this are in jeopardy. It simply will not happen, and, of course, the motivating section was the Presidio. That is not included. Sterling Forest, I might add, in New Jersey and New York, is not included. It is my understanding the appropriators chose to put in Mount Hood in honor of Senator HATFIELD, as well as very early this morning adding the San Francisco Bay cleanup, which was part of the Presidio omnibus package and now will be moving evidently on a separate track.

Unless the administration sees fit to lift their hold, the Presidio, Utah Snow Basin, Sterling Forest, and all those 126 will be lost, and we will have to start again in the next Congress. Evidently, the San Francisco Bay cleanup has gone on the appropriations process, as well as Mount Hood. So that is what we are left with.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FORD. I think negotiations are still available. I hope we can use the same procedure we did with the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill: have an agreement before it is referred back to conference. I think that is still doable. I would not say to my friend to throw it over his shoulder and forget it, that is the end of it. I think we ought to continue to try to work it out and have an agreement worked out prior to sending it back. I think it can be worked on.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Let me say we stand ready. We spoke with the White House last night about the 46 items they found objectionable and potentially subject to veto, and we are still awaiting word back from the White House on those. So I appreciate the response of the majority leader and the response of the Senator from Kentucky. Again, we stand ready to respond.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the majority leader yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LOTT. Yes, I will, Mr. President.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank all the parties. I think we should not let this moment go by, I say to my majority leader, because I do believe there are so many wonderful things in the package that have been assembled by the Senator from Alaska. I know he has invested himself personally in the Presidio. He has been out there and he has shown, by his presence there, the bipartisan support we have out there.

This is one of the few issues where we have President Clinton, we have Senator Dole, we have Vice President GORE and Vice Presidential candidate Kemp all in agreement. We have FRANK MURKOWSKI and BARBARA BOXER agreeing that we have to do something with this Presidio.

I talked with Congressman MILLER this morning. I know he is trying hard to come up with a compromise. I just think, knowing all of you as I do, there has to be some way we can reach agreement. I stand ready to help in any way. Please contact me at any point in the negotiations if I can be of help.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4137

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4137, a bill to combat drug-facilitated crimes of violence, which is at the desk.

I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think this is another one they are still trying to work out. But on behalf of Senators on my side, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do hope the effort will continue to be made to work it out, because it would, as I said, combat drug-facilitated crimes of violence, including sexual assaults. I don't know where the hangup is.

Mr. FORD. I say to my friend, I don't know either. I am doing like he does. He has some friends on his side who object. I have them on my side. I understand everyone is feverishly working on a lot of things. The push to get out of here soon may cause us to get out later. So I hope we can all work together.

I thank my friend.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4134

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 634, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny public education benefits to illegal aliens; further, that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators on my side, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1174

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 484, S. 1174, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; further, that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is one of the items in the so-called Presidio parks bill that is being attempted to be jerked out. I think if we are going to agree on one, we ought to agree on all or agree on the bill. So, therefore, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2715

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from H.R. 2715 and, further, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, and, further, that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, the distinguished majority whip asked me about this one earlier, how we could get it cleared. And I had given that information. So we are working on this bill. And until we get an answer back from your side, I must object. But I think we are moving in the right direction.

I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. This is the Paperwork Elimination Act. We will continue to work to see what we can do on that. I am aware of the Senator's other interests, and we are checking on that to see how we can work it out.

Mr. FORD. A quid pro quo here.

Mr. LOTT. We have been known to do that on occasion, for the best interests of the country.

Mr. FORD. You got that right.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3719

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3719, which is at the desk, further, that a substitute amendment at the desk offered by Senators BOND and BUMPERS be agreed to, the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to this Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act, which are amendments to the existing law of 1958, be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, this is the Small Business Act, as the majority leader said, and the Small Business Investment Act. Several Senators on both

sides have been trying very hard to work out an amendment that would be agreeable to everyone here. As I understand it, they are very close.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think we have one that we can clear here. It also is one that maybe the Senator in the chair would have some interest in.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE METRIC CONVERSION ACT OF 1975

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2779, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2779) to provide for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5417

(Purpose: To provide for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects, and for other purposes)

Mr. LOTT. Senator BURNS has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] for Mr. BURNS, for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GLENN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. GRAMS proposes amendment numbered 5417.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am happy to report today that the Senate is ready to pass legislation, H.R. 2779, designed to protect American businesses, American jobs, and the American taxpayers by providing for the appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects. I was pleased both to introduce the Senate version of this measure, S. 1386, last fall along with my colleague Senator SHELBY, and to lead the effort in the Senate to obtain bipartisan approval here. This legislation restores a degree of sensibility and sanity to the manner in which this country gradually converts to the metric system. It is good for small business.

Bright and forward-thinking people have told me they believe the metric system is the future of this country. I will take them at their word. But there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that there is a right way and a wrong way to bring about metric conversion. The right way is to work cooperatively with everyone who will be affected by metric conversion. The right way is to convert without unduly burdening businesses, without losing markets for U.S. firms, without forcing the taxpayers to pay a metric premium when Federal agencies procure metric products that are specialty items, not off-the shelf commercial items. The wrong way is to do precisely the opposite, which, unfortunately, has been happening.

The 1988 Trade bill contained language which established the metric system as the preferred system of measurement for the United States. Why was the language on the trade bill? The rationale was that it would improve the ability of American companies to export goods to metric-based countries if American firms could be moved to produce those goods in metric versions.

The principal tool for urging American companies to switch to the metric system is to use Government procurement policy. The trade bill includes language, ''to require that each Federal agency, by a date certain and to the extent economically feasible by the end of the fiscal year 1992, use the metric system of measurement in its procurement, grants, and other business-related activities . . .''

This legislation is being passed today because some Federal agencies responsible for implementing the metric policy either forgot to read or are completely ignoring the remainder of the above sentence: ''. . . except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms, such as when foreign competitors are producing competing products in non-metric units . . .''

Congress never intended for the switch to metrication to be forced at any cost or without regard to its impact on people, small business, or industry. This legislation insures that the Federal construction procurement policy will no longer ignore this important language which, in turn, can cause staggering problems for some industries.

We also need to keep in mind at the outset that metrication policy is rapidly running into conflict with other Government policies calling for the use of commercial products widely available in the private sector. Federal contracting personnel need to closely review procurement law developments such as the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act [FASA] to ensure that, in their fervor to bring about metrication through Federal procurement, they are not inadvertently violating key elements of procurement laws and policies designed to promote the use of widely available commercial products and maximum access to the commercial market place.

Let me briefly describe some of the finer points of the legislation, and send a very clear signal to the agencies as to how the law is to be interpreted and applied.

Agencies have begun to hide behind metric law to maintain Government unique specifications and the internal support staff needed to maintain the Government unique specifications. At the same time, Government procurement laws and procedures have been streamlined to require agencies to buy commercial items. In addition, some advocates were pushing the use of metrics without consideration of costs and industry impact, as required by the 1988 amendments. This substitution amendment to H.R. 2779 clearly states that procurement laws favoring commercial off-the-shelf items will be applied and certainly will not be overridden or avoided by the application of the metric law and policy. Where there is conflict between the two, procurement laws favoring commercial off-the-shelf items customarily used by the private sector will take precedence. This allows an orderly transition to items built in hard-metric configuration, when those items meet the economic and quality specifications of the commercial marketplace.

FASA requires agencies to conduct preliminary market research to make sure they can obtain commercial items. This amendment to H.R. 2779 says the results of that market research must be used to determine which design method is suitable to ensure that the design will accommodate commercial items. It would make no sense whatsoever for an agency to design a building requiring hard-metric components after it has learned that hard-metric construction items that meet the definitional requirements in this amendment for commercial items are not available. Consistent with FASA, my legislation requires that agencies determine early in the process whether hard-metric or soft-metric building materials are available. Even in a metric building, the design must accommodate non-hard-metric items if hard-metric versions of those products are not available as commercial, off-the-shelf, items.

Hard-metrication for two classes of construction products has been particularly controversial: concrete masonry units [CMU] and lighting fixtures. The problems these industries are facing are well documented so I will not recount them here. The treatment for both classes is virtually identical, except that there is an extra criterion relating to voluntary industry consensus standards that would be inappropriate to apply with CMU. This legislation allows agencies to use the metric system of measurement but they may not incorporate specifications that can only be satisfied by hard-metric versions of these products