

for the previous eight years. This wave of imported steel substantially reduced demand for U.S. steel production, and brought about the devastating loss of employment for more than ten thousand American steelworkers.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has found dumping margins of up to 200 percent on Russian steel, up to 67 percent on Japanese steel, and up to 70 percent on steel from Brazil. Appropriate actions are being pursued to assess penalties against those responsible for this illegal dumping of steel. However, even if penalty tariffs are collected against those responsible for this illegal dumping, U.S. steel mills will not receive any compensation for the losses they have suffered. A number of U.S. steel plants have closed or declared bankruptcy since September of 1998, and a number of others are close behind.

Estimates are that jobs of tens of thousands of additional steelworkers are in danger unless this illegal dumping is stopped and those in the U.S. steel industry are able to meet their financial obligations in order to get back on their feet.

EMERGENCY OIL AND GAS GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM

The Emergency Oil and Gas Guarantee program, as reported by the committee, provides a two-year, GATT-legal, five-hundred-million dollar guaranteed loan program to back loans provided by private financial institutions to qualified oil and gas producers and the associated oil and gas service industry, including Alaska Native Corporations. The minimum loan to be guaranteed for a single company at any one time would be \$250,000, and the maximum would be \$10,000,000. A board is established to administer this program consisting of the Secretaries of Commerce (who would serve as chairman), Treasury, and Labor. This board would have the authority to determine the specific requirements in awarding these loan guarantees, including the percentage of the guarantee, appropriate collateral, as well as loan amounts and interest rates thereon. Repayment of the loans guaranteed under this program would be required within ten years.

The committee makes these recommendations in response to the critical situation facing the domestic, independent oil and gas industry. Since the beginning of the most recent oil and gas crisis (January 1997), the industry has lost 42,500 jobs. Bankruptcies have fueled the closure of an estimated 136,000 wells. Twenty percent of total U.S. marginal well production has been jeopardized because of bankruptcies.

The economic slowdown in Asia led to depressed demand, and oversupply. The United Nation's Food for Oil program, which allows Iraq to sell additional oil in an already saturated market, further depressed prices. Every key indicator of domestic oil and gas industry's health—earnings, employment, production, rig counts, rig rates and seismic activity is down.

The committee notes that the United States was 36 percent dependent when the oil embargo of the 1970s hit. U.S. foreign oil consumption is estimated at 56 percent and could reach 68 percent by 2010 if \$10 to \$12 per barrel prices prevail. It has been predicted that half of marginal wells located in 34 states could be shut-in. Marginal wells produce less than 15 barrels of oil and day and are the most vulnerable to closure when prices drop. Yet, these wells, in aggregate, produce as much oil as we import from Saudi Arabia.

There is no current government loan program that will help the oil and gas producers and the oil and gas service industry. The industry tried to use our trade laws but without success. In 1994, when U.S. dependence

upon foreign oil was 51 percent, a Department of Commerce section 232(b) Trade Expansion Act investigation report found that rising imports of foreign oil threaten to impair U.S. national security because they increase U.S. vulnerability to oil supply interruptions. President Clinton concurred with that finding. Unfortunately, little action to address the problem has been implemented.

Without an emergency loan program to get them through the current credit crunch there will be more bankruptcies, more lost jobs, and greater dependence on foreign oil.

OFFSET

The committee's recommendation includes a rescission of \$270 million from the administrative and travel accounts of the object class entitled "Contractual Services and Supplies" in the non-defense category of the budget. This category includes such things as \$7 billion for travel and transportation; over \$7 billion for advisory and assistance services; \$44 billion for a category called "other services"; and almost \$30 billion for supplies and materials. The rescission shall be taken on a pro-rata basis from funds available to every Federal agency, department, and office in the Executive Branch, in the non-defense category. The Office of Management and Budget is required to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate a listing of the amounts by account of the reductions made.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported en bloc, an original fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, the fiscal year 2000 section 302(b) allocation, and H.R. 1664, by recorded vote of 24-3, a quorum being present.

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	Mr. Dorgan
Mr. Cochran	Mrs. Feinstein
Mr. Domenici	Mr. Durbin
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Kyl	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	

BUDGETARY IMPACT

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. All funds recommended in this bill are emergency funding requirements, offset herein.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTION OF OUTLAYS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following table contains 5-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

FISCAL YEAR 1999 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	270	108
Mandatory		
Total	270	180
Five year projections: Outlays:		
Fiscal year 1999		108
Fiscal year 2000		162
Fiscal year 2001		
Fiscal year 2002		
Fiscal year 2003		
Financial Assistance to State and Local Governments		

Note: The above table includes mandatory and discretionary appropriations, and excludes emergency appropriations.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 25, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,600,993,485,850.44 (Five trillion, six hundred billion, nine hundred ninety-three million, four hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred fifty dollars and forty-four cents).

Five years ago, May 25, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,594,146,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred ninety-four billion, one hundred forty-six million).

Ten years ago, May 25, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,779,572,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred seventy-two million).

Fifteen years ago, May 25, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,489,052,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred eighty-nine billion, fifty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,111,941,485,850.44 (Four trillion, one hundred eleven billion, nine hundred forty-one million, four hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred fifty dollars and forty-four cents) during the past 15 years.

WIC FOR MILITARY FAMILIES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been circulating drafts of bills designed to provide WIC benefits to military personnel and to certain civilian personnel, stationed overseas, for a few weeks. I know that Senator HARKIN and other Senators on both sides of the aisle have also been working on this matter as have members of the other body.

I have received valuable input regarding my drafts from Members, national organizations and even personnel stationed overseas and I appreciate all who have helped. This bill introduction does not mean that I am no longer seeking input. On the contrary, as I have always handled nutrition legislation, I want to work with all Members on this important legislation, which I hope can be unanimously passed.

Basically, the Strengthening Families in the Military Service Act mandates that the Secretary of Defense offer a program similar to the WIC program—the Supplemental Nutrition

Program for Women, Infants and Children—to military and associated civilian personnel stationed on bases overseas. If it makes sense to allow those stationed in the United States to participate in WIC, it makes sense to allow those stationed overseas to have the important nutritional benefits of that program. Why should families lose their benefits when they are moved overseas?

This bill provides that the Secretary of Defense will administer the program under rules similar to the WIC program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture within the United States.

WIC is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. In fact, just a few weeks ago, I joined Senators LUGAR and TORRICELLI, the National Association of WIC Directors' Executive Director Doug Greenaway, as well as others, in celebrating this accomplishment.

For 25 years the WIC program has provided nutritious foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum and breast-feeding women, infants, and children who are judged to be at a nutritional risk.

It has proven itself to be a great investment—for every dollar invested in the WIC program, an estimated \$3 is saved in future medical expenses. WIC has helped to prevent low birth weight babies and associated risks such as developmental disabilities, birth defects, and other complications. Participation in the WIC program has also been linked to reductions in infant mortality.

This program has worked extremely well in Vermont, and throughout the nation.

However, despite the successes of this program, there continues to be an otherwise eligible population who cannot receive these benefits—women and children in military families stationed outside of the United States.

These are families who are serving our country, living miles from their homes on a military base in a foreign land, and whose nutritional health is at risk. If they were stationed within our borders, their diets would be supplemented by the WIC program, and they would receive vouchers or packages of healthy foods, such as fortified cereals and juices, high protein products, and other foods especially rich in needed minerals and vitamins. If they receive orders stationing them at a U.S. base located in another country, they lose this needed support.

I know that I am not alone in my desire to establish WIC benefits for our women and children of military families stationed overseas. I look forward to working with all members of Congress in making a program that benefits nutritionally at risk women, infants and children serving America from abroad. I know there are other approaches being considered and I want to work out a good solution.

I have been informed of situations where this nutrition assistance is desperately needed by military and civil-

ian personnel overseas. I do not see how we can turn our backs on these Americans stationed abroad. I am willing to work with other ways of providing this assistance but I believe that my bill has advantages over other suggestions. First, this bill guarantees this assistance for the next three years and mandates a study to determine if improvements or other changes are needed.

This bill also disregards the value of in kind housing assistance in calculating eligibility which increases the number of women, infants and children that can participate and makes the program more similar to the program in the United States. The CBO has estimated that the average monthly food cost would be about \$28 for each participant based on a Department of Defense estimate of the cost of an average WIC food package in military commissaries. Administration costs which include health and nutrition assessments are likely to be about \$7 per month per participant, according to CBO.

I am advised that counting the value of in kind housing assistance as though it were cash assistance would reduce the cost of this program to \$2 million per year and that 5,100 women and children would participate in an average month under such an approach. This will be an issue which I look forward to discussing with my colleagues.

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

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

S.—

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 "Strengthening Families in the Military Service Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) prenatal care and proper nutrition for pregnant women reduces the incidence of birth abnormalities and low birth weight among infants;

(2) proper nutrition for infants and young children has very positive health and growth benefits; and

(3) women, infants, and children of military families stationed outside the United States are potentially at nutritional risk.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to ensure that women, infants, and children of military families stationed outside the United States receive supplemental foods and nutrition education if they generally would be eligible to receive supplemental foods and nutrition education provided in the United States under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786).

SEC. 3. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION BENEFITS FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN OF MILITARY FAMILIES STATIONED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1060a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (h); and

(2) by striking subsections (a) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall establish and carry out a program to provide, at no cost to the recipient, supplemental foods and nutrition education to—

“(1) low-income pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding women, infants, and children up to 5 years of age of military families of the armed forces of the United States stationed outside the United States (and its territories and possessions); and

“(2) eligible civilians serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside the United States (and its territories and possessions).

“(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall operate the program under this section in a manner that is similar to the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786).

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section that are as similar as practicable to regulations promulgated to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, but that take into account—

“(1) the need to use military personnel to carry out functions under the program established under this section, including functions relating to supplemental foods, nutrition education, eligibility determinations, oversight, enforcement, auditing, financial management, application reviews, delivery of benefits and program information, handling of local operations and administration, and reporting and recordkeeping;

“(2) the need to limit participation to certain military installations to ensure efficient program operations using funds made available to carry out this section;

“(3) the availability in foreign countries of exchange stores, commissary stores, and other sources of supplemental foods; and

“(4) other factors or circumstances determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense, including the need to phase-in program operations during fiscal year 2000.

“(d) ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall be responsible for the implementation, management, and operation of the program established under this section, including ensuring the proper expenditure of funds made available to carry out this section.

“(2) INVESTIGATION AND MONITORING.—The Inspectors General of the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense shall investigate and monitor the implementation of this section.

“(e) RECORDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall require that such accounts and records (including medical records) be maintained as are necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense to—

“(1) determine whether there has been compliance with this section; and

“(2) determine and evaluate the adequacy of benefits provided under this section.

“(f) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report describing the implementation of this section to—

“(A) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

“(C) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of participation rates, typical food packages, health and nutrition assessment procedures, eligibility determinations, management difficulties, and benefits of the program established under this section.

“(g) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to the Secretary of Defense to carry out this section—

“(A) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

“(B) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

“(C) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

“(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall be entitled to receive the funds and shall accept the funds, without further appropriation.”

IMPORTED FOOD SAFETY ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to join with Senator COLLINS in introducing S. 1123, the Imported Food Safety Act of 1999. This legislation will address a growing problem that affects everyone in this nation, the safety of the food that we eat.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates as many as 9,100 deaths are attributed to foodborne illness each year in the United States. In addition there are tens of millions of cases of foodborne illness that occur, the majority of which go unreported due to the fact that they are not severe enough to warrant medical attention.

The legislation that Senator COLLINS and I have crafted will target one of the most critical areas in helping to provide Americans with the safest food possible—the safety of imported food. The CDC has recognized that as trade and economic development increases, the globalization of food supplies is likely to have an increasing impact on foodborne illnesses.

Currently, one-half of all the seafood and one-third of all the fresh fruit consumed in the U.S. comes from overseas. In fact, since the 1980's food imports to the U.S. have doubled, but federal inspections by Food and Drug Administration have dropped by 50 percent.

Over the years there have been foodborne pathogen outbreaks involving raspberries from Guatemala, strawberries from Mexico, scallions, parsley and cantaloupes from Mexico, carrots from Peru, coconut milk from Thailand, canned mushrooms from China and others. These outbreaks have serious consequences. The Mexican frozen strawberries I have just noted were distributed in the school lunch programs in several states, including my home state of Tennessee, were attributed to causing an outbreak of Hepatitis A in March of 1997.

The Collins-Frist bill will do several vital things to safeguard against potentially dangerous imported food. The bill would allow the U.S. Customs Service, using a system established by

FDA, to deny entry of imported food that has been associated with repeated and separate events of foodborne disease.

The bill would also allow the FDA to require food being imported by entities with a history of import violations to be held in a secure storage facility pending FDA approval and Customs release.

To improve the surveillance of imported food, we authorize CDC to enter into cooperative agreements and provide technical assistance to the States to conduct additional surveillance and studies to address critical questions for the prevention and control of foodborne diseases associated with imported food, and authorize CDC to conduct applied research to develop new or improved diagnostic tests for emerging foodborne pathogens in human specimens, food, and relevant environmental samples.

These are just a few of the many provisions in this bill that will help improve the quality and safety of the imported food that we consume every day. I applaud the leadership of my colleague, Senator COLLINS, who as Chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations held 4 comprehensive hearings last year on the issue of food safety. As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Health, I look forward to working with Senator COLLINS and the rest of my colleagues on the issue of food safety and our overall efforts in improving our Nation's public health infrastructure. We must continue to fight infectious diseases and ensure that this legislation is enacted to help protect our citizens and provide them with the healthiest food possible.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to voice my support for S. 566, the Agricultural Trade Freedom Act, which was passed out of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry this morning on a 17-1 vote. I appreciate Senator LUGAR's strong leadership on these trade and international issues.

More than any other industry in America, agriculture is extremely dependent on international trade. In fact, almost one-third of our domestic agricultural production is sold outside of the United States. Clearly, a strong international market for agricultural commodities is therefore of utmost importance to our agriculture economy.

As those of us who herald from agricultural states know, the business of agriculture in America reaches far beyond farmers alone. There are many rural businesses, such as feed stores, machinery repair shops and veterinarians, who depend on a strong agricultural economy. And when we discuss international trade, there are many national businesses, such as agricultural exporters, which are greatly impacted by our trade policies.

Despite the importance of these international markets, agricultural commodities are occasionally eliminated from potential markets because of U.S. imposed unilateral economic sanctions against other countries. These economic sanctions are imposed for political, foreign policy reasons. Yet there is little to show that the inclusions of agricultural commodities in these sanctions actually have had the intended results. The question now emerging from this policy is who is actually hurt by the ban on exporting commercial agricultural commodities, and should it continue?

American farmers and exporters obviously face an immediate loss in trade when unilateral economic sanctions are imposed. Perhaps even more devastating, however, is the long-term loss of the market. Countries who need agricultural products do not wait for American sanctions to be lifted; they find alternative markets. This often leads to the permanent loss of a market for our agriculture industry, as new trading partnerships are established and maintained.

Our farmers, and the rural businesses and agriculture exporters associated with them, are consequently greatly hurt by this policy. The Agricultural Trade Freedom Act corrects this problem by exempting commercial agricultural products from U.S. unilateral economic sanctions. The exemption of commercial agricultural products is not absolute; the President can make the determination that these items are indeed a necessary part of the sanction for achieving the intended foreign policy goal. In this situation, the President would be required to report to Congress regarding the purposes of the sanctions and their likely economic impacts.

Recently, the administration lifted restrictions on the sale of food to Sudan, Iran and Libya—all countries whose governments we have serious disagreements with. It did so, and I am among those who supported that decision, because food, like medicines, should not be used as a tool of foreign policy. It is also self-defeating. While our farmers lost sales, foreign farmers made profits.

Unfortunately, the administration did not see fit to apply the same reasoning to Cuba. American farmers cannot sell food to Cuba, even though it is only 90 miles from our shores and there is a significant potential market there. This contradiction is beneath a great and powerful country, and Senator LUGAR's legislation would permit such sales. The administration should pay more attention to what is in our national interests, rather than to a tiny, vocal minority who are wedded to a policy that has hurt American farmers and the Cuban people.

The Agricultural Trade Freedom Act maintains the President's need for flexibility in foreign policy while simultaneously recognizing the impact that sanctions may have on the agricultural economy. This legislation is