In New Jersey, a major shipping company, Sea-Land Services, laid off 325 computer programmers this year and replaced them with Filipinos supplied by Manila-based Software Ventures International. The Americans. who were paid about $50,000 a year on average, also had to train the lower-paid Filipinos, most of whom eventually returned to Manila to carry out the work even more cheaply there.

''I was outraged,'' said Jessie Lindsay, one of the former Sea-Land programmers. ''There were highly paid technical jobs leaving the country. . . . What's the point of getting an education and technical training if companies can get away with hiring at slave wages?''

Mastech Corp., of Oakdale, Pa., a company owned by two Indian immigrants that has won millions of dollars in consulting contracts with the federal government, has brought in about 900 of its 1,300 workers from India under the H–1B program. From 1991 until Sept. 30, one of its contracts, obtained under a set-aside program for minority-owned businesses, involved ''computer system integration, installation, maintenance and operational support for the White House correspondence system,'' the presidential press office said.

''We have been lumped in with some other companies that allegedly underpay their foreign workers,'' a Mastech executive said. ''We are not a low-paying company.''

One of the latest controversies over the H–1B program erupted last month after it was reported that the National Association of Securities Dealers had laid off 30 contract computer programmers and hired an Indian firm, Tata Consultancy Services, to do the work. The government-chartered association, based in Rockville, Md., owns, operates and regulates the Nasdaq Stock Market. Tata, which has a regional office in Silver Spring, is part of a huge Indian conglomerate that company officials say produces everything from tea to computer software.

An NASD spokesman, Marc Beauchamp, said Tata would employ about 40 people on the project, half of them working here on H–1B visas and half at Tata's home office in Bombay. He denied that any full-time NASD employees were fired and said that ''fewer than 20 outside contractors could possibly be affected'' by the move.

The Indians essentially would be maintaining ''outmoded technology'' so that regular NASD programmers could ''focus on new technologies'' and perform ''more challenging work,'' Beauchamp said. ''We found it made no business sense to hire programmers that we would have to pay more than, or as much as, the people we have on staff,'' he said.

Neither NASD nor Tata would disclose details of the contract. However, Tata insisted that it follows all U.S. regulations and wage requirements.

''We are not a body shop,'' said A. Sruthi Sagar, the firm's personnel manager. ''We are not in the business of providing cheap labor to the United States.''

TRANSFER OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LANDS TO THE STATES

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue that I firmly believe in, more localized control of our public lands. I am here today to set the facts straight so that the people of Montana get the real story and can make their decision on two pieces of legislation before this body.

Several months ago I cosponsored a bill, S. 1031, that will allow the Governors of States with Bureau of Land Management lands to request these lands be transferred to the States in which they are located. This bill brings control of public lands to the local government and out of the stone cold buildings in this town. I signed on to this bill as a way of addressing an issue that I have fought long and hard for local control and oversight of public lands by the people that live in and around those lands.

This bill will provide for the Secretary of the Interior to offer to transfer BLM lands to the States in which they are located. The Governor of the State will then have 2 years in which to make the decision on the future of this land. A Governor can either accept the title transfer of these lands or they may reject this offer. If accepted, then within the following 10 years the Secretary will transfer these lands to the States.

What this effectively does, Mr. President, is place control and oversight of these lands into the hands of those closest to the land. This puts the decisions on the use of this land into the local hands, and out of the hands of people that live thousands of miles away. It will provide a better opportunity for all Montanans to have a voice in the future of the public lands in the State.

There have been many incidents in Montana where people, outside the State, have affected the Federal land policy of land within Montana. People living in downtown New York City have placed a stamp on an envelope and appealed decisions that effect the people in Montana. This goes against every promise the West ever offered to those who live there. Throughout my tenure in the Senate I have stood strong on one basic philosophy; the people of Montana know what is best for Montana. The best decisions are made at the local level. We do not need a Federal land manager in Washington to tell us how to manage our lands. The land managers in the State have a better understanding of the needs and the future of the lands in Montana.

One of the basic misconceptions that have been expounded on by the opponents of this bill is that the sportsmen and other Montanans will lose access to the lands. This is far from the truth. Our State lands are open to the public, more open than the Federal Government makes their land.

I must assure my fellow Montanans that I would never do anything to deprive them of their rights to hunt or fish or have access to our lands. As a founding member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus I have fought hard for the sportsmen across the country. The goal of the caucus is to provide more opportunities for all the sportsmen throughout the state and the nation, and I am proud to serve as the Senate cochair.

As I look at this legislation I would like to ask a couple of questions about the future of public lands. In Montana I wonder who among us would like to have the future of our public lands, our access to those lands and use of them, determined by Federal land managers in Washington? How many of us would prefer to have our neighbors and friends, those people who live in our state determine when and where we can use and have access to the lands?

I would like to return debate of this bill to the topic from which it has been built. Local control over local lands and access to lands by the people in the State where the lands are located. Multiple use of the lands by people who understand the concept of multiple use.

This is not a bill that sells land to private interests or closes land off to the residents of a State. It is a bill which allows each and every State that has lands the opportunity to determine the future of their lands.

I end by restating one belief that I have always held near and dear when talking about Montana. I stand firm in the fact that Montanans make the best decisions about the future of Montana.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on that evening in 1972 when I first was elected to the Senate, I made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

It has proved enormously beneficial to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the nearly 23 years I have been in the Senate.

Most of them have been concerned that the total Federal debt which is $27 billion shy of $5 trillion, which we will pass this year. Of course, Congress is responsible of creating this monstrosity for which the coming generations will have to pay.

The young people and I almost always discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 22, 1992. I wanted to make a matter of daily record of the precise size of the Federal debt which as of yesterday, Monday, October 23, stood at $4,973,904,347,350.96 or $18,881.03 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of S. 1166, the Food Quality Protection Act, introduced by Senator LUGAR.

This legislation addresses three major issues: the need to ensure that