

S. 333

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 333, a bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to improve the farmland protection program.

S. 335

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 335, a bill to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmarketability of certain deceptive matter relating to games of chance, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, and for other purposes.

S. 346

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit the recoupment of funds recovered by States from one or more tobacco manufacturers.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, a concurrent resolution expressing congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urging the President to assert clearly United States opposition to such a unilateral declaration of statehood.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THERE SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE PARITY BETWEEN THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CLELAND) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas members of the uniformed services of the United States and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States; and

Whereas, increases in the levels of pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall levels of pay of workers in the private sector so that there is now up to a 30 percent gap between the compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and the compensation levels of private sector workers and a 9 to 14

percent gap between the compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and the compensation levels of private sector workers; and

Whereas, in almost every year of the past two decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators MIKULSKI and WARNER in submitting a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that parity between Federal civilian pay and military pay should be maintained. Disparate treatment of civilian and military pay goes against longstanding Congressional policy that for more than a decade has ensured parity for all those who have chosen to serve our Nation, whether that service be in the civilian workforce or in the armed services. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution. •

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE FAIR AND EQUITABLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AMENDMENTS MADE BY FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Ms. LANDRIEU): submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. CON. RES. 11

Whereas the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-170; 110 Stat. 1489) was enacted with unanimous congressional approval and with the assistance and leadership of a broad coalition of agricultural, industry, and public interest groups;

Whereas the amendments made by that Act are intended to be an important tool in protecting public health, particularly the health and well-being of the most valuable resource of the United States, the children of the United States;

Whereas it is critical that the amendments made by that Act be implemented in a way that accomplishes the intent of Congress while maintaining an abundant, affordable, and safe food supply for the United States, ensuring urban pest control, and not unfairly providing competitive advantages to foreign food suppliers over domestic producers;

Whereas the amendments made by that Act require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop risk assessment methodologies that are based on reliable information and to undertake a massive review of all approved pesticide tolerances;

Whereas on August 4, 1997, the Administrator published a schedule for reassessment

of more than 3,000 tolerances by August 3, 1999, that could include certain classes of products that are extensively used;

Whereas the sudden loss of uses and products could both economically cripple a host of agricultural commodities, including corn, soybeans, wheat, rice, cotton, and dozens of fruit and vegetable crops and create a public health threat to the urban environment from the unchecked infestation of insects; and

Whereas it is critical that the amendments made by that Act be implemented in a fair and equitable manner, and that the protections be implemented while maintaining an abundant, affordable, and safe food supply for the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Agriculture should ensure that the implementation of the amendments made by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-170; 110 Stat. 1489)—

(A) be based on sound science that protects public health;

(B) include transparent processes with full disclosure of decisions and be subject to peer and public review;

(C) provide for a reasonable transition for agriculture; and

(D) require consultation with the public and other agencies;

(2) the development of risk assessment methodologies, guidelines, and protocols for collection of data under the amendments made by that Act be based on sound science and not default assumptions in the absence of reliable data;

(3) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should devote sufficient resources to register new pesticide products and uses to provide effective substitutes for pesticides that may be considered high risk under the amendments made by that Act; and

(4) the Administrator should establish ongoing means for input regarding the implementation decisions of the Administrator with respect to that Act from producers, pesticide users, registrants, environmental and public health groups, consumers, State and local agencies, tribal governments, Members of Congress, and appropriate Federal agencies.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I submit a Senate Concurrent Resolution which addresses the controversy surrounding the Food Quality Protection Act. I am pleased to be joined today by my colleagues, Senators CONRAD, BROWNBACK, HUTCHISON, FRIST, GRAMM of Texas, LANDRIEU, and HUTCHINSON who are original cosponsors of the resolution.

The Food Quality Protection Act directs the EPA to base its tolerance review decisions pertaining to pesticides on reliable data that is currently available. Or, the EPA can require the development of new data through the data call-in provisions of the Food Quality Protection Act.

In order to meet the review deadlines, the EPA is basing some critical decisions on assumptions, which are primarily EPA's preliminary findings. This could lead to needless and questionable product cancellations, and have a significant impact on the agricultural industry.

It is essential that the EPA's insect tolerance assessment process be based