

The brownfields and MSW fixes are minor, but they are crucial for successful brownfields development, or to relieve those subjected to unfair and unintended litigation. And they offer significant economic and environmental benefits. The nation's Mayors estimate they lose between \$200 and \$500 million a year in tax revenues from these properties sitting idle, and that returning these sites to productive use could create some 236,000 new jobs.

I am therefore honestly trying to understand what, if any, objective criteria exist for determining which small Superfund fixes will be made in this session.

When I consider yesterday's surety amendment, along with Senator LOTT's recycling proposal (S. 2180), I can find nothing that distinguishes sureties or recyclers from brownfields or MSW. There is virtually nothing that makes the surety's or recycler's needs more urgent than those of our cities in need of brownfields revitalization, and their taxpayers and residents, who want cleanup and redevelopment; or those of the homeowners and small businesses mired in litigation at landfill sites. And it certainly cannot be argued that brownfields or MSW have enjoyed any less broad-based support than have fixes for recyclers or sureties.

As a Senator from a state with literally thousands of brownfields sites, as well as altogether too many instances of homeowners and small businesses dragged into Superfund litigation by their corporate peers (and not by EPA), it is my responsibility to lobby for those communities and individuals who don't have lobbyists representing them here in the Congress. We, as their elected representatives, are their lobbyists. We are their voice. There is no reason in the world why this Senate, and this Congress, should not move forward to make the minor, non-controversial, and eminently sensible changes to Superfund law that impede brownfields development and rob small businesses of their hard earned profits.

Now, Mr. President, some of my colleagues have claimed that passage of brownfields or MSW amendments are anathema to comprehensive Superfund reform. Or some of my colleagues have argued that precisely because the brownfields and MSW amendments are so popular, and enjoy such broad ranging support, and provide such significant benefits to the nation, that they should be held hostage to comprehensive Superfund reform—that we should see if they will succeed in driving parties back to the table to negotiate comprehensive Superfund reform for the fourth consecutive Congress.

Mr. President, with all due respect, I think it is wrong to prevent enactment of legislation that enjoys broad support, and would reap acknowledged benefits, as a tactical matter to achieve unrelated goals. This disserves the public and adds to public cynicism. For a variety of reasons, efforts to

radically change Superfund, the nation's toxic waste cleanup program, have failed for six years running. Toward the end of each of the past two Congresses, many Senators, including this Senator, have argued that we should move ahead with achievable reforms that are non-controversial and permit our people, our communities, and our economy to benefit from their enactment. Today, as we head into the final week of this Congress, I make the same plea. Just as holding recyclers or sureties hostage to comprehensive Superfund reform has not gotten us any closer to producing an acceptable product that the President could sign, so holding brownfields development and persons who disposed of household trash hostage to other legislative goals is a failed strategy. It will not mitigate the controversy intrinsic to the broader issues raised by comprehensive legislation. But it will rob communities across the country of the jobs and tax ratables that flow from revitalized brownfields and will impose severe penalties on the individuals and small businesses caught up in a litigation nightmare through no fault of their own.

Mr. President, I call upon my esteemed colleagues to move brownfields and MSW amendments before this Congress ends. I believe otherwise we will all have a hard time explaining, when we return to our home states in October, why sureties and recyclers merited this body's attention, but our communities and our taxpayers and our small businesspeople were somehow less worthy.●

ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNCIL FOR RESPONSIBLE NUTRITION

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to offer my congratulations to the Council for Responsible Nutrition (CRN), which is now celebrating its 25th anniversary.

For over a quarter of a century, the members of CRN have been working to enhance the public's health by promoting wise dietary choices and the appropriate use of nutritional supplements. CRN's work with federal legislators and policy makers has helped to ensure that consumers have access to a variety of quality nutritional products and to accurate information about the health benefits of these products.

Over 100 million Americans are using dietary supplements daily. There is ample—and growing—scientific evidence that dietary supplements can help promote good health. To cite but one example, for many years, we have known that use of folic acid during pregnancy can reduce the risk of birth defects. Now it appears it can help prevent heart disease as well.

One of the most significant achievements of which I have been a part, as a Senator for the last 22 years, has been the passage of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act (DSHEA) of 1994. I worked closely with the CRN in

passing this bill, and I am extremely grateful to them for their insights and expertise, which were integral to the success of this endeavor.

I am pleased to have had such a positive relationship with CRN and look forward to working with this fine Association for many years in the future to help Americans live healthier lives. Again, my congratulations to the Council for Responsible Nutrition.●

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, last night, after several years of effort, the Senate passed S. 414, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act, and I strongly urge the President to sign this important piece of legislation into law.

The Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 modifies our existing shipping regulatory scheme by bringing it up to date with the industry as it operates today. It provides more flexibility for carriers and shippers to agree on transportation arrangements. It authorizes the privatized publication of rate information. It gives individual carrier conference members more leeway in taking independent actions and in entering service contracts, and thus makes the current system more competitive.

Yet the bill also preserves the basic system and principles of common carriage, and maintains protections for ocean transportation users against unfair or unreasonable actions by transportation providers. Importantly, S. 414 preserves the Federal Maritime Commission as an independent regulatory agency, which is vitally important as that agency enforces this program while it additionally ensures that our trades remain free from restrictive foreign shipping practices that impede our oceanborne foreign commerce.

The reason this bill was so long in coming is that the Senate took great care to make the legislative process an open one. I was critical of shipping legislation passed in the other body three years ago, because it did not reflect the diversity of concerns reflected in the broad spectrum of shipping interests. It was, as I noted at a Commerce Committee hearing, "conceived in darkness." By contrast, the legislation ultimately agreed to by both the House and Senate is truly a compromise, in which all industry interests were heard from and all sectors had input. No one got everything they wanted in this legislation, and no one's interests were completely disregarded. This legislation is a carefully crafted balance of the many interests at stake. When it was necessary, members of all segments sat down and negotiated a compromise. Not everyone is completely pleased with all aspects of the legislation, but it is incumbent upon us to move forward.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank a number of members of both the House and Senate for their efforts on this bill including; Congressmen SHUSTER, OBERSTAR, GILCREST