

Theodore Stuart Pierce, of New York.
 Jeffrey D. Rathke, of Pennsylvania.
 Whitney A. Reitz, of Florida.
 Timothy P. Roche, of Virginia.
 Daniel A. Rochman, of Nebraska.
 Daniel Edmund Ross, of Texas.
 Nicole D. Rothstein, of California.
 Kristina Luise Scott, of Iowa.
 Brian K. Self, of California.
 Dorothy Camille Shea, of Oregon.
 Apar Singh Sidhu, of California.
 John Christopher Stevens, of California.
 Leilani Straw, of New York.
 Mona K. Sutphen, of Texas.
 Landon R. Taylor, of Virginia.
 Alaina B. Teplitz, of Missouri.
 James Paul Theis, of South Dakota.
 Michael David Thomas, of Virginia.
 Gregory Dean Thome, of Wisconsin.
 Susan Ashton Thornton, of Tennessee.
 Leslie Meredith Tsou, of Virginia.
 Thomas L. Vajda, of Tennessee.
 Chever Xena Voltmer, of Texas.
 Eva Weigold-Hanson, of Minnesota.
 Matthew Alan Weiller, of New York.
 Colwell Cullum Whitney, of the District of Columbia.

David C. Wolfe, of Texas.
 Anthony C. Woods, of Texas.
 Thomas K. Yadgerdi, of Florida.
 Joseph M. Young, of Pennsylvania.
 Marta Costanzo Youth, of New Jersey.
 The following-named Members of the Foreign Service of the Departments of State and Commerce and the United States Information Agency to be Consular Officers and/or Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, as indicated:

Consular Officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Vicki Adair, of Washington.
 Stephen E. Alley, of the District of Columbia.
 Victoria Alvarado, of California.
 Travis E. Anderson, of Virginia.
 Patricia Olivares Attkisson, of Virginia.
 Courtney E. Austrian, of the District of Columbia.
 Barbara S. Aycok, of the District of Columbia.
 Douglas Michael Bell, of California.
 Robert Gerald Bentley, of California.
 Jerald S. Bosse, of Virginia.
 Bradley D. Bourland, of Virginia.
 Steven Frank Brault, of Washington.
 Eric Scott Cohan, of Virginia.
 Luisa M. Colon, of Virginia.
 Patricia Ann Comella, of Maryland.
 Clayton F. Creamer, of Maryland.
 Thomas Edward Daley, of Illinois.
 Mark Kristen Draper, of Washington.
 Jeanne M. Eble, of Maryland.
 Eric Alan Flohr, of Maryland.
 David William Franz, of Illinois.
 Justin Paul Freidman, of Virginia.
 Stacey L. Fulton, of Virginia.
 Susan Herthum Garrison, of Florida.
 William Robert Gill, Jr., of Virginia.
 Carolyn B. Glassman, of Illinois.
 David L. Gossack, of Washington.
 Theresa Ann Grecnik, of Pennsylvania.
 Richard Spencer Daddow Hawkins, of New Hampshire.
 Catherine B. Jazyanka, of the Mariana Islands.
 Richard M. Johannsen, of Alaska.
 Arturo M. Johnson, of Florida.
 Joanne Joria-Hooper, of South Carolina.
 Natalie Joshi, of Virginia.
 Erica Jennifer Judge, of New York.
 Jacquelyn Janet Kalhammer, of Virginia.
 Kimberly Christine Kelly, of Texas.
 Robert C. Kerr, of New York.
 Farnaz Khadem, of California.
 Helen D. Lee, of Virginia.
 Nancy D. LeRoy, of the District of Columbia.

Gregory Paul Macris, of Florida.
 Arthur H. Marquardt, of Michigan.
 Charles M. Martin, of Virginia.
 Joel Forest Maybury, of California.
 Sean Ian McCormack, of Maine.
 Heather D. McCullough, of Arkansas.
 Julie A. Nickles, of Florida.
 Patricia D. Norland, of the District of Columbia.
 Elizabeth Anne Noseworthy, of Delaware.
 Barry Clifton Nutter, of Virginia.
 Wayne M. Ondiak, of Virginia.
 Patrick Raymond O'Reilly, of Connecticut.
 Dale K. Parmer, Jr., of Virginia.
 Kay Elizabeth Payne, of Virginia.
 Terence J. Quinn, of Virginia.
 Timothy Meade Richardson, of Virginia.
 Edwina Sagitto, of Missouri.
 Mark Andrew Shaheen, of Maryland.
 Ann G. Soraghan, of Virginia.
 Ronald L. Soriano, of Connecticut.
 Karen K. Squires, of Illinois.
 Cynthia A. Stockman, of Maryland.
 James F. Sullivan, of Florida.
 Wilfredo A. Torres, of Virginia.
 Horacio Antonio Ureta, of Florida.
 Miguel Valls, Jr., of Virginia.
 Javier C. Villarreal, of Virginia.
 Lesley Moore Vossen, of Maryland.
 Philip G. Wasielewski, of Virginia.
 Joel D. Wilkinson, of Idaho.
 Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Sean D. Murphy, of Maryland.
 The following-named individual for promotion in the Senior Foreign Service to the class indicated, effective October 6, 1991:

Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Minister-Counselor:

James J. Blystone, of Virginia.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1021. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the primary standard attainment date for moderate ozone nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the percentage depletion allowance for certain minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1021. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the primary standard attainment date for moderate ozone nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT MODERATE NON-ATTAINMENT EXTENSION ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am committed to improving our air quality, but we can't expect cities to meet arbitrary deadlines for air quality attainment if the EPA is going to hamper rather than help their efforts.

The EPA required, as part of its enhanced monitoring program, an emis-

sions testing system that was expensive, burdensome, and ineffective. Even though the Clean Air Act itself does not mandate centralized testing, the EPA decided that, to prevent fraud, all cars would have to be tested at a State facility. It cost Texas over \$100 million, but has been found to cause little or no additional reduction in emissions.

Tests have found auto emissions virtually unchanged when similar centralized programs were initiated in other metropolitan areas. Decentralized testing is far less burdensome on drivers; instead of centralized testing at State-supervised facilities, private repair stations and remote sensing could be used at far less cost without loss of effectiveness.

The fewer than 10 percent of the vehicles that account for more than half of all emissions do not emit the same amount of pollutants from day to day. They often escape penalties by failing tests on one day, and then passing on the next. Testing should focus on identifying and repairing these vehicles first, and reducing the burden on everyone else.

Cities with a high portion of their emissions from cars and trucks—such as Dallas/Fort Worth in Texas—have been unable to reduce their emissions because of the EPA's mishandling of the Clean Air Act's automobile emissions testing requirements. They deserve adequate notice of what will be expected; an effective, low-cost, and efficient plan; and sufficient time to comply.

The choice by the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments of a 1996 attainment date for moderate areas requires attainment before implementation plans can be put in place, and air quality improvements shown. Today I am introducing a bill to give moderate nonattainment 2 additional years to meet the attainment date for air quality.

An extension of the deadline gives Dallas/Fort Worth, and other moderate nonattainment areas throughout the United States, a chance to prove themselves without being reclassified as serious non-attainment areas. It will give cities time to implement plans next year and still have 2 more years to meet the 3-consecutive-year requirement for air quality attainment. The 2-year extension also will give the EPA time to overhaul its Clean Air Act automobile inspection and maintenance program and administer it fairly across the country.

Dallas/Fort Worth has worked hard to improve its air quality, as I am sure other moderate nonattainment cities have, too. With the exception of enhanced monitoring, Dallas/Fort Worth has improved air quality; almost half of the 145 tons per day emission reduction requirement to achieve attainment under the computer model are in place today. Many of the largest employers have implemented voluntary employee trip reduction programs. In order to provide moderate areas with the flexibility necessary for the proper

implementation of the Clean Air Act, and to take into account Federal mistakes in administering this program, I urge the Senate to enact this change as soon as possible.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the percentage depletion allowance for certain minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ELIMINATION OF THE PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce S. 1022, legislation to eliminate percentage depletion allowances for four mined substances—*asbestos, lead, mercury, and uranium*—from the Federal Tax Code. This measure is based on language passed as part of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 by the other body during the 102d Congress. I am joined in introducing this legislation by my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, and my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE.

Analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation on the similar legislation that passed the House estimated that, under that bill, income to the Federal Treasury from the elimination of percentage depletion allowances in just these four mined commodities would total \$83 million over 5 years, \$20 million in this year alone. These savings are calculated as the excess amount of Federal revenues above what would be collected if depletion allowances were limited to sunk costs in capital investments. These four allowances are only a few of the percentage depletion allowances contained in the Tax Code for extracted fuel, minerals, metal, and other mined commodities—with a combined value, according to 1994 estimates by the Joint Committee on Taxation, of \$4.8 billion.

Mr. President, these percentage depletion allowances were initiated by the Corporation Excise Act of 1909. Provisions for a depletion allowance based on the value of the mine were made under a 1912 Treasury Department regulation, but difficulty in applying this accounting principle to mineral production led to the initial codification of the mineral depletion allowance in the Tariff Act of 1913. The Revenue Act of 1926 established percentage depletion much in its present form for oil and gas. The percentage depletion allowance was then extended to metal mines, coal, and other hardrock minerals by the Revenue Act of 1932, and has been adjusted several times since.

Percentage depletion allowances were historically placed in the Tax Code to reduce the effective tax rates in the mineral and extraction industries far below tax rates on other industries, providing incentives to increase investment, exploration, and output. However, percentage depletion also makes it possible to recover many

times the amount of the original investment.

There are two methods of calculating a deduction to allow a firm to recover the costs of their capital investment: cost depletion, and percentage depletion. Cost depletion allows for the recovery of the actual capital investment—the costs of discovering, purchasing, and developing a mineral reserve—over the period which the reserve produces income. Using cost depletion, a company would deduct a portion of their original capital investment minus any previous deductions, in an amount that is equal to the fraction of the remaining recoverable reserves. Under this method, the total deductions cannot exceed the original capital investment.

However, under percentage depletion, the deduction for recovery of a company's investment is a fixed percentage of gross income—namely, sales revenue—from the sale of the mineral. Under this method, total deductions typically exceed, let me be clear on that point, Mr. President, exceed the capital that the company invested.

The rates for percentage depletion are quite significant. Section 613 of the United States Code contains depletion allowances for more than 70 metals and minerals, at rates ranging from 10 to 22 percent—which is the rate used for all uranium and domestic deposits of *asbestos, lead, and mercury*. Lead and mercury produced outside of the United States are eligible for a percentage depletion at a rate of 14 percent. *Asbestos* produced in other countries by U.S. companies is eligible for a 10-percent allowance.

Mr. President, in today's budget climate we are faced with the question of who should bear the costs of exploration, development, and production of natural resources: all taxpayers, or the users and producers of the resource? Given that we face significant budget deficits, these subsidies are simply a tax expenditure that raise the deficit for all citizens or shift a greater tax burden to other taxpayers to compensate for the special tax breaks provided to some industries.

Mr. President, the measure I am introducing, despite the fact that taxes seem complicated, is fairly straightforward. It eliminates the percentage depletion allowance for *asbestos, lead, mercury, and uranium* while continuing to allow companies to recover reasonable cost depletion.

Though at one time there may have been an appropriate role for a Government-driven incentives for enhanced mineral production, there is now a sufficiently large budget deficit which justifies a more reasonable depletion allowance that is consistent with those given to other businesses.

Moreover, Mr. President, these four commodities covered by my bill are among some of the most environmentally adverse. The percentage depletion allowance makes a mockery of conservation efforts. The subsidy effec-

tively encourages mining regardless of the true economic value of the resource. The effects of such mines on U.S. lands, both public and private, has been significant—with tailings piles, scarred earth, toxic byproducts, and disturbed habitats to prove it.

Ironically, as my earlier description highlights, the more toxic the commodity, the greater the percentage depletion received by the producer. *Mercury, lead, uranium, and asbestos* receive the highest percentage depletion allowance, while less toxic substances receive lower rates.

Particularly in the case of the four commodities covered by my bill, these tax breaks create absurd contradictions in Government policy. The bulk of the tax break shared by these four commodities goes to support lead production. Federal public health and environmental agencies are struggling to come to grips with a vast children's health crisis caused by lead poisoning. Nearly 9 percent of U.S. preschoolers, 1.7 million children, have levels of lead in their blood higher than the generally accepted safety standard. Federal agencies spend millions each year to prevent lead poisoning, test young children, and research solutions. At the same time, the percentage depletion allowance subsidizes the mining of lead with a 22-percent depletion allowance. Lest we think that our nearly 15-year-old ban on lead in paint, or the end of the widespread use of lead in gasoline has solved our lead problems, exposure problems still exist. In 1993, 390 million tons of lead were produced in this country, with a value of \$275 million, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Some 82 percent of the production came from 29 plants with annual capacities of more than 6,000 tons. There continue to be major uses of lead in the production of storage batteries, gasoline additives and other chemicals, ammunition, and solder. Even more ironic, Mr. President, though the recovery and recycling of lead from scrap batteries was approximately 780 tons—twice the newly mined production—the recycling industry received no such tax subsidy.

To cite another example, hardly any individual in this body has not been acutely aware of the public health problem posed by *asbestos*. These compounds were extensively used in building trades and have resulted in tens of thousands of cases of lung cancer and fibrous disease in *asbestos* workers. As many as 15 million school children and 3 million school workers have the potential to be exposed because of the installation of *asbestos* containing materials in public buildings between 1945 and 1978. The EPA has already banned the use of *asbestos* in many building and flame retardant products, and will phase out all other uses over the next 5 years. *Asbestos* fibers are released at all stages of mining, use, and disposal of *asbestos* products. The EPA estimates that approximately 700 tons per year are released into the air during

mining and milling operations. It certainly seems quite peculiar to this Senator, that a commodity, the use of which the Federal Government will effectively ban before the year 2000, continues to receive a hearty tax subsidy.

Mr. President, the time has come for the Federal Government to get of the business of subsidizing business in ways it can no longer afford—both financially and for the health of its citizens. This legislation is one step in that direction.

Mr. President, in our efforts to reduce the Federal deficit and achieve a balanced budget, it is critical that we look at tax expenditures that provide special subsidies to particular groups, such as those proposed to be eliminated in this legislation. Tax expenditures are among the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget. According to the General Accounting Office, these tax expenditures already account for some \$400 billion each year. GAO has recommended that Congress begin scrutinizing these areas of the budget as closely as we do direct spending programs. Earlier this year, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] and I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling for imposing the same kind of fiscal discipline in the area of tax expenditures that we do for other areas of the Federal budget, an issue that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] has championed for some time as well. I am particularly pleased to have the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Minnesota join me in this effort today. As GAO noted in its report last year, "Tax Policy: Tax Expenditures Deserve More Scrutiny", many of these special tax provisions are never subjected to reauthorization or any type of systematic review. Once enacted, they become enshrined in the Tax Codes and are difficult to dislodge.

Of the 124 tax expenditures identified by the Joint Tax Committee in 1993, about half were enacted before 1950—nearly half a century ago. Clearly, in this case, the economic conditions which may have once justified a special tax subsidy have dramatically changed. Eliminating these kinds of special tax preferences is long overdue.

Mr. President, in 1992 I developed an 82+point plan to eliminate the Federal deficit and have continued to work on implementation of the elements of that plan since that time. Elimination of special tax preferences for mining companies was part of that 82-plus-point plan. Achievement of a balanced budget will require that these kinds of special taxpayer subsidies to particular industries must be curtailed, just as many direct spending programs are being cut back.

Finally, Mr. President, in conclusion I want to pay tribute to several elected officials from Milwaukee, Mayor John Norquist, State Representative Spencer Coggs, and Milwaukee Alderman Michael Murphy, who have brought to my attention the incongruity of the

Federal Government continuing to provide taxpayer subsidies for the production of toxic substances like lead while our inner cities are struggling to remove lead-based paint from older homes and buildings where children may be exposed to this hazardous material. I deeply appreciate their support and encouragement for my efforts in this area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1022

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

SECTION 1. CERTAIN MINERALS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PERCENTAGE DEPLETION.

(A) GENERAL RULE.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

(A) by striking "and uranium" in subparagraph (A), and

(B) by striking "asbestos," "lead," and "mercury," in subparagraph (B).

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 613(b)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting "other than lead, mercury, or uranium" after "metal mines".

(3) Paragraph (4) of section 613(b) of such Code is amended by striking "asbestos (if paragraph (1)(B) does not apply)".

(4) Paragraph (7) of section 613(b) of such Code is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ", or", and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) mercury, uranium, lead, and asbestos."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subparagraph (D) of section 613(c)(4) of such Code is amended by striking "lead," and "uranium,".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1995.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able today to speak on behalf of the bill that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has introduced and that I am co-sponsoring; a bill that I believe takes a crucial step toward returning some standard of fairness to our Nation's Tax Code.

Mr. President, I believe I can speak for a large majority of middle-income families in this country when I say that there are major problems with our tax system. When the American people send their checks to Washington every April 15, they want to know that their money is being used wisely and that everyone in the country is carrying his or her share of the load. They want to know that just because they don't have their own personal lobbyist up on the Hill and that there is a standard of basic economic fairness that is applied in our tax system—that the superwealthy can and should pay more than those who are struggling.

But the American people are angry—they are angry at Washington because they feel in their hearts that there is no standard of fairness being applied in

our tax system anymore. And do you know what Mr. President? They are right. Over the years our national Tax Code has become riddled with corporate tax breaks, loopholes, and outright giveaways, costing the Federal Government over \$400 billion each year; Mr. President—talk about the gift that keeps on giving. These are tax dollars that we forego—money that has to be made up somewhere, and all too often ends up costing American families of modest means even more.

These tax loopholes and corporate giveaways are like trying to fill up a bucket with water, but the bucket has hundreds of holes that let the water dribble out from every corner. You can turn on the spigot and put more and more and more water into the bucket, but until the holes are plugged you'll never keep the water where it belongs.

That's what this bill does; it begins to plug some of the tax holes. This bill removes a special tax break that only a very few businesses have in this country—companies that mine lead, mercury, uranium, and asbestos. It's called the special percentage depletion allowance, and it allows mining companies to deduct 22 percent of their profits from their income each and every year for each and every mine they operate. Twenty-two percent, Mr. President. Now I know of lots of small business operators in Minnesota who would love to have that kind of special allowance for their business—but they don't have it. Those who mine these minerals have it.

A twenty-two percent tax break—and for what? So miners can dig hazardous heavy metals like lead and mercury out of the ground? Do we give tax breaks to companies that take these dangerous metals out of our environment and recycle them? Why are we giving a tax break to companies that mine asbestos to encourage them to dig more out of the ground when in just a few years the use of asbestos will be banned altogether? Why give a 22-percent tax credit to a company that mines uranium and not to a company that produces ethanol, or solar panels, or geothermal power?

Mr. President, this 22-percent tax deduction is not free—it costs the American public. The Joint Committee on Taxation said that eliminating this deduction for these minerals would save the Government \$83 million over the next 5 years. If corporations do not pay their fair share of taxes, middle-class people have to pay more; the American public is in effect underwriting this tax dodge for these companies. That is not right, it is not fair, and it should be stopped.

This bill takes a bold step, and I applaud its author, my good friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for bringing it to the floor. And, I would say to the people of this country, and to my colleagues, that I see this bill as a beginning. I hope it will be the beginning of an all-out effort to reform what I and others have called

corporate entitlements; an effort to cut back on what are spending programs by fiat, programs that, unlike regular spending programs, never come up for review in Congress or by the public at large. It is an effort to return some standard of fairness to our tax system, and rebalance the tax scales to ensure that corporations will pay more of their fair share—and the American public will no longer be forced to underwrite multinational corporations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 254

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 254, a bill to extend eligibility for veterans' burial benefits, funeral benefits, and related benefits for veterans of certain service in the U.S. merchant marine during World War II.

S. 354

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 354, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage the preservation of low-income housing.

S. 426

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor 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. 491

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of outpatient self-management training services under part B of the Medicare program for individuals with diabetes.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of S. 885, a bill to establish U.S. commemorative coin programs, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain technical corrections relating to physicians' services, and for other purposes.

S. 905

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 905, a bill to provide for the management of the airplane over units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

S. 957

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 957, a bill to terminate the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

S. 969

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 969, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 34, a joint resolution prohibiting funds for diplomatic relations and most favored nation trading status with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam unless the President certifies to Congress that Vietnamese officials are being fully cooperative and forthcoming with efforts to account for the 2,205 Americans still missing and otherwise unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, as determined on the basis of all information available to the U.S. Government, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

SENATE RESOLUTION 133

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 133, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the pri-

mary safeguard for the well-being and protection of children is the family, and that, because the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child could undermine the rights of the family, the President should not sign and transmit it to the Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1995

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 1492

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to amendment no. 1487, proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill (S. 343) to reform the regulatory process, and for other purposes, as follows:

On page 25, delete lines 7-15, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

“(f) HEALTH, SAFETY, OR FOODSAFETY OR EMERGENCY EXEMPTION FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—(1) A major rule may be adopted and may become effective without prior compliance with this subchapter if—

“(A) the agency for good cause finds that conducting cost-benefit analysis is impracticable due to an emergency, or health or safety threat or a foodsafety threat, (including an imminent threat from E. coli bacteria) that is likely to result in significant harm to the public or natural resources; and”.

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 1493

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to amendment no. 1493, proposed by Mr. DOLE to amendment No. 1487 to the bill, S. 343, supra; as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

“(f) HEALTH, SAFETY, OR FOODSAFETY OR EMERGENCY EXEMPTION FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—(1) Effective on the day after the date of enactment, a major rule may be adopted and may become effective without prior compliance with this subchapter if—

“(A) the agency for good cause finds that conducting cost-benefit analysis is impracticable due to an emergency, or health or safety threat, or a foodsafety threat (including an imminent threat from E. coli bacteria) that is likely to result in significant harm to the public or natural resources; and”.

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 1494

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 343, supra; as follows:

Strike the word “analysis” in the bill and insert the following: “Analysis.

“() HEALTH, SAFETY, OR FOODSAFETY OR EMERGENCY EXEMPTION FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—(1) A major rule may be adopted and may become effective without prior compliance with this subchapter if—

“(A) the agency for good cause finds that conducting cost-benefit analysis is impracticable due to an emergency, or health or safety threat or a foodsafety threat, (including an imminent threat from E. coli bacteria) that is likely to result in significant harm to the public or natural resources.”

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 1495

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1494, proposed by Mr.