial review and possible revocation of good cause waivers granted in States where penalties have been imposed.

Section 302. Disclosure Protections under the Child Support Program.—Protects victims fleeing from domestic violence from disclosure of their whereabouts through the federal child support locator service.

Section 303. Bonus to Encourage Women and Children's Well-Being.—Amends the Social Security Act to provide bonuses to States that demonstrate high performance in operating their State welfare programs by providing recipients and low-income families with adequate access to affordable and quality child care; by effectively placing recipients in sustainable wage, non-traditional employment; and by adequately addressing domestic violence in the lives of recipients of assistance; requires HHS and others to develop a formula for measuring State performance.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Contains technical amendments to assure access to services by tribal women.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by Senator WELLSTONE to introduce the Battered Women's Economic Security Act. This has been a seven year effort and one that I will continue to pursue. I want to thank Senator WELLSTONE for his efforts on this important legislation. I also need to recognize the leadership of

Senator BIDEN regarding the Violence Against Women Act. Without his work on this historic legislation since 1994, we could not be here today talking about the economic needs of victims of domestic violence.

In 1994, we enacted the landmark Violence Against Women Act. For the first time, Congress said violence against women was a national disgrace and a public health threat. We had to act. This was no longer just a family matter or a family dispute, this was and is a serious threat against women and a serious threat to the community. We have had police officers in Washington state killed responding to domestic violence calls. We have seen too many women in the emergency room and too many families devastated by violence.

VAWA set in motion a national response to this crisis. We are now in the process of reauthorizing and strengthening VAWA. This is my major priority. Reauthorization of VAWA cements the foundation we need to build the structure that will ultimately end domestic violence and abuse.

The Battered Women's Economic Security Act takes the next logical step. As a result of the work that I have done concerning family violence, I have come to understand that the real long-term solution is to tear down the economic barriers that trap women in violent homes and relationships.

Our legislation addresses many of the economic barriers that I know force a cycle of violence. I have met with many of the advocates in the state of Washington and heard from them first hand, about how these barriers make long term security for women and their children difficult. From housing to child care to job protection to welfare waivers, our legislation attempts to deal with the long term economic problems.

Women should not have to be forced to choose between job security and violence. Each year one million individuals become victims of violent crimes while working on duty. Men are more likely to be attacked at work by a stranger, women are more likely to be attacked by someone they know. One-sixth of all workplace homicides of women are committed by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend or ex-boyfriend. Boyfriends and husbands, both current and former, commit more than 13,000 acts of violence against women in the workplace every year. This does not include harassment or the threat of violence. Clearly, women face a serious threat in the work place and yet if they leave to avoid harm, they are denied workers compensation. Perhaps even more offensive is the fact that some states require victims of domestic violence to seek employment in order to receive TANF benefits. To have any economic safety net some women are forced to jeopardize their own safety.

This is not just an issue that effects victims of domestic violence. We all suffer the economic consequences of violence. it has been estimated that work place violence resulted in $4.2 billion in lost productivity and legal expenses for American businesses. From what I have heard from victims and advocates, this is a very conservative estimate. The health care costs are also equally staggering. Both the American Medical Association (AMA) and the Surgeon General have labeled violence against women a public health threat. Violence is the number one reason women ages 19 to 35 end up in the emergency room. One out of every three women can expect to be the victim of violence at some point in her life.

Our legislation would also prohibit discriminating against victims of domestic violence in all lines of insurance. If a woman seeks treatment in an Emergency Room and reports this as domestic violence, she should not be denied disability or life insurance. If an estranged husband burns the house to the ground the woman should not be denied compensation simply because it was an act of domestic violence. To say that victims of domestic violence engage in high risk behavior similar to sky diving or race care driving is simply outrageous. It is the ultimate example of blaming the victim.

Our legislation is not the final solution, but it begins the process of addressing long term economic needs. I am hopeful that once we have secured reauthorization of VAWA we can begin to focus on these economic problems. Without VAWA we have no foundation.

I will be working with PAUL and other Members of the Senate towards enactment of key provisions of the bill. I am also committed to continuing my work with Senator BIDEN in an effort to enact Violence Against Women Reauthorization during this session.

I urge all of my colleagues to review the Battered Women's Economic Security Act. I encourage all of you to talk to your advocates and your police, ask them what issues keep women trapped in a violent home or relationship. Ask them what needs to be done to provide long term solutions. I know that after careful review and consideration, you will reach the same conclusions. There are economic barriers that must be torn down. I hope that many of you will join in cosponsoring this legislation and work with me to enact this comprehensive solution to ending the cycle of violence that too many women and children face every day.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. COVERDELL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. KYL, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. 1070. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to wait for completion of a National Academy of Sciences study before promulgating a standard, regulation or guideline or ergonomics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENSIBLE ERGONOMICS NEEDS SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business to introduce the Sensible Ergonomics Needs Scientific Evidence Act of SENSE Act. This bill calls on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to do the sensible thing—wait for sound science before imposing new ergonomics regulations on small businesses. If enacted, the SENSE Act would require OSHA to wait for the results of a study by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) before issuing proposed or final regulations, standards or guidelines on ergonomics. As a native of Missouri, the ''Show Me State,'' waiting for the NAS study makes good sense to me.

In introducing the SENSE Act, I am pleased to be joined by numerous colleagues from all across the country—including Senators ENZI, JEFFORDS, BURNS, VOINOVICH, SNOWE, ASHCROFT, MCCONNELL, LOTT, NICKLES, HUTCHINSON, MACK, COVERDELL, COLLINS, SHELBY, KYL, FITZGERALD, ABRAHAM, GREGG, HUTCHISON, HELMS, BUNNING, CRAPO, BENNETT, DEWINE, HAGEL, SESSIONS, and CHAFEE. These Senators, like me, agree with their small business constituents that it makes good sense for OSHA to wait for the results of the NAS study before proposing additional regulatory requirements for small businesses.

Just last year, Congress and the President agreed to spend $890,000 for NAS to undertake a thorough, objective, and de novo review of the scientific literature to examine the cause-and-effect relationship between repetitive tasks in the workplace and musculoskeletal disorders. The study is intended to achieve a scientific understanding of the conditions and causes of musculoskeletal disorders. The NAS has selected a panel of experts to conduct the study. The panel will examine the scientific data on the multiple factors and influences that contribute to musculoskeletal disorders and answer seven questions provided by Representatives BONILLA and Livingston. The NAS will complete its study by January 2001. As intended by Congress and the President, the NAS study will assist OSHA and the Congress in determining whether sound science supports a comprehensive ergonomics regulation as envisioned by OSHA.

In theory, an ergonomics regulation would attempt to reduce musculoskeletal disorders, such as Carpal Tunnel Syndrome, muscle aches and back pain, which, in some instances, have been attributed to on-the-job activities. However, the medical community is divided sharply on whether scientific

evidence has established a true cause-and-effect relationship between such problems and workplace duties. We need to understand the relationship between work and these injuries before moving forward.

Regrettably, rather than waiting for NAS' findings, OSHA now plans to publish a proposed rule by September of 1999. In fact, OSHA officials have suggested that a final rule could be issued by the end of 2000—just a few months before NAS will complete its study. This simply doesn't make sense. The NAS study should identify scientific and medical studies that are based on sound science and provide solid scientific evidence regarding the causation of ergonomics injuries. Our intent is simply to ensure that the requirements of any ergonomics program proposed by OSHA are based on sound science and are effective to improve workplace safety and health. It only makes sense for OSHA to wait for the scientific and medical information needed to know whether it is headed down the right path.

Waiting for the NAS study won't stop the progress being made as ergonomic principles are applied to the workplace. And, progress is being made. According to recent data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of injuries and illnesses involving repeated trauma, strains, sprains, tears, and carpal tunnel syndrome are all on the decline. Employers are actively implementing measures to address ergonomic risk factors. The SENSE Act is in no way intended to discourage employers from continuing to implement voluntary measures where appropriate and effective. Similarly, the SENSE Act does not prevent OSHA from continuing to work on ergonomics. In fact, I would encourage OSHA to use the time prior to the completion of the NAS study to research ergonomics further, identify successful prevention strategies, and provide technical assistance. For those who would argue that waiting for the NAS study will result in more employees being injury, OSHA can exercise its enforcement authority under the General Duty Clause, Section 5(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, to ensure a safe workplace and address any significant ergonomic hazards. My bill doesn't change that authority provided under current law.

Simply put, the SENSE Act requires OSHA to wait for NAS to complete its study and submit the findings in a report to Congress. Congress would then have 30 days to review the final report before OSHA issues proposed or final regulations, standards or guidelines. From where I stand, it only makes sense for Congress and OSHA to have the benefit of the NAS study before OSHA proposes to require employers to implement a comprehensive program addressing musculoskeletal disorders.

Tomorrow in the other body, the compansion bill to the SENSE Act is scheduled for mark up. H.R. 987, known as the ''Workplace Preservation Act,'' was introduced by Representantive ROY BLUNT from Missouri on March 4. Representative BLUNT is doing an excellent job shepherding his bill through the other body. In fact, his efforts have produced a bipartisan list of 138 cosponsors. I expect the Senate to show similar support for our Nation's small businesses.

I urge my collagues in the Senate to take a good look at the SENSE Act and join us in supporting legislation to ensure that the federal government does not propose an ergonomics regulation for small businesses until Congress can assess the findings of the NAS study.

I ask unanimous consent that the Sensible Ergonomics Needs Scientific Evidence (SENSE) Act be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 1070

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 ''Sensible Ergonomics Needs Scientific Evidence Act'' or the ''SENSE Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Department of Labor, through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (referred to in this Act as ''OSHA''), has announced that it plans to propose regulations during 1999 to regulate ''ergonomics'' in the workplace. A draft of OSHA's ergonomics regulation became available in February 19, 1999.

(2) In October, 1998, Congress and the President agreed that the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a comprehensive study of the medical and scientific evidence regarding musculoskeletal disorders. The study is intended to evaluate the basic questions about diagnosis and causes of such disorders. Given the uncertainty and dispute about these basic questions, and Congress' intention that they be addressed in a comprehensive study by the National Academy of Sciences, it is premature for OSHA to propose a regulation on ergonomics as being necessary or appropriate to improve workers' health and safety until such study is completed.

(3) An August, 1998, workshop on ''work related musculoskeletal injuries'' held by the National Academy of Sciences reviewed existing research on musculoskeletal disorders. It showed that there is insufficient evidence to assess the level of risk to workers from repetitive motions.

(4) A July, 1997, report by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) reviewing epidemiological studies that have been conducted of ''work related musculoskeletal disorders of the neck, upper extremity, and low back'' showed that there is insufficient evidence to assess the level of risk to workers from repetitive motions. Such evidence would be necessary to write an efficient and effective regulation.

SEC. 3. DELAY OF STANDARD, REGULATION OR GUIDELINE.

The Secretary of Labor, acting through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, may not propose or issue in final form any standard, regulation, or guideline on ergonomics until—

(1) the National Academy of Sciences—

(A) completes a peer-reviewed scientific study, as mandated by Public Law 105–277, of the available evidence examining a cause and effect relationship between repetitive tasks in the workplace and musculoskeletal disorders or repetitive stress injuries; and

(B) submits to Congress a report setting forth the findings resulting from such study; and

(2) the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the final report under paragraph (1)(B) is submitted to Congress.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1071. A bill to designate the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory as the Center of Excellence for Environmental Stewardship of the Department of Energy land, and establish the Natural Resources Institute within the Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AND NATURAL RESOURCES ACT OF 1999

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Environmental Stewardship and Natural Resources Act which I am introducing today with Senator CRAIG as cosponsor.

The nuclear defense capability of the United States has protected our form of government and ensured our freedoms since its inception during World War II. In order to sustain and develop our nuclear deterrence, a vast industrial complex was established. This complex of facilities was built under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission and its successor agency, the Department of Energy. Uranium mines, factories, laboratories, and reactors were located throughout the country to provide nuclear and conventional components for weapons. These facilities were mostly located on large tracts of land, which also included surrounding buffer areas for security.

With the end of the cold war, and the mutual reduction of the United States and Russian nuclear arsenals, many of our nuclear facilities are closing, changing or reducing their missions. Land management at these facilities, throughout their production lives was limited to accomplishing their missions and providing isolation and security. Protection of the ecosystems and natural resources, on which our nuclear arsenal was built, did not rate high priority in the agency's planning. Any environmental benefits or natural resources protection on these facilities was truly incidental to their isolation.

In addition to lack of natural resource planning, there exists a contamination legacy which has resulted in the largest and most expensive cleanup program in the federal government. Regardless of the effectiveness and efficiency of the cleanup program, some levels of contaminants will remain, and will need to be monitored and managed. Long term stewardship is the process of managing and protecting the natural resources that are unaffected by contamination, and also the continual monitoring and stabilization of contaminants that remain in place following mediation. Even after a

facility is cleaned up and closed, no matter how effective the remediation effort, the federal government is still liable for any subsequent action that may be necessary to insure that no harm will come to humans or the environment.

The Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, INEEL, has a long history with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Energy. Originally known as the National Reactor Testing Station, this site constructed, tested, and operated 52 reactors for various defense and civilian purposes since the early 1950's. All but a handful of these reactors have been decontaminated and dismantled. In addition to this nuclear mission, the INEEL has developed expertise and experience in the modeling the movement of contaminants in the environment; and research and development of technologies necessary for the detection, monitoring, stabilization, and mediation of contamination. I propose, with this bill, to establsh the INEEL as the Department of Energy Center of Excellence for the development of technologies, techniques, and methodologies for the implementation of an effective Long Term Stewardship program throughout the nuclear weapons production complex.

I also propose the establishment of a Natural Resource Institute at the INEEL. This institute will bring together scientists, scholars, and others in the field of natural resources management, to study complex issues that affect natural resources policy. The institute will also work on specific natural resource and environmental issues and problems, by utilizing the resources of the INEEL, northwest universities, states, and various federal agencies. The INEEL is a national laboratory, not is just a laboratory for the Department of Energy. The expertise, experience, and resources of this site must be made available to all. The natural Resource Institute will be the conduit for bringing expertise to the INEEL and for making information, data, and good science available for the solution of natural resource issues throughout the inland northwest.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and MR. HAGEL):

S. 1073. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to ensure that United States industry is consulted with respect to all aspects of the WTO dispute settlement process; to the Committee on Finance.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, developing trade policy that will increase Americans' competitiveness in the 21st century must be a priority of this Congress and of the administration. That is why I rise today, joined by Senators DANIEL INOUYE, CHUCK GRASSLEY, CONRAD BURNS, PAT ROBERTS, CHUCK HAGEL, and MIKE ENZI, to introduce the World Trade Organization Enforcement Act of 1999. It is a bill that will increase transparency and give the public more input into the dispute settlement process of the WTO. It is analogous to a ''Sunshine Law'' for the WTO.

The United States plays a major role in leading the world and shaping its economy and must continue to do so. We must be leaders, not simply participants. Our leadership as a country will be effective only if our trade policy is clearly defined and is based on the vital interests of the American people, because if Americans do not accept our leadership on trade policy, neither will the rest of the world.

Our success of more than 200 years has been because American is a nation dedicated to We the People. We are a nation whose greatness flows not from government, but from the creativity and ingenuity of the American people. Our service providers, manufacturers, retailers, farmers and ranchers, and investors are top notch compared with their competitors, and it is time for us in public service to lay aside the values and priorities of Washington, D.C., and promote the values and priorities of the American people.

As I have traveled around Missouri, one thing is clear: citizens want America to be defined today as she was 100-plus years ago. We have been known as a land of ascending opportunity, that every generation in America has more opportunity than the previous generation. This is a definition of America that we must maintain—''the best is yet to come.''

Already, U.S. companies are first-class in their production, processing, and marketing at home and abroad—always responding to the challenges of our competitive free-market system. While the United States can produce more goods and provide more services than any other country, we account for only five percent of the world's consuming population. That leaves 95 percent of the world's consumers outside of our borders—this is an astounding statistic when we put it in terms of creating opportunities.

For example, nearly 40 percent of all U.S. agricultural production is exported, but in September of last year, American farmers and ranchers faced the first monthly trade deficit of U.S. farm and food products since the United States began tracking trade data in 1941. Our farmers, or any other sector, simply will not succeed if they face descending opportunity. With manufacturing productivity increasing and with the consuming capacity of the world largely outside of our borders, our companies need equally increasing access to foreign demand. The prosperity of the next generation of Americans is tied to our current competitiveness in global markets.

We must develop policies that will shape opportunities for the 21st century—opening new markets, ensuring that our trading partners live up to their commitments, and to the greatest extent possible avoiding sanctions that hurt only our market opportunities abroad.

I still believe we must make a concerted effort to pass fast track trade negotiating authority. Because fast track has languished, U.S. businesses are increasingly being put at a competitive disadvantage. While Canada has already concluded a free trade agreement with Chile, and Mexico is expanding its free trade arrangement with Chile, the United States lags behind. Our companies clearly are being put at a competitive disadvantage in our own hemisphere. America must lead, not follow—in our back yard and around the world.

As we approach the next round of negotiations in the WTO, fast track is crucial to U.S. businesses. Clearly, trade negotiations designed to reduce or eliminate barriers and trade distorting practices have benefited our companies and our economy, and we need to continue our leadership role in multiple trade fora.

However, support for fast track and new negotiations is tied in the public mind to the benefit they receive from existing trade agreements. It is of utmost importance that the United States closely monitor and vigorously enforce our trade agreements. The private sector must be able to rely on U.S. agreements to be productive and long-lasting.

Opening foreign markets looms before us as a brick barricade. With the same will and authority of President Reagan before the Berlin Wall when he said—''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall''—we must face head-on the barricades before our exporters. It's not an easy task, but then again, neither was dismantling the Evil Empire. As John Wayne said in ''The Big Trail'': ''No great trail is ever blazed without hardship. You've got to fight. That's life.''

Just last week, the Europeans stood on their massive wall of protectionism built across the trail of free trade and simply rejected U.S. beef, even in the face of having lost the WTO case. We've got a trail to blaze—the Europeans cannot be allowed to make a mockery of the competitive spirit of our cattle ranchers. In this case, results, not words, count the most.

Failing to implement agreements already negotiated creates an environment of descending opportunity. It is imperative, therefore, that the Administration follow through with enforcing the decisions the U.S. has won in the WTO. What good is winning a case if we are unable to enforce the judgment?

It is clear that the most contentious issues ever to be brought before the WTO—whether it is negotiating new agreements or suing the dispute settlement process to enforce existing ones—have been about the agricultural policies of the United States and the European Union.

One of the significant changes in the dispute settlement process in 1994 was that panels would be set up and panel

decisions would be adopted but for a consensus against doing so. Also, strict time lines were built into the process. Soon thereafter, the U.S. took two agriculture cases against the EU through the new WTO dispute process—the banana case and the beef case (which had already been before the GATT panel). The new dispute settlement changes in the WTO worked, and the United States won these two agriculture cases without the EU having the ability to block unilaterally the cases from moving forward.

For every triumph, however, the United States has suffered multiple defeats. Our most recent triumphs were getting the EU to accept a WTO dispute settlement process that is quick and binding, and winning agriculture cases against the EU in that settlement process. However, the EU is now denying U.S. farmers and ranchers the benefits of the WTO cases we won by stalling endlessly in the implementation of those decisions.

If the EU, or any other country, is allowed to use delaying tactics, there could be detrimental effects on these agriculture cases and on future cases regardless of the sector litigated. Also, the public support for the WTO system and its ability to benefit U.S. interests will be undermined.

It is essential that the administration make the EU beef ban a top priority. The United States has won this case against the EU numerous times, and we are clearly within our rights to benefit from the cases we litigate and win.

We must take the position that if the EU insists on ''paying'' for its protectionism, the EU should ''pay'' at the highest levels allowable and on products that will hurt it the most. While U.S. ranchers can never be compensated fully for the EU's protectionist policies, the value of concessions withdrawn from the EU must at least equal the value of the beef producers current damage.

Beef producers in Missouri will not benefit if the level of retaliation is not such that will induce the EU to change its protectionist policies. A strong response to the EU's treatment of U.S. agricultural products is long overdue. We must have reciprocity in our cross-Atlantic agricultural trade. If U.S. meat is not welcome in the EU, then EU meat should not be accepted in the United States.

The EU's repeated, damaging actions against America's cattlemen must not go unaswered—that is why I have called on the Administration to retaliate with authority and that is why I am introducing the WTO Enforcement Act.

The WTO Enforcement Act has two major objectives: ensure that the U.S. government affords adequate transparency and public participation in the U.S. decision-making process, and begin multilateral negotiations with a view toward incorporating more transparency and consultation in the multilateral context of the WTO dispute settlement process.

If the farm groups and U.S. companies were to increase their public comment in the implementation and post-implementation stages of the WTO dispute settlement process, this will heighten the pressure on the foreign country to comply with the Panel decisions. Currently, while the USTR, Congress, and industry groups consult during the implementation stages of Panel decisions, making the comment and reporting requirements more established and anticipated will increase accountability. The WTO system needs to be given a chance to work, but the best way to do so is to increase pressure on those countries that would try to circumvent the implementation of panels. This is imperative not only for agriculture and our relations with the EU, it could affect all sectors that are litigated under the WTO dispute settlement process.

The proposed modifications to U.S. domestic rules regarding dispute settlement will prove more effective if the losing party to a WTO dispute provides to the winning party its plan to comply with the WTO decision and if the winning party is given meaningfully opportunity to comment on the plan prior to its implementation.

The WTO is currently in the midst of a review of the organization's dispute settlement procedures. Therefore, under the WTO Enforcement Act, the United States must request reforms that would oblige member government's to submit a proposed remedy well in advance of the deadline to comply to the decision and as well as consult with the other parties to the proceeding on the proposal.

If the WTO Enforcement Act is passed, the U.S. public would be able to obtain more information about the foreign government's plans for compliance with WTO panel decisions and would be afforded a more formal opportunity to comment on how the process is working. If we negotiate trade agreements for American citizens wishing to do business in foreign markets, they have every right to voice their support for or objections to the way foreign governments or the U.S. government is making those agreements beneficial.

It is time for us to enact policies that reflect our support for U.S. companies' efforts to reach their competitive potential internationally and policies that create ascending opportunity for Americans for the 21st century so that we can say, with confidence, ''the best is yet to come.''

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 3

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income tax rates by 10 percent.

S. 15

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that married couples may file a combined return under which each spouse is taxed using the rates applicable to unmarried individuals.

S. 30

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to provide contercyclical income loss protection to offset extreme losses resulting from severe economic and weather-related events, and for other purposes.

S. 38

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 38, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase out the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period.

S. 56

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 135

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 135, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 147

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 147, a bill to provide for a reduction in regulatory costs by maintaining Federal average fuel economy standards applicable to automobiles in effect at current levels until changed by law, and for other purposes.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 216, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the use of foreign tax credits under the alternative minimum tax.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) were added as cosponsors of S. 285, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.