By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 1693. A bill to protect the Social Security surplus by requiring a sequester to eliminate any deficit; to the Committee on the Budget and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. Res. 196. A resolution commending the submarine force of the United States Navy on the 100th anniversary of the force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BULLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1686. A bill to provide for the conveyances of land interests to Chugach Alaska Corporation to fulfill the intent, purpose, and promise of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CHUGACH ALASKA NATIVES SETTLEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1999

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President. This morning I rise to introduce legislation to implement a settlement agreement between the Chugach Alaska Corporation (CAC) and the United States Forest Service. This legislation will fulfill a long overdue commitment of the Federal government made to certain Alaska Natives.

I am terribly troubled and disappointed that Congress must once again step in to secure promises to Alaska Natives that at best have been unnecessarily delayed by this Administration and at worst have been trampled by them.

This legislation will accomplish three goals:

It will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to, not later than 90 days after enactment, grant CAC the access rights they were granted under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

It will return to CAC cemetery and historical sites they are entitled to under section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

It will require the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate the development, maintenance, and revision of land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System in Alaska with the plans of Alaska Native Corporations for the utilization of their lands which are intermingled with, adjacent to, or dependent for access upon National Forest System lands.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to section 1430 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the State of Alaska, and the CAC, were directed to study land ownership in and around the Chugach Region in Alaska. The purpose of this study was twofold. The first purpose was to provide for a fair and just settlement of the Chugach people and realizing the intent, purpose, and promise of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act by CAC. The second purpose was to identify lands that, to the maximum extent possible, are of like kind and character to those that were traditionally used and occupied by the Chugach people and, to the maximum extent possible, those that provide access to the coast and are economically viable.

On September 17, 1982, the parties entered into an agreement now known as the 1982 Chugach Natives, Inc. Settlement Agreement that set forth a fair and just settlement for the Chugach people pursuant to the study directed by Congress. Among the many provisions of this agreement the United States was required to convey to CAC not more than 73,308 acres of land in the vicinity of Carbon Mountain. The land eventually conveyed contained significant amounts of natural resources that were inaccessible by road. A second major provision of the Settlement Agreement granted CAC rights-of-way across Chugach National Forest to their land and required the United States to also grant an easement for the purpose of constructing and using roads and other facilities necessary for development of that tract of land on terms and conditions to be determined in accordance with the Settlement Agreement. It is obvious that without such an easement the land conveyed to CAC could not be utilized or developed in a manner consistent with the intent of Congress as expressed in ANILCA and ANCSA.

More than seventeen years after the Settlement Agreement was signed the much needed easement still has not been granted and CAC remains unable to make economic use of their lands. It seems absurd to me that Congress passed a Settlement Act for the Benefit of Alaska Natives; then the federal government entered into a Settlement Agreement to implement that Act where the CAC was concerned; and today, we find ourselves once again in a position of having to force the government to comply with these agreements.

I have spoken directly to the Chugach Forest Supervisor, the Regional Forester, and to the Chief of the Forest Service about this issue. Just last month I facilitated a meeting between the Forest Service and CAC to work out final details. While the parties thought they had an agreement in principle it fell apart once it reached Washington, D.C. Therefore, I find it necessary to once again have Congress rectify inaction on behalf of the Forest Service.

It is my intent to hold a hearing on this issue in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee as soon as possible.•

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1687. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Federal Trade Commission Reauthorization Act. The bill will authorize funding for the Commission for fiscal years 2001 and 2002. The measure sets spending levels at $149 million in FY 2001 and increases that amount for inflation and mandatory pay benefits to $156 for FY 2002.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has two primary missions: (1) the prevention of anticompetitive conduct in the marketplace; and (2) the protection of consumers from unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The Commission accomplishes its anticompetitive mission primarily through premerger reviews under that Hart-Scott-Rodino Act. Under that Act, merger and acquisitions of a specified size are reviewed for anticompetitive impact. During the 1990's, the number of mergers that met these size requirements tripled. This has placed an increased burden on the Commission.

Additionally, the Commission pursues claims of unfair or deceptive practices or acts—essentially fraud. As electronic commerce on the Internet increases, fraud will certainly increase with it and the FTC should and will play a role in protecting consumers on the Internet, as they do in the traditional market place. The Commission's performance of these dual missions is vital to the protection of consumers.

The Commission was last reauthorized in 1996. That legislation provided for funding levels of $107 million in FY 1997 and $111 million in FY 1998. The bill I introduce today increases the previous authorization by $37 million. In general, the increase is necessary to meet the rising number of merger reviews under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act and to protect consumers in the expanding world of e-commerce. According to the Commission's justification, the new authorization would fund 25 additional employees to work on merger and Internet issues. It will also help the Commission upgrade its computing facilities and fund increased consumer education activities.

The authorization, however, does not provide for the full amount requested by the Commission. In a recent request, the Commission asked for $176

million in FY2002. While I agree the Commission plays an important role in protecting consumers, their request represents more than a 50% increase in their authorization over a four-year period. At this point, I am not convinced that such a dramatic increase is warranted.

As we move through the authorization process, I look forward to hearing further from the FTC as to why such an increase is needed to meet its statutory functions. I also hope to explore other ways we can improve the Commission's ability to protect customers without increasing spending.

For example, I was very interested in the comments of the FTC nominee Thomas Leary during his confirmation hearing regarding the Commission's merger review process. I know over the past few years, the Commission has taken steps to simplify this process reducing its own costs and the costs to the business community. Mr. Leary indicated, however, that more work could be done to change the internal procedures of the FTC to further reduce the number of reviews without harming competition. I look forward to exploring this topic with Mr. Leary and the other commissioners.

I look forward to working with the members of the Commerce Committee, the full Senate, and the Commission as we move through the authorization process.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1688. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and the family of the employee in the program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee, but the employee fails to provide the coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS CHILDREN'S EQUITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce, along with my distinguished colleague Senator AKAKA, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Children's Equity Act of 1999.

This legislation concerns Federal employees who are under a court order to provide health insurance to their dependent children. If a Federal employee is under such a court order and his dependent children have no health insurance coverage, the Federal government would be authorized to enroll the employee in a ''family coverage'' health plan. If the employee is not enrolled in any health care plan, the Federal government would be authorized to enroll the employee and his or her family in the standard option of the service benefit plan. The bill would also prevent the employee from canceling health coverage for his dependent children for the term of the court order.

This bill would close a loophole created by the 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. The 1993 bill required each State to enact legislation requiring an employer to enroll a dependent child in an employee's group health plan when an employee is under a court order to provide health insurance for his or her child but neglects to do so. This legislation simply provides Federal agencies with the same authority granted to the states.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Children's Equity Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. ENROLLMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES AND FAMILY.

Section 8905 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f)(1)(A) An unenrolled employee who is required by a court or administrative order to provide health insurance coverage for a child who meets the requirements of section 8901(5) may enroll for self and family coverage in a health benefits plan under this chapter.

''(B) The employing agency of an employee described under subparagraph (A) shall enroll the employee in a self and family enrollment in the option which provides the lower level of coverage under the service benefit plan if the employee—

''(i) fails to enroll for self and family coverage in a health benefits plan that provides full benefits and services in the location in which the child resides; and

''(ii) does not provide documentation demonstrating that the required coverage has been provided through other health insurance.

''(2)(A) An employee who is enrolled as an individual in a health benefits plan under this chapter and who is required by a court or administrative order to provide health insurance coverage for a child who meets the requirements of section 8901(5) may change to a self and family enrollment in—

''(i) the health benefits plan in which the employee is enrolled; or

''(ii) another health benefits plan under this chapter.

''(B) The employing agency of an employee described under subparagraph (A) shall change the enrollment of the employee to a self and family enrollment in the plan in which the employee is enrolled if—

''(i) such plan provides full benefits and services in the location where the child resides; and

''(ii) the employee—

''(I) fails to change to a self and family enrollment; and

''(II) does not provide documentation demonstrating that the required coverage has been provided through other health insurance.

''(C) The employing agency of an employee described under subparagraph (A) shall change the coverage of the employee to a self and family enrollment in the option which provides the lower level of coverage under the service benefit plan if—

''(i) the plan in which the employee is enrolled does not provide full benefits and services in the location in which the child resides; or

''(ii) the employee fails to change to a self and family enrollment in a plan that provides full benefits and services in the location where the child resides.

''(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), an employee who is subject to a court or administrative order described under this section may not discontinue the self and family enrollment in a plan that provides full benefits and services in the location in which the child resides for the period that the court or administrative order remains in effect if the child meets the requirements of section 8901(5) during such period.

''(B) Enrollment described under subparagraph (A) may be discontinued if the employee provides documentation demonstrating that the required coverage has been provided through other health insurance.''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ANNUITY SUPPLEMENT COMPUTATION.

Section 8421a(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (4), the reduction required by subsection (a) shall be effective during the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the seventh month after the end of the calendar year in which the excess earnings were earned.''.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 1689. A bill to require a report on the current United States policy and strategy regarding counter-narcotics assistance for Colombia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COLOMBIAN COUNTER-NARCOTICS ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I share many of my colleagues concerns about the need to do more to aid Colombia. But I also believe that our aid must be based on a clear and consistent plan, not on good intentions. We do Colombia no favors by throwing money at the problem. We do not help ourselves. Too often, throwing money at a problem is the same thing as throwing money away. For that reason, I, along with Senator HELMS and Senator DEWINE, am introducing legislation today calling on the U.S. Administration to present a plan.

Colombia is the third largest recipient of U.S. security aid behind Israel and Egypt. It is also the largest supplier of cocaine to the United States. But, we seem to find ourselves in the midst of a muddle. Our policy appears to be adrift, and our focus blurred.

This past Tuesday, the Caucus on International Narcotics Control held a

hearing to ask the Administration for a specific plan and a detailed strategy outlining U.S. interests and priorities dealing with counter-narcotics efforts in Colombia. Before we in Congress get involved in a discussion about what and how much equipment we should be sending to Colombia, we need to discuss whether or not we should send any and why. Recent press reports indicate that the Administration is preparing a security assistance package to Colombia with funding from $500 million dollars to somewhere around $1.5 billion dollars.

And yet, Congress hasn't been able to evaluate any strategy. That's because there is none. From the hearing, it seems the Administration is incapable of thinking about the situation with any clarity or articulating a strategy with any transparency. It seems confused as to what is actually happening in Colombia.

At Tuesday's hearing, representatives from the Department of State and the Department of Defense assured me they were currently working on a detailed strategy to be unveiled at some future point. So far there have been difficulties in creating a detailed and coherent strategy and presenting it to Congress. Today we are introducing a bill that requires the Secretary of State to submit to Congress within 60 days a detailed report on current U.S. policy and strategy for counter-narcotics assistance for Colombia.

This is an issue that will not just simply disappear. Before we begin appropriating additional funding for Colombia, we need strategies and goals, not just piecemeal assistance and operations. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1690. A bill to require the United States to take action to provide bilateral debt relief, and improve the provision of multilateral debt relief, in order to give a fresh start to poor counties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DEBT RELIEF FOR POOR COUNTRIES ACT OF 1999

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, to introduce the Debt Relief for Counties Act of 1999. This bill simply forgives much of the debt owed to us by the world's poorest countries in exchange for commitments from these countries to reform their economies and work toward a better quality of life for their people. Our effort today is premised on the fact that we must help these poverty-stricken nations break the vicious cycle of debt and give them the economic opportunity to liberate their futures. I ask my colleagues to join me in this worthwhile effort.

Today, the world's poorest countries owe an average of $400 for every man, woman, and child within their borders. This is much more than most people in these countries make in a year. Debt service payments in many cases consume a majority of a poor country's annual budget, leaving scarce domestic resources for economic restructuring or such vital human services as education, clean water and sanitary living conditions. In Tanzania, for example, debt payments would require nearly four-fifths of the government's budget. In a country where one child in six dies before the age of five, little money remains to finance public health programs. Among Sub-Saharan African countries, one in five adults can't read or write, and it is estimated that in several countries almost half the population does not have access to safe drinking water.

Mr. President, the problems that yield such grim statistics will never be solved without a monumental commitment of will from their leaders, their citizens, and the outside world. That is not what we propose to do here today. Our bill is only a small step in the right direction, but it is one we can do quickly and for relatively little cost.

The effort to forgive the debts of the world's poorest countries has been ongoing for more than a decade. During this time the international community and the G7 came to the realization that the world's poorest countries are simply unable to repay the debt they owe to foreign creditors. The external debt for many of the developing nations is more than twice their GDP, leaving many unable to even pay the interest on their debts. We must accept the fact that this debt is unpayable. the question is not whether we'll ever get paid back, but rather what we can encourage these heavily indebted countries to do for themselves in exchange for our forgiveness.

Our bill requires the President to forgive at least 90 percent of the entire bilateral debt owed by the world's heavily indebted poor countries in exchange for verifiable commitments to pursue economic reforms and implement poverty alleviation measures. While roughly $6 billion is owed to the United States by these poor countries, it is estimated the cost of forgiving this debt would be less than ten percent of that amount. The U.S. share of the bilateral debt is less than four percent of the total, but our action would provide leadership to the rest of the world's creditor nations and provide some savings benefits to these countries as well.

Our bill also requires a restructuring of the IMF and World Bank's Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC). This program was begun in 1996, but to date only three countries have received any relief. While the premise of HIPC is sound, its shortcomings have become evident during the implementation. It promises much, but in reality it benefits too few countries, offers too little relief, and requires too long a wait before debt is forgiven. A process of reforming the HIPC was begun this year during the G7's meeting in Cologne, and our bill meets or exceeds the standards set out in the Cologne communique.

Specifically, we shorten the waiting period for eligibility from six to three years. We extend the prospect of relief to more countries. And we ensure that savings realized from the relief will be used to enhance ongoing economic reforms in addition to initiatives designed to alleviate poverty. This is a sound and balanced approach to help these poor countries correct their underlying economic problems and improve the standard of living of their people.

Mr. President, this legislation is not a handout to the developing world. Rather, it is an investment in these countries' commitment to implementing sound economic reforms and helping their people live longer, healthier and more prosperous lives. In order to receive debt relief under our bill, countries must commit the savings to policies that promote growth and expand citizens' access to basic services like clean water and education.

We have included a strict prohibition in our bill on providing relief to countries that sponsor terrorism, spend excessively on their militaries, do not cooperate on narcotics matters, or engage in systematic violations of their citizens' human rights. We are not proposing to help any country that is not first willing to help itself.

Mr. President, the debt accumulated in the developing world throughout the Cold War and into the 1990s has become a significant impediment to the implementation of free-market economic reforms and the reduction of poverty. We in the developed world have an interest in removing this impediment and providing the world's poorest countries with the opportunity to address their underlying economic problems and set a course for sustainability.

I believe our bill is an important first step in this process and I look forward to the support of my colleagues in the Senate.•

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from Florida, Mr. MACK, in introducing the ''Debt Relief for Poor Countries Act of 1999.'' This bill is the companion legislation to H.R. 1095, offered in the House by Representatives LEACH and LAFALCE and cosponsored by 116 other Members.

The purpose of the bill is to provide the world's poorest countries with relief from the crippling burden of debt and to encourage investment of the proceeds in health, education, nutrition, sanitation, and basic social services for their people.

All too often, payments on the foreign debt—which account for as much as 70 percent of government expenditures in some countries—mean there is little left to meet the basic human needs of the population. In effect, debt service payments are making it even harder for the recipient governments to enact the kinds of economic and political reforms that the loans were designed to encourage, and that are necessary to ensure broad-based growth and future prosperity.

To address this problem the World Bank and the IMF began a program in 1996 to reduce $27 billion in debt from the most Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, known as the ''HIPC Initiative.'' But the program created a number of stringent criteria and provided only partial relief, which meant that only a small number of countries actually qualified for participation and the ones who did received only marginal benefits after an extended period of time.

Following calls by non-government organizations, religious groups and member governments for faster and more flexible relief, the G–7 Finance Ministers, meeting this past June in Cologne, Germany, proposed alternative criteria that would make expanded benefits available quicker and to more countries. Last week, at the annual World Bank-IMF meetings here in Washington, President Clinton pledged to cancel all $5.7 billion of debt owed to the U.S. government by 36 of the poorest countries, and he sent a supplemental request for $1 billion over 4 years to pay the U.S. portion of the multilateral initiative. Canceling the debt will not cost the full $5.7 billion because many of the loans would never have been repaid and are no longer worth their full face-value. I commend the President for exercising international leadership on this important issue and for making it a foreign policy priority.

The legislation we are offering today goes even further by requiring the President to forgive at least 90 percent of the U.S. non-concessional loans and 100 percent of concessional loans to countries that meet the eligibility guidelines. To qualify, the countries must have an annual per capita income of less than $925, have public debts totaling at least 150 percent of average annual exports, and agree to use the savings generated by debt relief to facilitate the implementation of economic reforms in a way that is transparent and participatory, to reduce the number of persons living in poverty, to promote sustainable growth and to prevent damage to the environment.

Countries that have an excessive level of military expenditures, support terrorism, fail to cooperate in international narcotics control matters, or engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights are not eligible for debt relief under this legislation.

In addition, the bill urges the President to undertake diplomatic efforts in the Paris Club to reduce or cancel debts owed bilaterally to other countries, and to work with international financial institutions to maximize the impact of the HIPC Initiative. The United States accounts for less than 5 percent of the total debt burden, so it is essential that relief is provided in a coordinated and comprehensive fashion.

Mr. President, countries should not be forced to make a tradeoff between servicing their debt and feeding their people. And once debt is relieved, we should ensure that the savings are being used to reduce poverty and improve living standards, so that the benefits are widely shared among the population. This bill achieves both objectives, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its prompt consideration.●

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1691. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize programs for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

DISASTER MITIGATION ACT OF 1999

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Disaster Mitigation Act of 1999. As the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee with jurisdiction over FEMA, I have been working on this legislation for the last couple of years. I am joined in the introduction today with my ranking member Senator BOB GRAHAM. I appreciate his commitment to this legislation and I look forward to working with him to shepherd this Bill through the process.

We have been witness to several major natural disasters already this year. And, we have three more months to go. We have seen devastating tornadoes ravage Oklahoma City and Salt Lake City. We have also seen the destruction brought on the East Coast by hurricanes Dennis and Floyd. Our hearts go out to the victims of these natural disasters. I was in Oklahoma City the morning of May 4, the day after the tornadoes moved through the Oklahoma City metro area. I have never seen destruction like that any place in the world. I was moved by the stories I heard and saw as we traveled through the remains of entire neighborhoods.

Now a few months later, I see and hear stories of the destruction brought by the flooding in North Carolina and I know the problems that lie ahead as they begin to recover. As the recovery effort begin, our hearts and our prayers go out to the people of North Carolina.

The Federal government, through FEMA, has been there to help people and their communities deal with the aftermath of disasters for over a generation. As chairman of the oversight Subcommittee I want to ensure that FEMA will continue to respond and help people in need for generations to come. Unfortunately, the costs of disaster recovery have spiraled out of control. For every major disaster Congress is forced to appropriate additional funds through Supplemental Emergency Spending Bills. This not only plays havoc with the budget and forces us to spend funds which would have gone to other pressing needs, but sets up unrealistic expectations of what the federal government can and should do after a disaster.

For instance, following the Oklahoma City tornadoes, there was an estimated $900 million in damage, with a large portion of that in federal disaster assistance. Now, in the aftermath of hurricane Floyd in North Carolina, estimates of $1 billion or more in damages are being discussed. This problem is not just isolated to Oklahoma City or North Carolina. In the period between fiscal years 1994 and 1998, FEMA disaster assistance and relief costs grew from $8.7 billion to $19 billion. That marks a $10.3 billion increase in disaster assistance in just five years. To finance these expenditures, we have been forced to find over $12 billion in rescissions.

The Bill I am introducing today will address this problem from two different directions. First, it authorizes a Predisaster Hazard Mitigation Program, which assists people in preparing for disasters before they happen. Second, it provides a number of cost-saving measures to help control the costs of disaster assistance.

In our bill, we are authorizing PROJECT IMPACT, FEMA's natural disaster mitigation program. PROJECT IMPACT authorizes the use of small grants to local communities to give them funds and technical assistance to mitigate against disasters before they occur. Too often, we think of disaster assistance only after a disaster has occurred. For the very first time, we are authorizing a program to think about preventing disaster-related damage prior to the disaster. We believe that by spending these small amounts in advance of a disaster, we will save the federal government money in the long-term. However, it is important to note that we are not authorizing this program in perpetuity. The program, as drafted, is set to expire in 2003. If PROJECT IMPACT is successful, we will have the appropriate opportunity to review its work and make a determination on whether to continue program.

We are also proposing to allow states to keep a larger percentage of their federal disaster funds to be used on state mitigation projects. In Oklahoma, the state is using its share of

disaster funds to provide a tax rebate to the victims of the May 3 tornadoes who, when rebuilding their homes, build a ''safe room'' into their home. Because of limited funding, this assistance is only available to those who were unfortunate enough to lose everything they owned. We seek to give states more flexibility in determining their own mitigation priorities and giving them the financial assistance to follow through with their plans.

While we are attempting to re-define the way in which we respond to natural disasters, we must also look to curb the rising cost of post-disaster related assistance. The intent of the original Stafford Act was to provide federal assistance after States and local communities had exhausted all their existing resources. As I said earlier, we have lost sight of this intent.

To meet our cost saving goal, we are making significant changes to FEMA's Public Assistance program. One of the most significant changes in the PA program focuses on the use of insurance. FEMA is currently developing an insurance role to require States and local government to maintain private or self-insurance in order to qualify for the PA program. We applaud their efforts and are providing them with some parameters we expect them to follow in developing any insurance rule.

Second, we are providing FEMA with the ability to estimate the cost of repairing or rebuilding projects. Under current law, FEMA is required to stay in the field and monitor the rebuilding of public structures. By requiring FEMA to stay afield for years after the disaster, we run up the administrative cost of projects. Allowing them to estimate the cost of repairs and close out the project will bring immediate assistance to the State or local community and save the Federal government money.

We have spent months working closely with FEMA, the States, local communities, and other stakeholders to produce a bill that gives FEMA the increased ability to respond to disasters, while assuring States and local communities that the federal government will continue to meet its commitments.

In closing, I want to thank Senator GRAHAM for his help and the leadership he has taken on this important issue. Without his help, input, and insight, this legislation would be little more than an idea. As we continue to move this bill forward in the process, I look forward to continuing to work with him to make this legislation a reality.●

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma in introducing legislation that creates public and private incentives to reduce the cost of future disasters.

On June 1st, the start of the 1999 Hurricane Season, the National Weather Service predicted that the United States would face three or four intense hurricanes during the next six months.

We did not have a long wait to experience the accuracy of that forecast. From September 12–15, 1999, Hurricane Floyd dragged 140 mph winds and eight foot tidal surges along the eastern seaboard. Floyd caused flooding, tornadoes, and massive damage from Florida to New Jersey. Evacuations were conducted as far north as Delaware. This disaster claimed the lives of 68 people. Initial damage estimates suggest that Floyd could cost the federal government more than $6 billion. Just days later, Tropical Storm Harvey struck Florida's west coast. We are still assessing the combine effects of these storms.

Coming just seven years after Hurricane Andrew damaged 128,000 homes, left approximately 160,000 people homeless, and caused nearly $30 billion in damage, this year's developments remind us of the inevitability and destructive power of Mother Nature. We must prepare for natural disasters if we are going to minimize their devastating effects.

It is impossible to stop violent weather. But Congress can reduce the losses from severe weather by legislating a comprehensive, nationwide mitigation strategy. Senator INHOFE and I have worked closely with FEMA, the National Emergency Management Association, the National League of Cities, the American Red Cross, and numerous other groups to construct a comprehensive proposal that will make mitigation—not response and recovery—the primary focus of emergency management.

Our legislation amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. It will: Authorize programs for pre-disaster emergency preparedness; streamline the administration of disaster relief; restrain the Federal costs of disaster assistance; and provide incentives for the development of community-sponsored mitigation projects.

Mr. President, history has demonstrated that no community in the United States is safe from disasters. From tropical weather along the Atlantic Coast to devastating floods in the Upper Midwest to earthquakes in the Pacific Rim, we have suffered as a result of Mother Nature's fury. She will strike again. But we can avoid some of the excessive human and financial costs of the past by applying what we have learned about preparedness technology.

Florida has been a leader in incorporating the principles and practice of hazard mitigation into the mainstream of community preparedness. We have developed and implemented mitigation projects using funding from the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program and other public-private partnerships.

Everyone has a role in reducing the risks associated with natural and technological related hazards. Engineers, hospital administrators, business leaders, regional planners and emergency managers and volunteers are all significant contributors to mitigation efforts.

An effective mitigation project may be as basic as the Miami Wind Shutter program. The installation of shutters is a cost-effective mitigation measure that has proven effective in protecting buildings from hurricane force winds, and in the process minimizing direct and indirect losses to vulnerable facilities. These shutters significantly increase strength and provide increased protection of life and property.

In 1992, Hurricane Andrew did $17 million worth of damage to Baptist, Miami South, and Mercy Hospitals in Miami. As a result, these hospitals were later retrofitted with wind shutters through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

Six years after Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Georges brushed against South Florida. The shutter project paid dividends. Georges' track motivated evacuees to leave more vulnerable areas of South Florida to seek shelter. The protective shutters allowed these three Miami hospitals to serve as a safe haven for 200 pregnant mothers, prevented the need to evacuate critical patients, and helped the staff's families to secure shelter during the response effort.

In July of 1994, Tropical Storm Alberto's landfall in the Florida Panhandle triggered more than $500 million in federal disaster assistance. State and local officials concluded that the direct solution to the problem of repetitive flooding was to remove or demolish the structures at risk. A Community Block Grant of $27.5 million was used to assist local governments in acquiring 388 extremely vulnerable properties.

The success of this effort was evident when the same area experienced flooding again in the spring of 1998. While both floods were of comparable severity, the damages from the second disaster were significantly lower in the communities that acquired the flood prone properties. This mitigation project reduced their vulnerability.

We have an opportunity today to continue the working partnership between the federal government, the states, local communities and the private sector. In mitigating the devastating effects of natural disasters, it is also imperative that we control the cost of disaster relief. Our legislation will help in this effort. I encourage my colleagues to support this initiative.●

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 1693. A bill to protect the Social Security surplus by requiring a sequester to eliminate any deficit; to the

Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee has thirty days to report or be discharged.

SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Social Security Surplus Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. SEQUESTER TO PROTECT THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS PROTECTION SEQUESTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 15 calendar days after Congress adjourns to end a session and on the same day as a sequestration (if any) under subsection (a), section 252, and section 253, there shall be a sequestration to eliminate any on-budget deficit (excluding any surplus in the Social Security Trust Funds).

''(2) ELIMINATING DEFICIT.—The sequester required by this subsection shall be applied in accordance with the procedures set forth in subsection (a). The on-budget deficit shall not be subject to adjustment for any purpose.''.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to provide for payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 414, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension of the credit for producing electricity from wind, and for other purposes.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain medicare beneficiaries with an exemption to the financial limitations imposed on physical, speech-language pathology, and occupational therapy services under part B of the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for meal and entertainment expenses of small businesses.

S. 874

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 874, a bill to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment.

S. 1003

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased tax incentives for the purchase of alternative fuel and electric vehicle, and for other purposes.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1091

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a pediatric research initiative.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to provide increased flexibility in use of highway funding, and for other purposes.

S. 1187

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and for other purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide States with the option to allow legal immigrant pregnant women and children to be eligible for medical assistance under the medical program, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1277, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a new prospective payment system for Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

S. 1384

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1384, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national folic acid education program to prevent birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 1453

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1453, a bill to facilitate relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan.

S. 1478

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1478, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide equitable access for foster care and adoption services for Indian children in tribal areas.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from