surface transportation reauthorization bill.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise to expound upon a provision in the Transportation appropriations bill to forgive the State of Hawaii from its obligation to repay $30 million owed to the Airport Revenue Fund for ceded land payments to the Office of Hawaiian Affairs [OHA].

Current law states that airport revenues can only be used for airport purposes. The U.S. Department of Transportation's inspector general found in September of 1996, that the approximately $30 million in ceded land payments made from the Hawaii Airport Revenue Fund were not in compliance with the law. In April of this year, the U.S. Department of Transportation affirmed the decision, and is seeking the repayment of those moneys.

A continuation of the status quo—continued ceded land payments from the Airport Revenue Fund—was not possible. It was counter to the U.S. Department of Transportation's position and policy. I did not have the support of my colleagues to legislate its continuation. At this time, forgiveness of the $30 million debt was possible and achievable. I thank my colleagues for allowing for the congressional forgiveness of an airport revenue diversion in order to aid the State of Hawaii and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

However, I would like to make clear that as a result of the U.S. Department of Transportation ruling and the pending legislation, the removal of the Airport Revenue Fund for use by the State of Hawaii as a source of compensating the Office of Hawaiian Affairs for use of ceded lands upon which the airports sit, should not equate to a like reduction in the State's obligation to OHA under State law. This forgiveness provision should not be construed as a forgiveness of the State's obligation to OHA.

The airports continue to sit on ceded lands. The State's obligation to compensate OHA for the use of the land upon which the airports sit should also continue. The only difference would now be the source the State will draw upon to satisfy its obligation. I have viewed my role as aiding in alleviating the accumulated debt to reduce the pressure, and thereby allow the State and OHA to return to the negotiating table to work toward a mutually acceptable course of action that accepts as a premise, the existence of an obligation.

To ensure that my intent is clear in this regard, I have requested the inclusion of the following provision in section 335:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any existing statutes of the several states that define the obligations of such states to Native Hawaiians, Native Americans or Alaskan Natives in connection with ceded lands, except to make clear that airport revenues may not be used to satisfy any such obligations.

Mr. President, in light of the unique history of Hawaii's ceded lands and the obligations that flow from these lands for the betterment of the native Hawaiian people, I believe that this is more than a fiscal matter, this is a fiduciary matter—one of trust and obligation. Section 335 ensures that the State of Hawaii and OHA would not be required to return funds already in their possession. It is my expectation that this will calm the waters and clear the way for reasoned negotiations as the State, in good faith, looks to satisfy its obligations from other sources.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments to S. 1048 at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the House companion bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All after the enacting clause is stricken and the text of S. 1048, as amended, is inserted.

Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill was read the third time.

Mr. SHELBY. I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on passage of H.R. 2169 immediately following the vote with respect to S. 39, the tuna-dolphin bill, which will occur tomorrow morning.

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

Without objection, rule XII is waived as well.

MEASURE READ FOR FIRST TIME—S. 1085

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 1085, introduced earlier by Senator WELLSTONE, is at the desk. I ask for its first reading under rule XIV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (S. 1085) to improve the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and object to my own request on behalf of the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

PREGNANCY-BASED SEX DISCRIMINATION IN MEXICO'S MAQUILADORA INDUSTRY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate that Human Rights Watch, the International Labor Rights Fund, and Mexico's National Association of Democratic Lawyers have asked the U.S. National Administrative Office [U.S. NAO] to investigate reports of widespread pregnancy-based sex discrimination in Mexico's maquiladora industry.

These organizations report that maquiladoras routinely administer pregnancy exams to prospective female employees in order to deny them work, in blatant violation of their privacy. Female employees face invasive questions about contraceptive use, sexual activity, and menses schedules. In some cases, women who become pregnant after being hired are forced to resign. Maquiladora owners fear that pregnant women will reduce production standards and that legally mandated maternity benefits will drain industry money. The report concludes that the Mexican Government has failed to investigate these discriminatory practices in violation of their own laws and NAFTA.

The request for an investigation is the first of its kind that has been brought before the U.S. NAO. The case represents an important opportunity to convey to our trading partners and United States corporations who have operations in Mexico that sex discrimination is intolerable, illegal, and in violation of NAFTA.

As we consider expanding NAFTA benefits to the Caribbean Basin and other South American countries, the United States should demonstrate to our trading partners that we take labor rights violations seriously. I hope the U.S. NAO will consider this case expeditiously and I look forward to its report. The priviledge of free trade and its economic benefits should be conditional upon the trading partners abiding by the same labor and environmental laws.

THE SHAW'S SUPERMARKET LABOR CONTROVERSY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, for the past 2 days, 6,500 workers have been on strike at the Shaw's Supermarket chain in southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. These workers are members of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union. For months, they negotiated in good faith with their employer in an effort to reach a collective bargaining agreement fair to both sides.

But no agreement could be reached. The company insisted on cutting