

publish such rules in final form by February 1, 1997. Notwithstanding section 482(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c)), such rules shall, if so published by such date, be effective for award year 1997-98.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House.

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

#### NATIONAL INVASIVE SPECIES ACT OF 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 4283 be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the bill be immediately discharged and referred to the Committee on Science, Commerce and Transportation, and the bill then be immediately discharged and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4283) to provide for ballast water management to prevent the introduction and spread of nonindigenous species into the waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise to support adoption of H.R. 4283, the National Invasive Species Act of 1996.

Mr. President, this bill addresses a nationwide problem—nonindigenous species invading new habitats. This has tremendous impacts not only on native species in the aquatic environment but, in some areas, our communities as well.

This bill would control nonindigenous species by establishing a voluntary national ballast water management program, and funding for research and implementation.

Earlier this year, Senator GLENN had introduced S. 1660, a similar bill to that of the House. Under an earlier unanimous-consent agreement, S. 1660 was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Following action in that committee, the bill would have been referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation since the Commerce Committee shares jurisdiction on this issue. Likewise, H.R. 3217, a bill introduced by Congressman LATOURETTE was adopted by the House, sent to the Senate and referred to the Environment and Public Works Committee. This bill, if acted upon, would have also been referred to the Committee Committee.

Mr. President, while this procedure is somewhat different than our normal order for legislation, Senator ABRAHAM, a member of the Commerce Committee, has been very interested in addressing this issue. I am pleased that we are able to accommodate his desires by adopting this bill today.

The bill that the House adopted addresses a concern of the Commerce Committee on vessel safety that the shipping industry has raised. It would simply allow vessels to continue to discharge their ballast water in a harbor if during their voyage they could not exchange their ballast water on the high seas due to safety concerns. This provision and the bill itself has the support of the shipping industry, port authorities and the U.S. Coast Guard.

In closing, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H.R. 4283.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to say a few words on final passage of H.R. 4283, the National Invasive Species Act of 1996.

The threat posed by nonindigenous aquatic nuisance species was first brought to this Nation's attention in the 1980's when we witnessed the devastating effect of the zebra mussel infestation in the Great Lakes region. It was then that we learned such nuisance species are typically introduced through the ballast water exchange of vessels. Congress responded to this threat with the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990—legislation which established a program to research, prevent, and control the unintentional introduction of nonindigenous species into the Great Lakes.

Clearly, the problem of nuisance species is not limited to the Great Lakes. Invasions of nonindigenous species into marine and fresh waters of the United States can have significant economic and environmental consequences. That is why the legislation approved by the Senate today goes beyond the Great Lakes region and establishes a voluntary program for ballast water management that is national in scope.

Mr. President, I was deeply distressed to learn that non-native species have invaded the Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island. Recently, a number of invasive plant species have been discovered. Also, there is grave concern that the Japanese shore crab may have arrived. If that is the case, Rhode Island's oyster beds will be greatly disrupted.

That is why the original version of this bill, H.R. 3217, was modified at my request to include an amendment authorizing the appropriation of \$1 million for use by Rhode Island's Department of Environmental Management to address this problem. The pending bill, H.R. 4283, includes my amendment. These funds will allow the department to carry out research on the prevention, monitoring, and control of aquatic nuisance species in Narragansett Bay. It is imperative that we have a full inventory of the non-native species that have invaded the Bay. Once we have done so, we can work to manage the situation and hopefully, avoid future infestations.

Mr. President, this is a good bill and I applaud the Senate for its prompt action. It is my hope that the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 will stem

the tide of invasive species in our Nation's waterways.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for passage of the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 [NISA]. NISA reauthorizes and amends the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990, a measure that passed with wide bipartisan support in response to concern over the potential impact of the Eurasian ruffe on the Great Lakes fishery [NANPCA]. NANPCA set forth a national program for preventing, researching, monitoring, and controlling infestations in U.S. waters of alien aquatic species. NISA continues these important measures, and includes some additional important provisions.

NISA directs the Department of Transportation to develop voluntary guidelines, recordkeeping and reporting procedures, and sampling techniques to prevent the introduction and spread of nonindigenous species into U.S. waters. Since, the primary means of prevention are measures addressing the exchange of ballast water, this legislation will develop suggested direction for ballast exchange outside the U.S. exclusive economic zone and will authorize ecological and ballast discharge surveys to be conducted in highly susceptible waters. In the effort to develop other ways to repel these unwelcome intruders, the Interior and Transportation Secretaries will undertake a demonstration of technologies and practices which may prevent the introduction and spread of such species. Finally, if the spread of the zebra mussel has demonstrated anything, it has shown us how important regional coordination is to the control of invasive animals. Therefore, this act encourages the formation of regional panels to participate in activities to control the introduction of aquatic nuisance species.

Mr. President, the impact of invasive species in the Great Lakes has been enormous. In 1950, the Great Lakes fishery nearly collapsed under its assault. Were it not for the constant efforts of the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission and the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, a similarly dire situation could occur. Michigan in particular has suffered greatly from the effects of nonindigenous plants and animals. In my State, the uncontrollable spread of the zebra mussel shut down the Monroe city water supply for 2 days in 1990 and contributed to sewage overflow in Lake St. Clair. Without steps to curb the introduction and spread of such invasive species, the Great Lakes region, and other coastal States, can expect similar incidents in the future.

The spread of the zebra mussel, the sea lamprey, and other invaders have had a proven, negative impact on Great Lakes native species. Mr. President, I was happy to join as a cosponsor of legislation to control their spread, and I hope that the Senate can pass this reasonable, voluntary approach to curbing these species today.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 4283, the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 and urge my colleagues to join me in approving this measure. I authored and introduced S. 1660, the National Invasive Species Act, in cooperation with a broad community of interest groups and regional delegations. Nineteen fellow Senators, from both sides of the aisle joined me in gaining passage of this critical bill. I am particularly grateful to my Ohio colleague, Congressman STEVE LATOURETTE, for his skilled leadership in introducing and gaining House passage of H.R. 4283, the companion to my bill, S. 1660.

The National Invasive Species Act of 1996 addresses the growing problem of the unintentional introduction of aquatic nuisance species into the waters of our Nation via the ballast water of vessels. The National Invasive Species Act will prevent the introduction of these pest species through the establishment of a national ballast management program. In addition, it will set up a national program of monitoring, management and control of invasive species already established in U.S. waters. The bill before us represents a consensus among interest groups. The environmental programs it sets forth are both reasonable and effective.

In the Great Lakes region, we spend millions of dollars annually to battle sea lamprey and zebra mussel infestations, I can attest that such biological spills can and do happen elsewhere, their impacts on the receiving system are additive, and the resource degradation is permanent. The zebra mussel, a native species of Eastern Europe, has spread throughout the United States from the Great Lakes where it was unintentionally introduced in ballast water of commercial vessels. Wherever it becomes established, the zebra mussel threatens the economy and the environment. It clogs intake pipes, fouls drinking water, and covers swimming beaches with sharp shells. It has cost \$120 million over 5 years in direct costs to the raw water industry of our region. The zebra mussel also contributed to the loss of many highly valued native species of freshwater mussel in both the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River.

The Great Lakes are not the only entry way for invasive species into U.S. waters. In March, I hosted a National Forum on Nonindigenous Species Invasions of U.S. Marine and Fresh Waters. At the day-long event, experts from around the country cited serious species invasion in just about all of America's fresh and marine waters. Biodiversity and economic well-being are suffering due to invasions of nonindigenous species in the Pacific Northwest, San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Islands, the Gulf of Mexico, the Mississippi River, the Atlantic coasts, the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain. In particular, studies show that a new species of aquatic organism invades San Francisco Bay every 12 weeks. A crab which

is the host of a dangerous parasite has been found in U.S. waters within the Gulf of Mexico, fortunately not yet established.

In 1990, I authored and Congress enacted the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act to begin to address the tremendous problem of unintentional invasions of aquatic species into the Great Lakes and other U.S. waters. The 1990 act consisted of two basic parts: A regional program to prevent new introductions of species into the Great Lakes by the ballast water; and a national program of monitoring, management and control of invasive species once established in U.S. waters. Most of the revisions contained in H.R. 4283 revise the prevention portion of the act.

As you know, ballast water is the leading vector for unintentional transfers of nonindigenous species into U.S. waters. Ships carry ballast water to maintain trim when they are empty or partially empty of cargo. They discharge this water at their ports of call. An estimated 21 billion gallons of ballast water from vessels from foreign ports is discharged into U.S. waters each year. That's 58 million gallons per day, and 2.4 million gallons per hour. This ballast water contains just about everything and anything that was in the harbor from which the water was drawn. It is estimated that 3,000 species of aquatic organisms are in transit in ballast tanks around the world in any given 24-hour period. Most of these organisms will come to nothing in the receiving ports, but any one of them could cause billions of dollars of damage. It's a huge gamble. Even human cholera is transported in ballast water and has been detected in ships visiting Mobile Bay and the Chesapeake, among other regions.

Fortunately, a ballast management practice known as high seas ballast exchange can greatly reduce the transfers of dangerous organisms through ballast water. This technique is not applicable in all circumstances; it cannot be employed in stormy weather and with some types of vessels. However, if applied where it can be employed safely, it would result in a substantial reduction in the risk of invasive species transfers into our waters. It is for this reason that the International Maritime Organization already encourages ballast management practices for commercial vessels.

The 1990 law included a voluntary ballast management program for the Great Lakes which automatically became regulatory in 1992. The act assigned the Coast Guard the task of consulting with the maritime industry and Canada to develop voluntary guidelines, conducting education and outreach, and, after 2 years, promulgating regulations to help reduce the probability of new introductions of alien species by commercial vessels into the Great Lakes. This program has been highly successful.

My 1996 proposal establishes a national ballast management program to

begin to address concerns of other U.S. coastal regions. The Coast Guard is directed to issue ballast management guidelines for all vessels visiting U.S. ports after operating outside the exclusive economic zone. Consistent with the Great Lakes program, I want to stress that this program puts safety first. The guidelines will protect the safety of vessel and crew, whatever that may entail.

There will be no penalty against vessels which do not participate in the initial national program, though record-keeping by vessels to document participation is required. However, in the interest of maintaining a level playing field nationally, the Coast Guard has authority to issue the same guidelines as regulations in regions where a review of ship records reveals poor cooperation with the voluntary approach. Thus, the maritime industry would see only one set of rules nationally. However, over time, there may be enforcement associated with the guidelines in certain regions. Of great interest to the Great Lakes community, the successful Great Lakes regulatory program remains in place.

For better prevention of invasions in the future, a demonstration program is established in the act. Over time new technologies and practices may replace ballast exchange as safer and more effective means of prevention. Other changes to the 1990 program which are contained in our National Invasive Species Act of 1996 include (1) the authorization of research in several coastal regions—including the Chesapeake Bay, Lake Champlain, the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico—which are at particular risk of degradation by species invasions; (2) voluntary guidelines to help recreational boaters to prevent unintentional transfer of zebra mussels; and (3) provisions to encourage more regions to set up coordinating panels and develop State management plans for invasive species prevention and control. Though now much broader in scope, I am proud to announce that the overall cost of the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 does not exceed that of the 1990 law.

Recent discussions with interest groups have revealed gaps in S. 1660, which I have urged the lead sponsor of the House companion legislation, Congressman STEVE LATOURETTE, and my Senate colleagues to address. I am pleased that H.R. 4283 accommodates these concerns. For example, H.R. 4283 addresses the need for research on the fragile and precious natural resources of California, Rhode Island, and the Columbia River. Establishment of an ecological baseline and identification of alien species impacts in these regions will help us to ascertain whether our protection efforts are adequate.

A second set of concerns arose from the maritime industry. Senator JOHNSTON and I convened the leaders of this industry in Washington about a month ago to explore their position on the legislation and seek ways to increase

their level of support without compromising the effectiveness of the legislation. While their initial response was skeptical and critical of the potential for regulation within NISA, ultimately they agreed to the legislation if certain clarifications were made in the legislative language. These clarifications—already a matter of Coast Guard policy—concern the priority on vessel safety, international consistency, and he equitable treatment of foreign and U.S.-flag vessels.

With respect to ship safety, the bill now explicitly gives sole discretion over safety to the ship master. The Coast Guard does not want to be put in the position of second-guessing the ship's master on safety, unless the call is not made in good faith. While the safety exemption clearly could still be exploited by those who simply do not want to undertake an exchange, ship masters have highly responsible positions and we would expect them to act responsibly with respect to these guidelines. In addition, by measuring the rate at which the safety exemption is utilized, we can gauge the extent to which the use of it may impede effective prevention of new invasions. We may find that alternative technologies should replace ballast exchange. H.R. 4283 also assures that additional requirements will not be imposed upon vessels that exercise the safety exemption from national ballast exchange requirements. This provision does not affect the Great Lakes region, where an alternative exchange zone is already identified and convenient for vessels. For the national program, because alternatives are not yet identified, the Coast Guard is likely to encourage a vessel master using the safety exemption to attempt alternative actions to reduce the amount of unexchanged ballast that is discharged into one of our harbors, but leave the exercise of them to the master's discretion. In addition, the bill now explicitly requires the equal treatment of United States and foreign-flag operators and encourages consistency of our guidelines with any international regulatory regime established through the International Maritime Organization.

Finally, to benefit all of us in assessing the adequacy of the program, the legislation includes a report to Congress by the Coast Guard after 2 years of implementation of the national guidelines. While it will consume some time, this report will assess for all to see, the rate of compliance by vessels, the extent to which the safety exemption has been utilized, the effectiveness of the guidelines at preventing new introductions of exotic species, and the regions—if any—in which the Coast Guard intends to enforce the guidelines due to poor compliance. The report will give Congress and the public a chance to review prevention program implementation and its effectiveness at meeting our resource protection and ship safety needs.

In a last minute change, the House also included an exemption for crude

oil tankers engaged in coastwise trade. Most of this trade takes place along the West Coast and while coast-wise, some of these vessels will exit the exclusive economic zone and ply the high-seas on their way to Alaska from Hawaii or California. I am happy to say Senator STEVENS has included an amendment reflected in H.R. 4283 which evaluates the potential for upgrading a shore-side treatment facility, currently targeted at removing hydrocarbons from ballast water, for use in preventing non-native species transfer.

I would like to close by pointing out that biological pollution of U.S. waters, so far, has not had serious public health implications. But the 1992 transfer of human cholera from South American ports to the shellfish beds of Mobile Bay via ballast water of commercial vessels reminds us that our luck may not hold forever. It is in everyone's interest to improve our Nation's precautions against invasions of aquatic nuisance species.

Clearly, at this juncture, we do not have all the answers necessary to solve the problem of unintentional transfer of species via ballast water. H.R. 4283 has been carefully crafted to both generate and accommodate new information that will lead to rapid progress in protecting the natural resource wealth of our coasts. Unusual in the environmental arena, this issue offers us "low-hanging fruit" and bipartisan enthusiasm. I am grateful to my colleagues for joining in support of the National Invasive Species Act and urge enactment of this legislation this year.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, in order to protect our native aquatic plants and animals, we seek to pass H.R. 4283, the National Invasive Species Act of 1996. This bill amends the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-646), to establish a voluntary program to prevent the unintentional introduction of non-native invasive species through ballast water management. And, we will take one more step to manage to the best of our ability a particularly bad actor, the zebra mussel.

By passing this bill, we will be one step closer to taking control of the most common way that non-native species come to the United States—ballast water. Ballast water is carried in the holds of ships for stability as they travel empty or partly empty on the high seas. When the ships get to port, they discharge the water to make room for cargo.

When ballast water is discharged, all of the species that were picked up in a foreign port are discharged with them. The zebra mussel came to the Great Lakes in this manner. And, the zebra mussel has now colonized the Mississippi River drainage and is headed both east and west.

It turns out the zebra mussel, like many non-native invasive species, has ecological implications far wider than just its mere presence. This tiny

clam—like organism attaches itself to any solid surface, including the shells of our native snails and clams. The natives are smothered by the newcomer. The newcomer, in its multitudes, feeds on microscopic plants and animals from the water, and thereby filters away all of the food for the native species.

I am told that with the 2.4 million gallons of ballast water discharged into U.S. ports every hour comes every organism that was picked up elsewhere and that survived the trip. Fortunately for all of us, very few of the estimated 3,000 species of organisms in transit every day survive when they are discharged. But, when they do, we have the makings of serious trouble on our hands as in the case of the zebra mussel.

Nearly every part of the country has been affected by this game of chance. From the Chesapeake Bay, to Honolulu Harbor, including San Francisco Bay, and many places in between the problems created by invasive non-native species are immense.

This bill has been developed with the cooperation of the U.S. maritime industry and the U.S. port authorities. We have assured ourselves that the voluntary program for ballast water exchange will not cause unsafe conditions for our ships at sea. And we have been assured that this bill be extremely important in protecting our ports, water systems, and waterways from the economic impacts of invasive species.

There is no intent to try to control intentional introductions of useful organisms, or invasive species in terrestrial environments through this bill. We recognize that non-native species have been tremendously beneficial to us by enhancing recreational opportunities such as sport fishing, providing reliable sources of protein through mariculture and aquaculture, and by improving human existence through the pet and aquarium trade.

We understand perfectly well that intentional introductions are one thing, if they have been well studied, and have been introduced for a purpose. But, the game of roulette that is represented by ballast water introductions is something we cannot let continue.

For example, late last year a 2-inch predatory shrimp native to China was found near Portland, Oregon in the Columbia River. What effect this new species will have on the Columbia and Snake River insect life is still to be determined. My fear is that they will deprive the migrating salmon smolts of important food sources while they work their way from their native streams to the sea. One thing the beleaguered salmon and steelhead do not need at this time is another competitor for their food sources.

There is evidence that unintentional introductions of non-native animals cause the endangerment of native species. One fisheries biologist, D.R. Lassuy estimates that non-native species contributed to 68 percent of the

fish extinctions in the past 100 years, and the decline of 70 percent of the fish species listed by the Endangered Species Act.

But what is known about the effect of non-native invasive species is greater still. For example, it is thought by many accidentally introduced New Zealand mud snails have contributed directly to the decline of the native fauna in the Snake River, and led to the proposal to list at least one of the Snake River snails as endangered.

We hope that the Senate will quickly pass H.R. 4283. By passing this bill we will take one very important step to protect our aquatic habitats from non-native species.

#### BALLAST EXCHANGE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, a priority for me in the National Invasive Species Act has been to establish a ballast technology demonstration program to usher in the development of safer and more reliable alternatives to ballast exchange. I note that in H.R. 4283, the Secretary of Interior and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration implement this important program in cooperation with the Secretary of Transportation Administration. I believe the Secretary of Transportation should involve its Office of Shipbuilding and Technology which already has years of experience in ballast technology in this program.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Involvement of that office will be important to build upon past experience in ballast technology development and I also urge its involvement.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, which provides for the National Invasive Species Act of 1996, be deemed read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The bill (H.R. 4283) was deemed read the third time and passed.

#### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE COMPACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 193) granting the consent of Congress to the Emergency Management Assistance Compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be deemed read a third time and passed,

the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

I might say, this compact is among the States of Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 193) was deemed read the third time and passed.

#### WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT REGULATION COMPACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 194) granting the consent of the Congress to amendments made by Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be deemed read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 194) was deemed read the third time and passed.

#### MODIFYING BOUNDARIES OF TALLADEGA FOREST, AL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture Committee be immediately discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1874, a bill to modify the boundaries on the Talladega National Forest, AL, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
A bill (H.R. 1874) to modify the boundaries of the Talladega National Forest, Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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 measure be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 1874) was deemed read the third time and passed.

#### WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of H.R. 1281, received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1281) to express the sense of the Congress that it is the policy of the Congress that United States Government agencies in possession of records about individuals who are alleged to have committed Nazi war crimes should make those records public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1281, the War Crimes Disclosure Act, which expresses the sense of Congress that Government agencies in possession of records documenting Nazi war crimes should declassify such records and release them to the public.

Ideally, in a democracy, all government information belongs to the people, excepting such information as would be harmful to the body politic if made publicly available. Knowledge of wartime atrocities presents no threat to the American people. To the contrary, accurate information about the Nazi regime, and those who ruthlessly carried out its barbaric policies, can only serve to deepen our understanding of history's darkest chapter, and strengthen our resolve that it never be repeated.

On August 2, 1996, I introduced the War Crimes Disclosure Act (S. 2048), which would have amended the Freedom of Information Act to provide for disclosure of information relating to individuals who committed Nazi war crimes. This bill, cosponsored by Senators D'AMATO and DODD, is the Senate companion to a similar measure sponsored in the House of Representatives by my colleague from New York, the Honorable CAROLYN MALONEY.

Inexplicably, that measure has met with some opposition and, due to the impending adjournment of Congress, we will not be able to adopt it in its original form. Nevertheless, with the passage of this amended legislation, Congress makes an important statement in support of public disclosure of documents relevant to Nazi war crimes. This is a first step. I do hope that we can revisit this issue in the 105th Congress.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to