SENATE—*Monday, May 9, 1994*

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1994)

The Senate met at 3 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. MATHEWS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The prayer this morning will be offered by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, Jr.

PRAYER

The Reverend Richard C. Halverson, Jr., of Falls Church, VA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty God, may each person here, along with their associates elsewhere in the Senate, be reminded of their value to one another. When their work seems routine, may each realize that You have led them here for a purpose. As working relationships sometimes grow tense, remind them of their importance to one another—from the least to the greatest.

We give thanks for the leadership of the Senators and their staffs; the Officers of the Senate and their staffs. We thank Thee for those who deliver messages and run errands. We are grateful for those who record, publish and file our proceedings; and for those who oversee the orderly procedure of each day's business.

Remind us, Lord, that the smallest acts of kindness bear eternal fruit, and quiet words and deeds of love yield heavenly results. What progress could be made without the care of those who clean and maintain our buildings and grounds? Where would we be without the vigilant watch of our police and security officers? And to whom would we turn in the absence of those who prepare and serve our meals; order and repair our furnishings; keep our doors and guide our visitors?

Lord, may Thy Word concerning the Body of Christ bear some application to the body of the Senate when it says, "* * * now are they many members, yet * * * one body." One member "* * * cannot say * * * I have no need of you * * *. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary * * *. For * * * God hath tempered the body together * * * that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it."—I Corinthians 12:20–21; 24–26.

In Christ's name, Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Tennessee, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before we ponder today's bad news about the Federal debt, let us do what I have done a time or two before. Let us have a little pop quiz. How many million would you say are in a trillion?

When you figure that out, just consider that Congress has run up a debt now exceeding $4.5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business this past Friday, May 6, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly $4,571,838,912,004.05. This means that every man, woman, and child in America owes $17,536.04, computed on a per capita basis.

Now, Mr. President, to answer the question how many million in a trillion, there are a million million in a trillion. And I remind you, Mr. President, that the Federal Government, thanks to the U.S. Congress, where we work, owes more than $4.5 trillion.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO DR. STEPHEN A. FREEMAN

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Dr. Stephen A. Freeman, who celebrates his 96th birthday today. I would like to join his family and friends in wishing him continued good health and happiness in the coming year.

Steve has dedicated his life to a cause that I believe has been greatly underemphasized in this country—the teaching of foreign languages. Most of his career has been spent at Middlebury College, which during his lifetime has become one of the Nation's premier institutions for study of foreign language and literature.

Just a year ago, President John M. McCardell, Jr. and the Middlebury College Board of Trustees joined Steve and his family and friends to celebrate the opening of the Stephen A. Freeman International Center. This center houses Russian, German, and other foreign studies, focusing on an interdisciplinary approach to the study of languages through a close association with the teaching of the history, literature, and culture of these countries.

This center was named for Steve in recognition of his 45 years of active service to Middlebury College, during which time he was instrumental in creating the college's international reputation. Steve served in many capacities at the college. For 38 years he was professor of French, for 24 years director of the language schools, vice president of the college for 20 years, and on three critical occasions, acting president. He is still vitally interested in the college and is one of its most enthusiastic supporters.

Steve has been known nationally and internationally for his leadership in programs and associations to improve the teaching of foreign languages. In Middlebury's summer language program, he helped to found the Italian and Russian Schools, and went on to found the Chinese and Japanese Schools. He established Middlebury's first graduate schools abroad: the School of French in Paris and the School of Spanish in Madrid, and later the School of German in Mainz and the School of Italian in Florence. Steve was the driving force behind the development of the Sunderland Language Laboratory, a pioneer language teaching facility.

Steve's work has been recognized both at home and abroad. He has honorary degrees from the University of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Vermont, Norwich University, McGill University, Dickinson College, and Middlebury College. For his service in the field of French language teaching he was awarded the high honor of both the French Legion of Honor and the Palmes Academiques by the French Government.

Before the turn of the century, this energetic man was born the son of a postman, and with the aid of scholarships, earned his way through Harvard University. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa with a double Summa cum laude in the class of 1919. During World War I, in the earliest days of flying, he volunteered for Naval Aviation, and was commissioned ensign #1091. He was an instructor at Pensacola, FL, and did patrol and convoy work at New York harbor until the Armistice. He loved to fly, and as one of the oldest living World War I naval aviators, has recently enjoyed writing about his experiences. During World War II, he served as chief of the liberal arts section of the U.S. Army University in Biarritz, France and from 1948 to 1956 he was colonel of a Reserve Military Intelligence Unit on Middlebury's campus.

Steve and his wife Ruth were for many years avid world travelers, circling the globe twice. There are few countries in the world they have not explored. But they kept coming back to Middlebury, their beloved home. Steve loves to tell the story of how his Harvard mentor advised him, when he was first hired by Middlebury, "Don't buy a house there—you won't be likely to stay there that long!" Sixty nine years later he is still very involved in college activities and has maintained a long-standing, vigorous interest in town affairs. Steve has served on the board of Porter Hospital, as moderator of the Mary Hogan Elementary School and the Middlebury Congregational Church. He continues to be active with the Middlebury Rotary Club and the Ilsley Town Library. His roots are deep in Vermont.

Steve continues his obsession with intercultural communication. At 96 years of age, he reminds us that there is much work to be done. Let me quote briefly from an address Steve gave on the occasion of his acceptance of the Bicentennial Award of the Vermont Education Association on September 10, 1976. His remarks were enthusiastically greeted at the time, and I believe are very relevant today:

We must now admit the tragic fact that we do not have a global community . . . America needs a whole people who are willing to listen and try to understand the minds and hearts of our neighbors—white, black, brown or yellow; rich or poor, strong or weak; in Vermont or Detroit, Mississippi or Washington; in Russia or China or India, England or Angola or Lebanon: our brothers wherever they are. We must learn about them, try to talk their language, listen to their hopes, their fears, their minds; learn from them and try to comprehend their ways of speaking and thinking and doing. This is our task—global communication for a global community.

As many events of the past year have demonstrated, in spite of improved communication technology, we are still far from being a global community. We all benefit from the vision and inspiration provided by those like Steve who have spent their lives laboring to break down barriers between peoples. How fitting it is that the plaque that hangs in the new Stephen A. Freeman International Center quotes from another of his writings: "Let us build bridges."

UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as the world focuses on the continuing tragedy in Bosnia, we should not forget the importance of events elsewhere in the world. My distinguished colleague from Kentucky, MITCH MCCONNELL, recently spoke on United States-Russian relations. Senator MCCONNELL, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, is one of our leading voices on foreign policy—especially on relations with Russia. I guess that is why the New York Times and Washington Post accuse him of being a bear-baiter and a cold warrior.

As Senator MCCONNELL'S speech makes clear, there is certainly an alternative to the "Russia first policy followed by the United States under the direction of Strobe Talbott. Senator MCCONNELL'S speech lays out a number of specific proposals for reshaping our policies—a new focus for assistance, moving beyond Moscow, opposing Russian imperialism. I was impressed by Senator MCCONNELL'S analysis, and by his recommendations.

I urge my colleagues, and those responsible for foreign policy in this administration, to review Senator MCCONNELL'S remarks and ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard-Columbia Arden House Conference on American-Soviet Relations, Apr. 16, 1994]

COMMITMENT—NOT CAPITULATION

(By Senator Mitch McConnell)

INTRODUCTION

A funny thing happened to me on the way to give this speech: I was mugged by the New York Times. You may have seen it, two days ago, where the Times criticized my recent statements on Russia policy, characterizing them as "bear-baiting," "confrontational," and "thinking in cold war categories."

Of course, in my line of work, the only thing worse than being pilloried is being ignored, so I took some comfort in reading about myself in the Times—especially since I had some rather illustrious company: the editorial lumped my views together with those of former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who has played a major role in the development of this program.

But, there was another reason why I am pleased by the New York Times editorial, because it affirmed that there is more than one point of view when it comes to U.S. policy toward the New Independent States. There is, in fact, a wide-ranging debate going on about how we should deal with this part of the world; and I believe that serious discussion of these divergent viewpoints is healthy for our foreign policy.

With that in mind, I welcome the opportunity to share with you my view of the situation in the former Soviet states, and the proper course this country should take in response. First, I would like to review the remarkable changes and current trends; then focus on the Administration's priorities and policies; and finally, make some recommendations on how we must correct our course if the U.S. is to play a constructive role in advancing common interest in regional stability and the prospects for political liberty and economic prosperity.

THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE

Although there is a common chord which resonates through the changes occurring in all fifteen republics, I want to focus attention on Russia. For all of us, it has been convenient to refer to the dramatic events of the last half-decade in broad, sweeping terms. We speak of the collapse of communism, the birth of democracy, and the triumph of free-market capitalism. We are comfortable pigeon-holing complex trends with buzz-words like "glasnost" and "perestroika." But if our policy in the region is to be effective, we must realize that there are three very distinct transitions underway: one political, one economic, and one relating to Russia's definition of her security.

The Russian people, no longer dominated by a totalitarian dictatorship, have had the opportunity to elect their President and Parliament. Nevertheless, elections in and of themselves are no guarantee of basic individual liberties or political freedom, both essential to the endurance of a democracy. Further, it remains to be seen whether hopes for democracy will be corrupted by chauvinism—or undermined by ethnic nationalism, failed political leadership, or lack of consensus on the principles of good government. While President Yeltsin and his ministers express concern about the status of Russian minorities abroad, the real test of their commitment to democracy and civil rights is their willingness to protect religious and ethnic minorities at home. Zhirinovsky has been spreading a lethal strain of anti-semitism—and it remains to be seen whether Russia as a nation will embrace or repudiate those views.

Russia's economic transition presents an even murkier picture. Beginning with Gorbachev, the Russian political leadership has declared its desire to relax the controls of a state-planned economy. But while free markets, private enterprise and open trade are very much part of the public lexicon, they remain as goals rather than functional reality. Corruption, government subsidies, organized crime, the absence of a rational commercial code, and limited banking facilities all dampen the prospects for a flourishing free market.

The third uncertain transition can best be described as Russia's own sense of itself. An inchoate identity emerged as early as February 1993, when President Yeltsin called upon the U.N. and other international organizations "to grant Russia special powers as

a guarantor of peace and security in the regions of the USSR." Variations on this theme have been enunciated by a number of senior officials, but most clearly by Foreign Minister Kozyrev when he addressed the U.N. General Assembly last fall. His explication of Russia's rights in the so-called "near abroad" unquivocally signaled the subordination of the territorial integrity and political independence of the regional republics to Russian interests. Here again, I believe the transition is in flux, with the prospects for regional stability hanging in the balance.

THE U.S. RESPONSE

So far, I have emphasized that the changes we have seen in Russia are far from being settled or complete. This dynamic state of play raises two obvious questions. First, should the U.S. commit its political and economic resources to obtain the most positive outcome on each transition track? And second, if the answer to the first question is yes, then how?

As the Senate Republican manager of the 1994 foreign operations appropriations bill, which included President Clinton's request for $2.5 billion in aid to NIS, I have given my preliminary, affirmative answer to the first question. We can and we should make a serious commitment to promote free markets, democracy and respect for national sovereignty. As former President Richard Nixon has pointed out, "Russia is the only nation in the world which can destroy the United States. Therefore, Russia remains our highest foreign policy priority."

Although the nuclear nightmare could stand alone as justification for active engagement, I believe it serves a number of interests to open Russian markets and minds to the virtues of our 208-year-old experiment.

At the same time, I must part company with this Administration in answering the second question of how we should proceed. As the architect of the President's Russia policy. Strobe Talbott has advocated a point of view which is notable only for its unrelenting consistency, regardless of the facts. For more than twenty years, Mr. Talbott has advanced the notion that a reform-minded, moderate corps of political leaders are the guardians of democratic, free-market hopes. Presently, Boris Yeltsin stands at the top of this political pyramid, and has become the symbol of success for Russian-American policy. The Administration is bound by the notion that any criticism of Yeltsin or his policies fuels dangerous hard-line fires. I have diagnosed this syndrome as "Moscow myopia."

Unfortunately, the harmful consequences of this myopia are fairly evident on all three transition tracks. Let me review the problems I see, and on each track outline some constructive alternatives.

SUPPORTING PRINCIPLES VS. PERSONALITIES

First of all, it was obvious that the Administration was caught off-guard by the results of Russia's November elections. In a series of contradictory and confusing statements, Administration officials characterized the results—especially Zhirinovsky's ascendancy, as an inconsequential protest vote, an indication that we ought to "go slow" on reform, and evidence that we are on the right course. Nevertheless, the President and his advisors seemed to realize that something was happening which they had not anticipated. Even though the Administration still seems obliged to apologize to Yeltsin's erratic performance, the November elections were a useful wake-up call for everyone.

Further, it's becoming clearer every day that Boris Yeltsin is not the only Russian leader who both has a following at home and is friendly to the United States. Just as Boris Yeltsin came on the scene as a relative unknown, dozens of other capable Russians are emerging who have political vision and leadership potential.

Some, like Nikolai Travkin and Gregory Yavlinsky—who spoke here yesterday—have expressed presidential ambitions. Recent history provides ample evidence that there is no shortage of charismatic figures—both good and bad—who can capture popular political attention.

If only for that reason alone, it seems obvious to me that we must extend our official reach beyond Moscow circles. We also must continue to support programs that train parliamentarians in constitutional and legislative processes. We have increased funding for such programs—as well as for efforts to develop grassroots organizations that give citizens a voice on issues as far ranging as education and health care. Building participatory political institutions increases the prospects for democracy's survival.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH

On the other hands, our traditional economic assistance to Russia continues to suffer acutely from Moscow myopia. Although the Administration has emphasized that 75% of our aid flows through non-government spigots, the troubling fact is the largest single commitment of U.S. resources has been to high-priced American consultants involved in the mass privatization voucher program based on Moscow.

So far, privatization has merely involved a transfer of ownership of assets. Since they cannot produce statistics on how many of these privatized concerns are still viable, Administration witnesses concede that most of them continue to be subsidized by the state. In a harsh inflationary economy, the higher unemployment which might be triggered by eliminating these subsidies is a risk which the Russian government has been understandably unwilling to take.

Private enterprise also has been frustrated by a weak regulatory infrastructure to protect investments, trade and commercial transactions. To date, U.S. policy has emphasized transfer of ownership without adequate attention to the commercial setting in which business is attempting to function.

If we are to assist the transition from communism to capitalism, our aid program must change. It is my view the Administration must accept the premise that the *private* sector will be largely responsible for the pace and scope of economic change. No amount of grants or loans from the U.S. or international institutions can independently keep Russia afloat. To invest, create jobs, and expand growth, the business community must have confidence in the commercial environment, including fair tax treatment, timely payment for services, and respect for contractual obligations.

The conference report on foreign operations last year recommended that our assistance be made conditional on such key assurances. This year, I think we should make certain that these conditions have been met and take further steps to promote economic growth.

Specifically, I believe U.S. assistance must target three areas. First, we should help draft a national tax and commercial code which encourages private enterprise. Yes, I am suggesting we send Russia more lawyers. After all, it's basic economic rule that when you have a surplus of something, you should export it.

Seriously, though, let me give you just one example of how urgent this need is: I recently learned that an American company's $116 million investment was in jeopardy because the Russian tax code was changing on a *monthly* basis, local taxes consumed a fifth of its revenues, the company was required to convert half of its dollars to rubles, it paid a separate tax on any profit, a 28% value-added tax and a 60% corporate income tax. That ought to put in perspective the anguish we all felt yesterday!

In connection with making Russia's tax and commercial laws more palatable to private enterprise, we should help the government strengthen its enforcement system. Good laws mean nothing in the absence of a viable, independent judicial system.

Second, we should assist in the development of independent and stable financial institutions, including banks and credit unions. Obviously, this issue is tied up with macroeconomic issues like currency stabilization and monetary policy. Nevertheless, we should be laying a foundation to help businesspeople who complain that they have to carry suitcases full of cash because there are no facilities to secure deposits.

Third, our development aid should be coordinated with major private equity investments to maximize our impact on the growth of free enterprise and the quality of life of average citizens. Let me describe how this would work. Let's assume an oil company has agreed to a major investment in Western Siberia. In most rural areas there are serious inadequacies in transportation, water and food supply, social services, education, and housing. An impoverished infrastructure, in turn, dampens a community's productivity and prospects for revenue generation.

I propose that the Agency for International Development should work side-by-side initially with the top ten U.S. corporations with major equity investments. A.I.D. would assume a three- to five-year diminishing investment in a community's infrastructure, with the aid curve declining as expectations of corporate production and local revenue grow. In other words, as a community prospers, it would "graduate" from U.S. aid.

We are all aware of the growing anti-American sentiment rippling through Russian society. To some extent, this a reaction of disappointed expectations: when the press reported we would deliver $2.5 billion, many in Russia wondered when their personal check from Uncle Sam would arrive in the mail. But simmering anti-Americanism is also a reaction to intolerably difficult living conditions. I am not sure there is misery index adequate to express what it must be like to live in a country where half the water is undrinkable and 75 percent of the average Moscow family's income is spent on food. It's my hope that the joint ventures we intend to create between A.I.D. and the private sector would go a long way toward improving the Russian quality of life, as well as Russian perceptions about the value of American aid.

One final concern about our economic aid program has been the Administration's Russia-first bias. Of the $2.5 billion in aid appropriated last year, just over $1 billion has been committed to projects, though not actually disbursed. Despite legislative recommendation that at least a third of the $2.5 billion be spent in the fourteen other republics—and a requirement that not less than $300 million be made available to Ukraine—virtually all of the $1 billion has been committed to activities in Russia alone.

When it comes time to slice the foreign aid pie next year, I will insist that we meet our legislative commitments to the fourteen other republics. Not only can we have an im-

mediate, meaningful effect in nations with smaller populations and economies, but such a shift is essential to demonstrate our commitment and further our interests in the region.

U.S. RESPONSE TO RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Money is not the only issue, however. Russia has enjoyed first place not only in our apportionment of foreign aid, but also in our acquiescence to Russia's ever-expanding definition of its national interest in the region. As I mentioned earlier, Russian leaders began to reclaim superpower status a year ago. Two factors have framed and expanded these designs.

First, a complex amalgam of history, national pride, economic hardship—and legitimate concern about ethnic Russians who have been suddenly exiled by a redefinition of borders—have enabled some leaders—most notably Zhirinovosky—to twist nostalgia for security into spirited neo-imperialism. Although this strain of malignant nationalism has attracted some support, it is still relatively shallow. Steady economic growth is the best cure for this particular political virus.

But there is a second, potentially more troubling factor which is fueling Russia's expansionist rhetoric and policy. During the February "Group of Seven" meeting, Economic Minister Alexander Shokin drew attention to Russia's recent diplomatic efforts in Sarajevo. He argued that Russia's superpower status should be the decisive factor in according Russia equal treatment and membership in the G–7. While acknowledging the need for economic reforms, Shokin was clearly leveraging Russia's security role to buy economic status.

This purposeful linkage between security and economic status was echoed twice this week. Presidential spokesman Kostikov told journalists that joining the Partnership for Peace should be tied to Russian acceptance in the G–7. On Wednesday, President Yeltsin himself indicated that Russia may not join the Partnership, partly because of ruffled feathers over consultation on the Bosnian air strikes. But, he also linked the Partnership question to access to Western markets, and complained about "discrimination."

The fact that Russia is apparently leveraging its nuclear status for economic advantage should be considered in the context of the Clinton Administration's accommodationist policy toward Moscow.

For the past year, the U.S. has taken a course of overbearing regard for Russian sensitivity about its security position. We overlooked direct Russian military support for Abkhazi rebels, effectively destabilizing Georgia. During that time, President Shevardnadze wrote me with an urgent plea for help. He had earlier asked the Administration to intervene, urging President Clinton to salvage hope for democracy in Georgia by pressing Russia to cease and desist. While the Administration chose to ignore him, I offered an amendment to the foreign operations bill linking U.S. aid to the recipient country's respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity. My amendment passed—despite the Administration's objections that it would offend Moscow.

When Shevardnanze came to see me last month, we discussed where we needed to go from here. He shared my concerns about Russia's aggressive role in the region and our government's deferential response. Let me give you a few more examples. When we had the opportunity to expand NATO's security umbrella by welcoming the admission of former Warsaw Pact nations, the Administration deliberately punted, citing concerns about the ascendancy of reactionary forces in the Russian Parliament. Instead, President Clinton came up with the Partnership for Peace—or, as I call it, "NATO-Lite." As a result, we missed a major opportunity to establish peace and security in Eastern Europe on *our* terms, and we once again allowed Moscow to effectively shape our foreign policy.

Another example: we took no umbrage at Russia's intentional, crippling withholding of energy to Ukraine; in fact, we collaborated with Moscow by insisting that U.S. aid was *exclusively* linked to Ukraine's turning over its nuclear weapons More recently, when asked if it was reasonable for the Russians to link troop withdrawal from the Baltics to the status of Russian minorities, Secretary Christopher's reply was astonishing: the Russians' concern was "understandable and legitimate," and they should be treated with "generosity."

As Russia turns up its neo-imperialist rhetoric, the Clinton Administration's acquiescence is both disappointing and destabilizing. Our failure to challenge Russian regional ambitions only heightens the anxiety in the Baltics, the new republics and all of Europe, which in turn aggravates ethnic and national tensions.

Moreover, the lack of any predictability to Russia's exercise of its special status could compromise our interests beyond the European theater. No one was more surprised than Prime Minister Rabin when Foreign Minister Kozyrev arrived in Israel, unplanned and unannounced, to promote the PLO negotiations.

Yet the Administration has obstinately refused to challenge Russia's growing hubris or to decouple the three policy tracks, fearing that any perceptible shift would weaken Yeltsin and his like-minded reformers. Any change in policy could cause us to lose Russia altogether, they claim.

However, this argument blurs the line between Russia's legitimate interest in political and economic reforms—which merit our support—and emerging neo-imperial goals which clearly do not. We have incorrectly linked Yeltsin's survival to giving him free regional rein and nothing less than unconditional political and economic support.

The record over the past year suggests that appeasement may only strengthen the hand of extremists, exacting further concessions from Yeltsin and jeopardizing the course of reform. I have said before, as has Henry Kissinger and others, that it is *not* the drawing the bright lines that provokes and inflames nationalism, it is *ambiguity* about our principles and commitments that invites extremists to test the limits of our interests and our resolve.

For that reason, I believe it is extremely important that our policy in the New Independent States place a premium on the territorial integrity and economic and political sovereignty of each the new democracies. That is why I recently amended the Budget Resolution to include language expressing U.S. opposition to Russia's efforts to establish a sphere of influence in Europe through economic coercion, political intimidation, or force. In both Eastern and Central Europe, I believe independence is the key to stability, and therefore to our own interests in the region.

SECURING AMERICAN INTERESTS

Now, to answer the question that Shevardnadze and I discussed last month: where do we go from here?

First, we should expand NATO to include the Visegrad nations. Now, I am enough of a realist to know that this is unlikely to happen soon. In the interim, a common framework agreement should be developed so that all nations understand precisely what is expected of them in order to join. The agreement should specify not only the type and frequency of joint military activities, but also NATO's political expectations such as the submission of transparent defense budgets and civilian control of the armed services. At present, the Administration has encouraged each nation to negotiate separate agreements for participation. This piecemeal approach will only lead to confusion, competition, and friction down the road.

Second, to bridge the gap between NATO and the current military capabilities of the Warsaw Pact nations and the new republics, we should substantially expand our military education and training programs, known as IMET. Training should include exposure to our traditions of professionalism, as well as more technical education in areas such as military planning, command and control, and equipment maintenance and operations. I found it interesting that the Administration is planning to give Georgia only $75,000 in IMET—a nation where we have vital strategic interests—compared with $100,000 in IMET for Benin, where I am somewhat unclear of our mission.

Third, once countries are committed to the Partnership, we can being to establish eligibility standards for obtaining NATO excess defense articles, and equipment "cascaded" as a result of the Conventional Armed Forces Treaty. Obviously, this does not mean that we begin by providing F–16s to Bulgaria, but there are prudent ways to proceed. Let me cite one example. Currently, Germany possesses millions of rounds of Soviet-style weapons ammunition, stored in former East German warehouses. The nation of Latvia, whose army carries Soviet-made firearms, is issuing its soldiers just five rounds of ammunition monthly for training purposes. There ought to be some kind of clearinghouse or other mechanism for the coordinated—and controlled—transfer of useful supplies.

I recently met with Poland's Minister of Defense, who mentioned the need for standardizing communications systems if the Partnership is truly going to work. I'm sure there are a number of other areas where we could transfer equipment to bolster both confidence and coordination.

Each of these security initiatives represents an opportunity to enhance stability and cooperation in Europe and the NIS. Obviously, they depend upon recognition of the fact that the U.S. can pursue its security interests parallel with the promotion of economic and political progress in Russia. The tracks should be separate, but they are certainly not mutually exclusive.

For the past year, U.S. foreign policy and funding priorities have focused exclusively on Russia and unconditional support for Yeltsin's government. This approach has at least temporarily forfeited economic and political opportunities in the fourteen other nations of the NIS. Our failure to challenge Russia's regional ambitions has contributed to instability from Crimea to the Baltics. And we have poorly served our interest in European stability by giving Moscow a veto over NATO participation.

Russia needs and deserves our political and economic help. The vast changes that are continuing to reverberate through Russia and the rest of the NIS clearly require a flexible approach. But, helping to improve prospects for democracy and prosperity should not be at the expense of American

concern for regional stability and security. In international affairs, our interests are clear, our resolve must be firm, and our cooperation should be conditional.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 9, 1913, I was living in rural Edgefield, SC, and was a month into my 11th year. It was on that day, in the rural southern California agricultural town of Yorba Linda, that Richard Milhous Nixon was born. Little did anyone know that this son of devout Quakers, born in a humble mail order home, would grow up to become the 37th President of the United States of America and one of the most important men of the 20th century.

Americans love to talk about self-made men, but few realize that Richard Nixon was one such person. He was raised by God-fearing people of moderate means who never enjoyed great financial success in their lives. His parents worked hard and were passionately dedicated to their family, instilling strong values and qualities in all their children—values and qualities that would carry one of their sons to the highest office of the land.

From his earliest days, Richard Nixon was not someone who was afraid of a challenge or of work. As a student, he distinguished himself at Whittier College by earning high marks, taking part in a number of campus activities, including student government and football, and impressing his professors as a serious young man with a keen mind. His determination and drive helped him through long nights of grueling study at Duke University's School of Law, where he had to maintain a high-grade average in order to keep the meager scholarship that allowed him to attend that school. His service in the House and Senate were also characterized by hard work. He and his staff often worked late into the night, answering constituent mail or carefully preparing for his hearings on communism that were catching the Nation's attention. Throughout his life, he never failed to adhere to the strong work ethic that Hanna and Frank Nixon imparted to their son.

Richard Nixon was a man who possessed a love for his Nation that carried him into a lifetime of public service. At the outset of World War II, he was recruited to serve as an attorney in the Office of Emergency Management in Washington, DC. As a Quaker and a civil servant with a skill critical to war efforts, he could have been exempted from military duty; however, his patriotic streak motivated him to volunteer for service in the Navy. It was this same dedication and patriotism that caused him to heed the urgings of his fellow Californians and run for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1946. Nixon's successes in that race and in the Congress sparked what became one of the most important and significant political careers in the history of the United States.

In subsequent years, Richard Nixon would serve in the U.S. Senate, as Vice President, and as President. To each of these positions he brought an insightful mind, unbridled energy, and a clear vision of the role of the United States in the world.

In 1968, Richard Nixon reentered the political arena, this time as a Presidential candidate. This race was significant for several reasons. First, after two disappointing political setbacks earlier in the decade, Nixon's decision to seek the Presidency was another example of his perseverance and his uncanny ability to overcome personal challenges and setbacks. Second, it was the beginning of a new era in Presidential politics. Richard Nixon was an uncanny politician with a sense about him that has been matched by few others.

Nixon was the first to realize the importance of the South in a national election. He knew that the key to winning the White House in 1968 was to capture that region, which had traditionally been a stronghold of the Democratic Party, and he called upon me for my assistance at the Republican Convention and for the campaign. I campaigned very hard for Nixon throughout the Southeast that year, and for the first time in close to 100 years the South cast their votes for a Republican presidential candidate.

Richard Nixon was undoubtedly one of the most intelligent Presidents with whom I ever served, as well as one of the most effective. We have all heralded his many significant accomplishments in foreign relations, a field he loved and at which he excelled. His grasp of "realpolitik" allowed him to deal with foreign leaders without being intimidated or compromising the strength and security of the United States. I doubt if anyone else could have started his career as investigating communism and ended it by opening China to the West and ushering in a new era in United States-Soviet Union relations. Furthermore, he brokered a peace with Vietnam that ended an unpopular war in an honorable manner; and I believe that had he stayed in office, Saigon might not have fallen into the hands of the North Vietnamese. Nixon's experience as a statesman was so valuable, he continued to contribute to the debate on foreign policy literally until the end of his life. Each of his successors sought his counsel on international matters and there was an enthusiastic audience for Nixon's extensive writings regarding world affairs.

What is often overlooked is the strong role he took as a domestic leader. Perhaps it was his humble origins, or having lived during the Depression that President Nixon was extremely aggressive in fighting inflation and even introduced wage and price controls at one point. He took a very strong role in desegregation and affirmative action matters; and he became the Nation's first environmental President when he created the Environmental Protection Agency and the Endangered Species Act. Richard Nixon assumed the Presidency at one of the most fractious eras in our Nation's history, but under his firm leadership, America became a calmer place and the world became a little less dangerous.

As I watched the television coverage of President Nixon's casket being loaded aboard his old Air Force One, I was struck by the image of a young Marine in the Honor Guard. He was the epitome of Marine Corps "spit and polish," standing rigidly at attention with his rifle at "present arms"; there was, however, a noticeable exception to his military appearance—he had a tear streaking down the left side of his face. Perhaps this marine was caught up in the emotion of an overwhelming and somber event, but I doubt it. Funeral details are common duty for honor guards. I believe his tear was caused by grief. Despite the fact that this young man was probably not even alive when Richard Nixon was President, I think he realized that we had lost one of history's most important figures and one of this Nation's greatest leaders; and he, like the rest of us, was deeply saddened by this realization.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to sum up the life of Richard Nixon in just a few minutes here on the Senate floor. Historians will spend years studying and interpreting this very complex and gifted man, and they will write volumes sharing with us their discoveries. Suffice it to say, Richard Nixon is one of the few figures in American history who has truly gained immortality. His contributions transcended generations and have forever changed the international community, even laying the groundwork for the eventual dissolution of the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article written by Nixon biographer and British Member of Parliament Mr. Jonathan Aitken be included in the RECORD following my remarks. Mr. Aitken interviewed me for his excellent book, "Nixon: a Life," and I believe the tribute he wrote for Human Events does a very good job of summarizing President Nixon's life and giving us some insight into what made him such an amazing man.

Mr. President, I know that President Nixon was proud of his heritage and that all he accomplished in his life was the result of grit, determination, hard work, and intelligence. I also know that the one thing he truly loved in

this world was his family. He came from a tightly knit family and he idolized his mother. As a husband and father, he carried on the tradition of closeness and he was deeply committed to his devoted and lovely wife, Pat, and their two beautiful daughters, Tricia and Julie. It seems only appropriate that Richard Nixon will spend eternity next to his wife in the place where he learned his most important lessons—the site of his parents' home.

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

[From Human Events, May 6, 1994]

A TRIBUTE TO NIXON (1913–1994)

(By Jonathan Aitken)

Nixon the man was even more intriguing than Nixon the statesman. "Complex" was the adjective most used by journalists to described his multi-faceted personality, not least because he camouflaged that most elusive of characters, the real Nixon, behind a battle-scared carapace, which he himself described as "an over-developed wall of privacy." Surprisingly few people even got behind this wall. I think I may have been one of them, so I have concentrated this tribute on the lesser-known private qualities that lay behind this extraordinary public figure.

To begin near the end: Passing through London last month, aged 81, on the outward leg of his ninth visit to Moscow. Nixon telephoned unexpectedly on the morning of Saturday, March 5, and asked if I would like to come with him to the theater. The invitation, like his choice of show, and his somewhat disorganized arrangements for the evening seemed out of character but we duly set off for the Shaftesbury Theatre like a couple of tourists and settled unrecognized into our seats to see the revival of Rogers and Hammerstein's "Carousel." As the musical got underway it became apparent that Nixon was word perfect in many of the lines and most of the songs. As the story reached its climax, he seemed to be in the grip of powerful emotions, especially during the famous number "You'll Never Walk Alone" when tears started to trickle down his cheeks.

As we walked away from the theater Nixon felt it necessary to provide an explanation for the display of his feelings. He said that "Carousel" had been the favorite musical of his late wife Pat; that they had seen it many times together; and that he had chosen "You'll Never Walk Alone" as the music for her funeral last year.

After a pause he added that the show's lead male character, Billy Bigelow, reminded him of Harold, his elder brother who had died of tuberculosis during Nixon's childhood. In two days' time, he continued, it would be March 7, the anniversary of Harold's death. That date was also his mother's birthday, but she could never bear to celebrate it again. After another pause he said that before Harold had died, the family had often gone out for birthday picnics like the one in "Carousel."

For a man who normally shunned personalized small talk, Nixon's urge to share these poignant memories was a revealing reminder that his deep family roots and Quaker upbringing were central to his odyssey—which is surely the closest 20th-Century approximation to the "log cabin to White House" legend.

Nixon was born on Jan. 9, 1913, in a rustic Californian clapboard cottage, which had no electricity, running water, wireless, telephone or inside privy. He had a hardscrabble childhood, one step away from poverty, with his formative years made difficult by a domineering father and sad by the deaths of two of his brothers, Arthur and Harold. Their medical bills created many financial hardships for the family. One painful consequence of these came when the young Nixon won a scholarship to Harvard University and had to turn it down because his parents could not afford the associated travel and accommodation costs. Nixon overcame these early sorrows and disappointments with the help of two strong pillars of the Milhous matriarchy—his grandmother Almira and his mother Hannah.

Grandmother Almira Milhous was a poet and a teacher. She was the first to recognize that the young Richard was a gifted child and the first to say, "That boy will one day be a leader." She disciplined him into the habits of intellectual curiosity, iron application and deep reading of history that stayed with him for the whole of his life.

Still more important was the influence of his mother Hannah. Long before her son became famous, she was known in her local community of Whittier as "A Quaker Saint." She instilled into him the belief that equality between races and peacemaking between nations were Christ's most important teachings. In return he loved her deeply, but strangely. Time and again in my many hours of biographer's conversations with Nixon he spoke movingly about the great debt he owed to his mother for the inspiration and idealism she gave him throughout his career, but on one occasion he added the unexpected information that she had never kissed him.

When I expressed surprise, Nixon grew quite angry, saying that my comment might have come from "one of those rather pathetic Freudian psychiatrists" and added, "My mother could communicate far more than others could with a lot of sloppy talk and even more sloppy kissing and hugging. I can never remember her saying to any of us 'I love you'—she didn't have to!"

Although suppressed emotion may have been part of the Nixon heritage, this did not mean that he was an unfeeling or unemotional man. Far from it. He put his passion into his politics and it powered him to early stardom. Unknown freshman congressman at 33. Re-elected unopposed at 35. National celebrity as a result of the Hiss case at 35. Senator at 37. Vice President 11 days after his 40th birthday. This meteoric ascent owed far more to a zealous mastery of complex issues and a burning intensity to fight the evils of communism than it did to political opportunism. There was plenty of that too, but as he always acknowledged, Nixon would never have risen to the office one heartbeat away from the presidency had it not been for the granite support of his wife Pat, who in many ways was the tougher partner of the marriage.

It was she who persuaded him to put their life savings into what at the time seemed the reckless gamble of running for Congress in 1946 against safe Democratic incumbent Rep. Jerry Voorhis. It was she who nurtured his health through a stress-related breakdown in 1951. It was she who pulled him through the Fund crisis, literally dragging him in front of the television cameras seconds before the "Checkers speech" broadcast. Above all, it was she who gave him the contented family life with two daughters that created the happier hinterland of his hidden persona—a kind, generous and loving father and grandfather.

Yet for all his private virtues, it is as a public man that Nixon would wish to be judged. Even here the two sides of his existence were more connected than has been recognized. During his wilderness years period between 1960–68, Nixon told his intimate friends that the real reason he wanted the presidency was to honor his mother's ideals. It was a promise he did much to keep. For Nixon was the President who ended U.S. involvement in Vietnam (while giving South Vietnam a chance at survival), who terminated the draft, who saved Israel from possible annihilation, and who initiated the process of detente with the Soviet Union with a series of ground-breaking disarmament agreements. Through wily diplomacy, moreover, he managed to help put a check on Soviet aggression by bringing China back into the family of nations.

Nixon also undoubtedly had a dark side to his character. In his private musings, now embarrassingly preserved on the White House tapes, he could be vindictive and paranoid, particularly when talking about his liberal tormentors in Congress and the media.

As for Watergate it was a sordid and shameful mess, but Nixon's alleged villainy in it has been much exaggerated. It is true that he covered up for his closest friends and aides with mendacious maneuvers that were political folly of a high order. Yet contrary to the media's hysterical claims at the time, he had nothing whatever to do with the break-in; he was unaware of the enemies list; there never were any mission tapes and he destroyed no evidence. Even the notorious "expletives deleted" contained none of the familiar four- or six-letter sexual swear words. What Nixon actually excised were a mass of hells, damns, craps for Chrissakes and other puerile examples of Sunday school swearing. He explained to an aide that he could not publish the uncensored transcripts (which would have been far less damaging) because his mother "would turn in her grave" if such epithets saw the light of day.

So Watergate, like Nixon, deserves reevaluation. It was a bad episode in a great career and it has made Nixon the most controversial and complicated character ever to sit in the White House. If he had died, as he so nearly did soon after his resignation, his obituary notices would have been a undiluted chorus of vilification. They will read differently now because the last 20 years of his life were perhaps the most remarkable of all in terms of the development of his character. Transforming himself from exiled pariah to honored elder statesman was nothing less than a miracle of political resurrection. How did he do it?

I came to know him well during his two decades of rehabilitation or "the Fighting Back years" as he sometimes liked to call them. Running for Ex-President was a good label to describe his energetic globe trotting, writing and speech-making, but the reality was far more profound. The secret of his resilience was that he had developed his own new credo. It owed something to the religious counselors whom he saw regularly, such as Dr. Billy Graham and the Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, but was more a spiritual and philosophical concoction of his own.

It included several quintessential Nixonian ingredients, among them tenacity, reflective reading and the desire to perform useful public service by influencing great events. But there were other more unexpected elements, such as magnanimity. For he had put his past disappointments firmly behind him, forgiven his enemies (most of them!); and

dropped recrimination from his mind. "Remember the story of Lot's wife. Never look back," was one of his favorite lines, and he meant it.

Instead, he worked unremittingly to influence the future. During his pensionable years, he wrote eight best-selling books on foreign policy and dispatched a steady flow of influential private memoranda to Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton. He launched his presidential library and a new Nixon Center for Peace and International relations. He continued to travel and speak widely, winning increasing acclaim as America's leading foreign policy expert. Longevity brought him the serenity and fulfillment that had for so long eluded him.

By chance, the last audience he addressed was a gathering in my house on March 17. The still-ambitious octogenarian was keen to convey his latest impressions of the situation in Russia to a group of ministers, defense chiefs, intelligence experts, editors and parliamentarians. He prepared for the occasion with his usual intensity and delivered a *tour de force* of a speech without a note. Including question time, he was on his feet for nearly 90 minutes. The details of his knowledge, the lucidity of his presentation and the incisive brilliance of his judgments, dazzled all of us present.

Nixon enjoyed his evening. As he got into his car he said to me, "Went well, didn't it? Clever group. But I've spoken in your house eight times in 14 years. I think that will have to be the last one."

I said I hoped that he might come back one more time. "Nine speeches, eh? Nine lives? Who knows?" he mused. "Anyway keep on fighting!" and with that characteristic salutation he waved and was gone. We shall not look upon his like again.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would note that morning business is now closed.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1993

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume S. 978, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 978) to establish programs to promote environmental technology, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687

(Purpose: To authorize a rural water sanitation-health technology fund to make grants for technologies to improve sanitation conditions on Indian reservations and in Alaska Native villages and in other rural places, to eliminate the "honey bucket" sewage disposal method through innovative technologies, to develop new technologies to reduce and eliminate sanitation-related health problems and deaths, and to help to uphold the national trust responsibility of the United States to the American Indian and Alaska Native, and for other purposes)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 1687.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 18, strike line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 204. NATIVE AMERICAN SANITATION-HEALTH TECHNOLOGY FUND PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Administrator is authorized and encouraged to enter into an agreement to establish a partnership program to fund grants to research, engineer, develop, test, and demonstrate innovative water sanitation technologies for Indian reservations, Alaska Native villages, and other remote, rural regions. Funds provided pursuant to this section may be awarded beginning in fiscal year 1995 for competitively judged proposals that have the potential to improve health and sanitation conditions in Alaska Native villages, on Indian reservations, and in other rural areas, with emphasis on areas with conditions that are not conducive to utilization of conventional wastewater treatment methods.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Administrator shall coordinate disbursements related to Alaska Native village sanitation authorized by paragraph (a) with appropriate federal agencies and departments, including any such agency or department participating in the federal field working group on rural Alaska sanitation.

SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like the record to show that I am proposing this amendment for myself, for Senator INOUYE, and for Senator MURKOWSKI.

Mr. President, I have had a meeting with the staff of the Public Works Committee, and I have just had a conversation with the distinguished chairman of that committee. I want to take the time to discuss my amendment and explain why I am pursuing it and to hopefully work out something with my good friend from Montana concerning this problem.

Let me just state very basically that I believe that this is a good bill. It is a bill that is going to now centralize environmental technology and give much more authority to the Administrator of EPA, and it will really set a different tone for the appropriations that will be forthcoming to deal with a research in the environmental area.

I believe that one of the critical areas of research in the environmental area should be to deal with rural water sanitation health technology. I have some photographs that were taken in my State to demonstrate. I want to show those to the Chair in just a moment.

This amendment of mine and Senators INOUYE and MURKOWSKI really is not totally an Alaska amendment. I believe that the amendment specifically provides and covers Indian reservations, Alaska Native villages, and other remote rural regions of our country.

We have people now as we are approaching the 21st century and dealing with all sorts of technology and innovations, we have people in this country that not only do not have flushing toilets and running water, they do not have the bare necessities for just human dignity in dealing with sanitation problems.

Last summer I took a trip down the Kuskokwim River. Most of the pictures I am showing to you here are in that part of Alaska—the west coast. I have talked to some of my friends who have Indian reservations in their State, and they say that in many instances the same conditions prevail. We just have not as a nation developed the concepts we need to provide for just the rudimentary sanitation facilities that are necessary to assure the health of our people who live in these areas.

They are literally, Mr. President, the poorest of the poor. It is sad to say, but it is really true. What took me down the Kuskokwim River last year was the collapse of what we called the chum salmon run. There was total devastation in these villages because their basic food source and their basic resource that was really the foundation of their cash economy literally collapsed. They had no income and they had no food.

We were going through there to talk to them about their problems. One village I went to, they wanted to talk to me about sanitation and health problems which they consider to be even worse than the total economic problems they face following the collapse of their chum run.

As I said, I have a series of photographs here that demonstrate the situation now. This is summertime now in the arctic village with the human refuge being pulled on a little sled across the playground. That is the children's playground.

This is what happens when it gets to the destination. These are the so-called honey buckets which are brought to a

community bunker and dumped in that bunker. But the trouble is there are animals and just the conditions of the area in the wintertime with the snow and ice piled up around that bunker, pretty soon all of these bags of human waste are just out on the ground. Look at the health conditions.

There is the walk for the children through this area. This is going out to the river. This is where that one village had disposed of their bags that came from the honey buckets through the winter. It is a deplorable situation.

The impact from village to village, the boardwalk access to the river is littered with bags of human waste when the summer thaw really comes.

Here again are the children. That is their access to go to their playground, go to their own homes. They have no other area that they can go through. Here again, that is just like a sewage lagoon.

That is a housing project that we put up to assist those people to have a better way of life. In the wintertime, the honey buckets are emptied out on the ground because they cannot obviously put them into the ground. They are just frozen blocks of sewage. That is what caused those other areas that I showed, where in the springtime when the thaw comes and those frozen blocks of sewage melt. Here again, these are the bunkers. The only thing that can happen to those now is there was supposed to be another transportation system coming along to take those to a remote sewage area. Unfortunately, the appropriations for that never developed, so it never got moved.

Those bunkers are surrounded by, again, the normal plastic garbage sack that we had. There are liners in the system that is used inside the home that are taken out and put into the honey buckets, and they are brought to these bunkers, and there is hardly an area that you can find along the river—Mr. President, these are different villages I am showing; they are not all the same village. It is the same condition in every village that I saw.

This is a winter condition now. Again, when you try to empty the honey buckets they put in the area near the river, even that when the ice comes, if it breaks up, then the village downstream has the problem, if the ice moves the honey bucket bags out.

Here, again, this is an overloaded bunker right up against the housing project. People say, why do you bring those photographs in here? That is the technology that we have developed. In a country that can send a man to the Moon and develop the best communications systems in the world, we are still dealing with honey buckets in Indian and Alaskan Native villages. I have to tell you, I wish I could get more people to come up and look at these, and they would get as excited as I do about why we have that. The reason is that no portion of our Government has ever settled in on developing new technologies, new abilities to deal with human waste disposal where there is no running water.

You can go out in the outhouse in some places in the south 48, I guess. But in our State, you cannot dig down because it is permafrost underneath that land. There is no ability to deal with even an outhouse technique in Alaska. For years now, I have been asking everyone from NASA to HUD to work on developing some new technology to deal with this. They came up with the toilets that flush electronically, just burn up the insides and vaporize everything that is there. Well, that is wonderful, but they cost about $4-a-flush in my State because of the cost of electricity. These people cannot do that. They are literally on welfare to start with.

Last year, I talked to Miss Browner, and she was on our Commerce Committee. She is a very good Administrator of the EPA. Working with her and our State commissioner of environmental conservation, Mr. Sandor, and with the people at HUD and BIA and the Indian Health Service, we tried to get together a task force to deal with these problems. The trouble is that there was nobody in that area that has the authority to deal with literally putting out the contracts to develop new technology, a technology for the 21st century, to deal with the disposal of human waste where there is no possibility of running water and where the climactic conditions make it very difficult to have any kind of normal waste disposal.

That prevails in some of the reservations of the south 48, and certainly it prevails in some of the rural areas I have seen in West Virginia and Kentucky and the Rocky Mountains. Nobody is working with these people to find some new technology. When I saw this bill come along, and recognizing what it is—it is a very good bill to start out with, and I am not opposing the bill; I am supporting the bill. I wanted to earmark a portion of this money for the development of a program to try to bring about innovative technologies to deal with this problem.

My staff, meeting with the staff of the committee, was convinced that an earmark of money was not really going to be too welcome, frankly. On almost every bill that goes through here now, we earmark a portion of the money to be used only for American and Alaskan Native basic problems. I do not care what it is. You can look at housing, sewer grants, a lot of them, and we have the earmarking. I understand the committee does not want to earmark it.

Besides that, I have really a basic trust in Miss Browner as the head of the EPA. I would like for her to have the authority to be authorized and encouraged to enter into agreements. Those agreements, partnership kinds of agreements with our State—and, by the way, I hasten to add that because of Mr. Sandor, the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation in Alaska, Alaska has increased its appropriations in this area. The legislature is just closing business in Alaska, and it has made $25 million availability to deal with this.

We are working on a partnership concept, coming from BIA, Indian Health Service, HUD, the Corps of Engineers, and EPA, and we hope to get $25 million from the Federal Government to deal with putting facilities—there are a few areas in the State where it is possible to have running water because of the temperature and the soil conditions. That money will go, first, to those areas where we can put in the normal kinds of water and sewer projects. But in these other areas, I would like to have the EPA be the focal point of developing new technology.

This amendment would authorize a fund to make grants for technologies to improve these conditions on Indian reservations, Alaskan Native villages, and other rural places. It is not earmarking any money. I think anybody that gets in and takes a trip—and I stand ready to take a trip down those rivers with anybody from the Senate or from the administration that wants to look, and I made that offer last year. There is no question of the need.

Incidentally, all of the costs of all of the disease that comes from the situations I have just shown the Senate, Mr. President, are borne by the taxpayers of the United States. The health problems are met by the Indian Health Service. The problems of loss of capability are met, in the long run, by the BIA. Yet, in order to deal with the basic human conditions, we cannot seem to get anybody to cooperate and coordinate this, in order to find a way to develop the new technologies. I literally took a trip to one of the NASA conventions one time and talked to each one of the people who are developing facilities for NASA to put in our shuttles and our space vehicles. They had wonderful new designs to deal with the disposal of human waste in space. But you cannot get anybody authorized to deal with it right here on Earth, in the area where, as I said, the poorest of the poor of our country live.

I know my friend from Montana is a little disturbed with me because I have proceeded with this amendment, when his staff has said he does not really want to see this on the bill. I have changed the amendment since originally drafted, so it will not earmark any money. It does not direct the Administrator to do anything. It authorizes the Administrator and encourages the Administrator to enter into agreements and partnerships to find ways to

do the research and develop some new facilities.

Let me close by saying that I have seen water and sewer facilities go into several villages, and in some instances, unfortunately, we have had to replace those. I can think of one place where we replaced the system three times, and we had to do that primarily because the technology was so complicated nobody in the village was capable of maintaining it. That is another problem—the development of technology that the people of the area can use and maintain, and it will bring about a change in their lives and get rid of these terrible health and sanitation problems that exists in the villages of my State.

SANITATION-HEALTH TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I rise in support of the amendment to authorize a rural sanitation-health technology fund offered by the senior Senator from Alaska for himself, Senator INOUYE, and myself.

The amendment authorizes and encourages the EPA Administrator to enter into an agreement to establish a partnership program to fund grants to develop new innovative sanitation technologies for Indian reservations, Alaska Native villages, and remote, rural regions, and to coordinate any disbursements authorized related to Alaska Native village sanitation with appropriate Federal agencies and departments, including any such agency or department participating in the Federal field working group on rural Alaska sanitation.

In Alaska, the rural sanitation problem is clear, Residents of rural villages in Alaska do not have adequate drinking and human sanitation facilities in their homes and communities. As a result, sickness and disease, comparable to many Third World countries, are major problems for many communities.

According to the Rural Alaska Sanitation Task Force Report, 220 rural Native villages account for three quarters of Alaska's communities.

Waste water treatment facilities in over 190 of these villages have been assessed by the Federal Government as inadequate.

In 135 villages, honey buckets and pit privies are the sole means of sewage collection and disposal.

For the record, and those that don't know, a honey bucket is usually a 5-gallon bucket placed in one's home and used as the household toilet.

When the bucket is full, it is carried outside and dumped into a open sewage pit. In many instances, the honey buckets are dumped into ponds or in close proximity to homes. It is not uncommon for children to play dangerously close to these sewage dump sites.

Of the existing waste water service levels in rural Alaska: only 37 percent have flushing toilets; 49 percent have pit privies or honey buckets; and 14 percent have haul systems.

In over half of the villages in Alaska, water is hauled to the home by hand from washeterias, watering points, are from a creek or river, a washeteria is a centrally located building within a community where washing and drying machines are available. Washeterias also contain public showers.

In many of the homes where water is hauled by hand, a trash can is used as the water storage tank. Water for drinking, hand washing, and doing the dishes comes from this household trash can.

The existing water service levels in rural Alaska are abysmal. Only 40 percent of rural Alaskans have piped water to their residence; 30 percent use a washeteria; 20 percent use a year-round watering point; 7 percent have individual wells; and 3 percent have no system.

According to these figures, less than half of the residents living in rural Alaska villages have the basic water supply system we all take for granted—piped water to their homes.

Imagine half the residents in Washington, DC living without running water or toilets that flush. The results of having inadequate water and sanitation facilities are tragic.

Hepatitis A runs rampant among villages—causing death in some cases. Hepatitis A is a viral infection causing nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, and in some cases a yellowing of the skin or eyes. Deaths from hepatitis A occur at a rate of approximately 1 to 5 deaths per 1,000 cases.

The water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska must be addressed.

The water and sanitation conditions in these rural communities are considered worse than in many Third World countries.

The Alaska congressional delegation is committed to improving water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska.

Last year, on May 5, 1993, the Indian Affairs Committee held a 4½-hour hearing on water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska.

The committee received hundreds of pages of tesimony from Federal agencies, State agencies, and Alaska Natives which described the deplorable water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska.

The lack of basic water and sanitation services in rural Alaska has been well documented. We have thousands of pages of testimony that document the unacceptable water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska.

As a result of the May 5, 1993, hearing, the Environmental Protection Agency formed what has become known as the "Federal Field Work Group."

The Federal Field Work Group's goal was to determine methods by which the Federal Government could work with and assist the State in addressing the water and sanitation conditions in rural Alaska.

It is my understanding that the Federal Field Work Group has made significant progress. The Indian Affairs Committee will soon hold a hearing to receive testimony from Federal agencies, State agencies, and Native organizations on what progress has been made over the past year and what will be done in the future to address this problem.

We will continue to work to see that safe drinking water is provided to the residence of rural Alaska and that the honey bucket is eliminated from village homes.

As the country moves toward the 21st century, Alaska's rural residents should not be living in Third World conditions—they should not experience the disease and inconvenience they face because of inadequate sewer and water systems.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alaska. I have been to Alaska several times, and I have seen a good bit of the sanitation problems he refers to. There is no doubt about it. There are sanitation problems for Native Americans in Alaska just as there are, as we all know, in other parts of the country. There is no doubt about it. Something has to be done about it.

The more we can address the problem in Alaska and the more quickly we can address that problem the better off those folks will be, and we will be better off for it. I do not quarrel with the Senator from Alaska. There is a great need for that program.

The real question is, is this the proper place to do it and is this the proper bill in which to fight for this program? And a corollary question is, is there a better approach and what is that better approach, if there is one, one that is going to come about quickly or be interminably delayed as often is the case around here?

Quickly, Mr. President, I say to my very good friend from Alaska that I am not perturbed with him at all for offering this amendment. I very much respect his very ardent advocacy for his State's interest, and the fact is that Alaskans will be very proud at how strongly the Senator represents the State's interest.

I do believe, however, that when we get to the next bill before this body, the Safe Drinking Water Act or we get to the Clean Water Act later on this year, those are two much more appropriate bills to deal with this problem. After all, we are talking about innovative water and sanitation technologies. I can say to my good friend from Alas-

ka at this point that those bills, although they are not yet before us, will contain provisions that directly address this point he makes.

On the other hand, the bill before us today, the National Environmental Technology Act, is a bill designed to encourage environmental technologies generally in this country and on a competitive bid basis. The bill does not give favoritism or earmarking or preference to one form of environmental technology over another.

It is somewhat similar to the concept we attempt to use here with NIH, the National Institutes of Health, and with the National Science Foundation, that is, on the one hand, all of us want good science and a competitive bidding process to determine which grants NSF gives to scientists around the country to develop their scientific studies.

In addition to that use of the competitive bid basis is the competitive peer review proposal basis to determine which National Institutes of Health grants are awarded and which ones are not.

There is always a temptation for us here in the Senate and in the House, for that matter, to say for our State we give preference to this or for my State preference to that. There is always a temptation here as to how far to go in the first direction, that is, the solely competitive bid in the interest of competition and good science on the one hand, and to state it very crudely, on the other hand, parochialism, porkbarrel and what not on the other.

I think, Mr. President, that because this is only a modest bill—this is not a large bill—there are not a lot of dollars in this bill, we should stick to the former model, that is, keep this competitive, keep the basis of grants to various entities and developing new environmental technologies on the basis of competition and on the basis of what seems to be best and more likely to develop better technologies and get a bigger bang for our buck. I say that, also, because this bill is neutral with respect to different environmental technologies.

If we start now offering amendments to give preference or encouragement to one form of environmental technology at the expense of the other, then, frankly, we are just back here as Senators just carving this up, and my honest opinion is the whole will be worse than the sum of its parts.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BAUCUS. In a minute I will yield to the Senator.

On the other hand, I might say this: I can think of many different environmental technologies that I think deserve at least equal preference. Take my home State of Montana or other Western States. That is mine waste technologies. There are a lot of abandoned mines in the West. I can tell you, Mr. President, that tailings from those abandoned mines are polluting rivers and streams in the West. Trout streams are being polluted because of abandoned mines. There are countless abandoned mines in the West. They number thousands. There are small, little mines that have been dug into the hillside and abandoned mines. It is a major problem. This bill does not give preference to development of environmental technologies to address that problem.

We have smog in the cities. There is a lot of dirty air in this country. This bill does not give preference to environmental technologies to help clean up the air by development of a more efficient, say, electric car.

All I want to say, Mr. President, is I very much understand the Senator's concern. It would be inappropriate to single out essentially R&D for Native Americans in Alaska and addressing their water sanitation problems at the expense of other meritorious problems we have in this country. They also have to be addressed.

So I urge my good friend from Alaska, frankly, to not press this amendment, because I do pledge to him there are other opportunities coming along very quickly—the Safe Drinking Water Act, in particular, and the Clean Water Act, also, in particular, where I very much hope to address these concerns.

(Mr. METZENBAUM assumed the chair.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I looked at the Safe Drinking Water Act. It authorizes funds for research and technical assistance for small systems such as this, but it works through universities, only universities that serve a region of States. It does not have a focus on any specific area of need, but more particularly it funds the Indian Technical Assistance Program at $280,000 to $300,000 nationally, and that is again for research and training in technical assistance.

The bill before us now funds $80 million for 1995 and $120 million for 1996. If we are looking for a larger pool of money that could have just a small part set aside, originally, as I said, I was seeking to set aside 2.5 percent of the national budget for environmental technology development to meet this need on Indian reservations and Native villages. In my judgment safe drinking water does not have any relevance to this.

I would like to ask my friend—incidentally, does my friend know that the Safe Drinking Water Act was sponsored by Senator KENNEDY and myself following a village-to-village trip in 1969, and it became a national act—and only two projects I know of were established in Alaska—but the program became national and still continues on a national basis but only authorizes research on a regional basis? How could I look to the concept of trying to meet the State and local government and BIA and other agencies' funding having some sort of a partnership program?

Mr. BAUCUS. If I may say to the Senator——

Mr. STEVENS. Let me finish. There is no better place for it to be than in EPA. How can I get it to EPA and get some money unless it is in this bill?

Mr. BAUCUS. I think the answer is the Clean Water Act, not the Safe Drinking Water Act, but the Clean Water Act. The fact is that the Clean Water Act is on the calendar, I think, today—it was out over the weekend. If not today it will be on the calendar tomorrow. It doubles the amount of money available for Native Americans for building sanitation systems.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. BAUCUS. The total is $25 million.

Mr. STEVENS. That is to build them. There is no basic research. We will build more systems under that law and they will be built with off-the-shelf technology, and once again they will not work. How can we get a research program going on that will develop site-specific type of technology that will work?

Mr. BAUCUS. By utilizing another title in the Clean Water Act that is dedicated to research; $20 million, I might say to the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Senator unwilling to earmark that, too?

Mr. BAUCUS. The Senator is willing to look at the Senator's amendment when we get to the Clean Water Act.

Mr. STEVENS. That is the problem.

Mr. BAUCUS. Also, it seems to me that because of the very strong argument that the Senator makes as to the need, certainly, when the Native Americans of Alaska compete with other technologies in developing new environmental technologies, the EPA, which the Senator has a lot of faith in, is more likely to award the grant to Native American cleanup rather than to some other technology.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the study made by the Office of Technology Assessment, which, as you know, is an agency of the Congress, on the Alaska Challenge of Native Village Sanitation. Just this year one of the basic recommendations they made was to establish a research and development demonstration program for innovative sanitation technologies.

I appreciate what the Senator says. Incidentally, the money that is available in the clean water program is about one-tenth of what is going to be available annually under this program. The national environmental technology is going to be developed under this program. And to my knowledge, there is no way they are going to turn to that with the very basic problems that you have mentioned in terms of

smog and the problems of mine tailings.

Mr. BAUCUS. Smog is another matter. We are talking about the Clean Water Act, not to clean up the smog act.

Mr. STEVENS. I thought you were talking about the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Mr. BAUCUS. No, I am talking about the Clean Water Act.

Mr. STEVENS. There, again, you are talking about $20 million nationally to deal with the whole problem.

Mr. BAUCUS. Let me say this to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May I point out to the Senators that the rule of the Senate requires Senators to address the Chair.

Mr. BAUCUS. I apologize to the Chair.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I might say to the Senator, there is a good chance, much above 50-50, when we come to the Clean Water Act that we could accept the Senator's amendment.

I cannot guarantee it, but in hearing the Senator and listening to the Senator and, frankly, consulting with my staff, I think there is a very good chance that we could accept that amendment; a very good chance.

I know the Senator will remind me of the statement I am now making when we get to that act, in the event that is how we resolve this issue.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to ask for recognition?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I do not think I have any time left.

I will say this. Between now and Wednesday, I would like to confer with my friend from Montana, Mr. President, to see whether or not I should press forward with the agreement that is already in place to have 10 minutes to explain the amendment to the Senate before we vote on Wednesday.

I have high confidence in the Senator from Montana. But it was 25 years ago that I stood here with the Senator from Massachusetts and thought that we had a bill passed that would help us try to meet this problem. Year in and year out, we have had funding for projects and they have always come off the shelf. No one spent any money at all to develop new technology. We are now 25 years along the line and they are still talking about doing the same thing.

Do you know that they take new, prefabricated HUD homes to Alaska and they have the flushing toilets and the sinks and all the pipes and all you have to do is connect them? But, guess what? There is no running water in the village. There is no ability to use those flushing toilets. They are a monument to our capability to buy things in bulk and to think that off-the-shelf technology solves every one's problems—one size fits all.

The only trouble is, there is nothing to hook those toilets up to. I bet we spend more money sending toilets to places that do not have any systems than we would need to develop new technology.

Somehow or other, I would like to have just a little bit more of an assurance than "likely or not."

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I can give the Senator enough assurance which in my judgment would warrant him not pressing the amendment on this bill.

Mr. STEVENS. That is a different sound I just heard.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1687) was withdrawn.

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 978, the National Environmental Technology Act of 1994. I would like to thank the chairman for his outstanding leadership and extraordinary hard work on this bill. Senator BAUCUS made passage of this legislation one of his top priorities and he has followed through with enormous perseverance and creativity. I also commend Senator CHAFEE for his hard work on this bill, in particular his strong efforts on provisions to assist small businesses in pollution prevention and environmental compliance. Finally, Senator MIKULSKI also has been one of the true leaders in this field. Both Senator MIKULSKI and I had originally introduced separate environmental technology bills. Under Senator BAUCUS's leadership, these original bills have been combined with his legislation to develop a comprehensive environmental technology bill that will help make America a leader in environmental technology. By combining our efforts, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

This bill will address two big concerns of the American people—the environment and the economy. Innovative technologies can save American companies money, increase U.S. exports, create jobs and help ensure a healthy, productive environment. These are benefits that will help Americans, but the fact is that the benefits of American leadership in environmental technology would be global. As we seek to meet the needs of a rapidly growing world population, while maintaining the health of the planet, technological advances will be critical.

We need to act quickly. The worldwide demand for consumer goods is increasingly shaped by American environmental concerns. Likewise, the demand for pollution control and environmental cleanup equipment is growing. The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment estimates that the global market for environmental goods and services will reach $300 billion by the year 2000. Although the OTA has found that U.S. companies remain competitive in most environmental technology sectors, it has also found that the U.S. position has eroded in some areas, such as air, water, and some waste technologies. As the global market expands, U.S. companies must capture their fair share of this market.

There is a consensus among industry, Government and environmental groups about the need to act quickly to improve environmental technology. There is a pressing need for better and more cost-effective clean-up technologies. For example, we currently cannot clean-up certain types of contamination—like soils contaminated with heavy metals and ground water polluted with oily wastes. Improvements in pollution prevention technology may prove even more significant. They will improve our environment and save companies money in lower material usage, treatment and disposal costs, reduced paperwork and lower liability and insurance costs. As one business executive testified before my subcommittee, "We view pollution today as waste, as a sign of inefficiency. And to the degree that we can eliminate that waste, we are diminishing inefficiency and also reducing our costs."

This bill will help make America a leader in environmental technology. It is carefully structured to substantially increase Government support of environmental technology without increasing Government bureaucracy. First, the bill requires the Government to coordinate existing programs designed to stimulate the development of innovative environmental technologies—both for remediation and pollution prevention. Over $4 billion is currently being spent annually by Government agencies on research and development of technologies that could be classified as environmental technologies. A coordinated approach among these agencies is critical for cost-effective use of these funds. This bill accomplishes this and will improve Government accountability and efficiency. It is full consistent with our efforts to reinvent Government.

Second, the bill will spur technology development by having the EPA provide seed money, through cost-sharing partnerships, to early stage projects in the private sector. Third, the bill establishes a program for technology development modeled on the highly successful Small Business Innovative Research Program [SBIR]. The SBIR program funds development toward commercially viable technology in a staged, multi-phased program and has enjoyed widespread, bi-partisan support. Until title III of the bill, a small portion—1.25 percent—of the EPA's

budget for environmental cleanup would be authorized for private sector development of more efficient technologies contributions to the cleanup objectives. Like SBIR, this program uses a structured, three phase approach to review and grant awards to technology developers. It also requires EPA to consider commercial potential as well as scientific and technical merit in award decisions. This approach will help ensure that government-supported technology development leads to commercially viable technologies and creates new, high paying jobs.

Allocating a small portion of our cleanup funds for technology development should result in a significant reduction in the vast cost—estimated by one study at a "best estimate" of $752 billion in 1990 dollars over the next 30 years—to the Federal Government, private industry and others of cleaning up contaminated sites, and will improve cleanup results.

Fourth, the bill has several important provisions to reduce the barriers for the market for environmental technology development. Up to now, even if new environmental technologies were developed, many companies have had difficulty finding adequate testing facilities for their technologies. The bill would expand the Federal facilities that could be used as environmental technology test areas. It also establishes programs to verify the cost and performance characteristics relative to Federal regulations. These provisions will lower the market barriers created by preference within regulations for specific technologies and thurs stimulate competition and innovation.

Fifth, the bill direct's EPA, the Commerce Department and the heads of other executive agencies to work together to provide environmental services to small businesses including information and technical assistance on new environmental technologies, environmental compliance, methods for achieving compliance and pollution prevention. This would work through the Manufacturing Technology Centers administrated by the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] and other technology assistance programs for small businesses, as appropriate.

Small businesses have limited access to legal and technical staff. They often need assistance in identifying the requirements of the law and cost-effective approaches available to achieve compliance. Environmental technical assistance programs can make small businesses more competitive by saving them money while improving their environmental performance. Successful pollution prevention programs can help businesses avoid regulation altogether.

Some of the Commerce Department's Manufacturing Technology Center's [MTC's], such as the Great Lakes center, are beginning to integrate environmental technical assistance into their small business mission. The MTC's and other industry extension centers are well-positioned to integrate environmental technical assistance with other manufacturing concerns such as productivity, quality and worker training. As a recent OTA report, "Industry, Technology and the Environmental" notes:

> Separate programs make it hard for programs to market their services to industry. Moreover, it becomes more difficult for programs to establish the long-term working relationships so important to instituting both pollution prevention and manufacturing modernization as a continuous process.

The administration has proposed to dramatically increase the number of MTC's over the next 4 years. This legislation would build environmental considerations into the centers as the outset of this expansion.

This cooperative effort between EPA and the Department of Commerce and other agencies is an important opportunity to improve Government's response to both economic and environmental concerns. EPA can identify existing and pending compliance requirements, and has broad expertise in alternative compliance strategies. But EPA has limited capacity to reach out to and assist small businesses in their communities. Working together, the agencies can provide user friendly, one—stop service centers to best serve small business needs while improving environmental protection.

Mr. President, I believe this bill will help make America a leader in environmental technology. We need innovative environmental technologies now. This bill will help Government serve as a catalyst to promote private sector development of innovative technologies without increasing Government bureaucracy. It will also increase U.S. competitiveness in this important field. The United States is a leader in environmental protection—it also needs to be the leader in environmental technology.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1994

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 2019, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (S. 2019) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act"), and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, as the Senate today begins consideration of S. 2019, a bill to reform and reauthorize the Safe Drinking Water Act, I would like to basically say a few words about the concept and the principle of the bill before I turn to details of the legislation.

We often spend a lot of time here in this body and in a lot of committees talking about abstract issues. Some of them are quite arcane, I might add.

For example, on the Environment and Public Works Committee we spend time talking about the standard for developing an effluent guideline under section 302(b)(1)(B) of the Clean Water Act. Or the relationship between sediment quality criteria and Superfund "ARAR's."

Do not ask me what all that is. On the Finance Committee, we spend time talking about amortization schedules or the pros and cons of value added taxes. All that gets pretty arcane, pretty complex.

Today, however, we are not talking about some arcane, abstract issue. Rather, we are talking about the public health and safety of the Nation's drinking water—the water is our coffee, in our orange juice; the water our children drink from the fountains in school corridors; the water we drink—straight from the tap, two and a-half quarts a day, every day of our lives, water that we drink in one form or another.

Americans expect to turn on the faucet, fill a glass, and drink the water—without getting sick. They expect safe drinking water in their homes and in their local communities. They expect safe drinking water when they move to a new community, which the average American does 11 times in a lifetime.

We Americans expect safe drinking water when we travel. When people from Glendive, MT visit Billings, Spokane, or Boston, or when people visit their Nation's Capital, they expect to be able to drink the water without getting sick or without the worry of getting sick.

Some might say that we take safe drinking water for granted. Well, I might have agreed with that until recently, when vivid evidence—in Milwaukee and here in Washington, DC—has demonstrated that we can not take safe drinking water for granted. And there continues to be a very real need to protect public drinking water supplies.

The American people want their drinking water to be safe and realize that it costs money to make sure that it is safe. In fact, a survey conducted by the American Water Works Association—that is the industry association—last October found that 82 percent of consumers are willing to pay more to

ensure that the water they drink meets the standards the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has determined are necessary to protect human health.

The question is, how do we make sure that the money spent to protect drinking water supplies is spent wisely? The fundamental issue here, is balance. How do we ensure the public health will be protected while the costs of that protection are not prohibitive? Public health protection has a cost. It is our responsibility, it is our job, to strike the right balance.

Before Congress passed the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1974, the job was not getting done. From 1961 to 1970, there has been 128 outbreaks of illness or poisoning attributable to drinking water contamination. Eight million Americans were drinking unsafe water. The 1974 act created the Public Water System Supervision Program—there is a mouthful—and authorized EPA to regulate drinking water contaminants. That was back in 1974, just 20 years ago.

Twelve years later, in 1986, the job still wasn't getting done. EPA had identified 700 contaminants in drinking water, but had set standards for only 23. The incidence of waterborne disease was rising. In response, Congress enacted legislation to correct the major deficiencies in the act. The 1986 amendments established schedules of standard-setting. It required the simultaneous promulgation of goals and standards and based the standards on the best available technology.

The 1986 act reflected a consensus. The Committee on Environment and Public Works reported the bill unanimously, the full Senate approved the conference report by a vote of 94–0 and President Ronald Reagan signed the bill into law.

THE CHALLENGE

Today we know that, despite our good intentions and the many improvements made by the 1986 act, it was flawed. We overreacted. We pushed the pendulum too far in the direction of regulation. As a result, implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act has gone awry, particularly when it comes to smaller, local communities.

Local officials who operate drinking water systems are buried under a mountain of redtape, particularly those who operate small systems. Eighty-seven percent of the nearly 60,000 community water systems in this country serve fewer than 3,300 people. The operators of these systems are trying to provide a basic public service to their neighbors. The job is difficult enough without unnecessary recordkeeping and monitoring requirements that the present act, particularly the 1986 amendments, impose upon them.

There is another problem. Current standards do not take into account the economic burden on those who operate small systems. Small systems have limited economies of scale. They cannot spread the costs of treatment across a large number of ratepayers. So, in many cases, household rates skyrocket.

On top of all this, the standards-setting system keeps rolling along, with 25 new contaminants regulated every 3 years, whether they are needed or not. And, finally, we have not provided the kind of Federal financial aid necessary to help communities meet their increased obligations.

Because of all these problems, it seems that the Safe Drinking Water Act has become the very symbol of concern about unfunded mandates. But we have to get beyond symbolism. We have to solve the problems. We have to provide balanced solutions. Otherwise, we may overreact again. We may push the pendulum back too far in the other direction. If so, we may undermine the protection of public health.

STRIKING THE BALANCE

The legislation I introduced more than 7 months ago began the process of trying to strike the balance. Since introduction last fall, I have consulted with many other Senators on both sides of the aisle to address their concerns about the bill and the drinking water program. As a result of those discussions, I believe we have made significant improvements in the bill. The bill reported unanimously from the Environment and Public Works Committee in March strikes a good balance.

It creates a new—I underline the word "new"—State revolving loan fund to finance compliance with the act's requirements. It reforms the standards-setting process and the monitoring requirements.

It streamlines the enforcement system, and lightens the burdens on small communities while continuing to protect public health. It institutes a new program to prevent contamination of water supplies. And it encourages States to deal with systems that lack the ability to provide safe drinking water over the long term.

It also addresses the issue of risk. Risk assessment is not a magic answer to all our problems. But it is an important tool when applied to specific problems. This bill does that. It applies risk-based concepts to contaminant selection, radon, small system variances and standard-setting. In addition, it authorizes a broad-based research program directed toward risk assessment.

It has been a constructive, cooperative process. I am particularly grateful to the ranking member, Senator CHAFEE and his staff and to the members of committee, including the present occupant of the chair, for their help with this issue. That work is reflected in the bill before us today, and in a managers' amendment that will be offered later this week.

I also want to thank two Members not on the committee—Senator HATFIELD, who has done a very good job working on this bill, and Senator KERREY of Nebraska—for their interest in this issue and their tireless efforts on its behalf. I must say, were it not for their contribution I am not sure the bill would be up before us today.

This bill is the result of an extensive consensus-building process—after all, that is what the legislative process is all about. It addresses many of the concerns we have heard from all sides. It is not the bill that any single member would write.

But this bill is on the right track and I am confident that it will reduce regulatory burdens while fully protecting public health.

In addition to the managers' amendment, several Senators will be offering amendments that address specific changes to some of the provisions of this bill, for instance Senators KERREY and HATFIELD on monitoring and viability, and Senators WARNER and CONRAD on source water protection. But first I would like to take a few minutes to describe the bill before us and its major provisions.

FUNDING

Funding for States and communities is one of the most critical problems with the current program. Many systems, especially small systems, do not have the financial resources to comply with the current requirements of the act. This bill establishes a State revolving loan fund similar to the Clean Water Act revolving fund.

The funds can be used by all States to help communities comply with drinking water standards, restructure their operations, or find alternative sources of water. The fund is authorized at a level of $600 million in fiscal year 1994, money that has already been appropriated, and at a level of $1 billion annually through fiscal year 2000.

States are required to match 20 percent of the Federal grant, as under the Clean Water Act, and States can give loan subsidies or extended loan terms to systems that the State considers are disadvantaged. The fund also includes a 2-percent set-aside to be used for technical assistance for small water systems. That is, if they do not have the wherewithal to know how to comply, States may set aside 2 percent for that.

Initially, grants for the drinking water State revolving funds are distributed according to the same formula currently used to allocate Federal grants to States for the operation of State drinking water oversight programs. Beginning in fiscal year 1988, funds will be distributed according to a survey of drinking water treatment needs conducted by EPA.

The drinking water SRF differs from the clean water SRF in two important ways. First, States have the flexibility to use a portion of their drinking SFR funds to support current and new drinking water responsibilities, includ-

ing assistance to small systems and State-designed monitoring requirements. Initially, SRF funds can be used to meet 50 percent of a State's drinking water program funding shortfall.

In the second, third, and fourth years, SRF funds can be used to meet 100 percent of the State's programs shortfall. In the fifth year, after States have completed the start-up phase of reforms, funding from the SRF can be used to meet 50 percent of the State's funding shortfall.

This Federal assistance ensures that States have adequate funding to take full advantage of new flexibilities in the bill, including special programs for small communities, monitoring relief, and source-water protection programs. It will also give States time to develop their own sources of funding.

Another flexibility in the SRF provision allows Governors to shift up to 50 percent of the funds under the clean water or drinking water revolving loan funds between the two SRF's. This bill establishes a separate State revolving water fund. This allows Governors to shift back and forth according to State-specific needs. Some States may have greater clean water, that is, sewage treatment need as opposed to safe drinking water need. Some other States may be in the opposite situation.

This will give States added flexibility to address their most pressing problems, whether they are drinking water or wastewater.

This flexibility responds to the growing concerns over unfunded burdens being placed on State governments. Not only will the States have more flexibility, they will have the funding to tailor State programs to the needs of water systems.

Another way this bill addresses the resource problem is by increasing the authorization for State program grants from $40 million to $100 million annually through fiscal year 2000 and retains the current match requirement at 75 percent Federal, 25 percent State.

If drinking water reforms are going to succeed, it will take a true partnership among the Federal and State governments and the water systems.

HEALTH RISKS AND STANDARDS

The bill reflects recommendations from the Clinton administration, from industry and State and local governments to overhaul the process for selecting future contaminants for regulation. All parties believe EPA needs to use the best possible scientific judgment in setting risk-based priorities.

The current approach to contaminant selection mandates an outcome—83 contaminants plus an additional 25 contaminants must be regulated every 3 years—rather than a process based on good judgment and sound science. The bill eliminates this "25 every 3 years requirement" and replaces it with a new process for listing, researching, and selecting contaminants.

The process would operate on a 5-year cycle, and it would require EPA, in consultation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to identify the specific steps necessary to select health effects data and complete a risk analysis. After the studies are done, EPA would decide whether a contaminant poses a public health threat.

At the same time, EPA would use the newly established national occurrence database to determine if the contaminant was actually present in drinking water supplies. If it both appears in drinking water and poses a health threat, then it can be regulated as a new contaminant. If it does not meet both tests, it will not. This approach eliminates the current quota of regulations and ensures that good science supports all regulations.

While the contaminant listing and selection reforms have widespread support, there is a related issue that has attracted considerable discussion; namely, on what basis should standards be set?

I have worked extensively with concerned parties on all sides to reach an agreement on standard setting that preserves our fundamental health protections while avoiding unnecessary costs.

The proposal in this bill strikes a balance. Combined with the provision in the managers' amendment, the Administrator of EPA will have additional authority to consider setting the MCL for carcinogens and noncarcinogens at a level less stringent than the level that is technologically feasible provided that the substantial cost saving does not result in increased risk to health and the basis for the decision is founded on sound science.

I will speak in more detail about this provision later in the debate, but I believe it presents sound policy. I urge my colleagues to consider it carefully.

MONITORING

But perhaps the single most costly requirement for most small systems under the act is not treatment but monitoring. When a contaminant is not found through testing, no treatment should be required and there are no further costs. The key is to design water testing requirements that reasonably reflect the risk of a contaminant and avoid unnecessary and costly monitoring.

The bill uses risk considerations to modify monitoring requirements in three ways: First, EPA is required to look at monitoring requirements for no less than 12 contaminants it currently regulates and to modify them if monitoring can be reduced.

Second, States are allowed to completely replace Federal monitoring requirements based on local conditions. In areas of low risk—I might add, Mr. President, that this country is not homogenous. Some areas of the country are at a lot less risk than some others—a State may set low-frequency testing requirements or eliminate routine monitoring altogether in some instances. EPA is given clear criteria for approving State monitoring programs.

Finally, small systems that test and do not find any problems can avoid follow-up or repeat monitoring for many contaminants. These approaches can easily reduce water testing costs 50 percent for chemical contaminants in a State, and up to 75 percent for individual small systems.

SMALL SYSTEMS

As I mentioned earlier, one of the most critical problems that this legislation addresses is the disparity in compliance costs between large and small systems. Some 87 percent of the drinking water systems in this country are small, serving fewer than 3,300 persons. While they serve about 10 percent of the population, they bear about 40 percent of the cost of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

This bill helps small systems that cannot afford to use conventional treatment and that can benefit from technologies geared specifically to the needs of small systems.

Here is how it works: Any system serving 10,000 people or less may request a variance to install special small system technology identified by EPA. This means if a small system cannot afford to comply with current regulations through conventional treatment, system restructuring or finding an alternative source of water, the system can comply with the act by installing affordable small system technology.

Small systems that seek a variance will be protected from financial penalties while their application is being reviewed. If approved, they would have 3 years to install the affordable technology. States approve the initial variances for a 5-year period and may renew them for additional 5-year periods. A variance cannot be approved unless the technology provides adequate protection of human health.

If a system requests a variance but does not get one, either because the system can restructure, find a better source of water, or can afford to comply with a regulation, the system will have additional time to comply with the regulation, with extensions possible if the system is in line for SRF money.

Furthermore, the existing exemption procedure in the act is clarified so that disadvantaged communities experiencing economic hardship can be granted an additional period of up to 3 years, to come into compliance with the act if financial assistance through the SRF or other sources is likely to be available. An additional 2-year extension could apply to communities serving under 3,300 people.

But the paramount consideration, however, that underlies the granting of

a variance or exemption is that there be adequate protection of public health.

Part of the success of the small system program will depend on stopping the formation of new systems that are unable to comply with the act, and identifying restructuring options for systems that currently cannot meet safe drinking water standards.

In March, the GAO noted that States need to have authorities to deal with nonviable systems—that is what they are called—those that really cannot comply, those that do not have the ability to comply, and if we ever hope to protect the safety of drinking water in every small community, we have to give States the opportunity to deal with these nonviable systems.

The amendment to be offered by Senators HATFIELD and KERREY of Nebraska requires States to have that legal authority; that is, to prevent new, nonviable systems from forming in their States. States must also develop a program to encourage existing systems that are not in compliance with the act to restructure; that is, to become viable.

EPA will provide guidance on identifying those systems, including a survey of nonviable systems and options on how to restructure them.

Furthermore, systems may seek protection from enforcement penalties for preexisting violations for up to 2 years while they consolidate. And as another incentive, States cannot use SRF money to prop up nonviable systems.

MULTIMEDIA AND SOURCE WATER PROTECTION

During the Environment and Public Works Committee's "taking stock" hearings last year, one message we heard loud and clear was that our environmental laws need to work better together. The radon provision in this bill responds to that message.

Radon is a difficult problem. As you know, radon is a naturally occurring substance. It is also a potent carcinogen—the second leading cause of lung cancer. Yet, some 90 percent of our exposure comes not in the water but through indoor air.

In order to avoid spending huge resources controlling radon in drinking water, while ignoring the greater threat posed from radon in indoor air, the bill proposes a multimedia approach to the radon problem. It requires that in addition to a standard published under current law, the EPA must propose an alternative standard that is equivalent to the risk associated with radon in outdoor air.

To comply with this alternative standard, a system must be in a State that is participating in the radon control program under the Toxic Substances Control Act, or implement its own program of public education, testing, and radon prevention standards in new construction.

This provision recognizes two important facts. First, that the largest health threat from radon is in the air, and more of our resources and attention should go in that direction. Second, that controlling radon in water more strictly than the inevitable exposure from outdoor air is not a wise use of limited resources.

SOURCE WATER PROTECTION

Pollution prevention is an important and cost-effective means of ensuring safe drinking water. The current law needs to be expanded to encourage more attention to protection of sources before they are contaminated. An amendment by Senators WARNER and CONRAD deals with source water protection.

The provision encourages States to develop a source water protection program and provide assistance to local systems requesting their help in protecting their drinking water supplies. This assistance can be in the form of technical financial aid, including eligibility for grants under the nonpoint source program of the Clean Water Act.

ENFORCEMENT

The bill also provides more consistent authority to take action against violations of the Act, including compliance only administrative orders and administrative penalties of up to $10,000 per day. Civil enforcement is provided for in key parts of the act, with fines up to $25,000 per day. It also streamlines inspection procedures similar to other environmental laws and allows the Administrator to respond more quickly to emergency situations after notifying State and local officials.

The managers' amendment will also increase public notice requirements for violations that may adversely affect people's health, including a requirement that customers of a public water system be notified by mail if their drinking water supply is in violation of the act.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The bill also extends and increases authorizations for several research and training programs. One of the criticisms of the drinking water program is that there is insufficient research on the health effects of some contaminants. That complicates the setting of proper standards. The provisions in this bill will help alleviate that shortcoming.

The bill also encourages States to adopt certification programs for the principal operator of a community water system. The GAO recently identified operator certification as an important element in assuring safe water supplies. The managers' amendment will require States to have an operator certification program in place by 1999 or face the loss of a portion of their SRF funds. Some three dozen States currently have such programs.

Finally, let me repeat my thanks for the hard work of several Senators, including the ranking member of the committee, Senator CHAFEE, and also Senator HATFIELD and Senator KERREY of Nebraska. They have all helped bridge the differences that surrounded this very complex issue. Without their assistance, we would not have reached the point where we are today.

Mr. President, I very much urge Senators to take a long, hard look at this bill. Under the unanimous-consent agreement reached last Friday, we will not probably return to this bill until late Wednesday or early Thursday, so I urge Senators in the interim to come to me and to my staff with respect to any amendments they may have so we can work out those amendments as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. BAUCUS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. METZENBAUM pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 69 are located in today's RECORD under "Submissions of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 6, 1994, during the recess of the Senate, received a sundry nomination; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

(The nomination received on May 6, 1994, is shown in today's RECORD at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 109

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1703 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National

Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 on October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 on October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c) I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 on June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 (June 16, 1993).

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. These include, *inter alia*, a requirement that Member States deny permission for take off, landing or overflight to any aircraft flying to or from Haiti, other than aircraft on regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights. In addition, the Resolution strongly urges, but does not mandate, the freezing of funds and financial resources of officers of the military in Haiti, including police, major participants in the coup d'état of 1991, and in illegal governments since the coup d'état, those employed by, or acting on behalf of, the military, and immediate family members of the foregoing. Effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., May 8, 1994, I have taken additional steps pursuant to the above statutory authorities to enhance the implementation of this international embargo and to conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

This new Executive order:

—bans arriving and departing flights and overflights stopping or originating in Haiti, except regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights;

—blocks the funds and financial resources, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, of the individuals specified in Resolution 917, identified above;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consolation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to implement certain provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 of May 6, 1994, that are to take effect without delay. Further measures, including a comprehensive trade embargo with certain humanitarian exceptions, are required no later than May 21, 1994. I am considering additional measures to give full effect to these and other provisions of the Resolution. The measures we are imposing and the United Nations Security Council Resolution adopted on May 6, 1994, reflect the determination of the United States, acting in concert with the international community, to end the assault on democracy and human dignity in Haiti.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1994.*

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COVERDELL:

S. 2088. A bill to ensure that no person is required, other than on a voluntary basis, to complete certain quarterly financial reports of the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. WOFFORD, for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 2089. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Steamtown National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. METZENBAUM:

S. Con. Res. 69. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any legislation that is enacted to provide for national health care reform should provide for compensation for poison control center services, and that a commission should be established to study the delivery and funding for poison control services; ordered held at the desk.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 69—RELATING TO POISON CONTROL CENTERS

Mr. METZENBAUM submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was ordered held at the desk:

S. CON. RES. 69

Whereas poisoning remains a significant public health problem in the United States, especially for children;

Whereas, in 1991 alone, more than 13,000 persons died in the United States due to poisoning, including approximately 6,400 persons who died from unintentional poisoning;

Whereas 60 percent of the 2,400,000 poison exposure cases reported to poison control centers in 1992 involved children younger than 6 years of age;

Whereas poison control centers saves lives by providing free first-aid advice over the telephone to poison victims, health care professionals, and frightened parents of poisoned children;

Whereas physicians, hospitals, public health departments, and the public depend on poison control centers to provide indispensable emergency advice and treatment information for poisonings, and to be available 24 hours during each day of the year;

Whereas no other community health care service has the facilities and expertise to monitor the hundreds of thousands of consumer products with which children are unintentionally poisoned every day, or to provide the proper antidote advice when a person has been exposed to such consumer products;

Whereas poison control centers across the country are closing or drastically reducing the services they provide, due to misguided attempts by hospitals and States to save money;

Whereas approximately ½ of the 38 poison control centers in the Nation that meet national standards are in financial jeopardy, and lack of funding has caused some poison control centers to stop answering some emergency telephone calls;

Whereas many hospitals have stopped funding poison control centers because of funding constraints and because most poison control centers serve a wider geographic area than is served by any 1 hospital;

Whereas closing poison control centers increases the cost of health care, and needlessly places the lives of millions of children at risk;

Whereas poison control centers are cost efficient and economical because over 70 percent of the cases assisted by poison centers are resolved over the telephone while the patient is in the patient's own home, which avoids unnecessary emergency room visits, ambulance use, and hospital admissions;

Whereas every $1.00 spent on poison control centers saves at least $7.75 in health care costs;

Whereas, if poison control centers were not available, 600,000 additional poisoning victims would be unnecessarily treated in hospitals each year, at a much higher cost than the cost of assistance by a poison control center;

Whereas health care for Americans will cost $545,000,000 less each year if access to quality poison control centers is provided to all Americans than if no such access is provided, even after the costs of providing poison control center services are considered; and

Whereas Federal leadership in the funding plight of the Nation's poison control centers has been nonexistent: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) any legislation that is enacted to provide for national health care reform should contain provisions that ensure that qualified poison control centers that meet national

standards and are certified by the American Association of Poison Control Centers are fairly and adequately compensated by means that may include—

(A) a fee for service mechanism under which each health benefit plan would pay a fee for each service rendered by a poison control center to a member of the plan;

(B) a per capita mechanism, under which each health benefit plan would pay a negotiated or predetermined amount, based on the number of members in the plan or the amount of poison control center services used by members of the plan in the past, to support poison control centers; or

(C) an expanded public health program, including a program of Federal or State matching grants; and

(2) a national commission should be established, under the auspices of the Public Health Service or in any other appropriate format, to study the delivery and funding of poison control services, including—

(A) means to maximize the use of information technologies in the delivery of poison control services; and

(B) possible use of a nationwide, toll-free telephone number as a means for the public to receive poison control services.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, every year hundreds of thousands of parents call the Nation's poison centers for help to save their children's lives. In 1992 alone, 60 percent of the 2,400,000 cases reported to poison control centers were for children younger than 6 years old. Frantic families got help faster from the poison control centers than they could get it from an emergency room and at much less cost.

Every dollar spent on the Nation's poison control centers saves at least $7.75 in health care costs. If poison control centers were not available, 600,000 additional poisoning victims would be unnecessarily treated in hospitals each year—at a much higher cost than the cost of a lifesaving call to the poison center. Yet many of the Nation's 38 poison centers are in financial danger—the center here in the Washington area is closing and many others are closing or drastically reducing their hours or coverage or are even forced to refuse to take calls from certain areas. The problem is shortsighted budget cutting by hospitals and State and local governments.

Most of you have seen the news reports showing grateful parents with healthy children beside them—children who might otherwise have died without the swift, sure help of the poison centers. One news program, the *Crusaders*, actually contacted corporations and started a bumper sticker campaign to raise money to try to keep these centers open.

The response, I understand, has been heart warming but, at best it is an emergency stopgap action that may help some centers stay open for a while.

Mr. President, we need all of these centers nationwide to stay open and available 24 hours a day. It is in the national interest both to protect the lives of millions of Americans and to protect our health care system against the cost of unnecessary emergency room visits.

Mr. President, funding for the Nation's poison control centers should be a part of health care reform. The money it costs to run the poison control centers is a fraction of what it will cost us if we don't run them. Without the Nation's poison centers, the cost to evaluate and treat poison victims will rise $545 million.

Therefore I am introducing a resolution stating it is the sense of the Congress that poison centers should be funded as a part of health care reform. It outlines ways in which the program can be easily and adequately funded. The identical resolution has already been introduced by Representative TOWNS in the House.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 359

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to require the Secretary of Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 1208, a bill to authorize the minting of coins to commemorate the historic buildings in which the Constitution of the United States was written.

S. 1629

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1629, A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for expanding and intensifying activities of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases with respect to lupus, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the rules regarding subchapter S corporations.

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, supra.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1822, a bill to foster the further development of the Nation's telecommunications infrastructure and protection of the public interest, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide a uniform framework for the classification and declassification of information in the interests of national security.

S. 1948

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1948, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to improve the counterintelligence and security posture of the United States intelligence community and to enhance the investigative authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in counterintelligence matters, and for other purposes.

S. 2007

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2007, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II and General George C. Marshall's service therein.

S. 2027

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2027, a bill to provide for the reinstatement of democracy in Haiti, the restoration to office of the duly elected President of Haiti, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the end of human rights abuses against the Haitian people, support for the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement, and for other purposes.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to prohibit the imposition of additional charges or fees for attendance at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and to express the sense of the Senate that no additional charges or fees shall be imposed for attendance at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, and the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 158

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 158, a joint resolution to designate both the month of August 1994 and the month of August 1995 as "National Slovak American Heritage Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 165

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from South Caro-

lina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 165, a joint resolution to designate the month of September 1994 as "National Sewing Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 181

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 181, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 8, 1994, through May 14, 1994, as "United Negro College Fund Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 55

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 55, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to Taiwan's membership in the United Nations and other international organizations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1994

BINGAMAN AMENDMENTS NOS. 1689–1691

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BINGAMAN submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2019) to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act—commonly known as the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1689

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . ___. ENVIRONMENTAL FLEXIBLE FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the magnitude, causes, and interrelationship of environmental pollution are far more significant than previously estimated;

(2) because, in recent years, the requirements under Federal law to address pollution have expanded, State and local governments have greater economic burdens in meeting the Federal requirements;

(3) the nature and extent of environmental problems vary among and within States;

(4) Federal financial assistance to help remediate environmental pollution is limited;

(5) grant programs that are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act are generally restricted to funding specific categories of activities, without regard to the particular conditions of individual States or the relative importance of the activities within a State; and

(6) a single program designed to deal with all forms of environmental pollution within a geographic area may be more effective than a number of programs that address specific components of pollution.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) promote more effective and efficient use of Federal, State, and local funds with respect to the control of pollution;

(2) enable a State to adapt programs of Federal assistance to meet the particular environmental needs of the State;

(3) help alleviate the impact of Federal requirements by enabling States to integrate and target Federal assistance from a variety of funding sources into a single program to address priority problems if the integration of the assistance into the program furthers the goals and objectives of the programs for which the assistance was initially provided; and

(4) facilitate the funding of environmental programs that address multiple sources of pollution within a geographic area.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AREA OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN.—The term "area of environmental concern" includes air, drinking water, pesticides, solid and hazardous waste, toxics, and water quality (as defined and determined by the Administrator).

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL MEDIUM GRANT.—The term "environmental medium grant" means a grant made pursuant to the grant program established under subsection (d)(1).

(4) GOVERNOR OF A STATE.—The term "Governor of a State" means the Governor of a State, or if the State does not have a Governor, the equivalent official of the State.

(5) INDIVIDUAL GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The term "individual grant program authority" means an individual grant program authority described in subsection (d)(1)(B). The term does not include any authority for a grant made to a State for capitalization for the establishment of an environmental loan fund.

(6) MULTI-MEDIA ENVIRONMENTAL GRANT.—The term "multi-media environmental grant" means a grant made pursuant to the grant program established under subsection (d)(2).

(7) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau. The term includes, to the extent allowable by law—

(A) an interstate agency that has jurisdiction over 2 or more States and is established pursuant to an agreement or compact that is approved by Congress to carry out the control of pollution (as defined and determined by the Administrator); or

(B) an entity that is—

(i) established by a cooperative agreement between 2 or more States to carry out the control of pollution (as defined and determined by the Administrator); and

(ii) approved by the Administrator.

(8) STATE AGENCY.—The term "State agency" means an entity of a State that is designated by the Governor of a State as having primary responsibility for carrying out the laws of the State relating to pollution prevention, control, and abatement.

(d) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL MEDIUM GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall, in consultation with the Governors of States and by regulation, establish an environmental medium grant program. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each fiscal year, from the amounts made available to the Administrator to make grants to States under the individual grant program authorities specified in subparagraph (B), the Administrator may make a consolidated grant to any State with respect to which the Governor or the head of a State agency submits an application that is approved by the Administrator, in lieu of awarding the funds as individual grants that would otherwise be awarded to the State under the individual grant program authorities specified in subparagraph (B), to fund eligible programs and activities relating to pollution prevention, control, and abatement and related environmental activities of a State.

(ii) ADMINISTRATION BY STATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, in carrying out the consolidated grant program under this paragraph, a State may exercise the individual authorities that the State may exercise under the individual grant program authorities, and to the extent required to carry out this section, may transfer authority to an appropriate State agency.

(iii) USE OF GRANTS.—Under the grant program, grants shall be awarded to address the pollution prevention, control, and abatement problems and related environmental problems of 1 area of environmental concern on a statewide basis, in accordance with a priority work plan that meets the requirements of subparagraph (D) and that is developed by the appropriate official of the State pursuant to such subparagraph.

(B) INDIVIDUAL GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORITIES.—The individual grant program authorities specified in this subparagraph include the following grant program authorities granted to States under the following provisions of Federal environmental law:

(i) AIR PROGRAMS.—Sections 103(b), 105, 106, and 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7403(b), 7405, 7406, and 7412, respectively) and section 306 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2666).

(ii) DRINKING WATER PROGRAMS.—Sections 1427, 1428, 1443, and 1465 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300h–6, 300h–7, 300j–2, and 300j–25, respectively).

(iii) PESTICIDES.—Section 23 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136u).

(iv) SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS.—Sections 2007, 3011, and 4008 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6916, 6931, and 6948, respectively).

(v) TOXIC SUBSTANCES PROGRAMS.—Sections 10, 28, and 403 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2609, 2627, and 2683, respectively).

(vi) WATER QUALITY.—Sections 104(b), 104(g), 106, 205(j), 314(b), 319, 320, and 604(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1254(b), 1254(g), 1256, 1285(j), 1324(b), 1329, 1330, and 1384(b), respectively).

(vii) OTHER PROVISIONS.—Any other related provision of Federal environmental law that the Administrator considers to be appropriate.

(C) APPLICATION.—An application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) by the Governor of a State or the head of a State agency shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator determines appropriate and shall, at a minimum, include—

(i) a description of the programs and activities to be carried out by the State with funds made available under the grant that is the subject of the application;

(ii) a statement concerning how the programs and activities specified in clause (i)

will promote the goals and objectives of the priority work plan of the State developed pursuant to subparagraph (D);

(iii) for each program or activity listed pursuant to clause (i), a description of—

(I) the objectives of the program or activity; and

(II) measurable performance criteria to be applied to the program or activity;

(iv) a statement of the proposed distribution of funds made available under the grant among activities and programs, including an order of priorities;

(v) a statement concerning how the distribution of funds of the State will adequately address the requirements under the individual grant program authorities covered under the environmental medium grant; and

(vi) an identification of the State agency that will—

(I) carry out the programs and activities specified in clause (i);

(II) monitor the use of funds made available under the grant that is the subject of the application; and

(III) report to the Administrator on the use of the funds.

(D) PRIORITY WORK PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As part of a grant application, the Governor of the State or the head of the State agency of the State shall submit a priority work plan to the Administrator. The priority work plan shall be for a period of 1 or more years. The plan shall—

(I) be developed—

(aa) in accordance with guidance issued by the Administrator pursuant to clause (ii); and

(bb) with appropriate public notice and opportunity for review and comment; and

(II) include a description of—

(aa) the environmental problems to be addressed by the work plan;

(bb) the proposed strategy of the State to address the problems specified in item (aa), including the goals and objectives of the State relating to the strategy;

(cc) priority actions to be taken pursuant to the work plan; and

(dd) the expected outputs and results in terms of effects on the environment to be accomplished pursuant to the work plan.

(ii) GUIDANCE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall issue guidance for priority work plans prepared pursuant to this subparagraph.

(E) ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Any program or activity that is eligible to receive funding under a grant that would otherwise be awarded to a State under individual grant program authorities, but for this paragraph, shall be considered to be an eligible program or activity for the purposes of this paragraph.

(F) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—The amount of a grant awarded to a State under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount of grants that would otherwise be awarded to the State under individual grant program authorities, but for this paragraph.

(G) COST-SHARING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any requirement of individual grant program authorities that would otherwise apply but for this paragraph, the Federal share of each program or activity that receives funding from a grant awarded pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the program or activity.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as otherwise provided by law, as a condition of receiving a grant under this paragraph, the State shall pay a non-Federal share from non-Federal sources.

(iii) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any amount of funds contributed from non-Federal sources that is in excess of the non-Federal share required to be contributed pursuant to clause (ii) may not—

(I) be considered to be funds contributed pursuant to clause (ii); and

(II) be subject to Federal auditing requirements that would otherwise apply to funds contributed pursuant to such clause.

(H) LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any limitation or condition on the use of funds under any individual grant program authority that would otherwise apply but for this paragraph, a State that receives a grant under this paragraph may use funds made available pursuant to this paragraph for financial assistance to individuals only to the extent that the assistance is related to the costs of eligible programs and activities. The Administrator may not attach any other condition or limitation to the use of the grant funds.

(I) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS.—With respect to a State, the Administrator may reduce the amount of a grant or disapprove a grant application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (C) if the Administrator determines that—

(i) for a preceding fiscal year, the State has failed to make satisfactory progress in achieving the performance measures stated in an application for a grant awarded to the State under this paragraph; and

(ii) on the basis of information available to the Administrator concerning the reliability and achievability of the performance measures referred to in clause (i), the measures that the State failed to achieve are reliable and achievable.

(J) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 120 days after the end of the 1-year period of a grant made to a State pursuant to this paragraph, the appropriate official of the State agency identified under subparagraph (C)(vi) shall submit to the Administrator a report on the principal activities and achievements of the State accomplished with funds made available pursuant to the grant program under this paragraph. The report shall compare the achievements referred to in the preceding sentence to—

(i) the measurable performance criteria described in the application of the State submitted pursuant to subparagraph (C); and

(ii) the goals and objectives specified in the priority work plan pursuant to subparagraph (D)(i)(II)(bb) and the expected results specified in the priority work plan of the State pursuant to subparagraph (D)(i)(II)(dd).

(2) MULTI-MEDIA ENVIRONMENTAL GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall, by regulation, establish a multi-media environmental grant program. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may make a grant to each State that submits an application that is approved by the Administrator to assist the State in designing, developing, and carrying out pollution prevention, control, and abatement programs and activities and other related environmental programs and activities that affect 2 or more areas of environmental concern.

(B) APPLICATIONS.—An application for a grant under this paragraph shall be made in the same manner as prescribed under paragraph (1)(C).

(C) PRIORITY WORK PLAN.—A priority work plan submitted as part of an application made under this paragraph shall meet the requirements for a priority work plan developed under paragraph (1)(D).

(D) ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall designate programs and activities that shall be eligible to receive funding under this paragraph and shall include programs and activities for—

(i) designing and conducting environmental risk assessments;

(ii) environmental education;

(iii) enhancing the capacity of a State to support environmental programs;

(iv) enhancing the capacity of a State to support a geographical approach to environmental control programs and activities;

(v) promoting source reduction, including activities authorized under section 6605 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13104); and

(vi) pollution prevention, control, and abatement.

(E) FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as otherwise provided by law, the percentage amount of Federal share of a grant awarded under this paragraph shall not exceed the amount specified in paragraph (1)(G)(i).

(F) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS.—Paragraph (1)(I) shall apply to a grant or application for a grant made by a State under this paragraph in the same manner as such paragraph applies to a grant made under paragraph (1).

(G) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—In the case of a State that receives a grant under this paragraph, the reporting requirements under paragraph (1)(J) shall apply to the appropriate official of the State agency identified under subparagraph (B) in the same manner as the requirements apply to the appropriate official of the State agency of a State that receives a grant under paragraph (1).

(3) GOVERNORS' DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on the request of a Governor of a State, the Administrator may transfer an amount not to exceed 20 percent of the amount that would otherwise be awarded to the State pursuant to individual grant program authorities or a grant to the State under paragraph (1) or (2) and award the funds as a supplemental amount that shall be subject to the same requirements as any other amounts awarded pursuant to—

(A) a grant authorized under the individual grant program authorities specified in paragraph (1)(B);

(B) an environmental medium grant awarded pursuant to paragraph (1); or

(C) a multi-media environmental grant awarded pursuant to paragraph (2).

(4) REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.—The Administrator may request such information, data, and reports as the Administrator considers necessary to—

(A) review an application submitted under this subsection for approval or disapproval;

(B) evaluate progress made under a grant awarded pursuant to this subsection; or

(C) prepare a report that the Administrator is required to prepare under subsection (e).

(5) NO REDUCTION IN AMOUNTS.—In no case shall the award of a grant to a State pursuant to this subsection result in a reduction of the total amount of funds awarded by the Administrator to a State as grants for conducting environmental programs and activities. Except as expressly provided otherwise, nothing in this subsection is intended to reduce or supplant the obligation of a State to pay a non-Federal share of a grant awarded by the Administrator to the State for conducting an environmental program or activity.

(6) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall apply beginning with the first full fiscal year following the date of issuance by the Administrator of the regulations establishing an environmental medium grant program under paragraph (1)(A).

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in cooperation with the States, shall submit a report to Congress concerning the grant programs established under this section. The report shall include such recommendations for changes in the grant programs as the Administrator considers appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1690

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . GRANTS TO CERTAIN COMMUNITIES FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, there is a severe lack of wastewater treatment facilities in the area of the border between the United States and Mexico;

(2) the lack of facilities is leading to the pollution of rivers and ground water in the area and to environmental degradation; and

(3) the pollution presents a grave threat to public health through the proliferation of gastro-intestinal and infectious diseases.

(b) GRANTS TO CERTAIN COMMUNITIES.—Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 the following new section:

"SEC. 519. GRANTS TO CERTAIN COMMUNITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to award a grant for wastewater treatment to—

"(1) a community that meets the requirements of subsection (b); or

"(2) a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State acting on behalf of a community that meets the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) Eligible Communities.—A community that meets the requirements of this subsection is a community that—

"(1) is designated by the State or county in which the community is located as a colonia;

"(2) is located in the border area;

"(3) the Administrator determines is eligible to receive a grant under this subsection on the basis of objective criteria (including the lack of a potable water supply, an adequate sewage system, or decent, safe, and sanitary housing); and

"(4) before November 28, 1990, existed as a colonia (as determined by the Administrator).

"(c) USE OF GRANT.—A grant awarded under this section may be used for 1 or more of the following activities:

"(1) The construction (including planning, design, repair, extension, improvement, alteration, or reconstruction) of publicly owned treatment works (including collection lines or interceptor sewers, notwithstanding any limitation otherwise imposed with respect to the provision of assistance for collection lines or interceptor sewers).

"(2) The acquisition of land, or any easement or other right-of-way, with respect to which the recipient of assistance is not the owner (at the time of the receipt of assistance), that is necessary to carry out the construction or operation of the publicly owned treatment works, or the final disposal of residues resulting from the treatment of water or waste.

"(3) The disposal of wastewater by surface or underground methods (or both).

"(d) GRANT AMOUNT.—A grant awarded under this section may be for an amount not to exceed 100 percent of the cost of the project that is the subject of the grant.

"(e) DEFINITION OF BORDER AREA.—As used in this section, the term 'border area' means the area situated within 100 kilometers on either side of the United States-Mexican international boundary.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2001, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.".

AMENDMENT NO. 1691

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . GRANTS TO UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT.

"(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

"(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, there is a severe lack of wastewater treatment facilities in small, semi-rural, unincorporated communities in the United States;

(2) the lack of facilities is leading to the pollution of rivers and ground water in the areas; and

(3) the pollution presents a potential threat to the public health of the communities referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) GRANTS TO UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES.—Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 the following new section:

"SEC. 519. GRANTS TO UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

"(1) CONSTRUCTION.—The term 'construction' has the same meaning as is provided in section 212(1).

"(2) NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS.—The term 'non-metropolitan area' means an area no part of which is within an area designated as a metropolitan statistical area by the Office of Management and Budget.

"(3) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term 'treatment works' has the same meaning as is provided in section 212(2).

"(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANT AWARDS.—Notwstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to award a grant for wastewater treatment to an unincorporated community (without regard to whether the community is located in a metropolitan statical area) for a wastewater treatment project that serves a population—

"(1) of 20,000 or fewer residents; and

"(2) with a median household income that is less than or equal to 110 percent of the median household income for non-metropolitan areas of the State in which the community is located.

"(c) USE OF GRANT.—A grant awarded under this section may be used for 1 or more of the following activities:

"(1) The acquisition or construction (including planning, design, repair, extension, improvement, alteration, or reconstruction) of a treatment works or any portion or associated structure of a treatment works (including any associated collection line or interceptor sewer, notwithstanding any limitation otherwise imposed with respect to the provision of assistance for the line or sewer).

"(2) The acquisition of land, or any easement or other right-of-way, with respect to which the recipient of the grant is not the owner at the time of the acquisition, that is necessary to carry out the construction or operation of the treatment works referred to in paragraph (1).

"(3) The final disposal of residues resulting from the treatment of water or waste.

"(4) The disposal of wastewater by surface or underground methods (or both).

"(5) The disposal of wastewater through recycling or reclamation (or both).

"(d) COST-SHARING.—

"(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant described in subsection (b) shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the project that is the subject of the grant.

"(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Payment of the non-Federal share of a grant described in subsection (b) may be satisfied by any combination of public or private funds or in-kind services. The non-Federal share may include public funds authorized or expended for the project that is the subject of the grant during the period beginning on the date that is 3 years before the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2001, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.".

CHANGE OF HEARING SCHEDULE

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the hearing before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests previously scheduled for Thursday, May 12, 1994, at 2 p.m. will now begin at 2:30 p.m. The hearing will be in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on two bills pending before the subcommittee pertaining to the management of the Presidio in San Francisco. The bills are:

S. 1549, to amend the act establishing Golden Gate National Recreation Area to provide for the management of the Presidio by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; and

S. 1639, to provide for the management of portions of the Presidio under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit a written statement is welcome to do so by sending two copies to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information regarding the hearing, please contact David Brooks of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-8115.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL COALITION OF 100 BLACK WOMEN, INC.

• Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, 1994, the National Coalition of Black Women, Inc. [NCBW] will inaugurate the second Louisiana chapter in Baton Rouge.

NCBW is a nonprofit, volunteer organization dedicated to community service, leadership development, and enhancing career opportunities through networking and social programs. This group was initially formed in 1970 by a small group of women in New York City to address problems facing black women in the wake of the women's and civil rights movements. In 1981, under the leadership of one of its founders and current chairman of the board of directors, Jewel Jackson McCabe, the coalition expanded into a national organization which now has a membership of over 6,000 women nationwide and has chapters in over 20 States and the District of Columbia. The efforts of women such as Maya Angelou, Johnette B. Cole, and Yvonne Braithwaite Burke have had a tremendous impact on the direction of this organization and have been instrumental in expanding the worthy endeavors of the NCBW.

Through their outreach efforts, empowerment programs have been put in place to help meet the diverse needs of African-American women. These programs enable NCBW to develop and position the leadership talent within the community of black women; make black women a visible force in the socioeconomic and political arenas; and provide networking among black female leaders to establish links between them and the corporate and political sectors.

The NCBW chapter in Baton Rouge represents a cross-section of African-American women in the Baton Rouge community who are leaders in education, civic organizations, government, and business who are committed to improving the lives of African-American women in Louisiana. This group will work to bring together a united group of middle income African-American women to ensure their future economic viability; serve as mentors to young African-American girls to develop an awareness and understanding of self; boost

Mr. President, it will only be through expanding important initiatives like those of the NCBW that we will be able to address fully the expanding and challenging problems facing this underserved segment of our population. The formation of the Greater Baton Rouge NCBW marks an important day in Louisiana's history and one that I am confident will be long remembered for bringing committed individuals together to confront the challenges which face Louisiana in improving the lives of African-American women.•

CORPS OF ARTILLERISTS AND ENGINEERS BICENTENNIAL

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today's U.S. Army Corps of Engineers traces its beginnings to the establishment of the Continental Army in June 1775 when provision was made for a Chief Engineer. This week marks the bicentennial of another significant event in the long history of the corps. I would like to take a moment to recount the history of this important event.

On May 9, 1794, Congress established a Corps of Artillerists and Engineers in the U.S. Army. This action returned Engineers to the ranks of the Army for the first time in more than 10 years and assured that the Engineers would continue as a vital part of the Army of the new United States.

At the end of the Revolutionary War, several officers, including Louis Lebegue Duportail, Chief Engineer, argued for a peacetime Army with a single Corps of Artillerists and Engineers as was customary in many European states. But Congress decided instead to disband the bulk of the Continental Army, including the Corps of Engineers with its chief engineer and companies of sappers and miners, in November 1783. By June 1784, the surviving military establishment consisted solely of an infantry regiment and a company of artillery stationed at West Point.

When the new Government under the Constitution was launched in 1789, Secretary of War Henry Knox revived the recommendation for a small Corps of Artillerists and Engineers. Congress finally took action in 1794, when war with Britain threatened. There was suddenly an acute need to upgrade existing coastal fortifications and construct new ones.

In March 1794, Congress appropriated funds for fortifications works from Maine to Georgia, and Secretary Knox hired seven individuals as temporary engineers to carry out the work. The group included Pierre L'Enfant and Stephen Rochefontaine, both veterans of the Revolutionary War. Although employed by the War Department, these engineers did not join the Army.

Knox took advantage of the situation and again urged Congress to approve the plan he and Duportail had advanced earlier for a combined Corps of Artillerists and Engineers. In particular he argued that the corps would provide the additional trained troops needed to garrison the coastal fortifications. And so, 200 years ago today the Corps of Artillerists and Engineers was created. The new corps was commanded by a lieutenant colonel and had four battalions, each commanded by a major and each consisting of four companies.

Significantly, the legislation recognized that the grade of cadet denoted an officer candidate. The Secretary of War was also directed to provide the books, instruments, and apparatus necessary for the new corps. These were the first steps toward establishment of a national military academy.

It took months for the Corps of Artillerists and Engineers to recruit the officers and troops needed to reach its authorized strength. Then international tensions eased in the latter half of 1794 and jeopardized the whole effort. But, in December of that year, Congress resolved to continue a seacoast defense program.

By the end of the year, there were single company garrisons of artillerists and engineers at Fort Jay, New York; Fort Mifflin, Philadelphia; Fort Whetstone, later McHenry, Baltimore; and Fort Johnson, Charleston. The following February, Stephen Rochefontaine, one of the temporary engineers, was commissioned a lieutenant colonel and took command of the corps.

In 1798, when war with France appeared likely, Congress added a second regiment to the corps. However, by the time Thomas Jefferson became President in 1801, it had become clear that the united corps was not producing a well-educated body of engineer officers. The short-lived experiment was ended. In 1802 Congress permanently established a separate Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point as the Nation's first engineering school.

After 1800, many politicians, including Secretary of War James McHenry, desired the corps to contribute to both military construction and works of a civil nature. Thus in the years after the War of 1812, the corps took on civil works responsibilities in addition to the combat engineering and fortifications work it engaged in during the Revolution and the 1790's.

Today, after more than 200 years of service, the Corps of Engineers remains a vital part of America's Army. It is key to our military strength, as the Gulf war amply demonstrated. And the Corps of Engineers plays an important role in fighting natural disasters, such as floods and earthquakes, here at home. And it all began with an act of Congress 200 years ago during our Nation's infancy. The Corps of Engineers is an enduring arm of the Federal Government. I am certain that it will still be here providing civil and military engineering expertise for the United States 200 years from now.•

MFN FOR CHINA

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, most Americans are good citizens, and they look for good citizenship in the people and companies they do business with. In our country, most people would not have dealings with a company that

maintains sweatshop conditions and wages, locks up malcontented workers, bans unions uses force to take over and control a neighboring firm, and offsets its R&D outlays by smuggling missile parts and lethal weapons in defiance of the law of the land. People would certainly not wish to deal with such a company on the same favorable terms accorded to reputable business partners.

This is the kind of dilemma posed by the President's upcoming decision regarding the continuation of China's MFN status. Americans have a long history of sensitivity to the values and behavior of foreign countries they do business with. In the 1930's, when Japanese armies invaded China and committed atrocities there, many Americans were reluctant to buy Japanese goods. Some of the advocates of MFN renewal for China this year are suggesting that it is unsound policy to link trading conditions with human rights performance, the occupation of Tibet, China's export of ballistic missile technology in defiance of the international Missile Technology Control Regime, and other issues outlined in the President's May 1993 Executive order. In my view, this linkage is correct and reasonable.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the excellent May 6 New York Times article by A.M. Rosenthal that sets the facts straight: the United States accounts for 38 percent of the People's Republic's exports and is running a $25 billion annual trade deficit with the People's Republic. Who should be worried about whom? I agree that American jobs are at issue in the debate over China's MFN status, but we can secure those jobs without sacrificing our values by showing the Chinese that we are in earnest about human rights—not by falling all over ourselves in trying to justify a policy of appeasement.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 6, 1994]

THE CONTEST OF TWO LOBBIES

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

The struggle in Washington on whether the United States should continue to allow Communist China low-tariff privilege involves a skein of American interest—political, economic, strategic and moral.

But at its center are some simple realities that confront President Clinton, and every American who has hopes for him, as he nears the decision he has to make before June 3.

1. On May 28, 1993, Mr. Clinton signed an order committing him to remove those privileges unless by June 3, 1994, China had made "significant progress" toward human rights in China and occupied Tibet.

Congress was about to pass again a bill writing that either or plan into law—a bill once vetoed by President Bush. Mr. Clinton persuaded Congress to let him do the job himself, by executive order.

2. In the year since, repression by police and army power in China and Tibet has remained unalleviated.

Its instruments, used day in, day out as consistently as ever, are prison torture, religious persecution, arrest of political dissidents, forced confessions, arbitrary detention and the enforcement of the official bastions of economic growth: cheap labor, prison labor, slave labor and prohibition of labor unions.

To all this, despite a few carefully timed prisoner releases, the State Department's own reports bear witness.

3. Now Mr. Clinton is under pressure by American companies trading with China to decide that somehow Number 2 fulfills the promises he made to the American and Chinese people in Number 1.

Naturally, not a soul in Congress, the Administration or business believes for a moment that China has improved its human rights record. The China lobby wants to dump the promises of last year altogether or slide around them by accepting as progress more Beijing statements of intent like the ones they have already broken.

4. The China lobby in and out of government sells economic fear. It says the debate is about America "pulling out" of China economically. Nobody has suggested that. The lobby and its servants lie.

The China lobby heavily breathes warning that China itself will cut off trade with the U.S. The Communists are not suicides.

China exports to the U.S. $25 billion more than it buys from America. The exports to the U.S. are 38 percent of China's world total. Without American customers, China's growing trade deficit could bring the economy down. Who should be worried about whom?

5. The majority of Americans are against low American tariffs to China because they strengthen the wardens of the gulag. These Americans are not without voice or courage.

Most of Congress is behind them. So is the energetic human rights lobby—Asia Watch, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the International Campaign for Tibet, Amnesty International. They count.

6. But the China lobby has the money. The Clinton Administration is sending out so many mixed signals, and so many are craven, that Washington is convinced Mr. Clinton is caving fast.

The meaning of Mr. Clinton's 1993 order was clear: No human rights progress, no tariff privileges. A year later, nobody of knowledge in Washington seems to believe other than Mr. Clinton will sidle away from that.

The struggle now is about what is left. Should the human rights policy just be dumped as a lost cause? Or can Mr. Clinton save his name with a few more promises of intent from Beijing? How about a China-U.S. commission to improve human rights? Or a human rights code, not for the Communists but for American businesses in China?

If nobody can keep a straight face about those, how about ending the low tariffs only for goods produced by the state and the army? Maybe the Chinese will attach neat labels, for the convenience of U.S. customs?

The human rights people would rather have some compromise than nothing, so that they can fight another day. Most are too strong in soul to just vomit and walk away.

By nature, many daily newspapermen are optimistic. How could they otherwise keep confronting the keyboard?

All right; Honorable people in government still struggle for Mr. Clinton's mind and honor. So it's best to keep calling around, until the President makes his decision about the Executive Order of May 1993, now that it is May 1994.●

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METZENBAUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 3841

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of April 26, 1994, regarding H.R. 3841, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

The Chair apointed Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. SASSER, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRAMM of Texas, and Mr. ROTH conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on final passage of S. 978 occur, without any intervening action, following disposition of S. 1935, the gift ban legislation.

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

FOR THE RELIEF OF FANIE PHILY MATEO ANGELES

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 421, S. 116, a bill to provide for the relief of Fanie Phily Mateo Angeles; that the bill be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and, that any statements appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (S. 116) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was deemed read the third time, and passed; as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress in assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), Fanie Phily Mateo Angeles shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the proper number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of such Act, or if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 9:45 a.m., Tuesday, May 10; that, following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 10 a.m, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with Senator HEFLIN recognized for up to 7 minutes; that at 10 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 2042, the Bosnia arms embargo legislation, as provided for under the provisions of a previous unanimous-consent agreement; that, on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess from 12 noon until 2:30 p.m. in order to accommodate the respective party conferences.

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

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9:45 A.M.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, and I see no other Senator seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:48 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1994, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Secretary of the Senate after the recess of the Senate on May 6, 1994, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LINDA MARIE HOOKS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (ACQUISITION AND FACILITIES), VICE DAVID E. LEWIS, RESIGNED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 9, 1994*

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Whatever our place this day, whatever our responsibility, whatever our concern or petition, we join together in this common prayer of supplication and thanksgiving. We admit our weaknesses before You, O God, and pray for strength; we admit our limitations and pray for vision; we admit that we look to our own cares and we can miss the needs about us. As one people with one prayer and yet with individual necessities, we thank You for the grace of this new day and pray that Your benediction will remain with us always. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BEREUTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1727) "An Act to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 668. An act to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the Act, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2000, HUMAN SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1994

Mr. MARTINEZ submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate bill (S. 2000) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 to 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103–497)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2000), to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Human Services Amendments of 1994".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—HEAD START PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Short title; references in title.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Services.
Sec. 104. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 105. Allocation of funds.
Sec. 106. Report.
Sec. 107. Designation.
Sec. 108. Monitoring and quality assurance.
Sec. 109. Enhanced parent involvement and transition coordination with schools.
Sec. 110. Facilities and administrative requirements.
Sec. 111. Participation.
Sec. 112. Initiative on families with infants and toddlers.
Sec. 113. Appeals, notice, and hearing.
Sec. 114. Goals and priorities for training and technical assistance.
Sec. 115. Staff qualifications and development.
Sec. 116. Research, demonstrations, evaluation.
Sec. 117. Announcements and evaluations.
Sec. 118. Reports.
Sec. 119. Repeals.
Sec. 120. Study of benefits for Head Start employees.
Sec. 121. Ready to learn program reauthorization.
Sec. 122. State dependent care development programs.
Sec. 123. Consultation with the Corporation for National and Community Service.
Sec. 124. Reauthorization of Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985.
Sec. 125. Technical and conforming amendments.
Sec. 126. Study of full-day and full-year Head Start programs.
Sec. 127. Effective date and application.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 201. Short title and references.
Sec. 202. Authorizations of appropriations.
Sec. 203. Discretionary authority of Secretary.
Sec. 204. Community food and nutrition.
Sec. 205. Instructional activities for low-income youth.
Sec. 206. Amendment to Stewart B. Mckinney Homeless Assistance Act.
Sec. 207. Amendments to the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986.
Sec. 208. Effective date.

TITLE III—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Sec. 301. Short title and references.
Sec. 302. Statement of purpose.
Sec. 303. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 304. Emergency funds.
Sec. 305. Authorized uses of funds.
Sec. 306. Targeting of assistance to households with high home energy burdens.
Sec. 307. Clarification of audit requirement.
Sec. 308. Use of Department of Energy weatherization rules to achieve program consistency.
Sec. 309. Matters to be described in annual application.
Sec. 310. Report of funds available for obligation.
Sec. 311. Miscellaneous and technical amendments.
Sec. 312. Residential Energy Assistance Challenge Option (R.E.A.Ch.).
Sec. 313. Sense of the Congress regarding appropriations for LIHEAP.
Sec. 314. Effective date.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Sec. 401. Community-based family resource programs.
Sec. 402. Federal Council on Children, Youth, and Families.
Sec. 403. Family Resource Act.

TITLE I—HEAD START PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Head Start Act Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 637 (42 U.S.C. 9832) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5);

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(9) The term 'poverty line' means the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget)—

"(A) adjusted to reflect the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index For All Urban Consumers, issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, occurring in the 1-year period or other interval immediately preceding the date such adjustment is made; and

"(B) adjusted for family size.";

(3) by adding after paragraph (11) the following new paragraphs:

"(12) The term 'family literacy services' means services and activities that include interactive literacy activities between parents and their children, training for parents on techniques for being the primary teacher of their children and full partners in the education of their children, parent literacy training (including training in English as a second language), and early childhood education.

"(13) The term 'Indian tribe' means any tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community of Indians, including any Native village described in section 3(c) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(c)) or established pursuant to such Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.";

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (14), (5), (6), (4), and (10), respectively; and

(5)(A) by transferring paragraph (4), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraph after paragraph (3);

(B) by transferring paragraphs (5) and (6), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraphs after paragraph (4), as so redesignated;

(C) by transferring paragraph (10), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraph after paragraph (9), as so redesignated; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

"(11) The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given such term in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(12) The term 'migrant Head Start program' means a Head Start program that serves families who are engaged in agricultural work and who have changed their residence from one geographical location to another in the preceding 2-year period.

"(13) The term 'mobile Head Start program' means the provision of Head Start services utilizing transportable equipment set up in various community-based locations on a routine, weekly schedule, operating in conjunction with home-based Head Start programs, or as a Head Start classroom.".

SEC. 103. SERVICES.

Section 638(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 9833(a)(1)) is amended by striking "health, nutritional, educational, social, and other services" and inserting "health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, and other services".

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 639 (42 U.S.C. 9834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking all that follows "subchapter" and inserting "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

"(b) From the amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available—

"(1) $35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to—

"(A) carry out the Head Start Transition Project Act; and

"(B) carry out activities authorized under section 642(d); and

"(2) not more than $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out longitudinal research under section 649(e).".

SEC. 105. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) ALLOCATION AND USE OF FUNDS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—Section 640(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(2) by striking "(3)(C)" and all that follows through "quality improvement activities:" and inserting the following:

"(3)(A)(i) In order to provide assistance for activities specified in subparagraph (C) directed at the goals specified in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall reserve, from the amount (if any) by which the funds appropriated under section 639(a) for a fiscal year exceed the adjusted prior year appropriation, a share equal to the sum of—

"(I) 25 percent of such excess amount; and

"(II) any additional amount the Secretary may find necessary to address a demonstrated need for such activities.

"(ii) As used in clause (i), the term 'adjusted prior year appropriation' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a) for the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to reflect the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) during such preceding fiscal year.

"(B) Funds reserved under this paragraph (referred to in this paragraph as 'quality improvement funds') shall be used to accomplish any or all of the following goals:

"(i) Ensuring that Head Start programs meet or exceed performance standards pursuant to section 641A(a)(1)(A).

"(ii) Ensuring that such programs have adequate qualified staff, and that such staff are furnished adequate training, including developing skills in working with children with non-English language background, when appropriate.

"(iii) Ensuring that salary levels and benefits are adequate to attract and retain qualified staff for such programs.

"(iv) Using salary increases to improve staff qualifications, and to assist with the implementation of career development programs, for the staff of Head Start programs.

"(v) Improving community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments for such programs.

"(vi) Ensuring that the physical environments of Head Start programs are conducive to providing effective program services to children and families.

"(vii) Making such other improvements in the quality of such programs as the Secretary may designate.

"(C) Quality improvement funds shall be used to carry out any or all of the following activities:";

(3) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(vii) Such other activities as the Secretary may designate."; and

(4) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated in paragraph (1)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "for the first, second, and third fiscal years for which funds are so reserved"; and

(ii) in subclause (II), by inserting "geographical areas specified in subsection (a)(2)(B) and Indian and migrant Head Start programs," after "States,";

(B) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii);

(C) in clause (iv)—

(i) by striking "To be expended" and all that follows, through "reserved, funds" and inserting "Funds";

(ii) by striking "clause (ii)" the first place it appears and inserting "clause (i)";

(iii) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence, ", for expenditure for activities specified in subparagraph (C)"; and

(iv) by striking the second sentence;

(D) in clause (vi), by striking "paragraphs (2), (4), and (5)" and inserting "paragraph (2) or (4)"; and

(E) by striking clause (v) and redesignating clauses (iv) and (vi) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively.

(b) FUNDS SET-ASIDE.—Section 640(a) (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "through (5)." and inserting "through (4), and subject to paragraphs (5) and (6).";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "1990" and inserting "1994"; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "(including payments for all costs (other than compensation of Federal employees) of reviews of Head Start agencies and programs under section 641A(c), and of activities related to the development and implementation of quality improvement plans under section 641A(d)(2))" after "Secretary";

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking "paragraph (5)" each place it appears and inserting "paragraph (4)";

(4) by striking paragraph (4), and redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (7), respectively;

(5) in paragraph (4), as redesignated in paragraph (4), by striking "The" and inserting "Subject to section 639(b), the"; and

(6) by adding after paragraph (4), as redesignated in paragraph (4), the following new paragraphs:

"(5)(A) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraph (4), the Secretary shall reserve such sums as may be necessary to award the collaboration grants described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) From the reserved sums, the Secretary may award a collaboration grant to each State to facilitate collaboration regarding activities carried out in the State under this subchapter, and other activities carried out in, and by, the State that are designed to benefit low-income children and families.

"(C) A State that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall—

"(i) appoint an individual to serve as a State liaison between—

"(I) agencies and individuals carrying out Head Start programs in the State; and

"(II) agencies (including local educational agencies) and entities carrying out programs serving low-income children and families;

"(ii) involve the State Head Start Association in the selection of the individual, and involve the association in determinations relating to the ongoing direction of the collaboration;

"(iii) ensure that the individual holds a position with sufficient authority and access to ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) is effective and involves a range of State agencies; and

"(iv) ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) involves coordination of Head Start services with health care, welfare, child care, education, and national service activities, family literacy services, and activities relating to children with disabilities.

"(D) As used in this paragraph, the term 'low-income', used with respect to children or families, shall not be considered to refer only to children or families that meet the low-income criteria prescribed pursuant to section 645(a)(1)(A).

"(6) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4), the Secretary shall use, for grants for programs described in

section 645A(a), a portion of the combined total of such amounts equal to 3 percent for fiscal year 1995, 4 percent for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and 5 percent for fiscal year 1998, of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a).".

(c) CONSIDERATIONS FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAM EXPANSION.—Section 640(g) (42 U.S.C. 9835(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(g)" and inserting "(g)(1)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) For the purpose of expanding Head Start programs, in allocating funds to an applicant within a State, from amounts allotted to a State pursuant to subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

"(A) the quality of the applicant's programs (including Head Start and other child care or child development programs) in existence on the date of the allocation, including, in the case of Head Start programs in existence on the date of the allocation, the extent to which such programs meet or exceed performance standards and other requirements under this subchapter;

"(B) the applicant's capacity to expand services (including, in the case of Head Start programs in existence on the date of the allocation, whether the applicant accomplished any prior expansions in an effective and timely manner);

"(C) the extent to which the applicant has undertaken community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments involving other community organizations and public agencies serving children and families (including organizations serving families in whose homes English is not the language customarily spoken);

"(D) the extent to which the family and community needs assessment of the applicant reflects a need to provide full-working-day or full calendar year services;

"(E) the numbers of eligible children in each community who are not participating in a Head Start program; and

"(F) the concentration of low-income families in each community.

"(3) In determining the amount of funds reserved pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2) to be used for expanding Head Start programs under this subchapter, the Secretary shall take into consideration, to the extent appropriate, the factors specified in paragraph (2).".

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 640(h) (42 U.S.C. 9835(h)) is amended by striking "Each Head Start program may" and inserting "Financial assistance provided under this subchapter may be used by each Head Start program to".

(e) COMPENSATION.—Section 640 (42 U.S.C. 9835) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(j) Any agency that receives financial assistance under this subchapter to improve the compensation of staff who provide services under this Act shall use the financial assistance to improve the compensation of such staff, regardless of whether the agency has the ability to improve the compensation of staff employed by the agency who do not provide Head Start services.

"(k)(1) The Secretary shall allow center-based Head Start programs the flexibility to satisfy the total number of hours of service required by the regulations in effect on the date of enactment of the Human Services Amendments of 1994, to be provided to children in Head Start programs so long as such agencies do not—

"(A) provide less than 3 hours of service per day;

"(B) reduce the number of days of service per week; or

"(C) reduce the number of days of service per year.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to restrict the authority of the Secretary to fund alternative program variations authorized under section 1306.35 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations in effect on the date of enactment of the Human Services Amendments of 1994.

"(l) With funds made available under section 640(a)(2) to migrant Head Start programs, the Secretary shall give priority to migrant Head Start programs that serve eligible children of migrant families whose work requires them to relocate most frequently.".

SEC. 106. REPORT.

Section 640A (42 U.S.C. 9835a) is repealed.

SEC. 107. DESIGNATION.

(a) INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—Section 641(b) (42 U.S.C. 9836(b)) is amended by inserting after "Indian reservation" the following: "(including Indians in any area designated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as near-reservation)".

(b) DESIGNATION OF AGENCIES—Section 641(c) (42 U.S.C. 9836(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (2) through (4);

(2) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting "(subject to paragraph (2))" before ", the Secretary shall give priority"; and

(B) by striking "unless" and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following: "unless the Secretary makes a finding that the agency involved fails to meet program, financial management, and other requirements established by the Secretary.";

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2);

(4) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "except that, if" and inserting "If"; and

(B) by striking "subparagraph (A)" and inserting "paragraph (1)";

(5) by striking "Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph" and inserting the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection"; and

(6) by aligning the margins of paragraph (2) with the margins of paragraph (3).

(c) CONSIDERATIONS IN DESIGNATING NEW HEAD START AGENCIES.—Section 641(d) (42 U.S.C. 9836(d)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking all that precedes "then the Secretary" and inserting "If no entity in a community is entitled to the priority specified in subsection (c),";

(2) by striking the second sentence;

(3) in the third sentence—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "and subject to the preceding sentence";

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ", including Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)," after "preschool programs"; and

(C) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"(4) the plan of such applicant—

"(A) to seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

"(B) to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

"(C) to offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.), public and school libraries, and family support programs) to such parents—

"(i) family literacy services; and

"(ii) parenting skills training;

"(D) at the option of such applicant, to offer (directly or through referral to local entities) to such parents—

"(i) training in basic child development;

"(ii) assistance in developing communication skills;

"(iii) opportunities for parents to share experiences with other parents;

"(iv) substance abuse counseling; or

"(v) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children; and

"(E) to provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) in which such parents may choose to become involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);";

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking "non-English language children" and inserting "non-English language background children and their families"; and

(B) by inserting "and" after the semicolon;

(5) by striking paragraph (8); and

(6) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (8).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 641 (42 U.S.C. 9836) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

SEC. 108. MONITORING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE.

The Act is amended by inserting after section 641 (42 U.S.C. 9836) the following new section:

"SEC. 641A. QUALITY STANDARDS; MONITORING OF HEAD START AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.

"(a) QUALITY STANDARDS.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation standards applicable to Head Start agencies, programs, and projects under this subchapter, including—

"(A) performance standards with respect to services required to be provided, including health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, transition activities described in section 642(d), and other services;

"(B) administrative and financial management standards;

"(C) standards relating to the condition and location of facilities for such agencies, programs, and projects; and

"(D) such other standards as the Secretary finds to be appropriate.

"(2) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under this subsection shall establish the minimum levels of overall accomplishment that a Head Start agency shall achieve in order to meet the standards specified in paragraph (1).

"(3) CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING STANDARDS.—In developing the regulations required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

"(A) consult with experts in the fields of child development, early childhood education, child health care, family services (including linguistically and culturally appropriate services to non-English language background children and their families), administration, and financial management, and with persons with experience in the operation of Head Start programs;

"(B) take into consideration—

"(i) past experience with use of the standards in effect under this subchapter on the date of enactment of this section;

"(ii) changes over the period since the date of enactment of this Act in the circumstances and problems typically facing children and families served by Head Start agencies;

"(iii) developments concerning best practices with respect to child development, children with

disabilities, family services, program administration, and financial management;

"(iv) projected needs of an expanding Head Start program;

"(v) guidelines and standards currently in effect or under consideration that promote child health services, and projected needs of expanding Head Start programs;

"(vi) changes in the population of children who are eligible to participate in Head Start programs, including the language background and family structure of such children; and

"(vii) the need for, and state-of-the-art developments relating to, local policies and activities designed to ensure that children participating in Head Start programs make a successful transition to public schools; and

"(C)(i) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, review and revise as necessary the performance standards in effect under 651(b) on the day before the date of enactment of this section; and

"(ii) ensure that any such revisions in the performance standards will not result in the elimination of or any reduction in the scope or types of health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, or other services required to be provided under such standards as in effect on November 2, 1978.

"(4) STANDARDS RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS TO DELEGATE AGENCIES.—In developing standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall describe the obligations of a Head Start agency to an agency (referred to in this subchapter as the 'delegate agency') to which the Head Start agency has delegated responsibility for providing services under this subchapter and determine whether the Head Start agency complies with the standards. The Secretary shall consider such compliance during the review described in subsection (c)(1)(A) and in determining whether to renew financial assistance to the Head Start agency under this subchapter.

"(b) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with representatives of Head Start agencies and with experts in the fields of child development, family services, and program management, shall develop methods and procedures for measuring, annually and over longer periods, the quality and effectiveness of programs operated by Head Start agencies (referred to in this subchapter as 'performance measures').

"(2) DESIGN OF MEASURES.—The performance measures developed under this subsection shall be designed—

"(A) to assess the various services provided by Head Start programs and, to the extent the Secretary finds appropriate, administrative and financial management practices of such programs;

"(B) to be adaptable for use in self-assessment and peer review of individual Head Start agencies and programs; and

"(C) for other program purposes as determined by the Secretary.

"(3) USE OF MEASURES.—The Secretary shall use the performance measures developed pursuant to this subsection—

"(A) to identify strengths and weaknesses in the operation of Head Start programs nationally and by region; and

"(B) to identify problem areas that may require additional training and technical assistance resources.

"(c) MONITORING OF LOCAL AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to determine whether Head Start agencies meet standards established under this subchapter with respect to program, administrative, financial management, and other requirements, the Secretary shall conduct the following reviews of designated Head Start agencies, and of the Head Start programs operated by such agencies:

"(A) A full review of each such agency at least once during each 3-year period.

"(B) A review of each newly designated agency immediately after the completion of the first year such agency carries out a Head Start program.

"(C) Followup reviews including prompt return visits to agencies and programs that fail to meet the standards.

"(D) Other reviews as appropriate.

"(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS.—The Secretary shall ensure that reviews described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)—

"(A) are performed, to the maximum extent practicable, by employees of the Department of Health and Human Services who are knowledgeable about Head Start programs;

"(B) are supervised by such an employee at the site of such Head Start agency; and

"(C) are conducted by review teams that shall include individuals who are knowledgeable about Head Start programs and, to the maximum extent practicable, the diverse (including linguistic and cultural) needs of eligible children and their families.

"(d) CORRECTIVE ACTION; TERMINATION.—

"(1) DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines, on the basis of a review pursuant to subsection (c), that a Head Start agency designated pursuant to section 641 fails to meet the standards described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(A) inform the agency of the deficiencies that shall be corrected;

"(B) with respect to each identified deficiency, require the agency—

"(i) to correct the deficiency immediately; or

"(ii) at the discretion of the Secretary (taking into consideration the seriousness of the deficiency and the time reasonably required to correct the deficiency), to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2) concerning a quality improvement plan; and

"(C) initiate proceedings to terminate the designation of the agency unless the agency corrects the deficiency.

"(2) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

"(A) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—In order to retain a designation as a Head Start agency under this subchapter, a Head Start agency that is the subject of a determination described in paragraph (1) (other than an agency able to correct a deficiency immediately) shall—

"(i) develop in a timely manner, obtain the approval of the Secretary regarding, and implement a quality improvement plan that specifies—

"(I) the deficiencies to be corrected;

"(II) the actions to be taken to correct such deficiencies; and

"(III) the timetable for accomplishment of the corrective actions specified; and

"(ii) eliminate each deficiency identified, not later than the date for elimination of such deficiency specified in such plan (which shall not be later than 1 year after the date the agency received notice of the determination and of the specific deficiency to be corrected).

"(B) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start agency a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.

"(3) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide training and technical assistance to Head Start agencies with respect to the development or implementation of such quality improvement plans to the extent the Secretary finds such provision to be feasible and appropriate given available funding and other statutory responsibilities.

"(e) SUMMARIES OF MONITORING OUTCOMES.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish a summary report on the findings of reviews conducted under subsection (c) and on the outcomes of quality improvement plans implemented under subsection (d), during such fiscal year.".

SEC. 109. ENHANCED PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND TRANSITION COORDINATION WITH SCHOOLS.

Section 642 (42 U.S.C. 9837) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In order to be so designated, a Head Start agency shall also—

"(1) establish effective procedures by which parents and area residents concerned will be enabled to directly participate in decisions that influence the character of programs affecting their interests;

"(2) provide for their regular participation in the implementation of such programs;

"(3) provide technical and other support needed to enable parents and area residents to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources;

"(4) seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children, and to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

"(5) offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)), to parents of participating children, family literacy services and parenting skills training;

"(6) at the option of such agency, offer (directly or through referral to local entities), to such parents—

"(A) training in basic child development;

"(B) assistance in developing communication skills;

"(C) opportunities to share experiences with other parents;

"(D) substance abuse counseling;

"(E) regular in-home visitation; or

"(F) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

"(7) provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in paragraphs (4) through (6) in which such parents may choose to be involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);

"(8) consider providing services to assist younger siblings of children participating in its Head Start program to obtain health services from other sources; and

"(9) perform community outreach to encourage individuals previously unaffiliated with Head Start programs to participate in its Head Start program as volunteers.";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "schools that will subsequently serve children in Head Start programs,"; and

(B) by inserting ", including Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)," after "other programs"; and

(3) by adding after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Each Head Start agency shall carry out the actions specified in this subsection, to

the extent feasible and appropriate in the circumstances (including the extent to which such agency is able to secure the cooperation of parents and schools) to enable children to maintain the developmental gains achieved in Head Start programs and to build upon such gains in further schooling.

"(2) The Head Start agency shall take steps to coordinate with the local educational agency serving the community involved and with schools in which children participating in a Head Start program operated by such agency will enroll following such program, including—

"(A) developing and implementing a systematic procedure for transferring, with parental consent, Head Start program records for each participating child to the school in which such child will enroll;

"(B) establishing channels of communication between Head Start staff and their counterparts in the schools (including teachers, social workers, and health staff) to facilitate coordination of programs;

"(C) conducting meetings involving parents, kindergarten or elementary school teachers, and Head Start program teachers to discuss the developmental and other needs of individual children; and

"(D) organizing and participating in joint transition-related training of school staff and Head Start staff.

"(3) A Head Start agency may take steps to coordinate with the local educational agency serving the community involved and with schools in which children participating in a Head Start program operated by such agency will enroll following such program, including—

"(A) collaborating on the shared use of transportation and facilities; and

"(B) exchanging information on the provision of noneducational services to such children.

"(4) In order to promote the continued involvement of the parents of children that participate in Head Start programs in the education of their children upon transition to school, the Head Start agency shall—

"(A) provide training to the parents—

"(i) to inform the parents about their rights and responsibilities concerning the education of their children; and

"(ii) to enable the parents to understand and work with schools in order to communicate with teachers and other school personnel, to support the school work of their children, and to participate as appropriate in decisions relating to the education of their children; and

"(B) take other actions, as appropriate and feasible, to support the active involvement of the parents with schools, school personnel, and school-related organizations.

"(5) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Education, shall—

"(A) evaluate the effectiveness of the projects and activities funded under the Head Start Transition Project Act (42 U.S.C. 9855 et seq.);

"(B) disseminate to Head Start agencies information (including information from the evaluation required by subparagraph (A)) on effective policies and activities relating to the transition of children from Head Start programs to public schools; and

"(C) provide technical assistance to such agencies to promote and assist such agencies to adopt and implement such effective policies and activities.".

SEC. 110. FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 644 (42 U.S.C. 9839) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking "guidelines, instructions,";

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "640(a)(3)(A)(v)" and inserting "640(a)(3)(C)(v)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) Upon a determination by the Secretary that suitable facilities are not otherwise available to Indian tribes to carry out Head Start programs, and that the lack of suitable facilities will inhibit the operation of such programs, the Secretary, in the discretion of the Secretary, may authorize the use of financial assistance, from the amount reserved under section 640(a)(2)(A), to make payments for the purchase of facilities owned by such tribes. The amount of such a payment for such a facility shall not exceed the fair market value of the facility."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(g)(1) Upon a determination by the Secretary that suitable facilities (including public school facilities) are not otherwise available to Indian tribes, rural communities, and other low-income communities to carry out Head Start programs, that the lack of suitable facilities will inhibit the operation of such programs, and that construction of such facilities is more cost effective than purchase of available facilities or renovation, the Secretary, in the discretion of the Secretary, may authorize the use of financial assistance under this subchapter to make payments for capital expenditures related to facilities that will be used to carry out such programs. The Secretary shall establish uniform procedures for Head Start agencies to request approval for such payments, and shall promote, the extent practicable, the collocation of Head Start programs with other programs serving low-income children and families.

"(2) Such payments may be used for capital expenditures (including paying the cost of amortizing the principal, and paying interest on, loans) such as expenditures for—

"(A) construction of facilities that are not in existence on the date of the determination;

"(B) major renovation of facilities in existence on such date; and

"(C) purchase of vehicles used for programs conducted at the Head Start facilities.

"(3) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction or renovation of facilities to be used to carry out Head Start programs shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a et seq., commonly known as the 'Davis-Bacon Act').

"(h) In all personnel actions of the American Indian Programs Branch of the Head Start Bureau of the Administration for Children and Families, the Secretary shall give the same preference to individuals who are members of an Indian tribe as the Secretary gives to a disabled veteran, as defined in section 2108(3)(C) of title 5, United States Code. The Secretary shall take such additional actions as may be necessary to promote recruitment of such individuals for employment in the Administration.".

SEC. 111. PARTICIPATION.

Section 645 (42 U.S.C. 9840) is amended

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "may provide" and all that follows and inserting "shall be permitted to provide more than 1 year of Head Start services to eligible children (age 3 to compulsory school attendance) in the State."; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) An Indian tribe that—

"(A) operates a Head Start program;

"(B) enrolls as participants in the program all children in the community served by the tribe (including a community with a near-reservation designation, as defined by the Bureau of Indian Affairs) from families that meet the low-income criteria prescribed under subsection (a)(1)(A); and

"(C) has the resources to enroll additional children in the community who do not meet the low-income criteria;

may enroll such additional children in a Head Start program, in accordance with this subsection, if the program predominantly serves children who meet the low-income criteria.

"(2) The Indian tribe shall enroll the children in the Head Start program in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary may specify by regulation promulgated after consultation with Indian tribes.

"(3) In providing services through a Head Start program to such children, the Indian tribe may not use funds that the Secretary has determined, in accordance with section 640(g)(3), are to be used for expanding Head Start programs under this subchapter.".

SEC. 112. INITIATIVE ON FAMILIES WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Act is amended by adding after section 645 (42 U.S.C. 9840) the following new section:

"SEC. 645A. PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this section for—

"(1) programs providing family-centered services for low-income families with very young children designed to promote the development of the children, and to enable their parents to fulfill their roles as parents and to move toward self-sufficiency; and

"(2) provision of training and technical assistance to entities carrying out programs, and evaluation of programs, that were supported under the Comprehensive Child Development Act (42 U.S.C. 9881 et seq.), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) SCOPE AND DESIGN OF PROGRAMS.—In carrying out a program described in subsection (a), an entity receiving assistance under this section shall—

"(1) provide, either directly or through referral, early, continuous, intensive, and comprehensive child development and family support services that will enhance the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development of participating children;

"(2) ensure that the level of services provided to families responds to their needs and circumstances;

"(3) promote positive parent-child interactions;

"(4) provide services to parents to support their role as parents and to help the families move toward self-sufficiency (including educational and employment services as appropriate);

"(5) coordinate services with services provided by programs in the State and programs in the community to ensure a comprehensive array of services (such as health and mental health services);

"(6) ensure formal linkages with local Head Start programs in order to provide for continuity of services for children and families;

"(7) in the case of a Head Start agency that operates a program and that also provides Head Start services through the age of mandatory school attendance, ensure that children and families participating in the program receive such services through such age; and

"(8) meet such other requirements concerning design and operation of the program described in subsection (a) as the Secretary may establish.

"(c) PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE.—Persons who may participate in programs described in subsection (a)(1) include—

"(1) pregnant women; and

"(2) families with children under age 3 (or under age 5, in the case of children served by an entity specified in subsection (e)(3)); who meet the income criteria specified for families in section 645(a)(1).

"(d) ELIGIBLE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—To be eligible to receive assistance under this section, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Entities that may apply to carry out activities under this section include—

"(1) entities operating Head Start programs under this subchapter;

"(2) entities that, on the day before the date of enactment of this section, were operating—

"(A) Parent-Child Centers receiving financial assistance under section 640(a)(4), as in effect on such date; or

"(B) programs receiving financial assistance under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, as in effect on such date; and

"(3) other public entities, and nonprofit private entities, capable of providing child and family services that meet the standards for participation in programs under this subchapter and meet such other appropriate requirements relating to the activities under this section as the Secretary may establish.

"(e) TIME-LIMITED PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4) of section 640(a), the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in accordance with paragraphs (2) through (4).

"(2) PARENT-CHILD CENTERS.—The Secretary shall make financial assistance available under this section for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 to any entity that—

"(A) complies with subsection (b); and

"(B) received funding as a Parent-Child Center pursuant to section 640(a)(4), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this section, for fiscal year 1994.

"(3) COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

"(A) In the case of an entity that received a grant for fiscal year 1994 to operate a project under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, the Secretary—

"(i) shall make financial assistance available under this section, in a comparable amount and scope to the assistance provided for fiscal year 1994, for the duration of the project period specified in the grant award to such entity under such Act; and

"(ii) shall permit such entity, in carrying out activities assisted under this section, to serve children from birth through age 5.

"(B) In the case of an entity that received a grant for fiscal year 1989 to operate a project under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, the Secretary shall make assistance available under this section for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 to any entity that complies with subsection (b).

"(4) EVALUATIONS, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make financial assistance available under this section as necessary to provide for the evaluation of, and furnishing of training and technical assistance to, programs specified in paragraph (3)(A).

"(f) SELECTION OF OTHER GRANT RECIPIENTS.—From the balance remaining of the portion specified in section 640(a)(6), after making grants to the eligible entities specified in subsection (e), the Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis to applicants meeting the criteria specified in subsection (d) (giving priority to entities with a record of providing early, continuous, and comprehensive childhood development and family services).

"(g) DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants to eligible applicants under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure an equitable national geographic distribution of the grants; and

"(2) award grants to applicants proposing to serve communities in rural areas and to applicants proposing to serve communities in urban areas.

"(h) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—

"(1) GUIDELINES.—Not later than September 30, 1994, the Secretary shall develop program guidelines concerning the content and operation of programs assisted under this section—

"(A) in consultation with experts in early childhood development, experts in health, and experts in family services; and

"(B) taking into consideration the knowledge and experience gained from other early childhood programs, including programs under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, and from migrant Head Start programs that serve a large number of infants and toddlers.

"(2) STANDARDS.—Not later than December 30, 1994, the Secretary shall develop and publish performance standards for programs assisted under this section, and a grant announcement based on the guidelines developed under paragraph (1).

"(3) MONITORING, TRAINING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND EVALUATION.—In order to ensure the successful operation of programs assisted under this section, the Secretary shall use funds from the balance described in subsection (f) to monitor the operation of such programs, evaluate their effectiveness, and provide training and technical assistance tailored to the particular needs of such programs.".

(b) CONSOLIDATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In recognition that the Comprehensive Child Development Centers Act has demonstrated positive results, and that its purposes and functions have been consolidated into section 645A of the Head Start Act, the Comprehensive Child Development Centers Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 9801 note) and the Comprehensive Child Development Act (42 U.S.C. 9881 et seq.) are repealed.

(2) REPEALS.—

(A) Part E of title II of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100–297; 102 Stat. 325) is repealed.

(B) Subchapter F of chapter 8 of subtitle A of title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97–35; 42 U.S.C. 9801 note, et seq.) is repealed.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 638 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9833) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "(a)"; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 113. APPEALS, NOTICE, AND HEARING.

(a) MEDIATION FOR DISPUTES WITH DELEGATE AGENCIES, AND HEARING.—Section 646(a) (42 U.S.C. 9841(a)) is amended—

(1) at the end of paragraph (2), by striking "and";

(2) at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) the Secretary shall develop and publish procedures (including mediation procedures) to be used in order to—

"(A) resolve in a timely manner conflicts potentially leading to adverse action between—

"(i) recipients of financial assistance under this subchapter; and

"(ii) delegate agencies or Head Start Parent Policy Councils; and

"(B) avoid the need for an administrative hearing on an adverse action.".

(b) TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION NOT STAYED PENDING APPEAL.—Section 646 (42 U.S.C. 9841) is further amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(b) In prescribing procedures for the mediation described in subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall specify—

"(1) the date by which a Head Start agency engaged in a conflict described in subsection (a)(4) will notify the appropriate regional office of the Department of the conflict; and

"(2) a reasonable period for the mediation.

"(c) The Secretary shall also specify—

"(1) a timeline for an administrative hearing, if necessary, on an adverse action; and

"(2) a timeline by which the person conducting the administrative hearing shall issue a decision based on the hearing.

"(d) In any case in which a termination, reduction, or suspension of financial assistance under this subchapter is upheld in an administrative hearing under this section, such termination, reduction, or suspension shall not be stayed pending any judicial appeal of such administrative decision.

"(e)(1) The Secretary shall by regulation specify a process by which an Indian tribe may identify and establish an alternative agency, and request that the alternative agency be designated under section 641 as the Head Start agency providing services to the tribe, if—

"(A) the Secretary terminates financial assistance under section 646 to the only agency that was receiving financial assistance to provide Head Start services to the Indian tribe; and

"(B) the tribe would otherwise be precluded from providing such services to the members of the tribe.

"(2) The regulation required by this subsection shall prohibit such designation of an alternative agency that includes an employee who—

"(A) served on the administrative staff or program staff of the agency described in paragraph (1)(A); and

"(B) was responsible for a deficiency that—

"(i) relates to the performance standards or financial management standards described in section 641A(a)(1); and

"(ii) was the basis for the termination of financial assistance described in paragraph (1)(A);

as determined by the Secretary after providing the notice and opportunity described in subsection (a)(3).".

SEC. 114. GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 648 (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended—

(1) in the section heading to read as follows:

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING";

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "Head Start programs, including" and inserting "Head Start programs, in accordance with the process, and the provisions for allocating resources, set forth in subsections (b) and (c). The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements,";

(3)(A) by redesignating the final sentence of subsection (a), as amended by paragraph (2), as subsection (e);

(B) by transferring such subsection to the end of the section; and

(C) by indenting such subsection and aligning the margins of such subsection with the margins of subsection (d);

(4) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(5) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

"(b) The process for determining the technical assistance and training activities to be carried out under this section shall—

"(1) ensure that the needs of local Head Start agencies and programs relating to improving program quality and to program expansion are addressed to the maximum extent feasible; and

"(2) incorporate mechanisms to ensure responsiveness to local needs, including an ongoing

procedure for obtaining input from the individuals and agencies carrying out Head Start programs.

"(c) In allocating resources for technical assistance and training under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) give priority consideration to activities to correct program and management deficiencies identified through reviews pursuant to section 641A(c) (including the provision of assistance to local programs in the development of quality improvement plans under section 641A(d)(2));

"(2) address the training and career development needs of classroom staff (including instruction for providing services to children with disabilities) and nonclassroom staff, including home visitors and other staff working directly with families, including training relating to increasing parent involvement and services designed to increase family literacy and improve parenting skills;

"(3) assist Head Start agencies and programs in conducting and participating in community-wide strategic planning and needs assessment;

"(4) assist Head Start agencies and programs in developing full-working-day and full-calendar-year programs where community need is clearly identified and making the transition to such programs, with particular attention to involving parents and programming for children throughout a longer day;

"(5) assist Head Start agencies in better serving the needs of families with very young children;

"(6) assist Head Start agencies and programs in the development of sound management practices, including financial management procedures;

"(7) assist in efforts to secure and maintain adequate facilities for Head Start programs; and

"(8) assist Head Start agencies in developing innovative program models, including mobile and home-based programs."; and

(6) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

"Special consideration shall be given to entities that have demonstrated effectiveness in educational programming for preschool children that includes components for parental involvement, care provider training, and developmentally appropriate related activities.".

SEC. 115. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Head Start Act is amended by inserting after section 648 (42 U.S.C. 9843) the following new section:

"SEC. 648A. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) CLASSROOM TEACHERS.—

"(1) DEGREE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that not later than September 30, 1996, each Head Start classroom in a center-based program is assigned one teacher who has—

"(A) a child development associate (CDA) credential that is appropriate to the age of the children being served in center-based programs;

"(B) a State-awarded certificate for preschool teachers that meets or exceeds the requirements for a child development associate credential;

"(C) an associate, a baccalaureate, or an advanced degree in early childhood education; or

"(D) a degree in a field related to early childhood education with experience in teaching preschool children and a State-awarded certificate to teach in a preschool program.

"(2) WAIVER.—On request, the Secretary shall grant a 180-day waiver of the requirements of paragraph (1) with respect to an individual who—

"(A) is first employed after September 30, 1996, by a Head Start agency as a teacher for a Head Start classroom;

"(B) is enrolled in a program that grants any credential, certificate, or degree specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1); and

"(C) will receive such credential under the terms of such program not later than 180 days after beginning employment as a teacher with such agency.

"(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not grant more than one such waiver with respect to such individual.

"(b) MENTOR TEACHERS.—

"(1) DEFINITION; FUNCTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'mentor teacher' means an individual responsible for observing and assessing the classroom activities of a Head Start program and providing on-the-job guidance and training to the Head Start program staff and volunteers, in order to improve the qualifications and training of classroom staff, to maintain high quality education services, and to promote career development, in Head Start programs.

"(2) REQUIREMENT.—In order to assist Head Start agencies in establishing positions for mentor teachers, the Secretary shall—

"(A) provide technical assistance and training to enable Head Start agencies to establish such positions;

"(B) give priority consideration, in providing assistance pursuant to subparagraph (A), to Head Start programs that have substantial numbers of new classroom staff, that are experiencing difficulty in meeting applicable education standards, or that lack staff of a similar cultural background to that of the participating children and their families;

"(C) encourage Head Start programs to give priority consideration for such positions to Head Start teachers at the appropriate level of career advancement in such programs; and

"(D) promote the development of model curricula, designed to ensure the attainment of appropriate competencies of mentor teachers in Head Start programs.

"(c) FAMILY SERVICE WORKERS.—In order to improve the quality and effectiveness of staff providing in-home and other services (including needs assessment, development of service plans, family advocacy, and coordination of service delivery) to families of children participating in Head Start programs, the Secretary, in coordination with concerned public and private agencies and organizations examining the issues of standards and training for family service workers, shall—

"(1) review and, as necessary, revise or develop new qualification standards for Head Start staff providing such services;

"(2) promote the development of model curricula (on subjects including parenting training and family literacy) designed to ensure the attainment of appropriate competencies by individuals working or planning to work in the field of early childhood and family services; and

"(3) promote the establishment of a credential that indicates attainment of the competencies and that is accepted nationwide.

"(d) HEAD START FELLOWSHIPS.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may establish a program of fellowships, to be known as 'Head Start Fellowships', in accordance with this subsection. The Secretary may award the fellowships to individuals, to be known as 'Head Start Fellows', who are staff in local Head Start programs or other individuals working in the field of child development and family services.

"(2) PURPOSE.—The fellowship program established under this subsection shall be designed to enhance the ability of Head Start Fellows to make significant contributions to programs authorized under this subchapter, by providing opportunities to expand their knowledge and experience through exposure to activities, issues, resources, and new approaches, in the field of child development and family services.

"(3) ASSIGNMENTS OF FELLOWS.—

"(A) PLACEMENT SITES.—Fellowship positions under the fellowship program may be located (subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C))—

"(i) in agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services administering programs authorized under this subchapter (in national or regional offices of such agencies);

"(ii) in local Head Start agencies and programs;

"(iii) in institutions of higher education;

"(iv) in public or private entities and organizations concerned with services to children and families; and

"(v) in other appropriate settings.

"(B) LIMITATION FOR FELLOWS OTHER THAN HEAD START EMPLOYEES.—A Head Start Fellow who is not an employee of a local Head Start agency or program may be placed only in a fellowship position located in an agency or program specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A).

"(C) NO PLACEMENT IN LOBBYING ORGANIZATIONS.—Head Start Fellowship positions may not be located in any agency whose primary purpose, or one of whose major purposes, is to influence Federal, State, or local legislation.

"(4) SELECTION OF FELLOWS.—Head Start Fellowships shall be awarded on a competitive basis to individuals (other than Federal employees) selected from among applicants who are working, on the date of application, in local Head Start programs or otherwise working in the field of child development and children and family services.

"(5) DURATION.—Head Start Fellowships shall be for terms of 1 year, and may be renewed for a term of 1 additional year.

"(6) AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES.—From amounts appropriated under this subchapter and allotted under section 640(a)(2)(D), the Secretary is authorized to make expenditures of not to exceed $1,000,000 for any fiscal year, for stipends and other reasonable expenses of the fellowship program.

"(7) STATUS OF FELLOWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, Head Start Fellows shall not be considered to be employees or otherwise in the service or employment of the Federal Government. Head Start Fellows shall be considered to be employees for purposes of compensation for injuries under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code. Head Start Fellows assigned to positions located in agencies specified in paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall be considered employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the purposes of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, and for purposes of any administrative standards of conduct applicable to the employees of the agency to which they are assigned.

"(8) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

"(e) MODEL STAFFING PLANS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate public agencies, private agencies, and organizations and with individuals with expertise in the field of children and family services, shall develop model staffing plans to provide guidance to local Head Start agencies and programs on the numbers, types, responsibilities, and qualifications of staff required to operate a Head Start program.".

SEC. 116. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, EVALUATION.

Section 649 (42 U.S.C. 9844) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 649. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT; GENERAL PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall carry out a continuing program of research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, in order to—

"(A) foster continuous improvement in the quality of the Head Start programs under this subchapter and in their effectiveness in enabling participating children and their families to succeed in school and otherwise; and

"(B) use the Head Start programs to develop, test, and disseminate new ideas and approaches for addressing the needs of low-income preschool children (including children with disabilities) and their families and communities (including demonstrations of innovative noncenter-based program models such as home-based and mobile programs), and otherwise to further the purposes of this subchapter.

"(2) PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop, and periodically update, a plan governing the research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section.

"(b) CONDUCT OF RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, in order to conduct research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section—

"(1) may carry out such activities directly, or through grants to, or contracts or cooperative agreements with, public or private entities;

"(2) shall, to the extent appropriate, undertake such activities in collaboration with other Federal agencies, and with non-Federal agencies, conducting similar activities;

"(3) shall ensure that evaluation of activities in a specific program or project is conducted by persons not directly involved in the operation of such program or project;

"(4) may require Head Start agencies to provide for independent evaluations;

"(5) may approve, in appropriate cases, community-based cooperative research and evaluation efforts to enable Head Start programs to collaborate with qualified researchers not directly involved in program administration or operation; and

"(6) may collaborate with organizations with expertise in inclusive educational strategies for preschoolers with disabilities.

"(c) CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION.—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) consult with—

"(A) individuals from relevant academic disciplines;

"(B) individuals who are involved in the operation of Head Start programs and individuals who are involved in the operation of other child and family service programs; and

"(C) individuals from other Federal agencies, and individuals from organizations, involved with children and families, ensuring that the individuals described in this subparagraph reflect the multicultural nature of the children and families served by the Head Start programs and the multidisciplinary nature of the Head Start programs;

"(2) whenever feasible and appropriate, obtain the views of persons participating in and served by programs and projects assisted under this subchapter with respect to activities under this section; and

"(3) establish, to the extent appropriate, working relationships with the faculties of institutions of higher education, as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)), located in the area in which any evaluation under this section is being conducted, unless there is no such institution of higher education willing and able to participate in such evaluation.

"(d) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES.—The research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this subchapter shall include components designed to—

"(1) permit ongoing assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the programs under this subchapter;

"(2) contribute to developing knowledge concerning factors associated with the quality and effectiveness of Head Start programs and in identifying ways in which services provided under this subchapter may be improved;

"(3) assist in developing knowledge concerning the factors that promote or inhibit healthy development and effective functioning of children and their families both during and following participation in a Head Start program;

"(4) permit comparisons of children and families participating in Head Start programs with children and families receiving other child care, early childhood education, or child development services and with other appropriate control groups;

"(5) contribute to understanding the characteristics and needs of population groups eligible for services provided under this subchapter and the impact of such services on the individuals served and the communities in which such services are provided;

"(6) provide for disseminating and promoting the use of the findings from such research, demonstration, and evaluation activities; and

"(7) promote exploration of areas in which knowledge is insufficient, and that will otherwise contribute to fulfilling the purposes of this subchapter.

"(e) LONGITUDINAL STUDIES.—In developing priorities for research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to longitudinal studies that—

"(1) examine the developmental progress of children and their families both during and following participation in a Head Start program, including the examination of factors that contribute to or detract from such progress;

"(2) examine factors related to improving the quality of the Head Start programs and the preparation the programs provide for children and their families to function effectively in schools and other settings in the years following participation in such a program; and

"(3) as appropriate, permit comparison of children and families participating in Head Start programs with children and families receiving other child care, early childhood education, or child development services, and with other appropriate control groups.

"(f) OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS.—The Secretary shall take necessary steps to ensure that all studies, reports, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds under this subchapter shall become the property of the United States.".

SEC. 117. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND EVALUATIONS.

Section 650 (42 U.S.C. 9845) is repealed.

SEC. 118. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 651 (42 U.S.C. 9846) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through subsection (f) and inserting:

"SEC. 651. REPORTS.";

(2) by striking "(g)";

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking "evaluations conducted under section 641(c)(2)" and inserting "monitoring conducted under section 641A(c)"; and

(4)(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (11);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by adding after paragraph (12) the following new paragraphs:

"(13) a summary of information concerning the research, demonstration, and evaluation activities conducted under section 649, including—

"(A) a status report on ongoing activities; and

"(B) results, conclusions, and recommendations, not included in any previous report, based on completed activities; and

"(14) a study of the delivery of Head Start programs to Indian children living on and near Indian reservations, to children of Alaskan Natives, and to children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.".

(b) REDESIGNATION.—Section 651 is redesignated as section 650.

SEC. 119. REPEALS.

Sections 651A and 652 (42 U.S.C. 9846a and 9847) are repealed.

SEC. 120. STUDY OF BENEFITS FOR HEAD START EMPLOYEES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study regarding the benefits available to individuals employed by Head Start agencies under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) PREPARATION.—The Secretary shall prepare a report, containing the results of the study, that—

(A) describes the benefits, including health care benefits, family and medical leave, and retirement pension benefits, available to such individuals;

(B) includes recommendations for increasing the access of the individuals to benefits, including access to a retirement pension program; and

(C) addresses the feasibility of participation by such individuals in the Federal Employees' Retirement System under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit the report to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 121. READY TO LEARN PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part G of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.)—

(A) is amended by redesignating sections 4701 through 4708 as sections 471 through 478;

(B) is transferred to the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.);

(C) is redesignated as part F of such Act; and

(D) is inserted after part E of such Act.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 471(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by paragraph (1)) is amended—

(i) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Secretary of Education (hereafter referred to in this subchapter as the 'Secretary')"; and

(ii) by striking "4702(b)" and inserting "472(b)".

(B) Section 474 of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by paragraph (1)) is amended by striking "4701 or 4703" and inserting "471 or 473".

(C) Section 475 of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by paragraph (1)) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking "4701" and inserting "471"; and

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) by striking "4702(a)" in paragraph (1) and inserting "472(a)"; and

(II) by striking "4703(3)" in paragraph (1) and inserting "473(3)".

(D) Section 476(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by paragraph (1)) is amended in subsection (b), by striking "4703(1)(C)" and inserting "473(1)(C).

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Section 472(b)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking ", nongovernmental entity" and inserting "entity (including public telecommunications entities)".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 476(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (as transferred and added by subsection (a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1995"; and

(2) by striking "for fiscal year 1994." and inserting "for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1998.".

SEC. 122. STATE DEPENDENT CARE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 670A of the State Dependent Care Development Grants Act (42 U.S.C. 9871) is amended by striking "are authorized to be appropriated" and all that follows and inserting "is authorized to be appropriated $13,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 123. CONSULTATION WITH THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

The Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 657A. CONSULTATION WITH THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

"The Secretary shall consult with the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service regarding the dissemination of information about the Corporation's programs, to programs that receive funds under this subchapter.".

SEC. 124. REAUTHORIZATION OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1985.

Section 606 of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 10905) is amended by striking "$1,500,000" and all that follows and inserting "to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 125. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT.—Section 133(a) of the Head Start Transition Project Act is amended by striking "639(c)" and inserting "639(b)".

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 1924(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-5(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by striking "sections 652 and 673(2)" and inserting "section 673(2)".

SEC. 126. STUDY OF FULL-DAY AND FULL-YEAR HEAD START PROGRAMS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study of the extent to which Head Start programs are addressing the need for Head Start services during a full working day or full calendar year among eligible low-income families with preschool children.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate not later than January 31, 1997, containing the results of the study, including—

(1) the number of eligible children in need of full-day or full-year Head Start programs;

(2) the number of full-day, full-year Head Start programs and the number of children served in such program and those provided full-day or full-year services through cooperative arrangements with other funding sources;

(3) a description of promising models currently employed by Head Start programs for meeting such needs both directly and through arrangements with other service providers;

(4) a description of the barriers to meeting the need for full-day, full-year care among such families; and

(5) recommendations on how the barriers could be eliminated in order to meet the needs of children and families served.

SEC. 127. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this title.

(b) APPLICATION.—The requirements of this title and the amendments made by this title shall not apply to Head Start agencies and other recipients of financial assistance under the Head Start Act until October 1, 1994.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Community Services Block Grant Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.).

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Subsection (b) of section 672 (42 U.S.C. 9901(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated $525,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.".

(b) STATE ALLOCATIONS.—Section 674 (42 U.S.C. 9903) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b) and (c) as subsections (b), (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated), the following new subsection:

"(a)(1) Of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year pursuant to section 672(b), the Secretary may reserve not less than one-half of 1 percent and not more than 1 percent for training, technical assistance, planning, evaluation, and data collection activities related to programs or projects carried out under this subtitle. Such activities may be carried out by the Secretary through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with eligible entities or with organizations or associations whose membership is composed of eligible entities or agencies that administer programs for eligible entities.

"(2) The process for determining the technical assistance and training activities to be carried out under this section shall—

"(A) ensure the needs of community action agencies and programs relating to improving program quality, including financial management practices, are addressed to the maximum extent feasible; and

"(B) incorporate mechanisms to ensure responsiveness to local needs, including an ongoing procedure for obtaining input from the community action State and national network.

(c) APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) FORM AND ASSURANCES.—Section 675(a) (42 U.S.C. 9904(a)) is amended by inserting "or significant amendments thereof" before "shall contain assurances".

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 675(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(1)) is amended by striking "use the funds available under this subtitle" and inserting "ensure that, at its discretion and consistent with agreements with the State, each recipient of funds available under this subtitle will use such funds".

(3) ASSURED ACTIVITIES.—Section 675(c)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting "homeless individuals and families, migrants, and" before "the elderly poor".

(4) STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 675(c)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) if less than 100 percent of the allotment is expended under subparagraph (A), provide assurances that with respect to the remainder of the allotment a reasonable amount shall be used for—

"(i) providing training and technical assistance to those entities in need of such assistance and such activities will not be considered administrative expenses;

"(ii) coordinating State-operated programs and services targeted to low-income children and families with services provided by eligible entities funded under this subtitle, including outposting appropriate State or local public employees into entities funded under this subtitle to ensure increased access to services provided by such State or local agencies;

"(iii) supporting statewide coordination and communication among eligible entities;

"(iv) administrative expenses at the State level, including monitoring activities, but not more than $55,000 or 5 percent of its allotment under section 674; and

"(v) considering the distribution of funds under this subtitle within the State to determine if such funds have been targeted to the areas of greatest need.".

(5) TRIPARTITE BOARD.—Section 675(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(3)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "selected by the community action agency or nonprofit private organization and" after "board will be";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(C) by striking the comma after "provide assurances that" and inserting "(A)"; and

(D) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ", and (B) in the case of a public organization receiving funds under this subtitle, such organization either establish—

"(i) a board of which at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served; or

"(ii) another mechanism specified by the State to assure low-income citizen participation in the planning, administration, and evaluation of projects for which such organization has been funded;".

(6) REGULATIONS.—The next to last sentence of section 675(c) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary may prescribe procedures only for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of eligible entities in carrying out the purposes of this subtitle.".

(d) COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN.—Section 675(c) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A) as items (aa) through (cc), respectively;

(B) by realigning the margin of the sentence beginning with "For purposes of" so as to align with subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking "For purposes of" and inserting "(A) For purposes of";

(D) by striking "(A) a statewide" and inserting "(i) a statewide";

(E) by striking "(B) the failure" and inserting "(ii) the failure";

(F) by inserting immediately before paragraph (12) the following:

"(B) for purposes of making a determination with respect to a termination, the term 'cause' includes the material failure of an eligible entity to comply with the terms of its agreement and community action plan to provide services under this subtitle;".

(2) in paragraph (12) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraphs:

"(13) secure from each eligible entity as a condition to its receipt of funding under this Act a community action plan (which shall be available to the Secretary for inspection) that includes—

"(A) a community needs assessment (including food needs);

"(B) a description of the service delivery system targeted to low-income individuals and families in the service area;

"(C) a description of how linkages will be developed to fill identified gaps in services through information, referral, case management, and followup consultations;

"(D) a description of how funding under this Act will be coordinated with other public and private resources; and

"(E) a description of outcome measures to be used to monitor success in promoting self-sufficiency, family stability, and community revitalization; and

"(14) provide assurances that cost and accounting standards of the Office of Management and Budget shall apply to a recipient of funds under this subtitle.".

(e) PUBLIC INSPECTIONS OF PLANS.—Section 675(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 9904(d)(2)) is amended by inserting "or revision" after "Each plan".

(f) AUDITS.—The last sentence of section 675(f) (42 U.S.C. 9904(f)) is amended by inserting before "to the legislature" the following: "to the eligible entity at no charge,".

(g) EVALUATION INVOLVING WAIVERS.—Section 675(h) (42 U.S.C. 9904(h)) is amended by inserting "(including any State that received a waiver under Public Law 98-139)" after "States" the last place it appears.

SEC. 203. DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.

(a) TRAINING AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 681(a) (42 U.S.C. 9910(a)) is amended by striking "to provide for—" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting the following: "to provide for ongoing activities of national or regional significance related to the purposes of this subtitle, with special emphasis on—

"(1) a Community Initiative Program, awarded on a competitive basis, to fund private, nonprofit community development corporations for purposes of planning and carrying out community and economic development activities in economically distressed areas and in rural areas, as described in subsection (c);

"(2) grants to support the design, development, and widespread availability of interactive information technology among the nationwide network of Community Service Block Grant eligible entities, State administrators, national associations and organizations, and program recipients to promote electronic communication and access to program information that would enhance the effective delivery of social services; and

"(3) grants to nonprofit private organizations that provide assistance for migrants and seasonal farmworkers.".

(b) COMMUNITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—Subsection (b) of section 681 (42 U.S.C. 9910) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) COMMUNITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Economic development activities under this section shall be designed to address the economic needs of low-income individuals and families by creating employment and business development opportunities.

"(B) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall exercise the authority provided under subparagraph (A) in consultation with other relevant Federal officials.

"(C) GOVERNING BOARDS.—Each community development corporation receiving funds under this section shall be governed by a board that shall consist of residents of the community and business and civic leaders and shall have as a principal purpose planning, developing, or managing low-income housing or community development projects.

"(D) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—In providing assistance or entering into other arrangements under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the geographic distribution of funds among States and the relative proportion of funding among rural and urban areas.

"(E) RESERVATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, the Secretary may reserve not to exceed 1 percent for each fiscal year to make grants to private nonprofit organizations or to enter into contracts with private nonprofit or for profit organizations to provide technical assistance to aid community development corporations in developing or implementing projects funded under this section and to evaluate projects funded under this section.

"(2) RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Rural community development activities under this section shall include—

"(A) grants to private, nonprofit corporations that provide assistance to rural low-income families in home repair and in planning and developing low-income rural rental housing units; and

"(B) grants to multistate, regional private, nonprofit organizations that provide training and technical assistance to small, rural communities in meeting their community facility needs.".

SEC. 204. COMMUNITY FOOD AND NUTRITION.

Subsection (d) of section 681A (42 U.S.C. 9910a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out this section.".

SEC. 205. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR LOW-INCOME YOUTH.

The Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 682 and 683 as sections 683 and 684, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 681 the following:

"SEC. 682. NATIONAL OR REGIONAL PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR LOW-INCOME YOUTH.

"(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to make a grant to an eligible service provider to administer national or regional programs to provide instructional activities for low-income youth. In making such a grant, the Secretary shall give a priority to eligible service providers that have a demonstrated ability to operate such a program.

"(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) Any instructional activity carried out by an eligible service provider receiving a grant under this subsection shall be carried out on the campus of an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act) and shall include—

"(A) access to the facilities and resources of such an institution;

"(B) an initial medical examination and follow-up referral or treatment, without charge, for youth during their participation in such activity;

"(C) at least one nutritious meal daily, without charge, for participating youth during each day of participation;

"(D) high quality instruction in a variety of sports (that shall include swimming and that may include dance and any other high quality recreational activity) provided by coaches and teachers from institutions of higher education and from elementary and secondary schools (as defined in sections 1471(8) and 1471(21) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965); and

"(E) enrichment instruction and information on matters relating to the well-being of youth, to include educational opportunities and study practices, education for the prevention of drugs and alcohol abuse, health and nutrition, career opportunities and family and job responsibilities.

"(c) ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.—A national private nonprofit organization, a coalition of such organizations, or a private nonprofit organization applying jointly with a business concern shall be eligible for a grant under this subsection if—

"(1) the applicant has demonstrated experience in operating a program providing instruction to low-income youth;

"(2) the applicant shall contribute amounts in cash or fairly evaluated in kind of no less than 25 percent of the amount requested;

"(3) the applicant shall use no funds from a grant authorized under this section for administrative expenses; and

"(4) the applicant agrees to comply with the regulations or program guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for use of funds made available by this grant.

"(d) APPLICATIONS PROCESS.—Eligible service providers may submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for approval, an application in such form at such time as the Secretary deems appropriate.

"(e) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS OR PROGRAM GUIDELINES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate regulations or program guidelines to ensure funds made available under a grant made under this section are used in accordance with the intentions of this Act.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for each fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998 for grants to carry out this section.".

SEC. 206. AMENDMENT TO STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

The last section of subtitle D of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11646) is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 751." and by inserting "SEC. 754.", and

(2) by striking "1991" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998".

SEC. 207. AMENDMENTS TO THE HUMAN SERVICES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1986.

Section 408 of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 9901b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) Initial and subsequent grant awards may fully fund projects for periods of up to 3 years.";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B) by striking "After the first fiscal year" and inserting "After the first funding period";

(3) by amending subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) In addition to the grant programs described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make grants to community action agencies for the purpose of enabling such agencies to demonstrate new approaches to dealing with the problems caused by entrenched, chronic unemployment and lack of economic opportunities for urban youth. Demonstrations shall include such activities as peer counseling, mentoring, development of job skills, assistance with social skills, community services, family literacy, parenting skills, opportunities for employment or entrepreneurship, and other services designed to assist such at-risk youth to continue their education, to secure meaningful employment, to perform community service, or to pursue other productive alternatives within the community."; and

(B) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Such grants made under this subsection on a competitive basis shall be based on an annual competition determined by the Secretary. Grants made under this subsection shall not exceed $500,000."; and

(4) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated

$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, to carry out this section.

"(2) Of the amounts appropriated for this section, not less than 30 percent and not more than 40 percent shall be used to carry out the programs authorized under subsection (c).

"(3) In addition to sums which are required to carry out the evaluation, reporting, and dissemination of results under subsections (a), (c), (d), and (f), the Secretary is authorized to reserve up to 2 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) for administration of the program as well as for planning and technical assistance.".

SEC. 208. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall take effect on October 1, 1994.

TITLE III—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

Subsection (a) of section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this title, to States to assist low-income households, particularly those with the lowest incomes, that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, primarily in meeting their immediate home energy needs.".

SEC. 303. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.—Section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "this title" and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting "this title, $2,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 1999."; and

(2) in the last sentence of subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "July 1" and inserting "October 1"; and

(B) by striking "for which" and inserting "following the year in which".

(b) INCENTIVE PROGRAM FOR LEVERAGING NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—Subsection (d) of section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 2607A, $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999.".

SEC. 304. EMERGENCY FUNDS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621) as amended by section 303, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated in each fiscal year for payments under this title, in addition to amounts appropriated for distribution to all the States in accordance with section 2604 (other than subsection (g)), $600,000,000 to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection are hereby designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such funds shall be made available only after the submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President (for all or a part of the appropriation pursuant to this subsection) that includes a designation of the amount requested as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.".

(b) HOME ENERGY.—Section 2603 (42 U.S.C. 8622(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (2), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

"(1) The term 'energy burden' means the expenditures of the household for home energy divided by the income of the household."; and

(3) by inserting before paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

"(3) The term 'highest home energy needs' means the home energy requirements of a household determined by taking into account both the energy burden of such household and the unique situation of such household that results from having members of vulnerable populations, including very young children, individuals with disabilities, and frail older individuals.".

(c) ALLOTMENT OF EMERGENCY FUNDS.—Section 2604 (42 U.S.C. 8623) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding subsections (a) through (f), the Secretary may allot amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(e) to one or more than one State. In determining to which State or States additional funds may be allotted, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which a State was affected by the emergency or disaster, the availability to an affected State of other resources under this or any other program, and such other factors as the Secretary determines relevant. The Secretary shall notify Congress of the allotment pursuant to this subsection prior to releasing the allotted funds.".

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZED USES OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) use the funds available under this title to—

"(A) conduct outreach activities and provide assistance to low income households in meeting their home energy costs, particularly those with the lowest incomes that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, consistent with paragraph (5);

"(B) intervene in energy crisis situations;

"(C) provide low-cost residential weatherization and other cost-effective energy-related home repair; and

"(D) plan, develop, and administer the State's program under this title including leveraging programs,

and the State agrees not to use such funds for any purposes other than those specified in this title;".

(b) ENCOURAGED REDUCED HOME ENERGY NEEDS.—Section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: "(except for the costs of the activities described in paragraph (16))";

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

"(16) use up to 5 percent of such funds, at its option, to provide services that encourage and enable households to reduce their home energy needs and thereby the need for energy assistance, including needs assessments, counseling, and assistance with energy vendors, and report to the Secretary concerning the impact of such activities on the number of households served, the level of direct benefits provided to those households, and the number of households that remain unserved.".

SEC. 306. TARGETING OF ASSISTANCE TO HOUSEHOLDS WITH HIGH HOME ENERGY BURDENS.

(a) HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—Section 2605(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(2)(B)) is amended by striking the matter following clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"except that a State may not exclude a household from eligibility in a fiscal year solely on the basis of household income if such income is less than 110 percent of the poverty level for such State, but the State may give priority to those households with the highest home energy costs or needs in relation to household income;".

(b) OUTREACH ACTIVITIES.—Section 2605(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(3)) is amended by striking "are made aware" and inserting "and households with high home energy burdens, are made aware".

(c) ASSISTANCE LEVELS.—Section 2605(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(5)) is amended by inserting "or needs" after "highest energy costs".

(d) STATE PLAN.—Section 2605(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (H), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) describes any steps that will be taken (in addition to those necessary to carry out the assurance contained in paragraph (5) of subsection (b)) to target assistance to households with high home energy burdens;".

SEC. 307. CLARIFICATION OF AUDIT REQUIREMENT.

Section 2605 (42 U.S.C. 8624) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(10), by striking "and provide that" and all that follows and inserting "and provide that the State will comply with the provisions of chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Single Audit Act');"; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking "at least every two years" and all that follows and inserting "in accordance with chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.".

SEC. 308. USE OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WEATHERIZATION RULES TO ACHIEVE PROGRAM CONSISTENCY.

Section 2605(c)(1)(D) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)(D)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", including any steps the State will take to address the weatherization and energy-related home repair needs of households that have high home energy burdens, and describes any rules promulgated by the Department of Energy for administration of its Low Income Weatherization Assistance Program which the State, to the extent permitted by the Secretary to increase consistency between federally assisted programs, will follow regarding the use of funds provided under this title by the State for such weatherization and energy-related home repairs and improvements".

SEC. 309. MATTERS TO BE DESCRIBED IN ANNUAL APPLICATION.

Section 2605(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated by section 306(d) of this Act)—

(A) by striking "and (13)" and inserting "(13), and (15)"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end thereof; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated by section 306(d) of this Act), the following new subparagraph:

"(G) states, with respect to the 12-month period specified by the Secretary, the number and income levels of households which apply and the number which are assisted with funds provided under this title, and the number of households so assisted with—

"(i) one or more members who has attained 60 years of age;

"(ii) one or more members who were disabled; and

"(iii) one or more young children; and".

SEC. 310. REPORT OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION.

Section 2607(a) (42 U.S.C. 8628(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Each State shall notify the Secretary, not later than 2 months prior to the close of a fiscal year, of the amount (if any) of its allotment for such year that will not be obligated in such year, and, if such State elects to submit a request described in subsection (b)(2), such State shall submit such request at the same time. The Secretary shall make no payment under paragraph (1) to a State for a fiscal year unless the State has complied with this paragraph with respect to the prior fiscal year.".

SEC. 311. MISCELLANEOUS AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TREATMENT OF HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 2605(b)(7)(D) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(7)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) ensure that the provision of vendored payments remains at the option of the State in consultation with local grantees and may be contingent on unregulated vendors taking appropriate measures to alleviate the energy burdens of eligible households, including providing for agreements between suppliers and individuals eligible for benefits under this Act that seek to reduce home energy costs, minimize the risks of home energy crisis, and encourage regular payments by individuals receiving financial assistance for home energy costs;".

(2) INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 2607A(e) (42 U.S.C. 8626a(e)) is amended by striking "July 31, of each year" and inserting "2 months after the close of the fiscal year during which the State provided leveraged resources to eligible households, as described in subsection (b)".

(3) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 2609A(a) is amended by striking "$500,000" and inserting "$250,000".

(b) CRITERIA AND REPORT.—Section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Amendments of 1994, the Secretary shall develop model performance goals and measurements in consultation with State, territorial, tribal, and local grantees, that the States may use to assess the success of the States in achieving the purposes of this title. The model performance goals and measurements shall be made available to States to be incorporated, at the option of the States, into the plans for fiscal year 1997. The Secretary may request data relevant to the development of model performance goals and measurements.".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), as amended by section 303 of this Act—

(i) by inserting "(other than section 2607A)" after "to carry out the provisions of this title"; and

(ii) by striking the second period at the end thereof; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "Act" and inserting "title".

(2) Section 2603(2) (42 U.S.C. 8622(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking "the" in paragraph (2) and inserting "The"; and

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting a period.

(3) Section 2604(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 8623(b)(1)) is amended by inserting "of the United States" after "Virgin Islands".

(4) The sentence that immediately precedes paragraph (15) of section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is transferred so as to appear as a flush sentence immediately after paragraph (16).

(5) Section 2605(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(3)) is amended by striking "handicapped" and inserting "disabled".

(6) Section 2607A(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 8626a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ".0008 percent" and inserting "0.08 percent".

(7) Section 2610(a) (42 U.S.C. 8629(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking the semicolon after "used" and inserting a semicolon after "title"; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "handicapped" and inserting "disabled"; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof "or include young children".

SEC. 312. RESIDENTIAL ENERGY ASSISTANCE CHALLENGE OPTION (R.E.A.CH.).

The Act is amended by inserting after section 2607A the following:

"SEC. 2607B. RESIDENTIAL ENERGY ASSISTANCE CHALLENGE OPTION (R.E.A.CH.).

"(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Residential Energy Assistance Challenge (in this section referred to as 'R.E.A.Ch.') program is to—

"(1) minimize health and safety risks that result from high energy burdens on low-income Americans;

"(2) prevent homelessness as a result of inability to pay energy bills;

"(3) increase the efficiency of energy usage by low-income families; and

"(4) target energy assistance to individuals who are most in need.

"(b) FUNDING.—

"(1) ALLOCATION.—For each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1999, the Secretary may allocate not more than 25 percent of the amount made available pursuant to section 2602(d) for such fiscal year to a R.E.A.Ch. fund for the purpose of making incentive grants to States that submit qualifying plans that are approved by the Secretary as R.E.A.Ch. initiatives. States may use such grants for the costs of planning, implementing, and evaluating the initiative.

"(2) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve from any funds allocated under this subsection, funds to make additional payments to State R.E.A.Ch. programs that—

"(A) have energy efficiency education services plans that meet quality standards established by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Energy; and

"(B) have the potential for being replicable model designs for other programs.

States shall use such supplemental funds for the implementation and evaluation of the energy efficiency education services.

"(c) CRITERIA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 31, 1995, the Secretary shall establish criteria for approving State plans required by subsection (a), for energy efficiency education quality standards described in subsection (b)(2)(A), and for the distribution of funds to States with approved plans.

"(2) DOCUMENTATION.—Notwithstanding the limitations of section 2605(b) regarding the authority of the Secretary with respect to plans, the Secretary may require a State to provide appropriate documentation that its R.E.A.Ch. activities conform to the State plan as approved by the Secretary.

"(d) FOCUS.—The State may designate all or part of the State, or all or part of the client population, as a focus of its R.E.A.Ch. initiative.

"(e) STATE PLANS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall include each of the elements described in paragraph (2), to be met by State and local agencies.

"(2) ELEMENTS OF STATE PLANS.—Each State plan shall include—

"(A) an assurance that such State will deliver services through community-based nonprofit entities in such State, by—

"(i) awarding grants to, or entering into contracts with, such entities for the purpose of providing such services and payments directly to individuals eligible for benefits; or

"(ii) if a State makes payments directly to eligible individuals or energy suppliers, making contracts with such entities to administer such programs, including—

"(I) determining eligibility;

"(II) providing outreach services; and

"(III) providing benefits other than payments;

"(B) an assurance that, in awarding grants or entering into contracts to carry out its R.E.A.Ch. initiative, the State will give priority to organizations that—

"(i) are described in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(1)), except where significant geographic portions of the State are not served by such entities;

"(ii) the Secretary has determined have a record of successfully providing services under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program; and

"(iii) receive weatherization assistance program funds under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6863 et seq.);

except that a State may not require any such entity to operate a R.E.A.Ch. program;

"(C) an assurance that, subject to subparagraph (D), each entity that receives a grant or enters into a contract under subparagraph (A)(i) will provide a variety of services and benefits, including—

"(i) payments to, or on behalf of, individuals eligible for residential energy assistance services and benefits under section 2605(b) for home energy costs;

"(ii) energy efficiency education;

"(iii) residential energy demand management services, including any other energy related residential repair and energy efficiency improvements in coordination with, or delivered by, Department of Energy weatherization assistance programs at the discretion of the State;

"(iv) family services, such as counseling and needs assessment, related to energy budget management, payment plans, and related services; and

"(v) negotiation with home energy suppliers on behalf of households eligible for R.E.A.Ch. services and benefits;

"(D) a description of the methodology the State and local agencies will use to determine—

"(i) which households will receive one or more forms of benefits under the State R.E.A.Ch. initiative;

"(ii) the cases in which nonmonetary benefits are likely to provide more cost-effective long-term outcomes than payment benefits alone; and

"(iii) the amount of such benefit required to meet the goals of the program;

"(F) a method for targeting nonmonetary benefits;

"(G) a description of the crisis and emergency assistance activities the State will undertake that are designed to—

"(i) discourage family energy crises;

"(ii) encourage responsible vendor and consumer behavior; and

"(iii) provide only financial incentives that encourage household payment;

"(H) a description of the activities the State will undertake to—

"(i) provide incentives for recipients of assistance to pay home energy costs; and

"(ii) provide incentives for vendors to help reduce the energy burdens of recipients of assistance;

"(I) an assurance that the State will require each entity that receives a grant or enters into a contract under this section to solicit and be responsive to the views of individuals who are financially eligible for benefits and services under this section in establishing its local program;

"(J) a description of performance goals for the state R.E.A.Ch. initiative including—

"(i) a reduction in the energy costs on participating households over one or more fiscal years;

"(ii) an increase in the regularity of home energy bill payments by eligible households; and

"(iii) an increase in energy vendor contributions towards reducing energy burdens of eligible households;

"(K) a description of the indicators that will be used by the State to measure whether the performance goals have been achieved;

"(L) a demonstration that the plan is consistent with section 2603, paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) of section 2605(b), subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of section 2605, and section 2606 of this title;

"(M) an assurance that benefits and services will be provided in addition to other benefit payments and services provided under this title and in coordination with such benefit payments and services; and

"(N) an assurance that no regulated utility covered by the plan will be required to act in a manner that is inconsistent with applicable regulatory requirements.

"(g) COST OR FUNCTION.—None of the costs of providing services or benefits under this section shall be considered to be an administrative cost or function for purposes of any limitation on administrative costs or functions contained in this title.".

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS FOR LIHEAP.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Seventy-seven percent of the over 25 million households that were eligible for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (hereinafter referred to as "LIHEAP") in fiscal year 1992 did not receive assistance due to a lack of funds.

(2) Recent economic distress has caused significant unemployment, which has resulted in a greater need for energy assistance than ever before.

(3) More than 66 percent of LIHEAP household recipients have an annual income that is below the poverty level.

(4) Forty-three percent of all LIHEAP eligible households include children.

(5) LIHEAP eligible households with children spend approximately 16 percent of their annual incomes on home energy costs, which is more than 4 times greater than that paid by the average household in the United States, and far beyond their means.

(6) Approximately 40 percent of LIHEAP household recipients are comprised of elderly or disabled persons.

(7) Congress appropriated $1,475,000,000 for LIHEAP for fiscal year 1995.

(8) The Department of Energy predicts that the costs of residential fuels will increase at a pace greater than inflation.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the maintenance of LIHEAP should be a high priority in order to enable low-income households, especially the working poor, the disabled, and the low-income elderly, who all depend on LIHEAP, to meet their energy costs and needs;

(2) all appropriations made for LIHEAP for fiscal year 1995 should be expended; and

(3) expenditures for LIHEAP for fiscal year 1996 should ensure the provision of services at the level provided in fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 314. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments and repeals made by this title shall become effective on October 1, 1994.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 201. COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.

"(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to assist each State to develop and implement, or expand and enhance, a comprehensive, statewide system of family resource services through innovative funding mechanisms and collaboration with existing education, vocational rehabilitation, health, mental health, employment and training, child welfare, and other social services agencies within the State.

"(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall make grants to States on a formula basis for the purpose of—

"(1) establishing and expanding statewide networks of community-based family resource programs, including funds for the initial costs of providing specific family resource services, that ensure family involvement in the design and operation of family resource programs which are responsive to the unique and diverse strengths of children and families;

"(2) promoting child abuse and neglect prevention activities;

"(3) promoting the establishment and operation of State trust funds or other mechanisms for integrating child and family services funding streams in order to provide flexible funding for the development of community-based family resource programs;

"(4) establishing or expanding community-based collaboration to foster the development of a continuum of preventive services for children and families, which are family-centered and culturally competent;

"(5) encouraging public and private partnerships in the establishment and expansion of family resource programs; and

"(6) increasing and promoting interagency coordination among State agencies, and encouraging public and private partnerships in the establishment and expansion of family resource programs.

"(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—A State is eligible for a grant under this section for any fiscal year if—

"(1) such State has established or maintained in the previous fiscal year—

"(A) a trust fund, including appropriations for such fund; or

"(B) any other mechanism that pools State, Federal, and private funds for integrating child and family service resources; and

"(2) such trust fund or other funding mechanism includes (in whole or in part) provisions making funding available specifically for a broad range of child abuse and neglect prevention activities and family resource programs.

"(d) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated for a fiscal year to provide grants under this section shall be allotted to the designated lead agencies of eligible States in each fiscal year so that—

"(A) 50 percent of the total amount appropriated for such fiscal year is allotted among each State based on the number of children under the age of 18 residing in each State, except that each State shall receive not less than $100,000; and

"(B) the remaining 50 percent of the total amount appropriated for such fiscal year is allotted in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total amount allocated by each such State to the State's trust fund or other mechanism for integrating family resource services in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the allotment is being determined.

"(2) ALLOCATION.—Funds identified by the State for the purpose of qualifying for incentive funds under paragraph (1)(B) shall be allocated through the mechanism used to determine State eligibility under subsection (c) and shall be controlled by the lead agency described in subsection (f)(1).

"(e) EXISTING GRANTS.—A State or entity that has a grant in effect on the date of enactment of this section under the Family Resource and Support Program or the Emergency Child Abuse Prevention Grants Program shall continue to receive funds under such Programs, subject to the original terms under which such funds were granted, through the end of the applicable grant cycle.

"(f) APPLICATION.—No grant may be made to any eligible State under this section unless an application is prepared and submitted to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary determines to be essential to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section, including—

"(1) a description of the agency designated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State to administer the funds provided under this section and assume responsibility for implementation and oversight of the family resource programs and other child abuse and neglect prevention activities, and an assurance that the agency so designated—

"(A) is the trust fund advisory board, or an existing organization created by executive order or State statute that is not an existing State agency, that has interdisciplinary governance, including participants from communities, and that integrates family resource services and leverages State, Federal, and private funds for family resource programs; or

"(B) with respect to a State without a trust fund mechanism or other organization that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), is an existing State agency, or other public, quasi-public, or nonprofit private agency responsible for the development and implementation of a statewide network of community-based family resource programs;

"(2) assurances that the agency designated under paragraph (1) can demonstrate the capacity to fulfill the purposes described in subsection (a), and shall have—

"(A) a demonstrated ability to work with other State and community-based agencies, to provide training and technical assistance;

"(B) a commitment to parental participation in the design and implementation of family resource programs;

"(C) the capacity to promote a statewide system of family resource programs throughout the State; and

"(D) the capacity to exercise leadership in implementing effective strategies for capacity building, family and professional training, and access to, and funding for, family resource services across agencies;

"(3) an assurance that the State has an interagency process coordinated by the agency designated in paragraph (1) for effective program development that—

"(A) does not duplicate existing processes for developing collaborative efforts to better serve children and families;

"(B) provides a written strategic plan for the establishment of a network of family resource programs (publicly available and funded through public and private sources) that identifies specific measurable goals and objectives;

"(C) involves appropriate personnel in the process, including—

"(i) parents (including parents of children with disabilities) and prospective participants in family resource programs, including respite care programs;

"(ii) staff of existing programs providing family resource services, including staff of Head Start programs and community action agencies that provide such services;

"(iii) representatives of State and local government such as social service, health, mental health, education, vocational rehabilitation, employment, economic development agencies, and organizations providing community services activities;

"(iv) representatives of the business community;

"(v) representatives of general purpose local governments;

"(vi) representatives of groups with expertise in child abuse prevention, including respite and crisis care;

"(vii) representatives of local communities in which family resource programs are likely to be located;

"(viii) representatives of groups with expertise in providing services to children with disabilities; and

"(ix) other individuals with expertise in the services that the family resource programs of the State intend to offer; and

"(D) coordinates activities funded under this title with—

"(i) the State Interagency Coordinating Council, established under part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

"(ii) the advisory panel established under section 613(a)(12) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(12));

"(iii) the State Rehabilitation Advisory Council established under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;

"(iv) the State Development Disabilities Planning Council, established under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act;

"(v) the Head Start State Collaboration project;

"(vi) the State Advisory group designated in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974; and

"(vii) other local or regional family service councils within the State, to the extent that such councils exist;

"(4) an inventory and description of the current family resource programs operating in the State, the current unmet need for the services provided under such programs, including the need for building increased capacity to provide specific family resource services, including respite care, and the intended scope of the State family resource program, the population to be served, the manner in which the program will be operated, and the manner in which such program will relate to other community services and public agencies;

"(5) evidence that Federal assistance received under this section—

"(A) has been supplemented with nonFederal public and private assistance, including a description of the projected level of financial commitment by the State to develop a family resource network; and

"(B) will be used to supplement and not supplant other State and local public funds expended for family resource programs;

"(6) a description of the core services, as required by this section, and other support services to be provided by the program and the manner in which such services will be provided, including the extent to which either family resources, centers, home visiting, or community collaboratives will be used;

"(7) a description of any public information activities the agency designated in paragraph (1) will undertake for the purpose of promoting family stability and preventing child abuse and neglect, including child sexual abuse;

"(8) an assurance that the State will provide funds for the initial startup costs associated with specific family resource services, including respite services, and a description of the services to be funded;

"(9) assurances that the State program will maintain cultural diversity and be culturally competent;

"(10) a description of the guidelines for requiring parental involvement in State and local program development, policy design, and governance and the process for assessing and demonstrating that parental involvement in program development, operation, and governance occurs;

"(11) a description of the State and community-based interagency planning processes to be utilized to develop and implement family resource programs;

"(12) a description of the criteria that the State will utilize for awarding grants for local programs so that they meet the requirements of subsection (g);

"(13) a description of the outreach and other activities the program will undertake to maximize the participation of racial and ethnic minorities, persons with limited English proficiency, individuals with disabilities, and members of other underserved or underrepresented groups in all phases of the program;

"(14) a plan for providing training, technical assistance, and other assistance to local communities in program development and networking activities;

"(15) a description of the methods to be utilized to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the family resource programs within the State;

"(16) a description of proposed actions by the State that will facilitate the changing of laws, regulations, policies, practices, procedures, and organizational structures, that impede the availability or provision of family resource services; and

"(17) an assurance that the State will provide the Secretary with reports, at such time and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(g) LOCAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall use amounts received under such grant to establish local family resource programs that—

"(A) undertake a community-based needs assessment and program planning process which involves parents, and local public and nonprofit agencies (including those responsible for providing health, education, vocational rehabilitation, employment training, Head Start and other early childhood, child welfare, and social services);

"(B) develop a strategy to provide comprehensive services to families to meet identified needs through collaboration, including public-private partnerships;

"(C) identify appropriate community-based organizations to administer such programs locally;

"(D) provide core services, and other services directly or through contracts or agreements with other local agencies;

"(E) involve parents in the development, operation, and governance of the program; and

"(F) participate in the development and maintenance of a statewide network of family resource programs.

"(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding local grants under this section, a State shall give priority to programs serving low-income communities and programs serving young parents or parents with young children and shall ensure that such grants are equitably distributed among urban and rural areas.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

"(1) CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.—The term 'children with disabilities' has the meaning given such term in section 602(a)(2) of Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.

"(2) COMMUNITY REFERRAL SERVICES.—The term 'community referral services' means services to assist families in obtaining community resources, including respite services, health and mental health services, employability development and job training and other social services.

"(3) CULTURALLY COMPETENT.—The term 'culturally competent' means services, supports, or other assistance that is conducted or provided in a manner that—

"(A) is responsive to the beliefs, interpersonal styles, attitudes, languages, and behaviors of those individuals receiving services; and

"(B) has the greatest likelihood of ensuring maximum participation of such individuals.

"(4) FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAM.—The term 'family resource program' means a program that offers community-based services that provide sustained assistance and support to families at various stages in their development. Such services shall promote parental competencies and behaviors that will lead to the healthy and positive personal development of parents and children through—

"(A) the provisions of assistance to build family skills and assist parents in improving their capacities to be supportive and nurturing parents;

"(B) the provision of assistance to families to enable such families to use other formal and informal resources and opportunities for assistance that are available within the communities of such families; and

"(C) the creation of supportive networks to enhance the childrearing capacity of parents and assist in compensating for the increased social isolation and vulnerability of families.

"(5) FAMILY RESOURCE SERVICES.—The term 'family resource services' means—

"(A) core services that must be provided directly by the family resource program under this section, including—

"(i) education and support services provided to assist parents in acquiring parenting skills, learning about child development, and responding appropriately to the behavior of their children;

"(ii) early developmental screening of children to assess the needs of such children and to identify the types of support to be provided;

"(iii) outreach services;

"(iv) community referral services; and

"(v) follow-up services; and

"(B) other services, which may be provided either directly or through referral, including—

"(i) early care and education (such as child care and Head Start);

"(ii) respite services;

"(iii) job readiness and counseling services (including skill training);

"(iv) education and literacy services;

"(v) nutritional education;

"(vi) life management skills training;

"(vii) peer counseling and crisis intervention, and family violence counseling services;

"(viii) referral for health (including prenatal care) and mental health services;

"(ix) substance abuse treatment; and

"(x) services to support families of children with disabilities that are designed to prevent inappropriate out-of-the-home placement and maintain family unity.

"(6) INTERDISCIPLINARY GOVERNANCE.—The term 'interdisciplinary governance' includes governance by representatives from communities and representatives from existing health, mental

health, education, vocational rehabilitation, employment and training, child welfare, and other agencies within the State.

"(7) OUTREACH SERVICES.—The term 'outreach services' means services provided to ensure (through home visits or other methods) that parents and other caretakers are aware of and able to participate in family resource program activities.

"(8) RESPITE SERVICES.—The term 'respite services' means short-term care services provided in the temporary absence of the regular caregiver (parent, other relative, foster parent, adoptive parent, guardian) to children who meet one or more of the following categories:

"(A) The children are in danger of abuse or neglect.

"(B) The children have experienced abuse or neglect.

"(C) The children have disabilities, or chronic or terminal illnesses.

Services provided within or outside the child's home shall be short-term care, ranging from a few hours to a few weeks of time, per year, and be intended to enable the family to stay together and to keep the child living in the child's home and community.

"(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

(b) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—

(1) FAMILY RESOURCE AND SUPPORT GRANTS.—Section 933 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12339) is repealed.

(2) EMERGENCY CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION SERVICES GRANTS.—Sec. 107A of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a-1) is repealed.

SEC. 402. FEDERAL COUNCIL ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 918 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12314) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) identify program regulations, practices, and eligibility requirements that impede coordination and collaboration and make recommendations for their modifications or elimination; and

"(7) develop recommendations for creating jointly funded programs, unified assessments, eligibility, and application procedures, and confidentiality protections that facilitate information sharing.";

(2) in subsection (o), by striking "1991 through 1994" and inserting "1995 through 1998"; and

(3) in subsection (p), by striking "1995" and inserting "1998".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 934 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12340) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), to read as follows:

"(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out sections 931 and 932 such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 403. FAMILY RESOURCE ACT.

(a) NATIONAL CENTER.—Section 958(b)(3) of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12353(b)(3)) is amended by strike "model".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 960 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12355) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "$2,300,000" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "$700,000" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998.".

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

WILLIAM D. FORD,
M.G. MARTINEZ,
DALE E. KILDEE,
MAJOR R. OWENS,
ROBERT E. ANDREWS,
BOBBY SCOTT,
LYNN C. WOOLSEY,
CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ,
SCOTTY BAESLER,
BILL GOODLING,
SUSAN MOLINARI,
BILL BARRETT,
MIKE CASTLE,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title III of the Senate bill, and title III of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JOHN D. DINGELL,
PHIL SHARP,
EDWARD J. MARKEY,
RICHARD LEHMAN,
MIKE KREIDLER,
CARLOS J. MOORHEAD,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TED KENNEDY,
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM,
JIM JEFFORDS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2000) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

TITLE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment cites the Act as the "Human services Amendments of 1994."

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes a table of Contents for the Act.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with amendments as appropriate to reflect the conference substitute.

TITLE I—HEAD START

DEFINITION OF POVERTY LINE

Senate bill.—Amends the current law definition of "poverty line" to reference the Community Services Block Grant Act definition.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to clarify that the current poverty line definition shall be adjusted for family size. The conference substitute included technical amendments resulting from the amendment to the poverty line definition.

DEFINITION OF MOBILE HEAD START PROGRAM

The Conferees have included in the conference substitute a definition of "mobile Head Start program." The Conferees also with to clarify that such mobile Head Start programs shall be required to comply with performance standards related to provision of educational, social and other services such as apply to home-based Head Start programs. Although mobile Head Start programs shall not be held to the facilities-related performance standards which apply to center-based models, it is the intent of the Conferees that mobile Head Start programs shall operate in safe and secure areas.

DEFINITION OF FAMILY LITERACY SERVICES

Senate bill.—The bill includes an illustrative list of activities in the definition of family literacy services.

House amendment.—The House amendment limits the definition of "family literacy services" to specified activities, and references training in English as a second language activities as one of the parent literacy activities.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

DEFINITIONS OF LEA, IMIGRANT HEAD START, AND SEA

Senate bill.—The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes definitions of "local education agency," "Imigrant Head Start program," and "State educational agency."

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to strike the "State educational agency" definition.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to enhance program quality and expand Head Start services to all eligible children, as consistent with the funding levels authorized in 1990. The Conferees note that while the authorization level for the current fiscal year is $7.66 billion, the authorization level of "such sums" provides the Congress with the flexibility of making substantial progress towards the goal of reaching every eligible child while taking into consideration new initiatives and current fiscal constraints.

The conference substitute is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1995 budget

request for Head Start, including a projected annual increase of $700 million for each of the next four fiscal years. The Conferees applaud the Administration's commitment to the Head Start program and reaffirm their commitment to serving all eligible families who seek service with due consideration of assisting underserved communities and maintaining a high level of quality in all Head Start programs.

The conference substitute also authorizes the use of not more than $3 million for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary through fiscal year 1998 for longitudinal studies.

USES OF QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill outlines the permissible uses of quality improvement funds.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes a provision that staff training shall include training in working with children of a non-English language background.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

ALLOCATION OF QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill provides for the allocation of quality improvement funds among states.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes a technical amendment to include territories in the allocation of quality improvement funds.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

RANGE OF COLLABORATION GRANT ACTIVITIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill funds a broad range of Head Start collaboration activities with state-wide organizations and initiatives designed to "target" low-income children and families.

House amendment.—The House amendment funds only collaboration activities between Head Start and State governments which are "designed to benefit" low-income children and families.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to fund a broad range of activities "which are 'designed to benefit' low-income" children and families. The Conferees believe that the limited resources available for these collaboration grants will be maximized by allowing the Head Start liaison to coordinate with state-wide initiatives that give the collaboration the broadest reach.

AGENCIES INVOLVED IN COLLABORATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill describes the activities to be undertaken by the collaboration liaison.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes State and local educational agencies as entities with whom the States must liaison under the collaboration grant program.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to include local education agencies in the list of agencies to participate in collaboration through these grants. The conference substitute also includes an amendment to the collaboration grant language to provide for collaboration with family literacy services providers.

CRITERIA FOR AWARD OF EXPANSION FUNDS

Senate bill.—the Senate bill requires HHS to take into consideration the extent of an applicant's consultation with a range of other agencies and other criteria when awarding expansion funds.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds consultation with State agencies administering early childhood programs, references to ESL organizations, and consideration of the need for full day, full year services to the Senate list.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to include organizations serving families in non-English language homes, consultation with the local affiliates of appropriate State agencies, and the extent to which the appplicant's family and community needs assessment reflects a need for full day and full year services in the Senate list.

The Conferees are aware of situations in which agencies have been designated as Head Start sponsors in communities that are outside the area in which the Head Start sponsor agency is located. The Conferees ask the Secretary to identify situations in which replacement grantees are operating Head Start programs in adjacent communities and to examine whether the existing arrangements serve the best interests of the communities involved and of the Head Start program. The Conferees ask HHS to examine the feasibility of negotiating changes in existing sponsorship arrangements where such arrangements are not meeting the needs of children and families.

FLEXIBILITY IN MEETING MINIMUM HOUR OF OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains a provision requiring HHS to allow grantees flexibility in meeting minimum Head Start hours of operation requirements.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that the flexibility granted shall not reduce the minimum hours of service per day, days of service per week, or days of service per year.

PRIORITY TO MIGRANT GRANTEES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires HHS to give priority to migrant grantees that serve children in families that must relocate most frequently in awarding funding to Migrant Head Start grantees.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

DESIGNATION OF INDIAN HEAD START SERVICE AREA

Senate bill.—The Senate bill includes members of Indian tribes living near the reservation in the population to be served by Indian Head Start grantees.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes Indians in any area designated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as near-reservation in the population to be served by Indian Head Start grantees.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

CONSIDERATIONS IN DESIGNATING NEW HEAD START AGENCIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the criteria which must be taken into consideration by HHS when designating new Head Start agencies.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes Even Start programs as one of the programs that prospective grantees would be expected to coordinate with in order to receive designation as a Head Start agency.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR FAMILY LITERACY SERVICE REFERRALS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill includes Even Start programs as entities to which families may be referred to receive family literacy services and skills training.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds public and school libraries as entities to which families may be referred to receive family literacy services and skills training.

Conference agreement.—the Senate recedes with an amendment to include family resource programs as entities to which families may be referred for the specified services.

In order to avoid duplication of services and maximize the use of limited resources, Head Start agencies are strongly encouraged to develop formal collaborations, linkages, and other forms of coordination with existing education and training agencies, including those funded under the Job Training Partnership Act.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION AS A NEW HEAD START GRANTEE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the criteria which must be taken into consideration by HHS when designating new Head Start agencies.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds training in nonpunitive discipline techniques, training in basic child development, development of communication skills, opportunities for parents to share experiences, and activities designed to help parents understand the importance of their involvement in their children's education to the list of activities that HHS would have to consider in selecting grantees.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment that creates the following list of activities which HHS must consider in selecting grantees: training in basic child development, assistance in developing communication skills, opportunities for parents to share experiences with other parents, substance abuse counseling, and activities designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children.

SERVICES TO NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE CHILDREN

Senate bill.—The Senate bill retains the current law elements of designees' plans with respect to services to non-English language children.

House amendment.—The House amendment expands the scope of plans required to include non-English language background children and their families.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

QUALITY STANDARDS; MONITORING OF HEAD START AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the programmatic and administrative areas for which HHS must develop quality standards within one year of enactment.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes transition to elementary school, record keeping and file maintenance as areas for which HHS must develop quality standards.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to include performance standards pertaining to the transition activities referenced in section 642(d) of the Act.

The conference substitute includes transition-to-elementary school among the areas for which the Secretary is to establish quality standards. The quality standards should describe the types of activities (e.g., transfer of records to elementary schools, parent-child orientation activities, etc.) which all Head Start programs are expected to implement.

The Conferees wish to emphasize that these standards are not intended to include

academic requirements. These standards should only address those activities for which Head Start agencies are reasonably responsible, and should seek to hold Head Start programs accountable only for the activities which are within their control. The Conferees believe that coordination and cooperation with public schools is a critically important aspect of transition, but recognize that Head Start programs are limited in their abilities to carry out transition activities without the full support and cooperation of the local public school system.

The Conferees would also like to direct the Secretary's attention to the questions of record keeping and file maintenance practices identified in the Inspector General's report. Appropriate performance standards addressing these issues should be developed.

DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY STANDARDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the programmatic and administrative areas for which HHS must develop quality standards within one year of enactment.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes services to families with very young children in the list of performance standards to be developed.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

The Conferees wish to note that performance standards guiding the provision of services to families with very young children will be developed by December 30, 1994 as part of the 0–3 initiative and expect that Head Start programs serving families with very young children will be guided by those standards.

CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill describes the range of experts with whom HHS must consult in developing quality standards.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes child health experts and clarifies that experts in the field of family services also includes experts in providing family services for non-English language children and families.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that knowledge of linguistically and culturally appropriate services shall be among the areas of expertise to be drawn upon in developing standards.

The Conferees wish to emphasize the importance of assisting non-English language families in becoming literate in English. However, this is not intended to prevent programs from utilizing a bilingual approach or from assisting the large number of Hispanic families who receive services under this Act in becoming literate in Spanish, nor to prevent efforts by Indian or Native Alaskan or Hawaiian programs to promote literacy in indigenous languages.

CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING QUALITY STANDARDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the factors which should be taken into consideration in developing new quality standards.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes guidelines and standards to promote child health services, changes in the population of eligible children, and the need for local policies and activities to promote transition in the list of factors to be taken into consideration.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

HEAD START MONITORING PROCESS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill clarifies the process of monitoring Head Start grantees.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires monitoring reviews to be conducted by HHS employees who are knowledgeable about the diverse (including linguistic and cultural) needs of eligible children and families.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that each monitoring team should include members who are not only knowledgeable about the Head Start program but are also knowledgeable about the diverse (including linguistic and cultural) needs of eligible children and families.

PUBLICATION OF MONITORING SUMMARY REPORTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires the Secretary to publish annually a summary report of the outcomes of triennial grantee reviews.

House amendment.—The House amendment sets an annual time frame of 90 days within which the Secretary is to issue the summary.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to extend the deadline to 120 days.

ENHANCED PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND TRANSITION COORDINATION WITH SCHOOLS

The Conferees agreed that Section 109 of the Senate bill shall be referred to as "Enhanced Parent Involvement and Transition Coordination with Schools."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Senate bill.—The Senate bill incorporates amendments on transition and parent involvement into an existing section in the Head Start Act.

House amendment.—The House amendment rewrites a section of the Act to incorporate amendments on transition and parent involvement.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details parent involvement activities that are to be provided by Head Start programs.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes additional parent involvement activities to be provided that are not included in the Senate bill. It would require grantees to establish procedures for participation in program decisions, provision of technical and other support to help them secure assistance, establishment of procedures to seek reimbursement from other agencies for services that Head Start provides, and to provide or consider providing other services. The House amendment also makes references to training in nonpunitive discipline techniques and other training.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to include a list of parent involvement services similar to that in the section on plans for parent involvement taken into account in designating new Head Start grantees.

TRANSFER OF RECORDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires Head Start programs to transfer essential records to each child's elementary school upon graduation from Head Start.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires parental consent in transferring Head Start records to schools.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

TRANSITION ACTIVITIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill details the list of required transition activities.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes in its coordination requirements provisions that Head Start agencies coordinate the provision of transportation and use of facilities and the provision of non-educational services to children at the request of the local educational agency.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that Head Start programs and local education agencies may work together to coordinate transportation and use of facilities and exchange information regarding the provision of non-educational services to children.

TRANSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires HHS to assess the results of the Head Start transition program.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires HHS to evaluate the effectiveness of the transition program, and to disseminate the evaluation information and other information on effective transition activities, and to provide technical assistance to Head Start grantees to adopt and implement effective transition practices.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill allows Head Start grantees in low-income communities to construct facilities if there are no other facilities available, if the lack of facilities will inhibit the operation of the program, and if construction is more cost effective than purchase of available facilities. The bill also permits Head Start grantees to make capital expenditures (including amortizing the principal and paying the interest on loans) for construction of facilities, major renovation of facilities, and purchase of vehicles used for programs located at Head Start facilities.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

PARTICIPATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill allows Head Start to serve children for more than one year.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to clarify that Head Start programs may serve children from age 3 to compulsory school age for more than one year.

PROGRAMS FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill describes the new 0–3 initiative.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires infant and toddler programs to coordinate services with programs including transition to school programs and local educational agency programs.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

The Conferees wish to express their intent that Head Start 0–3 programs collaborate with appropriate local service providers, including Part H and other programs, as needed to ensure the provision of a comprehensive array of health, mental health, and social services.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill describes the range of programs whose experiences must be taken into consideration in developing guidelines for the new infant and toddler program.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires that consideration also be given to the knowledge and experience gained from migrant Head Start programs that serve a large number of infants and toddlers.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

REPEALS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment repeals conforming references in Part E of title II of the Elementary and Secondary School Amendments of 1988, Subchapter F of chapter 8 of subtitle A of title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, and contains a conforming amendment to section 638 of the Head Start Act.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

The Conferees intend to give the Secretary and the 0–3 working group latitude to design appropriate models for the 0–3 initiative. Therefore, the Congress has not statutorily delineated specific funding cycles or monitoring provisions of 0–3 grant recipients. It is the intent of the Congress that existing CCDP and PCC programs be grandfathered as part of the 0–3 initiative through 1997, and that, beginning in 1998, these grantees shall be treated in a manner which is consistent with the status of the other 0–3 grantees.

APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

The conference substitute includes technical amendments to clarify that the administrative hearing described as part of the mediation process for settling disputes between grantees and their policy councils or directors is to be held only in the case of adverse actions resulting from unresolved disputes.

GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill lists the goals and priorities for training and technical assistance.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds assisting programs in developing full day and full year programs, assisting programs in better serving the needs of families with very young children, and giving special consideration to entities that have demonstrated effectiveness in educational programming for preschool children that includes components for parental involvement and care provider training to the Senate list.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that Head Start agencies should be assisted with developing full day and full year programming where a community need for such services has been clearly identified. With respect to the provision of training and technical assistance for the Migrant Head Start agencies, special consideration shall be given to entities which have a demonstrated experience and understanding of the unique needs of the migrant and seasonal farmworker population and the necessity for a specialized service delivery approach.

The Conferees recognize that community-based service providers and certain federal agencies have specialized expertise in areas that are essential for Head Start agencies if they are to effectively include children with severe disabilities in their programs. The Conferees expect that Head Start agencies will actively seek technical assistance necessary to serve children with disabilities from a variety of resources, and that such technical assistance will not be guided solely by any one agency, organization, or activity.

The conference substitute also includes amendments to the training and technical assistance section to allow provision of training and technical assistance to grantees in developing innovative Head Start models such as home based and mobile programs.

STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

Senate bill.—The Senate bill lists the programs which should be given priority in establishing mentor teacher positions.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds a priority for grantees who lack staff able to communicate in the languages of the children enrolled when establishing mentor teacher positions.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that programs which lack staff of a similar cultural background to participating children shall be included among the delineated priorities.

MODEL CURRICULA FOR MENTOR TEACHERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires HHS to promote the development of a model curricula for mentor teachers.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to clarify that the curricula shall be developed to ensure the attainment of appropriate competencies by mentor teachers in the Head Start program. The Conferees wish to note that HHS should build on existing mentor teacher programs and curricula in the development of its model curricula for Head Start, but that the curricula developed for Head Start should take into consideration the unique aspects of Head Start services and performance standards.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The Conferees wish to clarify that Section 648A identifies four different ways to meet the degree requirements for classroom teachers. Each is intended as an alternative to the others. Therefore, although both options B and D identify a state-awarded certificate, they should not be considered to be identical. Option B specifies a state-awarded certificate which is intended to cover individuals possessing state teacher certification covering instruction of preschool-aged children. Option D is intended to cover individuals who possess a degree in a related field but which incorporates coursework covering the growth, development and education of preschool aged children.

The conference substitute includes amendments to the demonstration program language to suggest that demonstrations be designed to include innovative non-center-based program models such as home based and mobile Head Start programs.

REPORTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires HHS to conduct a study of the availability and delivery of Head Start services to Indian children and children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to study Head Start services to Indian children, the children of Alaska natives, and children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

The Conferees wish to point out the unique needs of programs serving Indian, Native Alaskan, and migrant and seasonal farmworker children and families. Many are extremely rural programs with transportation and other costs which are disproportionately high. Nearly 40% of the children served by Migrant Head Start programs are infants and toddlers, yet the Head Start programs are given the same per-child funding for young children as they receive to provide services to four year olds. No reliable information about the number of children eligible for Migrant Head Start services is available. These funding constraints and special circumstances have a direct impact on quality of services provided. The Conferees direct the Secretary to examine the Head Start services provided to Indian, Native Alaskan, and migrant and seasonal farmworker children in light of these concerns.

STUDY OF BENEFITS FOR HEAD START EMPLOYEES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires HHS to study the feasibility of providing Head Start employee benefits through the federal retirement system.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY OF HEAD START PARTICIPANTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill makes Head Start income-eligible enrollees automatically eligible for meals under the child care food program.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

The Conferees are concerned by the burden placed on Head Start programs by the need to establish eligibility for the child care food programs for Head Start-eligible children. Although Head Start-eligible children are income eligible for child care food programs, Head Start spends as much as $15,000 per year per program paying staff to fill out the paperwork required to establish eligibility. Because the Conferees do not have the authority to address the "pay-go" entitlement spending issues raised by the automatic eligibility provision in the Senate bill, the Conferees have agreed not to address this issue in this legislation at this time. The Conferees urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture to work together to accomplish this goal, to the extent possible, through regulatory changes, and urge the appropriate Committees to address this problem in the context of the reauthorization of other child nutrition programs.

READY TO LEARN PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill reauthorizes the Ready to Learn program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment reauthorizing the Ready to Learn program through fiscal year 1998, but transferring the program authority to the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA).

STUDY OF FULL-DAY AND FULL-YEAR HEAD START PROGRAMS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study of the need for full-day and full-year Head Start services.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment clarifying the

scope of the study and requiring the submission of a report containing the results of the study not later than January 1997.

The Conferees also wish to direct the Secretary to encourage the development and testing of innovative, locally designed options to extend the hours of service to meet local needs. Options may include collaboration with child care and other child and family service programs where such collaborations maintain the quality and integrity of services provided under the Head Start performance standards. Where administrative rules and regulations are a barrier to effectively combining funds from different federal program sources, a timely mechanism for requesting and granting waivers should be put into place.

CONSULTATION WITH THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires the Secretary of HHS to consult with the CEO of the Corporation for National and Community Service regarding the dissemination of information about the Corporation's programs.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Senate bill.—The Senate bill repeals the Demonstration Partnership Agreements, under section 408 of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986.

House amendment.—The House amendment extends the authorization for this program through fiscal year 1998, and adds a set-aside for grants supporting programs that target at-risk youth.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes to the House with an amendment modifying the at-risk youth set-aside.

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill sets aside not less than one-half of one percent and not more than 1 percent of the appropriation for training and technical assistance, but does not define the activities to be funded.

House amendment.—The House amendment specifies a process for determining the technical assistance and training activities that would be conducted, and establishes requirements that the Secretary would follow in allocating resources for technical assistance and training.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment identifying eligible entities for funding to carry out the training and technical assistance activities.

TRIPARTITE BOARD

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires that the Board be selected by the Community Action Agency or non-profit organization.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

REGULATIONS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires the Secretary to issue regulations governing the manner in which states comply with the title.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment. It is the intent of the managers that this change allow the Secretary only to prescribe procedures for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of eligible entities in carrying out the purposes of the program. Such procedures may include the collection of data and such other information as may be necessary to satisfy that goal.

EVALUATION INVOLVING WAIVERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment would amend the current law requirement that the Comptroller General periodically evaluate program expenditures by States, to specifically include States which have received waivers under P.L. 98–139.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill includes grants for innovative anit-poverty approaches in the Secretary's discretionary fund.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill adds as an authorized use of the Secretary's discretionary fund grants to support the design, development and widespread availability of interactive information technology among eligible entities.

House amendment.—The House amendment has no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill would include management of low-income housing and community development projects as a principal purpose of the governing board of an eligible community development corporation.

House amendment.—The House amendment would include management of community development projects, but would not include management of low-income housing.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment clarifying that the eligible entities are those with experience and expertise in developing and managing low-income housing or development projects.

COMMUNITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill would reserve no more than one percent of Community Initiative Program funds for training and technical assistance.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

MIGRANTS AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill eliminates the migrant and seasonal farmworkers program from the Secretary's discretionary fund, and instead requires each State to address the needs of this population through its regular community services program.

House amendment.—The House amendment maintains in the discretionary fund grant to nonprofit private organizations that serve migrants and seasonal farm workers as eligible rural community development activities.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

Because of the unique problems associated with providing assistance to migrant and seasonal farmworkers, these programs shall be centrally administered from the national level. No programs and activities supported under this section shall preclude assistance to farmworkers under any other provision of this Act.

NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill eliminates the National Youth Sport Program from the Secretary's discretionary fund.

House amendment.—The House amendment would remove this program from discretionary fund and authorize it at $15 million in each of fiscal years 1995–1998 for national or regional programs designed to provide instructional activities for low-income youth.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment would extend the authorization of appropriations for the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act Emergency Community Services Homeless Grant Program for fiscal years 1995–1998.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

TITLE III.—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill places the primary emphasis of the program on meeting the immediate home energy needs of those with low incomes and high relative energy burdens, with a secondary emphasis on reducing the energy needs and costs of such households.

House amendment.—The House amendment places an equal emphasis on the two purposes.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment striking the secondary purpose, leaving the primary purpose of meeting the immediate home energy needs of low-income households. The Conferees believe that activities to reduce home energy needs and costs can be a useful supplement to basic benefits. They note, however, that the decline in funding for the LIHEAP program over the past nine years as well as the continued high percentage of income spent by low-income households on residential energy and understand the need for basic benefits. The Conferees believe that, in a time of scarce resources, every possible dollar should be spent on helping households meet their energy bills.

AUTHORIZATION LEVEL

Senate bill.—The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of $2,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

House amendment.—The House amendment authorizes $2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary fiscal years 1996 through 1999.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

HIGHEST HOME ENERGY NEEDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill defines "highest home energy needs" in the statute to include households with very young children and the frail elderly.

House amendment.—The House amendment defines "highest home energy needs" with slightly different language and includes individuals with disabilities among vulnerable populations.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

EMERGENCY NOTIFICATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires the Secretary of HHS to notify Congress of a proposed allotment under the Emergency Fund provision before the release of such funds.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to strike the word "proposed" in the conference agreement.

EMERGENCY ALLOCATION

The Conferees note that in allocating funds under this section it is the responsibility of the Secretary of HHS to assure that any formula for allocation of funds is based on information obtained in a manner which is consistent from state to state. If information as to weather conditions or other emergency conditions is derived from other agencies, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, ascertain and make available to the public the methodology by which such information or data was generated.

AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill in its statement of the authorized use of funds targets households with high relative energy burdens.

House amendment.—The House amendment targets funds to those with the lowest incomes that have a high relative energy burden.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

ENCOURAGED REDUCED HOME ENERGY NEEDS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill subjects the activities described in a new paragraph (16) of section 2650(b), which are intended to encourage and enable households to reduce their home energy needs, to the program's 10 percent administrative cost cap as defined in paragraph 9(A). It would also allow for the use of other federal funds to pay for such activities.

House amendment.—The House amendment does not subject the activities described in paragraph (16) to the administrative cost ceiling, and contains no provision comparable to the Senate's provision regarding the permitted use of other federal funds.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment limiting the amount that may be spent on such activities to 5 percent of a State's total allocation. The House recedes to the provision to allow the use of other Federal funds for these activities. In addition, States using the option in assurance 16 must report to the Secretary on the impact of such activities on the number of households served, the level of direct benefits provided to those households, and the number of households that remain unserved. The Conference substitute also includes language included in both bills to encourage States to work with vendors to reach agreements that recognize the benefits the vendors receive from LIHEAP payment assistance on behalf of their clients. The Conferees believe such efforts should be particularly directed at unregulated vendors. The Conferees emphasize that these provisions are not meant to infringe on a State's regulatory authority or process regarding residential energy providers. The Conferees intend that no regulated utility covered by the plan shall be required to act in a manner inconsistent with applicable regulatory requirements.

REMOVAL OF CONSTRAINT ON SECRETARIAL PROGRAM GUIDANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill removes the clause that prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from prescribing the manner in which States comply with program provisions.

House amendment.—The House amendment does not have a comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND MEASURES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop, in consultation with State, local, and tribal grantees, performance goals and measurements that grantees may use to assess their success in achieving the purposes of the program. The Secretary shall report to Congress on the manner in which grantees are achieving these program goals.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes to the House with an amendment. The Conference substitute requires the Secretary to develop model performance goals that states may use at their discretion. The Conferees see these model performance goals as an optional tool for states. They are not mandatory and should not be a burden on the states.

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Conferees recommend a change in the set-aside for training and technical assistance to state, local and tribal agencies. Given the fluctuations in the appropriations for the program and the significant effect that recent natural disasters have had on program delivery, agencies have expressed a need for more training and technical assistance. However, given the downward trend in funding LIHEAP, this provision ensures that no greater portion of the appropriation is applied to training and technical assistance than is necessary, so that agencies can be trained and guided in the most effective ways of dealing with shrinking program funding, the best way to "do more with less."

The Conferees also recommend that the services provided through the National Center for Appropriate Technology and others be expanded, to the extent practicable, to meet current demand and to address the technical assistance needs of states, local and tribal grantees in making modifications to their programs so as to provide more effective long-term solutions to the problems faced by recipients or program funds and services. The expenditures for conferences and other costly meetings should be considered a second level priority in this set aside and should only be considered when such expenditures will not diminish the provision of services to program recipients or the provision of direct technical assistance to grantees.

R.E.A.CH. INITIATIVE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment establishes a new initiative, the Residential Energy Assistance Challenge (R.E.A.Ch.), and directs the Secretary to set aside, beginning in fiscal year 1996, an amount equal to at least 5 percent of the amount appropriated under section 2607A (the Leveraging Incentive Program) for the purpose of making challenge grants to States that qualify. States may use such grants to achieve performance goals, including the long-term reduction of the energy burden program dependency of households eligible for, or receiving energy assistance, to minimize health and safety risks that result from high energy burdens on low-income Americans, to prevent homelessness as a result of energy usage by low-income families, and for other purposes.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to allow up to 25 percent of the Leveraging Incentive program funds for the R.E.A.Ch. program and demonstrations. An incentive fund will be distributed by the Secretary to qualifying programs to encourage and reduce the costs of, innovation. The Secretary is encouraged to use program guidance, rather than regulations, but is authorized for this program only, to disapprove applications for R.E.A.Ch. funds on the basis of such guidance. The Conferees seek to make clear that R.E.A.Ch. services to eligible LIHEAP recipients are provided in addition to regular LIHEAP benefits received by households participating in the program.

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON APPROPRIATIONS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment expresses the sense of Congress that all appropriations made for LIHEAP for fiscal year 1995 be expended in fiscal year 1995, and that appropriations for fiscal year 1996 be at or above the fiscal year 1995 level.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes to the House with an amendment stating that expenditures for LIHEAP for FY 1996 should ensure the provision of services at the level provided in FY 1995.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

STATUTE AMENDED

Senate bill.—The Senate bill amends Section 933 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act.

House amendment.—The House amendment creates a new Community-based Family Support and Family Resource Program and titles the section the "Family Resource and Support Act of 1994".

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to amend Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and replace it with a new Community-Based Family Resource Program.

PURPOSES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill states that the purpose of the program is to develop a systematic approach to prevention and promote innovative funding mechanisms.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes developing a "family centered and family directed" comprehensive system in collaboration with existing State agencies.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to incorporate promotion of innovative funding mechanisms as a purpose of the program.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

Senate bill.—The Senate bill refers to both the "Secretary" and the "Commissioner" as the responsible official in setting out the authority to make grants.

House amendment.—The House amendment refers to the "Commissioner".

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to replace "Commissioner" with "Secretary".

ALLOWABLE PURPOSES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes as an allowable State purpose ensuring the involvement of families of children with disabilities in planning statewide systems.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

PROGRAM REFERENCES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill refers throughout the title to "family resource program".

House amendment.—The House amendment refers to "family support and family resource program".

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

TECHNICAL DIFFERENCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires services to be culturally relevant.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires services to be culturally competent.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes as a State activity increasing and promoting interagency coordination.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with a technical amendment.

REMOVING STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BARRIERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill does not address efforts to change statutory and regulatory barriers to the integration of services in the authorized activities, but does include them in the State application section.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes as a State activity changing laws, regulations, procedures and organizational structures which impede the provision of family support.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to the relevant paragraph in the application section.

MINIMUM GRANT SIZE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires that each State receive a minimum grant of $100,000.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires that each State receive a minimum of $1 million.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to clarify that the funds must go to the designated lead agency and to define the leveraged funds that a State may use to qualify for incentive grants. These funds must flow through the mechanism used by the state to establish eligibility for this program and they must be under the control of the lead agency. The Conferees believe the mechanism for integrating funds is the key to the family resource program's ability to be a catalyst for systems change. The Conferees hope that States will channel funds from various federal and State sources through his mechanism, that will in turn channel the funds to the local level to give flexibility in the way families are served. The formula is therefore designed to reward States' efforts to pool or integrate funds.

NATURE OF GRANTS AWARDED

Senate bill.—The Senate bill awards all grants to eligible States through a formula based on the number of children under age 18 in a State and the amount of other funds the State is able to leverage, with a minimum grant size of $100,000.

House amendment.—The House amendment allows grants to be awarded competitively if less than $50.4 million is appropriated in any given fiscal year with no grantee receiving less than $1 million. These competitive grants would be awarded for a 3 year period and each territory approved would received not less than $100,000.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

TREATMENT OF EXISTING GRANTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill allows grantees under the existing Family Resource and Support program and the Temporary Child Care and Crisis Nurseries Program to continue to receive funds under until the end of their grant cycle.

House amendment.—The House amendment allows grantees under the Family Resource and Support Program to continue to receive funds until the end of their grant cycle.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment deleting the Temporary Child Care and Crisis Nurseries Program and adding the Emergency Child Abuse Prevention Grants.

LEAD AGENCY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill states that the first choice for the State lead agency is the trust fund advisory board or a quasi-public organization with interdisciplinary governance.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains similar language with technical differences.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to clarify that such an organization does not have to be quasi-public, but does need to be created by either legislation or State statue. The Conferees are aware that in some States the advisory board of the Children's Trust Fund is already supporting family resource programs and would be in an excellent position to guide the development of a network. In other States, however, other interdisciplinary groups, such as a Children's Cabinet, also may be involved in these activities. Some States may have more than one entity that could fill the lead agency role. The Conferees stress that the purpose of this legislation is to encourage more coordination and urge States with several appropriate bodies to move toward integrating their roles in helping build a family resource network. The managers are aware that, in some States individual State agencies currently have responsibility for family resource programs and believe this is appropriate in some cases, as the legislation provides. However, the Managers encourage these States to move toward interdisciplinary governance, including the existing State agency.

The conferees believe effective service integration and systems change can only come from the involvement of a cross-section of agencies, organizations, and individual families in planning and operating these programs. The Conferees are particularly concerned that family resource programs be seen as preventive and family directed and not be closely associated with the formal child welfare system or agencies, or subsidiaries of such agencies. Such an association may deter parents from seeking out the family resource program and interfere with the supportive atmosphere that is its objective.

CAPACITY OF LEAD AGENCY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires applications to assure that the designated lead State agency have the capacity to promote a statewide system of family support; and to exercise leadership in capacity building, training and access to and funding for family support services.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with a technical amendment.

COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill places all coordination requirements in the planning process with the lead agency to develop the family resource program.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires the State to assure that the lead entity will coordinate its activities with those of other State councils including those under established under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act and local family support councils. It requires the State also to assure that the lead agency coordinate with the above councils in developing a comprehensive statewide system of family support and family resources services.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment adding these councils and others, including the Head Start collaboration projects, to the interagency coordinating process required of the lead agency. The House recedes on the assurance.

STRATEGIC PLANS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires the lead agency to develop a plan for establishing a network of family resource programs.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains similar language with technical differences.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment requiring a strategic plan that identifies specific measurable goals and objectives. In developing this strategic plan, the Conferees expect States to take appropriate steps to involve a wide cross-section of families and service providers. The strategic plan should include specific goals and objectives for the development of a statewide system of family resource programs, with a strong emphasis on interagency coordination and integration of services, and regular evaluation of the statewide system. If a State has already conducted a statewide review of existing family resource programs and developed a strategic plan relating to family resource programs prior to applying for funds under this Title, the State may present the plan to satisfy the strategic planning requirement, although the Secretary may request additional clarifying information about the plan.

INCLUSION OF ALL FAMILIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill specifies the parties to be involved in the lead agency's planning process.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains similar language with technical differences.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to specify that parents of children with disabilities be included in the planning process. The Conferees wish to stress that Family Resource Programs should be inclusive of all families. Where families, such as those with children with disabilities, have special needs, the Family Resource Program should already have formed the linkages necessary to gain access for those families to other, more specialized service networks.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires as participants in the State planning process a number of State and local government representatives.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains a similar list, but includes vocational rehabilitation.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

GROUPS SERVING CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires representatives of groups with expertise in providing services to children with disabilities to be included in the planning process.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAM INVENTORY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill refers to "family resource services".

House amendment.—The House amendment refers to "family resource and family support".

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to require an inventory of current family resource programs in the State.

CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND COMPETENCY

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires States to provide assurances that the State program will maintain cultural diversity.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires, in addition, an assurance that the state program will be "culturally competent".

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires a plan for training and technical assistance.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains similar language with technical differences.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to add "networking activities" to the training and technical assistance list.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BARRIERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires a description of proposed actions by the State that will reduce practical and regulatory barriers to the provision of comprehensive services.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains a similar provision as one of the authorized purposes of the program.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment requiring a description in the application of activities that will facilitate changing laws, regulations, policies, practices, procedures, and organizational structures that impede the development of family resource services.

RESPITE SERVICES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires State to make available funds for the start-up costs associated with specific family resource services, including respite services.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires an assurance that the lead agency will ensure a maintenance of effort equivalent to current Federal funding for respite services.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

OUTREACH SERVICES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires a description of the outreach and other activities the State will undertake to promote the participation of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved or underrepresented groups.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAM

Senate bill.—The Senate bill requires the involvement of a variety of local agencies and organizations in the local community needs assessment.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes vocational rehabilitation as one of the agencies that must be involved.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment requiring local programs to participate in the statewide network of family resource programs.

DEFINITION OF FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAM

Senate bill.—The Senate bill defines "family resource program" as a program that offers community-based services that provide sustained assistance to families.

House amendment.—The House amendment defines "family support and family resource programs", with similar language.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment to specify "sustained assistance and support to families".

OTHER SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED

Senate bill.—The Senate bill defines other services that the family resource program may provide, either directly or through referral, including early childhood services, respite services, education and literacy services, referral for health care, and others.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes a similar list, but adds English as a second language and family literacy services.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes with an amendment adding family support services for families of children with disabilities in the list of "other services". The managers wish to clarify that, although the community-based planning process should address all family support needs within the community, recipients of funds under this program are not expected to provide services to meet absolutely every need identified. To the maximum extent possible, they should meet identified needs, but they also are expected to help coordinate existing services and resources for families, including those families that have children with disabilities.

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPITE SERVICES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill includes respite services in the list of other services that may be provided.

House amendment.—The House amendment includes as a core service respite care services which are available 24 hours a day and every day of the calendar year.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

DEFINITION OF INTERDISCIPLINARY GOVERNANCE

Senate bill.—The Senate bill includes a list of various government agencies involved in "interdisciplinary governance".

House amendment.—The House amendment includes vocational rehabilitation as an agency that must be involved in the interdisciplinary governance.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes.

ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill defines various terms related to family resource programs.

House amendment.—The House amendment adds definitions of culturally competent, children with disabilities, family centered and family directed, and family support.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment deleting the definitions of the terms "Commissioner," "Family-Centered and Family-Directed," and "Family Support."

STRATEGIC PLAN

Senate bill.—The Senate bill contains no comparable provisions.

House amendment.—The House amendment requires the lead agency of each State to prepare a strategic plan to achieve the purposes of this section.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes (see previous agreement re: strategic plan).

DEFINITION OF OUTREACH SERVICES

Senate bill.—The Senate bill amends the definition of outreach services in the Young Americans Act to apply to "other caretakers" as well as "parents".

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

AUTHORIZATION LEVEL

Senate bill.—The Senate bill authorizes the Young Americans Act State Grant Program appropriation at such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1995–1998; for the Community-Based Family Resource program, and authorizes an appropriation of $75 million for fiscal years 1996–1998.

House amendment.—The House amendment authorizes an appropriation of $30 million for 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to move the Young Americans Act authorization to a different section and authorize the Community-Based Family Resource Program at $50 million for fiscal year 1995. Because this new program becomes part of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Conferees believe it should be on the same reauthorization cycle as that Act, which expires in 1995.

REPEALS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill repeals the Community-Based Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Grants, the Emergency Child Abuse Prevention Services grants, and the Temporary Child Care and Crisis Nurseries grants programs.

House amendment.—The House amendment contains no comparable provision. Instead it repeals Sec. 933 of the Younger Americans Act, which describes the Family Resource and Support Program.

Conference agreement.—The Senate recedes with an amendment to also repeal the Emergency Child Abuse Prevention Services grants. The Conferees emphasize that they are consolidating these programs and therefore expect that the new Community-Based Family Resource Program will receive an appropriation which is at least equal to the sum of the appropriations of the individual programs that are being repealed or replaced.

NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS

Senate bill.—The Senate bill reauthorizes the National Resource Center on Family Resource and Support Programs.

House amendment.—The House amendment reauthorizes the National Center, but adds developing and disseminating information about respite services to its duties.

Conference agreement.—The House recedes.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

WILLIAM D. FORD,
M.G. MARTINEZ,
DALE E. KILDEE,
MAJOR R. OWENS,
ROBERT E. ANDREWS,
BOBBY SCOTT,
LYNN C. WOOLSEY,

CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ,
SCOTTY BAESLER,
BILL GOODLING,
SUSAN MOLINARI,
BILL BARRETT,
MIKE CASTLE,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title III of the Senate bill, and title III of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JOHN D. DINGELL,
PHIL SHARP,
EDWARD J. MARKEY,
RICHARD LEHMAN,
MIKE KREIDLER,
CARLOS J. MOORHEAD,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TED KENNEDY,
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM,
JIM JEFFORDS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE ORDER PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103–253)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1703 et seq.) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 on October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 on October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c) I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 on June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 (June 16, 1993).

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 on October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. These include, inter alia, a requirement that Member States deny permission for take off, landing or overflight to any aircraft flying to or from Haiti, other than aircraft on regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights. In addition, the Resolution strongly urges, but does not mandate, the freezing of funds and financial resources of officers of the military in Haiti, including police, major participants in the coup d'état of 1991, and in illegal governments since the coup d'état, those employed by, or acting on behalf of, the military, and immediate family members of the foregoing. Effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., May 8, 1994, I have taken additional steps pursuant to the above statutory authorities to enhance the implementation of this international embargo and to conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

This new Executive order:

—bans arriving and departing flights and overflights stopping or originating in Haiti, except regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights;

—blocks the funds and financial resources, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, of the individuals specified in Resolution 917, identified above;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to implement certain provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 of May 6, 1994, that are to take effect without delay. Further measures, including a comprehensive trade embargo with certain humanitarian exceptions, are required no later than May 21, 1994. I am considering additional measures to give full effect to these and other provisions of that Resolution. The measures we are imposing and the United Nations Security Council Resolution adopted on May 6, 1994, reflect the determination of the United States, acting in concert with the international community, to end the assault on democracy and human dignity in Haiti.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1994.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and because there is no designee of the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I continue by way of accountability as chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. I said before to my colleagues that I would commit myself to doing this just 3 days after I was formally sworn in as chairman in January 1989, and I continue to do so but with increased problems of a complexity and difficulty that heretofore the Nation has not faced. That is, there has been no awareness.

I have been compelled to come a little bit more often in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues what I brief every member of the committee. As chairman, I have said from the beginning that it has always been my philosophy and my belief and based on the rules and the precedents of this great body, since the first Congress, that the real power and, actually, I believe, the exclusive and only power of a chairman was to set the agenda, set the course, mark the course and lead.

For years, this has not been done and particularly on this level. I am not now casting aspersions on predecessors. I am just saying that because of many other factors, mostly ones which I think infected us Americans and made us victims of our hubris or pride, that history will show was so misbegotten and so much in error; that is, that we are the greatest and would be forever and a day, that prosperity was here to stay forever and a day.

□ 1210

Also, our system governing our financial institutions, one which was actually sort of jerry-built since the depression and before the war, the complacency led to not keeping up with the exponential pace of change, and particularly the tremendous technological breakthrough since the war, where instantaneous communication is today making the world a very, very small village.

Today I rise because of the disturbing news that efforts were being made unilaterally by the government, that is, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, in their words to "shore up the dollar," the value.

I have been trying to alert not only my colleagues, in fact, my colleagues first, as long ago as the middle 1970's, and with more intensity since 1979, when it was apparent and the statistics showed it and the correlation of events as they were happening, and those of us on the committee, charged with knowledge, it was obvious that our country was headed for a very different world from that in which it had thrived since the war, and particularly in the decades of the 1950's and 1960's.

However, it was disturbing even in the 1960's, and I spoke out there. But so much for history. The thing is that now, as I had so much wanted to avoid, there is tendency to have a knee-jerk reaction on the part of our managers in this very difficult area in which, as I have told my colleagues, we in the Congress have little direct power to control, not only constitutionally, but traditionally and in precedent.

The disturbing thing about the events was that after the intervention with somewhat massive input of dollars on the part of the Treasury and the Fed, the dollar still is in anemic condition. I have pointed out that this is the biggest danger that has confronted out Nation since its founding, even the Civil War.

When I say that, naturally I lost a lot of people that seem to think that this is a gross exaggeration. I wish it were, and I pray I am wrong, but nevertheless, up to now there has been no credible rebuttal.

The events of last week and the week before clearly show that what used to be a joint effort, for instance, in 1970 when there was a massive—in fact, it was not so massive compared to the tremendous exposure of the so-called Euro dollar at that time, just a fast movement of what I call hot money from the markets in London, France, into the German mark created a minor emergency. At that time, though, there was a joint venture of the part of these countries and their central banks to invest in trying to support the dollar.

Then came the 1970's and the 1980's, in which, incredibly, sitting on that committee, I heard all of the outstanding economists, international, national, and everybody else, saying that the reason we were having a negative balance of trade, or even a current account imbalance, was that the dollar was being artificially held too high.

I asked in one of the brief periods of time I had this panel of the outstanding economists, not only of the United States, I said "Okay, so you are saying and advocating that the dollar should be allowed to drop? But how far? What is your estimate?" Oh, they did not know. All they knew was let it drop, because that will stimulate the purchase of our exports.

I said "What if you have a free-fall? You don't control it, once it drops to a certain level, and it keeps going?" Well, there was no answer to that, but I was looked upon, and in fact one whispered and said "Who is this guy?" Remember, that was 19—the middle 1980's. I was not chairman yet.

Today I have directed letters to Secretary Bentsen and Chairman Greenspan inviting them to testify on the exchange rate policy at a banking hearing on May 18, that is next week, as well as a suggested summary of the proposed additions to the Humphrey-Hawkins Act which I intend to submit and will submit, and over which we intend to have the hearings.

Last March, Mr. Speaker, I put this question:

> Under the following circumstances, would you vote today to give the Federal Reserve a $30.1 billion line of credit that will be used to loan money to foreign countries, no strings attached, no conditions, no nothing, but in accordance with the Federal Reserve's, not the Treasury, the Federal Reserve's judgment and politics, it will choose and pick where it wants to send all or part of that $30.1 billion?

Over 3 years ago, in fact, almost 4 years ago, shortly after I had become chairman, I called a hearing of the committee. Unfortunately, the turnout was very poor. Like last year's three different hearings on the so-called NAFTA on chapter 14, that had to do with banking and financial activities, which was really the engine, not free trade, but this year, banking and finance, we were totally censored. There was not any coverage of the three hearings.

I am speaking now because all of this is on the record, and therefore, available to your perusal and study. What if I tell you further that you, my colleagues, not only on this side but on the other side of the rotunda, have nothing to say about who gets the money, what country gets the money? You can put no conditions on the loans, and you have to abdicate your congressional oversight role, which in fact and indeed has happened, as we brought out in these hearings almost 4 years ago, in which at that time there was talk, and later implemented by the so-called Brady plan.

This is something I would like to come back and report, once I have brought my colleagues on the committee up to date, because there again the U.S. Treasury is a guarantor of billions of billions of dollars of bonds issued by other countries, such as Mexico, and now other countries in South America.

In addition to this—that is, you having no say-so—contrary to the Constitution, the General Accounting Office will be prevented by law from any examination of "transactions of the Federal Reserve for or with a foreign central bank." And the records of the expenditures will be intentionally vague, and even at times purposely misleading.

This came up, and there was an election year, 1992, 2 years ago, and all of a sudden what we could not even get attention on the committee level, much less on the information disseminating responsible agencies to even report, all of a sudden it became an issue. The Italian agency bank in Atlanta, the BNL, then with greater furor and headlines for days, the BCCI—and I want to remind my colleagues that I have not closed out as chairman of this committee either one of those two, because we still have to perfect the laws to protect the American national interests and the integrity and safety and soundness of our financial system, which still continues at risk, as was seen clearly in the case of those two much-publicized, for a while, spectacular cases.

□ 1220

But now we have by law our only agency that is our watchdog agency and the only one we have in order to ride herd on the executive branch by law prohibited from even asking or even trying to locate the records of these expenditures.

My colleagues will agree with me, I am sure, that if they were put to a vote, they would say, I am not going to have any part of that. But yet, in effect, the Congress has.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a conjecture or a bizarre scenario. This is what is going on and has been going on now for some time at great cost and jeopardy to the Treasury, if not the more fundamental stability and well-being of our financial institutions. The Fed has been now for years making what are essentially loans to foreign countries without any congressional input or consent. It does it through this $30.1 billion fund known as a swap fund, and despite the Federal Reserve's keep-your-nose-out-of-my-business attitude, I am putting our central bank on notice that we in the Congress have not relinquished our oversight responsibilities, especially when it comes to billions of dollars of taxpayers' money which are at risk and which may be used for purposes contrary to the national interest as expressed by the administration that the people may have at a particular time duly elected into office.

Mr. Speaker, I posed these questions in March here on the House floor and elsewhere. Since then the Federal Reserve has formally joined the Secretary of the Treasury and the finance ministers and the central bank governors of Mexico and Canada in a permanent trilateral agreement involving a $6 billion line of credit to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, there are two issues here: First is the right of Congress to control spending. The Constitution says there shall be no expenditure other than that which is based on an appropriation and thereby also with a respective authorization and only upon that basis. That is what the Constitution says. Of course today we live in a

day and time when the Constitution, well, my goodness, my colleagues, even if the Ten Commandments today, one of the most powerful individuals in America, controls today the most substantial disseminating electronic communication just last year, some time ago, said the Ten Commandments were out of vogue, they were not valid any longer. So if we have that, what is the Constitution, among friends, as somebody wrote a book entitled in that way.

So that, Mr. Speaker, the first issue is the right of Congress and responsibility under the Constitution to control spending. Where are all of these budgeteers that want to balance the budget with a constitutional amendment as long as they do not come out on this very basic question?

Mr. Speaker, second and equally profound is a question of how world monetary systems are to be structured and controlled. This is a question we have evaded for over 23 years, ever since the so-called fixed exchange rate system was effectively ended by the closing of the U.S. so-called gold window. Let me say, that was 1971, it was August 15, and it was President Richard Milhous Nixon who made that decision and brought it about. Yet there was not one American newspaper calling it a devaluation of 10 percent of the dollar and much less saying what this means is the United States is going off the gold exchange system, meaning that it was going to go into what I protested at the time as a lowly Member down in the committee, but still by that had become chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance, so I felt I had some knowledge. But, Mr. Speaker, when a snowball starts sliding faster and faster down that slope, there is not much one can do about standing in its way. But the record is there and it will show that I predicted that anytime you leave something stable, to a certain extent, and go into something unstable, unpredictable, that unpredictability and instability is the enemy of financial doings and marketing.

Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why we were the only creditor Nation in two world wars, today we are the biggest debtor Nation in the world, and that happened also as of September 16, 1985, and at that time officially our Government said, we are a debtor nation for the first time since 1914, before World War I.

Mr. Speaker, it is dangerous, because at the heart of the matter, and this is what I said over 25 years ago, the target is "the vaunted American standard of living." The main avenues are to doing what can be done to destroy or at least debauch the currency of a country, and this is where we are today, because on that day, also, what in effect happened was that the center of gravity of financial power which had gravitated during World War II and immediately thereafter to New York, went from New York to Tokyo.

Mr. Speaker, this may surprise some, but let me say that I have a good memory, and I remember in college when Franklin Roosevelt made his speech on quarantining nations like Japan, that was 1937, and the big flare-up was the sinking of the Panay gunboat, the American gunboat on the Yangtze River or wherever it was, in China. There was not anybody in America that said then, why, if those Japanese dare try to do anything, we would shoot them out of the water in 4 days.

Mr. Speaker, that is where we are today financially. We hear the boasts about how the United States is the one and only still remaining great power now that Russia is supposed to have collapsed in its dismemberment of the Soviet Union. What an illusion, or delusion. What a fallacy. What hubris. What hubris. It is not true. We are vulnerable. We are America, the vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of the matter is our economic and financial freedom and liberty, without which what is political?

Mr. Speaker, the first of these two issues that I spoke about, this line of credit, is, of course, the right of Congress to control.

□ 1230

After all, you are the one that has to go before the people every 2 years, not Chairman Greenspan or now Secretary Bentsen, and you are the one that has to answer the question about the debt overbuild and the deficit.

And how do we stand up to answering the question, "Well, how can the Fed do this?" We thought it was a creature of Congress, not the master of the country.

But the second and equally profound question is the one of how the world monetary system and systems are to be governed and controlled and structured. As I said, we have evaded that question, went into this so-called floating exchange. Well, floating itself means instability, and we reached the end of the rope as far as that system is concerned, and that has been true for some time now, as should have been clearly evidenced, and I said so in the middle and late seventies.

From 1945 until 1971, world exchange rates were controlled by tying all currencies to the dollar. The dollar, in turn, had a fixed relationship to gold. Now, you can argue about gold and whether or not, like the leaders at that time said, the day of gold was gone, we should demonetize is the fancy word they used. It does not make any difference whether it is gold or maybe platinum, as long as you have a consensual agreement that that is the fixed objective against which you are going to have some standard of evaluation.

Now, the idea was to stabilize currencies and to force countries with trade imbalance to follow economic policies that would create balance and thus maintain stable currency values.

My question was: How can you say that when you say that the thing to do now is to go into floating exchange rates? How can you say that you are doing that in order to stabilize? And, of course, I was ridiculed, and mostly, really, in all truthfulness, ignored. As long as the United States dominated world trade, now, this could work, but as other economies grew, our policies did not change. We assumed that a U.S. trade deficit could last forever without upsetting the balance, But, of course, that was impossible. And I said so.

If any of my colleagues are interested, they can look up the RECORD from the late sixties through the seventies and eighties, what I said then, not now.

And finally, the price of the dollar in relation to gold could no longer be sustained. President Nixon, as I said, and repeat, closed the gold window, and the world moved into the new era of floating exchange rates. As the time the Secretary of the Treasury argued that in a floating-rate system countries would have to take steps to stay in a trade balance. If they did not, their trade would dry up or they would suffer other bad consequences. Japan, for instance, would be forced to reduce its trade surplus or see the yen go up, and its exports destroyed by rising prices. The U.S. could reduce its imbalance, because our goods would be cheaper, and so on and so on.

It was to no avail to point out the contradictions inherent in that argument. So that did not work either. And today our trade deficit is larger than ever despite this vastly devalued dollar where within the last 15 years it has lost two-thirds of its value to the Japanese yen and the German deutsche mark continues the slide.

And last week's intervention was meant to restore confidence in the dollar. Otherwise, a declining dollar will mean a quick rise in interest rates, because we need those foreign dollars to finance our deficit, and particularly since 1985. Why, up until very recently the Japanese owned 35 percent of our Treasury, that is, that they were funding our debt. As soon as they start withdrawing is when we start getting these pains, and other countries have done likewise.

In other words, intervention is needed, because a structural change is needed. The ones that were supposed to be automatic have not happened, but ultimately it is the condition in the economies of different countries, their price levels, interest rates, and levels of output that will determine the exchange rate.

We do not want to finance meaningless interventions that do not have

lasting effects on exchange rates and only provide a profit for the speculators who are reaping billions and billions of dollars of profit. I believe all of my colleagues want to know the intentions of these interventions.

The worldwide foreign exchange market grew from about $800 billion a few years ago to more than a trillion dollars in trading each day at present. When the United States put in $5 billion, as it did by selling off part of its inventory of foreign currencies and buying U.S. dollars, as it did last week, billions of dollars of taxpayers' money are at stake. I am very concerned that the result may compromise the best interests of taxpayers and benefit, as it has up to now, only the crafty and foxy speculators who have no nationality.

I said in my last report here that the old Latin saying is true now as ever it was, "Ubi pecunia, ubi patria," very simple Latin, ubi pecunia, money, ubi patria, country: "Where my money is, there is my country." These are the jet-set speculators. They have no allegiance to any one sovereign nation. They are profiting.

When one of the major investors in the world, George Sorrels, who controls Sorrels Fund Management, testified before the House Banking Committee on April 13, this last month, he said he did not like fixed exchange rates or floating exchange rates. He said he preferred what he called a dirty float, where governments try to change the international price of currency.

I think it is appropriate to try to dissect. Let us analyze this for you.

Also, government interventions are sometimes needed, perhaps may be appropriate in the United States under the proper circumstances. They have be viewed with extreme caution. The end result could mean big profits for speculators when the Government drops $5 billion into the foreign currency markets, especially when the Government's action is expected to have only temporary effect.

There are billions of dollars for speculation, but very little for those in low-paying jobs or waiting in the employment lines in the United States. I would like to know if the Treasury's present policy is to maintain or raise the international price of the U.S. dollar by small currency interventions and increase in interest rates by the Federal Reserve.

I strongly object to a monetary policy aimed at changing exchange rates by raising interest rates so that the U.S. economy stagnates and declines even further than it has already.

The labor markets in this country are still very weak, and I invite my colleagues to particularly in some of the sections of the country just talk to their constituents. In my area, to me it is not only disturbing, it is excruciatingly hurtful to see young, and they are not unprepared, they are college-trained, and I mean young, in their thirties, for more than a year, a year-and-a-half, have not been able to find gainful employment, not through the fact that they do not want to work. They will take a job. But where are they?

And when at the same time you hear these people talking about recovery, when the major industrial employers have been downsizing and every week thousands of employees thrown out, mostly now white-collar. This cannot continue for long without having its social repercussions. This is what I have been reminding my colleagues on the committees.

So that our labor markets in the country are weak, and average hourly earnings, adjusted for inflation, if you want to call it that, are still much too low to forget our first priority, and that is to achieving economic health and growth.

□ 1240

We, the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, including the House Banking Committee, which has oversight responsibilities over the Federal Reserve operations and the foreign currency operations of the Treasury, do not have full details of this recent intervention in foreign currency markets. How do you think I feel, a Depression-era child, when just 3 years ago we had occasion to go to the great State of Rhode Island, one of the most historic original States and colonies; in distress, in bankruptcy, where banks were closed, S&L's were closed, and credit unions. We had a hearing in Providence, and over a thousand people showed up. I had not seen anything like that since my childhood memories of the Depression. And it hurt to see the elderly say, "We live on the proceeds from our pensions" or "our annuities, and they are tied up, they are frozen."

Well, I asked the Federal Reserve—which it did—why the Federal Reserve could not intervene for a sovereign State? But did it? Absolutely not. But it will for a foreign sovereign nation like Mexico. Where is our sanity, my colleagues?

Well, I had the other agencies, like the OECD and banking institutional agencies; they could have extended a guarantee if they wanted to enable the sovereign State of Rhode Island to issue bonds. And did they do it? No. We had to come back and, on June 28, in the Banking Committee, pass out a loan guarantee that finally, less than a year later, the State of Rhode Island took advantage of; issued its bonds, opened the doors and restored some of this money to these people.

The relief rolls between January and May, when we had the hearing on May 25, had grown 50 percent. This is the cause-and-effect of their policies. Now, that could have been solved. The Federal Reserve, under the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, could have acted if it had wanted to, as it has done on some other occasions. Why, when Charles Keating was floundering with his Lincoln S&L, what happened? Astounding, the Federal Reserve let him have $100 million; between April 1989, when that institution was declared insolvent, and July 1, when it was finally closed down. Where do you think that money went to? Oh, the Federal Reserve said, "Well that was our emergency window opening." I said, "What do you mean? You do that for banks, but what other S&L have you ever done that for?" None other. And yet did anybody cover that? No. That was brought out in committee hearings and all.

If the Federal Reserve can intervene with $100 million to help Charlie Keating's institution, and you know now the sorry history there, you mean it could not intervene to help the sovereign State of Rhode Island? Not to give it money but to give it the line of credit it needed as a sovereign State, pledging its revenues in order to redeem those bonds, as it finally did with the guarantees that we structured.

That was not necessary for Congress to do. It was intended in the Federal Board Act that such would be ultimately the lender of last resort—but only in one case where it exercised that judgment, and that was in Charlie Keating's cheating activities.

According to the Constitution of the United States, we have the right to insist on a full accounting of these operations. Article 1, section 9 states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Now, my colleagues, that is the Constitution; that is the fundamental law. That is the prime oath of office we take when we are sworn in to uphold and defend and protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Have we done that? You answer that question.

The Federal Reserve does not use appropriated funds and has the right to order unlimited amounts of U.S. currency and coins from the Treasury.

In fact, look into your pockets, dig into your pockets and pick out the dollar note or the $5 or $10 note. What do you see? "Federal Reserve note." It used to be "U.S. Treasury Note." But that is another story. The point I am making right now is it is the Federal Reserve that has the money printing presses, not the Congress, not the politicians, as they have argued.

The Fed has bought over $330 billion in Government securities from which it earns interest. All income in excess of expenses is returned to the Treasury and thus is supposed to reduce the Federal deficit. However, the Federal Re-

serve does not have the right to enter into these foreign currency swaps, loans and lines of credit, without giving a full and a prompt accounting to the Congress. The Constitution, in section 8, gives the Congress the right to coin money, but I do not believe that legislation gives the Federal Reserve the right to make loans and grant credit lines to foreign countries without complete and timely accounting to the House and to the Senate Banking Committees, which have oversight authority.

I asked Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan on April 21,

> What is your basis for your entry into the foreign exchange markets and your ability to grant loans without congressionally authorized funds? What is the legislative basis and the constitutional basis?

I am still waiting for a reply.

I urge the Federal Reserve not to play games and to respond quickly. I anticipate that the Fed will deny that its $3 billion line of credit to a foreign country and past exchanges of U.S. dollars for Mexican pesos, that were expected to decline, have anything to do with loans. But we know better. Clearly, taxpayer funds were and still are at great risk.

It is essential that the Congress and the American public have complete accountability for the use of their tax dollars. Extending lines of credit to foreign governments and diving headlong into foreign waters in order to shore up a country's sagging currency could prove risky to the American taxpayer. The Congress has a right to know whether our central bank is putting taxpayer moneys into jeopardy. For this reason I am proposing to modify the reporting requirements of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, also known as the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, which requires the Federal Reserve Chairman to report to the House and Senate Banking Committees twice a year about the domestic economy.

The Congress needs a full accounting of the Federal Reserve's and the Treasury's international transactions. My legislation will require both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Chairmen to report during the semiannual Humphrey-Hawkins hearings about these transactions and about how the two agencies coordinate their foreign currency policies.

I have invited Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan to appear before the House Banking Committee on May 18 to discuss their agencies' recent foreign exchange activities. I also plan to ask them for suggestions for improving their accountability to the Congress and the American public about these activities. Unfortunately, it is currently very difficult to get a complete accounting of the Federal Reserve foreign exchange activities.

The FED persists in refusing to release in a timely manner the complete minutes of its Federal Open Market Committee [FOMC] meetings, the next one being held May 17. During this decisionmaking committee's meeting, the FED's SWAP fund activities are discussed. Unfortunately, only an incomplete summary of the meeting with no attribution of individual members' views are publicly released within 5 or 6 weeks.

I ask you, my colleagues, is this our constitutional democracy, or is it a warmed-over feudal kingdom in which we have the all-powerful and unaccountable master of all, the Federal Reserve Board, saying, "We don't have to tell you anything. We don't have to report to you. We don't have to account to you," meaning the American people. "We are so independent that we are independent of the Government and the Constitution."

□ 1250

The GAO is not allowed to examine transactions of the Federal Reserve for or with a foreign central bank.

Now I brought this out 3 years ago, when nobody was paying any attention to BNL, and I was trying to get information from the Federal Reserve Board about these foreign banking activities, and they said, "We can't tell you. First," they said, "the Attorney General has entrusted us not to answer you. Secondly, we can't tell you because this has to do with our very, very critical and protected relationships with these entities that are really central bank, our government's own."

Most, if not all, of the Foreign banks doing business in the United States of any consequence are really government owned by those countries' government. BNL was Italian, government owned.

Now, they would not give us even elementary information on that basis. They will not even tell the Congress whether or not, through the central bank of Iraq, in New York, in a corresponding bank, old Saddam Hussein himself has not squirreled some funds there protected by the secrecy that is involved. I ask, "You think that's not possible?" Let me say it is not only most possible, but it is very possible.

During this decision making committee's meetings the Fed's swap fund activities are discussed, as I said, but remember they call it the open market committee because it is secret. They meet behind closed doors, and they are saying that they are above the law.

Now the Congress created the Fed. The Fed did not come heaven sent as in the words of Old John Adams referring to George Washington. I say to my colleagues, "If you think that there wasn't bitter acrimony between our leaders then and that modern-day acrimony is only modern day, well you ought to read what old John Adams thought of General George Washington."

That tall Virginian, who thinks he is like the ancient Hebrew Jews, selected by their height and not their ability, and who considers himself heaven sent, booted, spurred, and ready to ride on the hapless backs of mankind; that is what John Adams thought of George Washington.

Now that is what the Federal Reserve Board thinks, that it is heaven sent, not created by Congress, booted, spurred, and ready to ride on the hapless backs of American citizens. Therefore, until we have complete disclosure in a timely fashion of the open market committee—

Incidentally, the way it operates, it has the power to determine, as former Secretary of HUD, Jack Kemp, used to say, the existence or disappearance of any given administration. The British used to have a similar system, and it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer who, by the same manipulations, could determine whether a particular government endured or did not be controlling the price for what they called the gills over there or the treasuries over there.

Well, it is true today in America. Do not think the Congress is doing this, my colleagues. If the people were to know this, would they not rise in arms angrily and demanding that there be accountability? Oh, I think so. I think inevitably, it will happen unfortunately. It will come about in a time of pressure, and distress and crisis, and we cannot do our good thinking.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I have been anticipating for more than 25 years and trying to erect our safeguards in protecting this national interest and, above all, the safety and soundness. But that is just one person's attempt. I would like the GAO to investigate the mechanism for intervening used by the Federal Reserve and the U.S. Treasury that involves release of exploitable inside information to some people. More information, not less, about intervention by governments and foreign exchange markets significantly aids policymakers.

According to Kathryn M. Dominguez and Jeffrey A. Frankel in their new book, "Does Foreign Exchange Intervention Work?," U.S. intervention has a greater impact when the Federal Reserve "lets the market know it is intervening." Their research showed that the "official announcements regarding exchange rate policy have far more impact than intervention that is quietly disseminated." They add, "By preannouncing the limits, policymakers can get speculators working for them rather than against them."

Equally important in supporting the need for information and accountability is the need to transmit information about interventions to everyone at the same time. The attempts at secrecy—secret government has brought about the sad and dreary days that we are going through, and always that would

be the case. My answer to those that have made request to have closed-door meetings and all this:

"Well, wait a while. If what you're espousing is so good, then we ought to brag about it. We ought to shout it from the rooftops instead of hiding behind closed doors and windows. Now why would you want to hide it if it's good?"

That is my simple question.

We now live in a global economy with global financial markets and instant information in which now this tremendous overbill I have spoken to my colleagues about, and I will not go into it this morning, endangers like never before, since before 1929, not only the United States stability, but worldwide. Now it is essential that we start here, that the reporting requirements of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury be brought up to date to reflect all their international currency operations that may one day not only put taxpayers' funds in jeopardy, but bring about a collapse around our ears.

Will this all end up in, like I consider most of our mundane activities, and again, using the Latin and the old ascetic philosophers and teachers:

Vanitas, vanitatum. Vanity, vanity, all is vanity.

But worse than that, Mr. Speaker, it is reflected in what Shakespeare said in his famous play of Antony and Cleopatra, and he has Brutus saying these words:

Antony, you have been a boggler ever, and, when a nation becomes arrogant, and smug, and complacent, and actually indecent in its own dirt, it then becomes a laugh-at to the world, strutting and prancing to the jest and the laugh of all.

I would hate to say that the history will write that those of us inheritors of the greatest democratic and freedom of environment ever would have traded our inheritance for a mess of potage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1994.

Hon. ALAN GREENSPAN,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREENSPAN: The Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs will hold a hearing to discuss how the Administration's exchange rate policy affects monetary policy, and the adequacy of Congressional reporting on the exchange rate policy on May 18, 1994, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building. You are invited to testify at the hearing.

GOALS OF EXCHANGE RATE POLICY

The Federal Reserve, at the request of the Treasury Department, recently intervened in the foreign exchange markets to support the dollar versus the yen and the deutsche mark. The Committee is interested in learn more about how the Administration's exchange rate affects the conduct of monetary policy. Accordingly, please describe in your testimony how the Administration's exchange rate policy affects the conduct of monetary policy, and whether or not the policy exchange rate policy will compel the Federal Reserve to alter the course of its monetary policy.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS ON EXCHANGE RATE POLICY

International trade and investment are now vital to the health of the U.S. economy. Consequently, the exchange rate of the dollar has become an increasingly important factor in setting and conducting monetary and fiscal policy.

Given the implications of the exchange rate, I am concerned that the Congress receives insufficient and untimely reporting on the Administration's exchange rate policy, and I have directed my staff to develop legislation that would require the Federal Reserve to report additional information on how exchange rates affect monetary policy and other economic variables.

Attached, please find a summary of the proposed legislative changes. I would appreciate receiving your comments on the proposed changes in its testimony.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important issues. The Committee looks forward to your testimony.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1994.

Hon. LLOYD BENTSEN,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY BENTSEN: The Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs will hold a hearing to discuss the Administration's exchange rate policy and the adequacy of Congressional reporting on the exchange rate policy on May 18, 1994, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building. You are invited to testify at the hearing.

GOALS OF EXCHANGE RATE POLICY

The Treasury Department recently ordered several rounds of foreign exchange intervention apparently aimed at supporting the dollar versus the yen and the deutsche mark. The Committee would like to learn more about the Administration's exchange rate policy, including the reason(s) for the recent interventions. Accordingly, please describe the goals of the Administration's exchange rate policy and the success, to date, in achieving those goals.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS ON EXCHANGE RATE POLICY

International trade and investment are now vital to the health of the U.S. economy. Consequently, the exchange rate of the dollar has become an increasingly important factor in setting and conducting monetary and fiscal policy.

Given the policy implications of the exchange rate, I am concerned that the Congress receives insufficient and untimely reporting on the Administration's exchange rate policy, and I have directed my staff to develop legislation that would require the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve to report semi-annually on the Administration's exchange rate policy.

Attached, please find a summary of the proposed legislative changes. I would appreciate receiving your comments on the proposed changes in your testimony.

Thank you for your time and consideration of those important issues. The Committee looks forward to your testimony.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman.

OUTLINE OF EXCHANGE RATE POLICY REPORTING ACT

I. AMENDMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE

A. The Humphrey-Hawkins monetary policy reporting requirements are amended to require the Federal Reserve to report information on how the conduct of monetary policy affects the exchange rate of the dollar, and how the exchange rate impacts domestic interest rates, employment, inflation, wages, and economic growth, the current account, and the capital and financial account of the United States;

B. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is required to appear, simultaneously with the Secretary of the Treasury, and report on the expanded Humphrey-Hawkins requirements.

C. The Chairman shall describe all actions taken to adjust or stabilize the exchange rate of the dollar, and how those transactions impact monetary policy.

D. The Chairman's report shall contain information on currency swap agreements, changes in inventories of currencies, foreign loans and lines of credit, from or to foreign entities, detailing the names of the foreign entities and all conditions of the swap agreements and currency transactions, and the reasons for, and benefits of, such transactions.

E. In formulating the semi-annual report to Congress, the Chairman shall consult on exchange rates with groups representing labor, agriculture, consumers, manufacturing, and services.

II. AMENDMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A. The Treasury Secretary shall make semi-annual appearance before the House and Senate Banking Committee's simultaneously with the Federal Reserve Board Chairman to report on exchange rate policy. The report shall contain:

1. objectives and plans—

A. the development of a flexible target zone for the exchange rate of the dollar against our major trading partners.

B. a statement of the Administration's objections and plans with respect to the exchange rate of the dollar for the calendar year during which the report is transmitted.

C. a status report on the success in achieving the objectives and plans with respect to the exchange rate of the dollar since the last reporting date.

D. as a part of the mid-year report, a statement of the Administration's objectives and plans with respect to the exchange rate of the dollar for the calendar year following the year in which the report is submitted.

2. the relationship of the aforesaid objectives and plans to the short-term goals set forth in the most recent Economic Report of the President pursuant to section 1022(a)(2)(A) of Title 15 and to any short-term goals approved by the Congress.

3. an analysis of the factors that determine the exchange rate of the dollar and an analysis of the impact of the exchange rate of the dollar on—

A. employment, production, inflation, wages, and economic growth, the current account and the capital and financial account of the United States;

B. the international competitive performance of United States industries and the external indebtedness of the United States;

4. an analysis of the relationship between the dollar and the currencies of our major trading partners.

5. a description of all actions taken to adjust or stabilize the exchange rate of the dollar;

6. the results of negotiations conducted pursuant to section 3004 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988;

7. key issues in the United States policies arising from the most recent consultation requested by the International Monetary Fund under article IV of the Fund's Articles of Agreement.

B. Consultations

1. In formulating the semi-annual report to the Congress the Secretary shall consult with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, the Chairman of the National Economic Council, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and the United States Trade Representative to consider exchange rate developments in light of trends in monetary policy, fiscal policy, consumer prices, labor costs, the trade balance, and productivity.

2. In formulating semi-annual report to Congress, the Secretary shall consult on exchange rates with groups representing labor, agriculture, manufacturing, and services.

C. Not labor than 24 hours after intervening, and/or directing a Federal Reserve intervention in the currency markets, the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make a report to the Congress describing the factors prompting the intervention, the objectives of the intervention, and the success in achieving the intervention.

D. The Secretary's report shall contain information on currency swap agreements, changes in inventories of currencies, foreign loans and lines of credit, from or to foreign entities, detailing the names of the foreign entities and all conditions of the swap agreements and currency transactions, and the reasons for, and benefits of, such transactions.

E. Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to require that the objectives and plans with respect to exchange rate policy disclosed in the reports be achieved if the Secretary determines that they cannot or should not be achieved because of changing conditions: *Provided*, That in the subsequent reports to the aforesaid Committees of the Congress pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include an explanation of the reasons for any revisions to or deviations from such objectives and plans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

CALL FOR SPECIAL ENVOY TO SUDAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor to share my very deep disappointment with the Clinton administration for not appointing a special envoy for Sudan. Those of us who listened to the news yesterday saw that the President appointed a special envoy, a former colleague of ours, Bill Gray, former Congressman from Pennsylvania from Philadelphia, to be a special envoy to Haiti.

□ 1300

That is fine, Mr. Speaker. We commend him for appointing Mr. Gray, and we would hope and pray that Mr. Gray is successful in bringing an end to the violence that is taking place with the dictatorship in Haiti.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we wonder why President Clinton has been negligent for not appointing a special envoy to Sudan. Nine months ago, Mr. Speaker, and countless thousands of lives ago, I first wrote the President urging the immediate appointment of a high profile envoy to address the worsening crisis in Sudan.

As many people know, Mr. Speaker, in Sudan in the last 10 years, 1.4 million people have died of famine and starvation and have been killed in the fight that has taken place in southern Sudan. In southern Sudan we have black Christians who are being persecuted for their faith, and yet we get very little response from the West.

In spite of the promises earlier this year that the administration made that they would appoint a special envoy, this crucial post has not been filled. Mr. Speaker, let me ready to the Members a resolution that the House and the Congress passed on November 22, 1991, under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], who has done yeoman work on this issue. When this resolution passed, I still remember that it was just hours before the Congress adjourned to leave for the Thanksgiving recess, to go home and have turkey with all the trimmings and all the food while the people of southern Sudan had absolutely nothing. In that resolution, on page 5, we called upon the President to appoint a special representative for mediation and reconciliation and peace in humanitarian affairs in Sudan.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1993—how the time passes; how many people have died since then—a number of the Members of Congress wrote to Secretary Christopher saying this: "Mr. Secretary, we are writing to express our continued concern about the situation in Sudan and to offer some recommendations."

We went on to say this: "In recent months humanitarian and political conditions have deteriorated significantly. An estimated 500,000 people have died in the past 2 years while 2 million southern Sudanese have been displaced internally. Moreover, the United States has a moral responsibility to help the victims of the 10-year-old civil war and people who have escaped the notice of the community of nations. Ignoring the plight of millions of citizens of Sudan need not become a viable option."

Then we went on to say, among many other things: "We strongly recommend the United States appoint a special envoy for mediation and reconciliation." And yet, not to belittle the situation in Haiti because it is a serious situation, many more have died in southern Sudan than have died in Bosnia and Haiti combined. Yet we get nothing from the Clinton administration. We get rhetoric, words, and facial expressions, but we got nothing else during this period of time.

Also, before I came over, I pulled out a letter that the President sent to me, along with many other letters, saying the same thing. This is April 6, 1994. This is what he said:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the situation in Sudan. As you know, ending the conflict and human suffering in Sudan is one of my highest priorities in Africa.

I ask if this is true. If it were the highest priority in Africa, they would have had a special envoy appointed, and we are no closer than we were when Congress passed the resolution in November of last year.

Mr. Speaker, since August the Sudanese Government has launched its greatest offensive to date against the helpless southern Sudanese, bombing innocent civilians and forcing refugees to flee from what they call the triple A camps and the scarce safe havens during much of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in southern Sudan three times in the last several years. The last time was in January of last year, and I took a series of pictures.

I do not know if the camera can pick up on these pictures, but this was in that area we call the triple A camps, and here is a young boy who probably had only about 30 percent of his body weight then. He almost certainly perhaps died several days or weeks after I left this camp.

We also, Mr. Speaker, have another picture of another camp. We can see the extended stomachs of most of these young boys who have lost their moms and dads. Many have had to swim in crocodile-infested rivers. In southern Sudan, it is not like you having the Red Cross in these camps or these camps being someplace where there is plenty of help and supplies. The temperature is about 110 degrees in the shade, and yet there is very little shade. They have very little, if any, clothing. They have no food to speak of except a little porridge once and sometimes twice a day. They get water from polluted streams where cattle and animals and everyone goes to the bathroom in the streams. The streams are very, very polluted.

They get a few supplies of what you would call medicine, like maybe an aspirin or two, but it is like being sick with the flu with a 104-degree temperature.

Think about that, how it was the last time you were sick. And they have no medicine; but you had medicine. They have no place to lie; but you had a place to lie in bed. The chances are you

had a loved one who stayed home to take care of you; they have no one there to take care of them. The water is polluted.

But on top of that, Mr. Speaker, they bomb them almost every day. High-altitude bombers come in from the Khartoum government in northern Sudan, killing these people. Yet we get no action on the part of the Clinton administration.

Here is another picture of a refugee camp, and we can see many of them are very, very young people. Mr. Speaker, we ask the President to imagine his own child. Imagine our sons and daughters living in an environment like this, with high-altitude bombing coming on top of them. And, Mr. Speaker, the President has not appointed a special envoy after 6 months? I say, Mr. Speaker, shame on the President. He had an opportunity, and he has failed. He has failed the people in southern Sudan, and he has failed the history this great country has had.

I can remember when President Jimmy Carter sensitized this country and sensitized this world for human rights. Probably very few people have done more than President Carter to stand up for human rights around the world, and, frankly, this Clinton administration has done almost nothing. It appointed a special envoy for Haiti, and I say, congratulations, but we have not seen it do very much in other areas of the world. The fact is we have seen it do absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, the President and the State Department, has failed to do what it knows is right and what it said it was going to do.

This closing picture is taken of a mother with a little boy. I don't know if the television camera will pick this up to clearly see the ribs of this young boy. He probably died several days or maybe several hours after we left the camp. This is a TB hospital, too.

□ 1310

The people had TB and were sick with all kinds of diseases, and yet nobody has gone to their aid. Hundreds of thousands have died since that time.

Mr. Speaker, millions—millions, we are not using the word lightly as sometimes you use the words thousands and millions—millions are at risk of starvation. Even as the Clinton administration has put on hold the special envoy's appointment and much needed Security Council attention in the United Nations to Sudan, deferring to largely ineffective IGGAD talks.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, I want to recognize the National Security Advisor, Anthonly Lake's leadership on this issue, and the good proposals out of the National Security Council to address the worsening crisis in the Sudan. I will give good marks to the National Security Council, and I will give good marks to Tony Lake. But I would flunk the President of the United States for this failure to let so many continue to die everyday.

Hopefully, by the end of this day, if the President wants to be consistent, having appointed a Special Envoy to Haiti, he will quickly by the end of this week or end of this day, Mr. Speaker, appoint a Special Envoy to southern Sudan.

Now, the good thing about Haiti is that Americans know what is going on in Haiti, because we are able to go to Haiti. Fortunately, the press has done a relatively good job of letting the world know. But no one goes to southern Sudan. It is dangerous. You might die in southern Sudan. So we do not see every day what is taking place to hundreds of thousands of women and children and men that are dying.

Mr. Speaker, I question the long delay in the face of the brutal genocidal war, and in light of the President's letter to me stating that: "Ending the conflict and human suffering in Sudan is one of my highest priorities in Africa."

I say, Mr. Speaker, if this were one of the President's highest priorities, he would have appointed a special envoy. Or if he wants the opportunity still, he will appoint one this week.

Why? The poor people of southern Sudan, the Christians who have been persecuted for their faith, they don't have a powerful lobby here in Washington. They don't have a powerful law firm downtown on K Street to lobby. They don't have the interest that the people in Haiti have. So they continue to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has spoken clearly about the need for a special envoy and Security Council action thought the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 131 last fall. But the President has failed to carry through with these critical policies. When I was in Sudan, Mr. Speaker, many of the people came, and I have pictures that I can make available, and spoke out the name of President Clinton, as they said, "President Clinton." I interviewed one young man who urged me to come back and tell President Clinton to help the people of southern Sudan. He begged and begged, and we have it on videotape. So on behalf of that man, and a woman named Rebecca who was written up in Vanity Fair who said: "In the United States you have groups that are there to save the whales and save animals. Why won't you save us?"

I say Mr. Speaker, on behalf of them, and on behalf of all the children who did not know what to say, who were just sitting in the Sun doing nothing, waiting for their daily porridge that would come, and sometimes not getting anything, and then worrying about the high altitude bombing that was coming.'

On behalf of the woman we saw in a makeshift hut they called a hospital who has shrapnel in the head because the Khartoum government had high altitude bombing, on behalf of her, and clearly she died. I say, Mr. Speaker, the President has an opportunity to act on their behalf.

We have waited 6 months. We have waited 1½ years. When we first came back from the Sudan Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, liberal newspapers and conservative newspapers, all humanitarian groups from World Vision, and all the other groups have begged and pleaded for you to appoint a special envoy.

Mr. Speaker, history will judge President Clinton on his actions here, whether he wants to speak out and help these people. They do not seek American financial support. They do not seek American soldiers. They do not want American troops to come there. They want a special envoy and some humanitarian efforts whereby humanitarian groups can come in and help.

When I was there the last time, early last winter, the only two groups left there, because four relief workers had been killed, were Norwegian People's Aid, and Catholic Relief Services. Now, quite frankly, they were doing what Christ said in the Bible in Matthew 25. You remember when he said when I was hungry, you fed me. When I was naked, you clothed me. When I was in prison, you visited me. And it says in the Bible, and I say, when do we do that, Jesus? We did not see you. He said when you have done it unto the least of these, you have done it unto me.

This, in southern Sudan, is a Matthew 25 situation. These people are hungry, these people are naked, these people are in a prison that you cannot even imagine, and yet they get no assistance from this administration, from this President.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the President, today, after now appointing Bill Gray, our former colleague, to be the special envoy for Haiti, and let the record state that I salute the President for that appointment. And now, Mr. Speaker, I beg the President, on behalf of the suffering people of Sudan, to do what he said he was going to do, do what the Congress has urged him to do, do what the people of southern Sudan have begged him to do. Appoint this week a special envoy to bring about reconciliation and end the killing, the starvation, and the death in southern Sudan.

I include the following matter for the RECORD.

H. CON. RES. 131

Whereas the war-induced famine in southern Sudan is threatening the lives of an estimated 4,000,000 people, and an estimated 80 percent of children in some areas of southern Sudan are reportedly malnourished;

Whereas the civil war between the Government of Sudan and the factions of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army, as well as fighting within the Sudanese People's Lib-

eration Army, have resulted in the displacement of millions of civilians;

Whereas the United States Government has provided over $130,000,000 in humanitarian assistance to Sudan in fiscal years 1992 and 1993;

Whereas access for humanitarian relief organizations has been inconsistent and subject to the military and political objectives of the Government of Sudan and Sudanese People's Liberation Army factions;

Whereas a human rights group reported in early 1993 that the Government of Sudan "is engaged in a program of military action which appears to amount to ethnic cleansing" in the Nuba Mountains and that it continues to torture political prisoners;

Whereas an estimated 500 unarmed civilians were reportedly executed by security forces on suspicion that they had collaborated with the Sudanese People's Liberation Army after its incursions into Juba in June and July of 1992;

Whereas the Government of Sudan executed Andrew Tombe and Baudoin Talley (Sudanese employees of the United States Government) and Mark Laboke Jenner (an employee of the European Community) in Juba in mid-August 1992;

Whereas all factions of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army also are responsible for serious abuses of human rights, including the killing in September 1992 of 4 foreign citizens, the reported killing of 87 civilians by the Nasir faction of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army in January 1992 in Pagarau, and the reported killing of 200 "deserters" by the Torit group near Tonj in Bahr al-Ghazal;

Whereas the government of General Omar Hassan al-Bashir, which came to power by overthrowing the democratically elected civilian government on June 30, 1989, formed a 15-member Revolutionary Command Council, abolished the constitution, the National Assembly, political parties, and trade unions, and declared a state of emergency;

Whereas the political, religious, and military policies of the Bashir government have heightened political and religious tensions in the country;

Whereas the military government in Khartoum has become a threat to regional stability in part because of its reported activities in neighboring countries and its relations with known terrorist and political extremist groups;

Whereas the conflict in southern Sudan, which has dragged on for over 3 decades, is the result of decades of political, religious, and economic discrimination against the people of southern Sudan by successive governments in the north;

Whereas the people of southern Sudan have never exercised their political rights freely, except for a brief period after the Addis Ababa agreement, and the lack of serious efforts by successive governments in Khartoum has resulted in deep mistrust;

Whereas the divisions within the Sudanese People's Liberation Army in 1991 have resulted in untold suffering for the people of southern Sudan; and

Whereas the resolution of the conflict in southern Sudan will not guarantee respect for human rights and political freedom in other regions of the country, and a number of peace talks between the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army have failed to produce lasting, tangible results: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the Government of Sudan for its severe human rights abuses, and calls upon that government to improve human rights conditions throughout the country;

(2) deplores the internecine fighting among the Sudanese People's Liberation Army factions which has caused untold suffering for the people of southern Sudan;

(3) calls on all factions of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army to cease hostilities and resolve their differences through peaceful means;

(4) urges the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army factions to provide full access for and to cooperate with relief organizations;

(5) encourages the military government of Sudan to hand over political power to an elected civilian government as soon as possible;

(6) urges the Government of Sudan to lift the press ban which was imposed after it took power in June 1989;

(7) recognizes the right of the people of southern Sudan to self-determination;

(8) urges the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army factions to allow free access to human rights organizations;

(9) commends the Government of Nigeria, the Government of Uganda, and the Organization of African Unity for their mediation efforts;

(10) calls upon the President—

(A) to appoint a special representative for mediation, reconciliation, peace, and humanitarian affairs in Sudan;

(B) to increase the levels of humanitarian assistance for Sudan that is provided through nongovernmental organizations, including local church groups,

(C) to place the Government of Sudan on the list of states that support international terrorism;

(D) to oppose all loans and credits for Sudan from the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association, and the African Development Bank, and all nonhumanitarian assistance from United Nations agencies; and

(E) to explore other means necessary to force the Government of Sudan to halt its war policies should the humanitarian conditions further deteriorate and the Government of Sudan continue to impede relief efforts; and

(11) further calls upon the President—

(A) to urge the United Nations to exert all efforts to bring an early end to the conflict in Sudan;

(B) to urge that the situation in Sudan be brought to the attention of the United Nations Security Council; and

(C) to urge the United Nations Security Council—

(i) to consider the creation of demilitarized zones for war and famine victims in southern Sudan that would be off limit to all warring factions;

(ii) to consider the creation of safe havens for war and famine victims should the warring factions reject the creation of demilitarized zones;

(iii) to facilitate safe passage for war and famine victims to and from conflict zones; and

(iv) to impose an arms embargo on Sudan.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, April 6, 1994.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the situation in Sudan. As you know, ending the conflict and human suffering in Sudan is one of my highest priorities in Africa.

I understand that you met recently with Tony Lake on this issue. As Tony mentioned, my Administration has taken several measures to address the crisis in Sudan. At the start of the current offensive, we made a demarche to the Sudanese Government both here and in Khartoum to underscore the horror with which we view the military operation and the bombing of civilians. We followed immediately with a strong press statement condemning the blatant lack of concern for the lives of innocent Sudanese and the interruption of the one-going international humanitarian relief effort. We also have provided continuous support for the Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD) peace effort which we hope will lead to a comprehensive settlement between the parties in Sudan. I will appoint a special envoy to Sudan to work with the IGADD leaders in this effort.

I share your concern regarding the humanitarian crisis in Sudan and look forward to working the Congress to end this tragedy.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

STATEMENT BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FRANK R. WOLF—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO THE HORN OF AFRICA, FEBRUARY 5 TO FEBRUARY 12, 1993

I recently returned from an official visit to the Horn of Africa. Using Nairobi, Kenya as a staging point, I visited southern Sudan for a two-day period followed by one day's stop in Baidoa, Somalia.

The Sudan is far, far away. Not only in terms of the 20 hour flight to get there, but it is a distant place in a distant time. The refugees in southern Sudan are a forgotten people in a remote corner of the world whose story is an untold tragedy of oppression, of cruelty and of hopelessness. The ravages they continue to endure seem worse because they result not only from drought, plague and natural holocaust, but also spring from man's inhumanity to man.

On Monday, February 8, I flew in a small twin engine plane carrying relief medical supplies into southern Sudan from the Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) organization. I arrived at the base camp which is home to the NPA, the only Non-Government Organization (NGO) today with a permanent round-the-clock presence in Sudan since four relief workers were recently killed in a skirmish involving factions of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA). Joining the NPA in Sudan is the Catholic Relief Service (CRS), another outstanding group whose vital role is convoying life-giving food supplies from outside the country to three refugee feeding camps in the southern region: Aswa, Ame and Atepe. These loosely defined camps are located in proximity to the main road bisecting Sudan on which hundreds of thousands of refugees make their way southward driven by the relentless and unforgiving army of the Sudan government in Khartoum. People are without food, without medicine, without clothing and without hope. These are people who would surely perish without the bare subsistence provided by the Norwegian People's Aid and Catholic Relief groups.

I visited two of these three camps and saw the relief efforts which seem, at best, to fend off starvation and sickness for the moment, rather than provide lasting sustenance to the refugees. Twice each day, infants and children with their feeding bowls formed an endless line to receive meager rations of food

to prolong their existence until they again line up and repeat the process. In these camps, I listened to the refugees and to the people, I heard Rebekka, a woman from the Dinka tribe who was angry and upset. She had lost her husband and three children. She told me three things which I heard again and again all throughout the region.

First, she said that the world is silent to the suffering in southern Sudan because, she thought, the victims are black. The reluctance to act, in her view and others was a matter of race discrimination and would not be tolerated in any other part of the globe. The second point is, she felt, that they were being persecuted, starved, bombed and killed because they were Christians. The last point on which there is near universal agreement by the southern Sudanese refugees is that the other humanitarian groups such as World Vision and others who do a wonderful job should come back to help with their life-giving assistance. These groups left the region after the relief workers were killed and have been reluctant to return until some measure of security for the care-givers can be assured. These three points were echoed by others with whom I met. A pharmacist who provided the only medical and health care at the Ame camp made a similar plea and asked for the return to Sudan of the private humanitarian relief groups.

Until significantly more relief is available, there is little medical care, no health care, insufficient food to sustain life—people are starving to death every day—no opportunity to educate the children and no chance for tomorrow. The people in Sudan have literally lost a generation and maybe more.

I also met with representatives of the SPLA, the Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Association (SRRA), with a number of Catholic Priests, local officials and a number of "old hands" in Sudan. I visited hospitals including one exclusively for those with tuberculosis. I saw first hand recent damage in the town of Kajo Keji on the western bank of the Nile where the Khartoum government bombed the crowded town market square, killing and injuring many. The Khartoum government conducted high altitude bombing on this village when there was no military presence. I saw bomb craters where they hit huts and destroyed the market place. I visited what was termed a hospital but what was in reality a filthy, rat infested place where the injured were gathered. One woman, injured in the air-raid, had shrapnel still in her head. She had no hope and little chance for tomorrow. When it seemed conditions were as bad as they could be, they got worse.

This is a story that must be told. This was my third trip to Sudan. I first travelled there in 1988 and then again in 1989. Conditions there are worse today than they were before. This situation must not be permitted to last. It need not last; there is much that can be done.

I want to summarize some recommendations. Our government must work for relief from the Khartoum government. Pressure must be put on them to stop the bombing and stop the killing. In the southern region of Sudan, buffer zones around pockets of refugees should be agreed to by the Khartoum government and the SPLA, to keep soldiers out and allow relief groups the freedom to administer food, medical and humanitarian aid. Humanitarian relief organizations must be encouraged to return to the region. Stepped-up efforts to provide medical teams to help out for short but frequent periods is essential. Failure to act soon will surely result in still more tragic loss of life and possibly the loss of an entire culture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 22, 1993.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to express our continued concern about the situation in Sudan and to offer some recommendations. Your decision to add the Government of Sudan to the list of states that sponsor terrorism was welcome news to many Members of Congress. This kind of assertive move on the part of the United States will send a very strong message to Khartoum that Washington and the international community will not tolerate Sudan's support for terrorist groups. But the placing of Sudan on the list is not enough—pressure must be continuously focused on the government, which has shown wanton disregard for human lives over the past several years.

In recent months, humanitarian and political conditions have deteriorated significantly. An estimated 500,000 people have died in the past two years, while over 2 million southern Sudanese have been displaced internally. Many languish in refugee camps in Uganda, Kenya, and other neighboring countries. The children of southern Sudan continue to die in large numbers as a result of starvation, disease, and war, while the international community's attention continues to focus on Somalia and Bosnia. The Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) factions have also been reckless. Many innocent civilians have died and scores of people have been forced to flee their homes because of SPLM factional fighting since November 1991.

The United States has played a limited role in addressing the North-South conflict and the factional fighting within the SPLM. We strongly believe that the United States should play a greater role in Sudan. Efforts by other countries in Africa, such as Nigeria and Kenya, have not produced tangible results over the past several years. The United States has assumed paramount responsibilities in the new international order, almost as an unavoidable consequence of its Cold War victory. Sudan represents an extreme case of a situation by no means unusual, in which nations are torn apart by identity crises. The situation in Sudan, because it is so dire, begs for U.S. active engagement in mediation and reconciliation efforts.

Moreover, the United States has a moral responsibility to help the victims of the ten year old civil war, people who have escaped the notice of the community of nations. Ignoring the plight of millions of innocent civilians in Sudan need not become a viable option. The people of Sudan have suffered enough, it is time for the international community to act. The likelihood of a Somalia-like scenario is high unless the international community acts soon. In the case of Sudan, there is still time to address the problem.

We strongly recommend that the United States appoint a Special Envoy for mediation and reconciliation. Ambassador Herman Cohen, who has expressed an interest in facing this challenge, would be an excellent choice for the post. As Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 1989 to 1993, Ambassador Cohen showed profound knowledge about the complex political problems in Sudan. Appointing a Special Envoy for mediation and reconciliation will be seen by the international community as evidence of commitment to find a solution. Any measure short of this could be considered window-dressing for lack of policy, complacency, and the shelving of the case. The recent appointment of a Special Envoy for Humanitarian Affairs only addresses one aspect of the Sudan problem. We believe the humanitarian issue can best be addressed by the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum since it will require continual monitoring and coordination with other donors.

We are hopeful that you will give serious consideration to our recommendation. The United States can play a pivotal role in mediation and reconciliation efforts in Sudan. We cannot afford to stand by and watch the tragedy unfold, evolve, and come to a catastrophic conclusion.

Sincerely,

HARRY JOHNSTON,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Africa.
DONALD M. PAYNE.
ALCEE L. HASTINGS.
DAN BURTON.
ELIOT L. ENGEL.
PAUL SIMON,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee in Africa.
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM.
JAMES M. JEFFORDS.
CLAIBORNE PELL.
FRANK R. WOLF.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Washington, DC, August 5, 1993.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I appreciate your personal attention to the worsening situation in Sudan. I believe the Clinton Administration has taken positive steps to bring an end to the suffering in Sudan, but I believe that the United States must do more.

I commend their appointment of Ambassador Frances Cook as Special Envoy to Sudan for humanitarian issues. This appointment made clear to the government of Sudan that the United States considers the crisis in Sudan very serious and Ambassador Cook has made progress in alleviating much suffering in Sudan. I am distressed that Ambassador Cook will soon be leaving her post as Special Envoy.

To ensure that the positive efforts of Ambassador Cook are not interrupted, I strongly encourage the prompt appointment of a new Special Envy to Sudan. I believe this special envoy should have expanded powers which allow him or her to address political issues as well as the humanitarian ones. To simply ensure the safe passage of humanitarian assistance to the people is not enough; this envoy must have the authority to help bring an end to the decade-old civil war. Further, to gain the respect of all parties, this person must be of the ambassadorial rank and must have a thorough knowledge of East African issues.

It is becoming more clear that establishing a lasting peace in Sudan between the government of Sudan and the rebel factions is a very elusive proposition. One major obstacle to peace is the apparent unwillingness of the two major rebel factions in Southern Sudan, the SPLA United under the leadership of John Garang and the Nasir faction headed by Lam Akol, to meet together with the Sudanese government. While I believe the United States must continue to pressure the Khartoum government to negotiate an end of the

civil war, so-called "south-south" negotiations between the two SPLA rebel factions must be convened to end inter-SPLA fighting. (Right now some of the violent human rights abuses recently in Sudan have been perpetrated by SPLA rebels.) The United States must immediately begin work with other nations to bring together these two rebel factions to negotiate a settlement to their differences.

Peace can and must be brought to Sudan. But it can only be achieved with strong American leadership. Please ensure that a new Special Envoy is appointed and work to make peace a reality in Sudan.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 5, 1993.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The President, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I appreciate your personal attention to the worsening situation in Sudan. I believe the Clinton Administration has taken positive steps to bring an end to the suffering in Sudan, but I believe that the United States must do more.

I commend the appointment of Ambassador Frances Cook as Special Envoy to Sudan for humanitarian issues. This appointment made clear to the government of Sudan that the United States considers the crisis in Sudan very serious and Ambassador Cook has made progress in alleviating much suffering in Sudan. I am distressed that Ambassador Cook will soon be leaving her post as Special Envoy.

To ensure that the positive efforts of Ambassador Cook are not interrupted, I strongly encourage the prompt appointment of a new Special Envoy to Sudan. I believe this special envoy should have expanded powers which allow him or her to address political issues as well as the humanitarian ones. To simply ensure the safe passage of humanitarian assistance to the people is not enough; this envoy must have the authority to help bring an end to the decade-old civil war. Further, to gain the respect of all parties, this person must be of the ambassadorial rank and must have a thorough knowledge of East African issues.

It is becoming more clear that establishing a lasting peace in Sudan between the government of Sudan and the rebel factions is a very elusive proposition. One major obstacle to peace is the apparent unwillingness of the two major rebel factions in Southern Sudan, the SPLA United under the leadership of John Garang and the Nasir faction headed by Lam Akol, to meet together with the Sudanese government. While I believe the United States must continue to pressure the Khartoum government to negotiate an end of the civil war, so-called "south-south" negotiations between the two SPLA rebel factions must be convened to end inter-SPLA fighting. (Right now some of the violent human rights abuses recently in Sudan have been perpetrated by SPLA rebels.) The United States must immediately begin work with other nations to bring together these two rebel factions to negotiate a settlement to their differences.

Mr. President, peace can and must be brought to Sudan. But it can only be achieved with strong American leadership. Please quickly appoint a new Special Envoy and work to make peace a reality in Sudan.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, on May 10 and 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. GORDON.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. MANTON.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 10, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3132. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting status of budget authority that was proposed for rescission by the President in his fourth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 103–254); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3133. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the Javelin major defense acquisition program is essential to the national security, has no alternative that would cost less, its new estimates are reasonable and its management structure is adequate, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3134. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the C–17 major defense acquisition program is essential to the national security, has no alternative that would cost less, its new estimates are reasonable and its management structure is adequate, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3135. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the Titan IV major defense acquisition program is essential to the national security, has no alternative that would cost less, its new estimates are reasonable and its management structure is adequate, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3136. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the AN/SQQ–89 major defense acquisition program is essential to the national security, has no alternative that would cost less, its new estimates are reasonable and its management structure is adequate, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3137. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the ASAS major defense acquisition program is essential to the national security, has no alternative that would cost less, its new estimates are reasonable and its management structure is adequate, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3138. A letter from the Deputy and Acting CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 1994 Semiannual Comprehensive Litigation Report, covering the period from October 1, 1993 to March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public law 103–204, section 3; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3139. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 02–94, concerning a proposed Agreement with the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3140. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 03–94, concerning a proposed Agreement with the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Secretary's determination and justification to exercise the authority granted him under section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizing funds for a Palestinian police force in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2261(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3142. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3143. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the administration's policy on multilateral peace operations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3144. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 2333, H.R. 4066, S. 1636, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–582); to the Committee on Government Operatios.

3145. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting

copies of Federal construction prospectus for Tucson, AZ, and Cleveland, OH, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[The following action occurred on May 6, 1994]

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3567. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to transfer operating responsibilities to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-453, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 9, 1994]

Mr. OBEY: The 1994 Joint Economic Report on the 1994 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 103-496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 2000. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-497).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. MCCRERY) introduced a bill (H.R. 4369) to remove the restrictions on the export of Alaskan North Slope oil, and for other purposes; which was referred, jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1080: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1191: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 3678: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 3818: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 4100: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4211: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 4212: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHENK, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 4215: Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 129: Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. REED, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. PENNY.

H. Con. Res. 188: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. COX, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. LONG, and Mr. DELLUMS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S GET MOVING, AMERICA

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1994

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports has declared the month of May "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month" in celebration of our Nation's commitment to physical fitness and sports participation. This May is no exception.

During May, we also traditionally promote awareness for such issues as mental health, older Americans, osteoporosis prevention, high blood pressure, physical education, better sleep, and arthritis.

In recognition that May is a time for many Americans of enhanced participation and awareness of physical fitness and health needs, the President made a landmark decision this year to bring 23 health and fitness advocacy groups together as a united, powerful voice in support of physical activity and fitness. The result of this union is Presidential Fitness Partners in May.

These organizations—many fighting for differing agendas—are to be commended for their decision to form this valuable partnership. Through cooperation, there is a greater chance of reaching more Americans uneducated about the benefits of good health and fitness and ways to make it fun and convenient. Together, these organizations can make a real difference in building a healthier, more physically fit America.

We all will benefit by joining in this celebration of good health and fitness.

CONGRATULATING THE KAHUKU HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT FINALIST WINNERS IN THE "WE THE PEOPLE CONSTITUTION" CONTEST

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1994

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row students from Kahuku High School represented the State of Hawaii in the national finals of the "We the People Constitution" competition. The students who reached the national finals this year after winning competitions at the district and State levels are members of Kahuku High School's 10th grade honors history class. I congratulate the students on their hard work and scholarship. They are: Ursula Aiu, Dana Barnhill, Beth Frederick, Amber Grigsby, Kalli Kamauoha, Marie Kritikos, Larie Langi, Nadya Leinau, Kimberly Miller, Marci Ostrowski, Christian Palmer, Jesse Palmer, Ian Parnell, Taliana Pasi, Mariaha Peters, Emily Shumway, Shelley Smith, Leah Taala, Israel Temple, Carrie Tilley, and Kanai Yang.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Ms. Sandra Cashman. Please note that Ms. Cashman also taught the Kahuku High School students who represented the State of Hawaii in last year's "We the People Constitution" national competition. Ms. Cashman clearly knows how to motivate her students.

Ms. Kathy Ellwin and Ms. Jane Kinoshita, district coordinators with the State of Hawaii Department of Education, and Ms. Sharon Kaohi, the State coordinator, deserve recognition for their efforts in helping the Kahuku High School team reach the national finals.

The "We the People Constitution" Program is administered by the Center of Civic Education and supported and funded by the U.S. Congress. The program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights. During the course of the 3-day "We the People Constitution" competition, student finalists are tested on their knowledge of constitutional issues as they take part in activities that simulate a congressional hearing.

I commend the program for providing students an opportunity to gain an appreciation of the significance of the Constitution and how it has both shaped this Nation's history and impacts our lives today.

Again, my congratulations to the students of Kahuku High School for having reached and participated in the national "We the People Constitution" competition.

NEW ORLEANS VA BENEFITS OFFICE EMPLOYS OWN COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1994

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, before the now common buzzwords of modernization and reengineering came into fashion, the New Orleans Regional Office automated its Loan Guaranty Division using only in-house resources. The director, Tony Lentini, in response to the burgeoning rating workload, took the initiative and directed his adjudication officer and IRM team to develop in-house a computer rating application. Unlike many contractor-developed products, the rating application, Word Assisted Rating System [WARS], was developed with involvement by rating specialists who would eventually use it. It was offered to any regional office that might benefit from its employment and has since been adopted for VBA-wide use. Its application at the New Orleans Regional Office not only improved quality of rating decisions, but also allowed Lentini to dismantle his typing pool and redistribute those valuable human resources to other functions in the regional office. The stations' philosophy under Lentini's leadership has been one of including employees, embracing technology, and of welcoming change.

I want to recognize and pay tribute to the employees of the New Orleans VA Regional Office who are responsible for developing a program that will revolutionize the way VA rates disability claims. Testimony before our committee recently revealed that by the end of the year, more than 900,000 claims will be pending before the regional offices. VA is doing something to change the way it conducts its business and this is but one example of creative initiatives in the field that will help solve a major problem in claims adjudication.

WARS is an automation tool for assisting Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA] employees in completing documents related to the disability claims within the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. The software, which is fully compatible with the initial stage of VA's new computer modernization effort, leads rating specialists and other technicians through the steps in completing complex disability evaluations.

The system automatically generates decision and appeal documents in the proper format. Users have at their disposal electronic text from the disability rating schedule as well as all of the pertinent laws and regulations related to disability claims. What separates this system from ordinary word processors is the structure. The system uses a decision tree approach in its organization which leads the user through the process. Simple keystroke answers generate much of the needed text for many rating decisions. In this way the documents are more consistent and many of the errors associated with traditional dictating systems are eliminated. Other electronic aids, such as medical dictionaries, are also part of the system. Operating in a windows environment allows the user to interface with other automated systems such as the Automated Medical Information System [AMIE] and gives great potential for future interfacing.

In mid-1993 it became apparent that the need existed for interim solutions to automating rating document creation and that the voice recognition solution would be more of a long term possibility. Because of the major investment in system design and development in the voice recognition area, New Orleans VA Regional Office director, Anthony R. Lentini, directed his adjudication officer, Sandy Bowron, to lead a new effort to capitalize on that investment by converting the decision tree approach used in voice to a system that would be compatible with the new stage I equipment being delivered to field offices. The southern area director, James Maye, supported this initiative and authorized the assistance of Ver-

non Boggs from the Atlanta Regional Office. The result was a utilization of many of the same field office personnel who had worked together in the AMIE project, the voice project, and now the WARS project. With their efforts, they designed an application that retained much of the positive features of the voice system. At the New Orleans Regional Office, Ms. Denise Engolia and other IRM technicians began the labor-intensive task of reprogramming the system in stage I compatible software. By July 1993 the initial software, WARS, was ready for testing.

During July 1993, the rating board at the New Orleans Regional Office began converting from the traditional methods for dictating rating decisions to the WARS system. This transition was completed during October 1993. As a direct result of this project, the New Orleans VARO's centralized transcription activity [CTA] was abolished and the personnel were reassigned to the Adjudication Division. In early 1994, the system was made available to all regional offices seeking to create rating documents using the stage I equipment.

Finally, in March 1994, the Systems Development Service in Central Office accepted WARS as an interim solution to assist with the completion of rating documents and accepted responsibility for including WARS in the inventory of approved VBA applications. This is another example of meeting Vice President GORE's challenge to reinvent government by empowering employees to develop creative solutions for meeting customer needs.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other new programs developed by regional offices that will enhance the VA's ability to deliver timely services to veterans. To all of those in the field and in Central Office who continue to work so diligently for our Nation's veterans, and especially to those in the New Orleans Regional Offices I have singled out for special recognition, I office congratulations and our thanks for what they are doing. We are very proud of them.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 1994, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 11

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the possible health effects to non-smokers of environmental tobacco smoke.
SH-216

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the Administration's crop insurance proposal.
SR-332

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

Armed Services
Defense Technology, Acquisition, and Industrial Base Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, and the future years defense program, focusing on the Technology Reinvestment Program.
SR-222

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine discrimination in homeowners insurance.
SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on S. 1822, to safeguard and protect the public interest while permitting the growth and development of new communications technologies, focusing on electric utilities entry into telecommunications.
SR-253

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (Ex. C, 95th Congress, 2nd Session).
SD-419

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1981, the Orphan Drug Act Amendments, and S. 784, Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act, and to consider pending nominations.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control, and Defense Intelligence Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the ballistic missile defense program.
SR-222

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the General Services Administration.
SD-116

MAY 12

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold closed (SH-219) and open (SH-216) hearings on United States military operations in Somalia during United Nations Operations in Somalia II (UNOSOM II).
SH-219

Office of Technology Assesment Board
meeting, to consider pending business.
EF-100, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the proposed plan to make independent the air traffic control services of the Federal Aviation Administration.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed renewable oxygenate standard.
SD-366

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Election Commission.
SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Corporation for National and Community Service.
SD-106

Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Architect of the Capitol.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To continue hearings on S. 1822, to safeguard and protect the public interest while permitting the growth and development of new communications technologies, focusing on long-distance services.
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1964, to authorize funds to States for programs for worker reemployment and retraining.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1513, authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
SD-430

1:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine United Nations peace operations.
SD-628

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on C-17.
SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1549, to revise the Act establishing Golden Gate National Recreation Area to provide for the management of the Presidio by the Secretary of the Interior, and S. 1639, to provide for the management of the portions of the Presidio under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.
SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of the U.S. Supreme Court Decision in Central Bank of Denver v. First Interstate Bank of Denver.
SD-538

Small Business
Export Expansion Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine export assistance efforts for small business.
SR-428A

Joint Printing
Business meeting, to consider the financial position of the Government Printing Office, and related measures.
S-324, Capitol

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on the global land mines crisis.
SH-216

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
SD-192

Governmental Affairs
Regulation and Government Information Subcommittee
To hold hearings on adjusting poverty data for differences in cost-of-living.
SD-342

MAY 16

4:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Joseph R. Paolino, Jr., of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malta.
S-116, Capitol

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to bomb exports in the 1990's.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on environmental programs.
SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for foreign assistance programs.
SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the earthquake disaster program.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 112, to establish the Hudson River Artists National Historical Park in the State of New York, S. 1660 and H.R. 3498, bills to establish the Great Falls Historic District, S. 1683, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide funds for the Palisades Interstate Park Commission for acquisition of land in the Sterling Forest area of New York/New Jersey Highlands Region, and S. 1999, to establish the Lower East Side Tenement Museum National Historic Site.
SD-366

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on S. 1614, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1998 for programs of the Child Nutrition Act and the National School Lunch Act.
SR-332

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Veteran's Affairs, and the Selective Service System.
SD-106

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 3252, to provide for the conservation, management, or study of certain rivers, parks, trail and historic sites, and H.R. 4034, to revise the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 to authorize grants for the expansion of recreation opportunities for at risk youth in urban areas with a high prevalence of crime.
SD-366

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Departments of Veteran's Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD-138

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the science concerning global climate change.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic programs.
SD-192

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on export promotion.
SD-138

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 26

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 1350, to revise the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine policy options for the disposition of excess weapons plutonium.
SD-366

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1824, Legislative Reorganization Act, H.R. 877, Smithsonian National African American Museum, an original bill authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Election Commission, S. Res. 196, printing resolution for Aging Committee, an original resolution authorizing the purchase of 1995 wall calendars, H. Con. Res. 222, authorizing acceptance and placement of a bust in the Capitol, and other legislative business.
SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD-106

JUNE 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Energy.
S-128, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine water quality and quantity problems and opportunities facing the lower Colorado River area.
SD-366

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To continue hearings on water quality and quantity problems and opportunities facing the lower Colorado River area.
SD-366

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 10

10:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on the Convention on the Prohibition of Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, opened for signature and signed by the United States at Paris on January 13, 1993 (Treaty Doc. 103-21).
SD-419