S. 807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who have attained age 59 1/2 may contribute to individual retirement accounts without regard to their compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 808. A bill to extend the deadline for the conversion of the vessel M/V TWIN DRILL, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 809. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to limit the eligibility for treatment under the generalized system of preferences in the case of countries that support international acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 810. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remove from the Coastal Barrier Resources System a tract of land in South Carolina that was added to the System without notice to the county in which the tract is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 806. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to entities in rural areas that design and implement innovative approaches to improve the availability and quality of health care in such rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE RURAL HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, during the last several years, Americans have heard a lot about the need to reform our health care system. Health care costs are soaring out of control—far outpacing the rate of inflation—and nearly 38 million Americans are without health care insurance. Solutions for reform are complex and will go through much debate and consensus building before implemented on a national level.

While local and regional health care systems have rushed to consolidate and integrate their services and resources over the last decade, rural entities, due to their shortage of physicians, the vulnerability of their hospitals, their geographical and technical isolation, and the demographics of their patient populations, have been largely unable to adjust in a similar way. As public concern over the national health care crisis grows and legislative bodies and policymaking agencies scramble to devise and implement far-reaching health care reform, the special health care needs of rural America must not be neglected.

Today I am reintroducing the Rural Health Improvement Act because I feel, given the current direction of the health care reform debate, that it provides an essential transition into comprehensive health care reform. Now, more than ever, health providers in rural communities are joining with their urban counterparts to create networks to assure that health care is accessible in rural areas. There are a number of obstacles, however, that create a disincentive for providers to participate in these efforts. I believe that the legislation that I am introducing today will remove these obstacles and help rural communities position themselves for comprehensive health care reform.

Mr. President, the Rural Health Improvement Act will help our rural communities in the following ways. First, this legislation provides grants to allow rural and urban providers to develop rural health extension networks to facilitate the delivery of health care in rural communities. It allows existing networks such as area health education centers to compete for these grants in order to prevent needless duplication and to assure that successful programs will have the ability to expand their capabilities. The goal of the rural health extension networks grant is to facilitate resource sharing within the network by providing education and training for health care providers in rural areas, creating linkages between rural and urban providers through the use of telecommunications and other consultative projects, and assisting rural providers in developing cooperative approaches to health care delivery.

Second, my bill provides grants for the creation of rural managed care cooperatives which will enhance the economic viability of health care providers in rural areas. The idea of health cooperatives in rural areas is not new. In 1929, the first health maintenance organization in the United States was developed in rural Elk City, OK, by the Farmers' Cooperative. Since 1929, there have been several attempts to create rural health cooperatives, however, they have suffered because they lacked sufficient startup support. My bill provides this startup support.

These cooperatives will be made up of health providers of all types including, but not limited to, hospitals, physicians, rural health clinics, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and public health departments. By establishing an effective case management and reimbursement system designed to support the financial needs of rural hospitals and health care systems, cooperatives will provide an effective framework for negotiating contracts with payers and assuring a defined level of quality. The cooperatives will also help rural practitioners with a portion of their payments on malpractice premiums.

Due to the concerns about possible antitrust problems that might arise in the formation of the rural health extension networks and the rural managed care cooperatives, the bill includes language which would protect providers who participate in these entities from antitrust law. This exemption from antitrust law should facilitate the development of network and cooperatives in rural areas.

Third, the bill allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award competitive grants to develop and implement mental health outreach programs in rural areas. The bill emphasizes the needs of the elderly and children in rural areas. Grant recipients are encouraged to form relationships with rural managed care cooperatives to enhance the delivery of these services.

Fourth, my bill provides stipend grants under the Area Health Education Centers [AHEC] Program to health care providers and trainees in rural communities as an incentive to provide health care services in those areas. While the stipends envisioned in this legislation will not completely relieve the financial burden young providers face, especially physicians, it is my hope that they will provide enough of an incentive to attract and retain health care providers in rural areas.

It has been 20 years since the AHEC Program was enacted and we now have a network of 48 AHEC Programs in 38 States. In my own State of Oregon, we have an excellent statewide AHEC program with five centers now operating to meet the challenges of both rural and urban areas. State studies have shown that AHEC's have an excellent record in addressing the primary health care profession needs of underserved areas. In fact, since AHEC's inception more than 1.5 million students, residents, and preceptors have been trained in medicine, allied health, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy.

Finally, this year I have included a nonrefundable tax credit for qualified providers in rural and underserved areas. This tax credit is similar to the tax credit proposed in health care reform legislation last session. Under this provision qualified providers will be eligible for a tax credit if they serve in rural or underserved areas for 5 years. A similar tax credit program in Oregon has enjoyed great success. In a recent survey by the Oregon Office of Rural Health, rural providers indicated that the Oregon Tax Credit Program is the most important program offered that keeps them practicing in rural areas.

Mr. President, our rural communities are facing a crisis in health care delivery. Nationwide, 141 rural community hospitals closed between 1989 and 1993. In Oregon, five rural hospitals have closed since 1986 and several other rural facilities are threatened with imminent closure. These hospitals simply cannot compete with their urban counterparts. I believe my legislation will give rural health care providers the tools to build rural health care delivery systems which meet the health needs of their communities. This is the first step in developing an infrastructure of providers who will support and sustain comprehensive health care reform and provide health care access for all Americans.

I'd like to take a moment to thank the National Rural Health Care Association, the Oregon Office of Rural Health, the Oregon Association of Hospitals, the Oregon Medical Association, the Oregon Nurses Association, and the Oregon AHEC Program Office for their support in developing this innovative legislation.

I urge my colleagues to take a careful look at this bill and consider it as a transition into comprehensive health care reform that can help our rural communities now.●

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 808. A bill to extend the deadline for the conversion of the vessel M/V *Twin Drill,* and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

M/V TWIN DRILL LEGISLATION

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to extend the deadline for the completion of the conversion of the vessel M/V *Twin Drill.* This vessel is what is known as a SWATH or small waterplane area twin hull vessel of advanced design that provides for an unusually smooth operating platform. This vessel currently undergoing initial conversion in Louisiana to ready her for a complete conversion to a U.S.-flag day cruise service.

Under terms of section 601(d) of Public Law 103–206 the M/V *Twin Drill* was granted full coastwise privileges provided that the cost of major conversion work on the vessel in a U.S. shipyard was more than three times the purchase value of the vessel. Furthermore, the owners were required to commit to build a new vessel entirely within a U.S. shipyard. These requirements were to have been completed by certain dates. A number of delays resulted from the discovery of additional work that was necessary because of unknown conditions on the vessel slowed the project to the point where it will now be impossible to complete the conversion by the statutory deadline.

Given the significant investment to date, and the progress already made, it is only reasonable that we provide some additional time for this shipyard work to be completed. This will cost the Government nothing, but it will mean immediate jobs at the shipyard and long-term employment opportunities onboard the *Twin Drill.* Failure to act would also mean foregone job opportunities in the construction and operation of the new vessel as well. A similar provision was passed by the House of Representatives last fall as part of the Coast Guard authorization legislation which we were not able to act on before the end of the last session. It is time we finish the job and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 809. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to limit the eligibility for treatment under the generalized system of preferences in the case of countries that support international acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 AMENDMENT ACT OF 1995

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I introduce a bill that would make our Nation's Generalized System of Preferences Development Program conform with out foreign aid program when it comes to eliminating benefits for countries that sponsor terrorism. I am pleased that Senators HELMS and BRADLEY are original cosponsors of this legislation.

Under this bill, a country would automatically lose its GSP benefits once the Secretary of State makes a determination under the Export Administration Act of 1979 that ''the government of that country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.'' Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, once the Secretary makes this determination and a country is added to the State Department's so-called ''terrorism list,'' it is no longer eligible to receive foreign assistance from the United States. Likewise, state sponsors of terrorism should be precluded from importing products into this country duty free under the GSP Program.

But they are not.

Syria is a case in point. Syria was designated by the State Department as a state-sponsor of terrorism on December 29, 1979, which made it ineligible to receive foreign assistance. Nonetheless, Syria continued to import products into the U.S. duty free under the GSP Program until August 16, 1992. At that time, Syria's eligibility was suspended due to concerns about workers' rights—not a concern about terrorism.

Technically, the GSP law prohibits the President from designating a country GSP eligible ''if such country aids or abets, by granting sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism.'' But the law did nothing to prohibit Syria, a country our Government already recognized as a state-sponsor of terrorism, from benefiting from the United States Government's GSP Development Program. That is why I am proposing a change in the law.

Mr. President, once the Secretary of State determines that a country sponsors terrorism it ought to automatically lose its GSP benefits, just as it loses its foreign assistance. There is no sensible rationale for barring foreign assistance for state sponsors of terrorism while providing GSP benefits to those same state sponsors of terrorism. Like foreign aid, GSP is a benefit, not a right. It is development program with goals that are similar to those of the foreign aid program. Both programs ought to be governed by the same terrorism standard.

When it comes to fighting terrorism, our Government needs to speak with one voice. We need to make it crystal clear that the benefits of American friendship are not provided to countries that, by their presence on the terrorist list, have been found to have a consistent pattern of state support for terrorism.

Mr. President, by making the GSP Program conform with the foreign aid program when it comes to providing benefits to countries that support terrorism, this bill would add an important element of consistency to our antiterrorism foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

S. 809

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION AS BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRY.

Section 502(b)(6) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19) U.S.C. 2462(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) if—

''(A) such country aids or abets, by granting sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which committed an act of international terrorism, or

''(B) the Secretary of State makes a determination with respect to such country under section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979; and''.●

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 810. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remove from the Coastal Barrier Resources System a tract of land in South Carolina that was added to the System without notice to the county in which the tract is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM FAIRNESS ACT OF 1995

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Coastal Barrier Resources System Fairness Act of 1995. The bill is aimed at correcting a mistake in the Coastal Barrier Resource System. Without this correction, a portion of Colleton County, SC, will remain in the Coastal Barrier Resources System even though the county never had an opportunity to voice their objection to their inclusion.

In 1980 Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to study and propose a Coastal Barrier Resources System. The aim was to create a system made up of relatively undeveloped low-lying coastal lands which, because of their susceptibility to flooding, would not be eligible for Federal flood insurance. Practically speaking, to be included in the CBRS means you can't sell or develop your property.

Soon after the passage of the 1980 act, the Department of the Interior created a study group charged with promulgating an inventory of coastal

properties—properties to be included in the CBRS. By the end of 1988, the study group had completed its work and the Department of the Interior submitted the CBRS proposal to Congress.

This proposed inventory was the culmination of 8 years work and included suggestions made during two public comment periods. The first public comments were made following the release of an initial draft inventory in 1985. Additional comments were made following the release of a second draft in the spring of 1987. The Department of the Interior received numerous comments on these draft inventories and incorporated many in their final report to Congress. This final report was the basis for the Coastal Barrier Resources System adopted in 1990.

I recite this history because without an understanding of it, Mr. President, one can't understand the intent of my legislation.

While the Department of the Interior was drafting this proposed system, a strip of coastal South Carolina was being annexed by Colleton County from Charleston County. Unfortunately, this annexation occurred in 1987 in the midst of the 1987 CBRA comment period. Unfortunately, the notice of this second draft inventory was not received by Colleton County. The county never received any notice. It appears, the draft inventory was provided to Charleston County, not Colleton County. In fact, the maps currently on file at the Department of the Interior, still, incorrectly show this tract in Charleston County—not Colleton County. Thus, the citizens of Colleton County, never having had an opportunity to comment on these proposed changes, now find this tract included in the CBRS. And for all practical purposes off limits for development.

This bill corrects that mistake. It rights that wrong. It does not drastically redraft the Coastal Barrier Resources System nor withdraw any lands included in the 1985 draft. The bill simply returns a small portion of Edisto Island, SC, to its 1985 status.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 426

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 426, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to update references in the classification of children for purposes of United States immigration laws.

S. 495

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to stabilize the student loan programs, improve congressional oversight, and for other purposes.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code regarding false identification documents, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to limit assistance for Turkey under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act until that country complies with certain human rights standards.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide certain consumer protections if a depository institution engages in the sale of nondeposit investment products, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. BRYAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 667, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 in order to reform the conduct of private securities litigation, to provide for financial fraud detection and disclosure, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions against Colombia with respect to illegal drugs and drug trafficking.

S. 770

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] were added as cosponsors of S. 770, a bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

S. 794

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] were added as cosponsors of S. 794, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to facilitate the minor use of a pesticide, and for other purposes.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to improve the rural electrification programs under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, to improve Federal rural development programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to provide for exclusive State jurisdiction over retail electric service areas, to prohibit certain practices in the restraint of trade, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a joint resolution designating April 9, 1995, and April 9, 1996, as ''National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day.''

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT OF 1995

MURRAY (AND GORTON) AMENDMENT NO. 1079

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 534) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; as follows:

Title II, following section (f) State Solid Waste District Authority, add the following section (g) and reletter all the following subsections accordingly:

''(g) STATE MANDATED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING.—A political subdivision of a state may exercise flow control authority for municipal solid waste, and for voluntarily relinquished recyclable material that is generated within its jurisdiction, if State legislation enacted prior to January 1, 1990 mandated the political subdivision to plan for the management of solid waste generated within its jurisdiction, and if prior to January 1, 1990 the State delegated to its political subdivisions the authority to establish a system of solid waste handling, and if prior to May 15, 1994:

''(1) the political subdivision had, in accordance with the plan adopted pursuant to such State mandate, obligated itself through contract (including a contract to repay a debt) to utilize existing solid waste facilities or an existing system of solid waste facilities; and

''(2) the political subdivision is currently undertaking a recycling program in accordance with its adopted waste management plan to meet the State's solid waste reduction goal of fifty percent; and

''(3) significant financial commitments have been made, or bonds have been issued, a major portion of which, were used for the construction of solid waste management facilities.''