law, the report of a rule relative to local exchange carriers, received on February 6, 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1041. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to FM broadcast stations, received on February 7, 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1042. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to maximum license terms, received on February 7, 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1043. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to FM broadcast stations, received on February 7, 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1044. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to appliance labeling, received on February 6, 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. WELLSTONE:

S. 292. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certain ambulance services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. NICKLES):

S. 294. A bill to amend chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal penalties for the killing or attempted killing of a law enforcement officer of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 295. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 292. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certain ambulance services; to the Committee on Finance.

THE AMBULANCE SERVICES ACT OF 1997

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Ambulance Services Act of 1997 today to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries are covered for necessary transport for emergency treatment.

I am deeply concerned that Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas have a difficult time gaining access to emergency care, and there are relatively few hospitals in these areas, and patients must often travel a great distance to reach them. The Medicare ambulance transport reimbursement regulations have not kept pace with changes in the health care system that have occurred as a result of efforts to improve care while decreasing the cost of care.

In many locales, clinics and ambulatory surgery centers staffed by physicians have developed the ability to provide routine emergency care. The local physicians are often available at the clinic, which has facilities and capability for emergency treatment. In fact, patients who are transported to the hospital emergency department during the day wait longer to see a physician than those at the clinic, as the physician must travel from the clinic to the hospital in order to see the patient.

It is often necessary for seniors who are experiencing a medical emergency to be transported via an ambulance. Under current regulation, seniors who require ambulance transport to an emergency care facility must be taken to a hospital. Therefore, the senior is left with a difficult choice: be transported to the hospital facility, which may take longer and is likely to involve a longer waiting time for emergency care, or be transported to a local facility that provides emergency care to other citizens, and pay for the ambulance transport out of pocket. Neither of these is an optimal choice.

As the reimbursement policy stands now, patients are required to use a more expensive facility when it may not be necessary. It would seem that allowing reimbursement for transport to nonhospital facilities that provide emergency care could result in fiscal savings in that the cost of ambulance transport combined with a clinic visit bill would be less than that of ambulance transport and a hospital emergency department bill. In addition, it would allow our senior citizens to have a health care benefit that is available to other members of the community.

Concerns that might arise about the medical necessity of transporting certain patients to a hospital emergency department can and should continue to be addressed by local and regional emergency medical service systems, based on levels of care that are available in the area. These systems set standards and protocols for emergency medical service providers and work with the health care community in developing protocols for transport and patient care.

Mr. President, I remain concerned about providing all of our citizens with an adequate level of health care. Our seniors need to be able to avail themselves of expeditious emergency care, without having to worry about how transport for this care will be paid for. The Ambulance Services Act of 1997 will go a long way toward this goal.

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

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

S. 292

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ambulance Services Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE COVERAGE OF CERTAIN AMBULANCE SERVICES.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(7)) is amended by striking ''regulations;'' and inserting ''regulations, except that such regulations shall not fail to treat ambulance services as medical and other health services solely because, in the case of an emergency, the individual is transported to a clinic or to an ambulatory surgical center;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to items and services provided on or after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

THE ORPHAN DRUG ACT OF 1997

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Orphan Drug Act of 1997, legislation to extend permanently the orphan drug tax credit. I am pleased that my good friend and colleague from Montana, Senator BAUCUS, is joining me. Similar legislation was introduced in the House last year by Representatives NANCY JOHNSON and ROBERT MATSUI. I am confident that they will once again introduce legislation this year to make the credit permanent.

Mr. President, this credit encourages private firms to develop treatments for rare diseases. As many of my colleagues know, we extended this medical research tax credit last year, but, it will expire on May 31 of this year.

Since the 1983 enactment of the orphan drug tax credit we have seen very encouraging progress in developing new drugs to alleviate suffering from a number of so-called orphan diseases, those diseases that afflict a relatively small number of people. Because the process of research, development, and approval for new pharmaceuticals is so costly—running into hundreds of millions of dollars—the small market for a drug discourages drug companies from undertaking it.

Mr. President, the incentive provided by this credit gives hope to individuals who suffer from such rare but devastating conditions as Tourette's syndrome. Huntington's disease, and neurofibromatosis, to name a few. Many

drugs designated as orphan drugs have a much small potential market than even the 200,000 patients referred to in the definition in this credit—sometimes they are for conditions that affect as few as 1,000 persons in the United States. This means that without some incentive there is simply no possibility for a firm to profit from its decisions to develop drugs that treat these diseases.

Fortunately, the orphan perception has been changing over the years that this research credit has been in effect. In fact, Mr. President, pharmaceutical companies have made great strides in discovering treatments for these orphan diseases. While only seven orphan drugs were approved by the FDA in the decade before the credit's initial passage, over 100 have been approved since and approximately 600 are now in development.

Last year, I mentioned the first-ever treatment for Gaucher disease, a debilitating and sometimes fatal genetic disorder. This disease afflicts fewer than 5,000 people worldwide, yet the company who discovered the treatment expended its time and money to search for a treatment precisely because of the orphan drug credit's incentives. There are other examples as well.

Mr. President, this credit's effectiveness has been tested for the past 14 years, and it has passed with flying colors. Few provisions of the tax code can claim to have clearly reduced human suffering and to have expanded our store of medical knowledge. This credit has done both.

By helping small, entrepreneurial firms to take advantage of the orphan drug credit, we can make it even more effective. Before last year, the tax credit only served as an incentive for companies that earn a current-year-profit. If the credit could not be used immediately, it was lost forever. For large, profitable drug companies, this was rarely a problem.

However, for many small, start-up pharmaceutical companies, this current-year restriction made the credit of little or no use. These firms typically lose money in the early years since they put all available funding into research. They only expect to see profits many years into the future.

In order to improve the credit's usefulness, we modified the credit in legislation last year to allow firms to carry the credit back 3 years and carry it forward 15 years. This will give small, growing companies an incentive to find ways to treat these rare diseases that cause so many to suffer. I have been impressed by the strides being made in the biomedical field, including growing firms in my home State of Utah.

In the course of research, scientists often stumble upon treatments that could, if developed, improve the lives of victims of rare diseases. However, because of the high cost of drug experiments and the enormous expense involved in gaining FDA approval, many researchers reluctantly set these promising drug innovations aside. Mr. President, this should not happen, not when so many are suffering from these rare diseases, and we have an effective credit available that has proven its benefits.

The following national groups officially endorse the Orphan Drug Act of 1997: National Organization for Rare Disorders [NORD], National Multiple Sclerosis Society, Tourette Syndrome Association, United Parkinson Foundation, American Autoimmune Related Disease Association, Leukemia Society of American, Cystinosis Foundation, New England Biomedical Research Coalition, Biotechnology Industry Organization, and the Epilepsy Foundation.

I urge my Senate colleagues to join us in sponsoring this bipartisan legislation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 293

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

SECTION 1. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN CLINICAL TESTING EXPENSES MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after May 31, 1997.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 294. A bill to amend chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal penalties for the killing or attempted killing of a law enforcement officer of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE OFFICER BRIAN GIBSON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I appreciate this opportunity. I came to the floor because I want to introduce a bill today that I think is very important. It is the Officer Brian Gibson District of Columbia Police Protection Act. I send this bill to the desk and ask for its appropriate referral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Madam President. I am introducing this bill today on behalf of myself, Senator LOTT, Senator THURMOND and Senator SESSIONS, because I think that today when we are laying to rest a person who has given his life for the public protection, Officer Gibson, in the District of Columbia, who was brutally murdered in his squad car. A person went up to his car, stuck a gun in his face and shot it.

If we cannot protect that man and make sure that he has every possible ounce of support that we can give to protect him, then I do not know what we can do to help the crime rate in the District.

I hope very much that the Mayor of the District and Congresswoman NORTON will be helpful on this. I have not yet been able to talk to them though I have put in a call. But the bottom line is we are trying to make the Capital City good for the people who live here but also good for any American or any foreign visitor, so they can come and see the most beautiful symbol of America possible. And that is not the case today.

So we are asking for the death penalty for the murder of a police officer in the District of Columbia, the same protection that a member of the Capitol Police now has and that police in 38 States now have. I think this is one way to say that if you are going to commit a heinous crime like this, you are going to face the ultimate of penalties.

I want Officer Gibson and his family to know that we appreciate that he gave his life in the line of duty. I want them to know that in the future, in his memory, we are going to not only give the highest penalty to someone who would kill one of his comrades, but we will also give restitution to the family that is suffering from the loss of their breadwinner, their father, their husband.

So I will introduce this bill today. I hope that we can get immediate action on it because it is time for us to say that the District of Columbia is going to be the model Capital City. I know all of us, on a bipartisan basis, want to make that happen. We want to come together to make this city work. After all, it is the beacon to the world for what is good about America. It is time that the Capital City met that test.

So in memory of Officer Gibson, I hope we will pass this bill. I hope we will do everything possible to get the crime rate in our Capital City down so that visitors from all over America will want to come and see this beautiful city that is our Capital.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 295. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGERS ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I am introducing, together with a number of my colleagues, the Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of

1997. This bill is identical to the TEAM Act approved by the Senate last year.

This bill responds to a series of decisions by the National Labor Relations Board which have cast doubt on the legality of many forms of workplace cooperation. Specifically, the Board held in the Electromation case that certain employer-employee committees violated the National Labor Relations Act's prohibition against employer-assisted labor organizations.

This ruling has had a chilling effect on some 30,000 companies that have employee involvement programs. The TEAM Act amends Federal labor law to allow voluntary workplace cooperation to continue. The legislation allows employers and employees to meet together to address issues of mutual interest, including issues related to quality, productivity, and efficiency as long as the committees or other joint programs do not engage in collective bargaining.

This last point is important. The bill does not allow employers to establish company unions or sham unions that undermined independent collective bargaining back in the 1930's. Under the TEAM Act, workers retain the right, as well they should, to choose an independent union to engage in collective bargaining.

More importantly, the TEAM Act gives workers the opportunity for greater input and involvement in the workplace. Not only does this allow workers to improve and expand their skills, but workplace cooperation also increases our productivity and competitive edge in the global marketplace.

This bill received bipartisan support in the last Congress, and I am confident it will again this year. This bill is not about labor versus management. It's about clarifying the law so that workers and management can work together to their mutual benefit and to the benefit of our economy as a whole. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle so that the TEAM Act becomes law in the very near future.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I rise in support of my colleague from Vermont in his introduction of the Team Work for Employees And Management Act. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership in helping American workers develop the capacity to be competitive, to be productive, and to maintain our standard of excellence throughout the world. The Team Act, which passed both the Senate and the House during the 104th Congress, but was vetoed by President Clinton, is vital to the survivability and strength of our Nation's economy.

Our Nation's strength is a result of recognizing the importance of the human resource in the equation. You simply cannot be competitive without tapping every part of the resource that you have. When we think of the NCAA basketball tournament next month, it is unthinkable that we would send teams into competition and forbid the coaches to talk to the players. What nonsense that would be.

It is fundamental recognition of the fact that the people on the court will have a different perspective than the people off the court. The people on the field will have an awareness of how things are going that is special, different, unique, and of value.

The same is true in industry. No matter how hard a compassionate manager tried to observe the process from outside, no matter how well the engineer from the design room tries to structure the environment for productivity, the person who actually is on the floor is going to have the ability to say, ''This doesn't work here. It may look good in theory, but it doesn't work in practice.''

I think that is what the TEAM Act is all about. It is about understanding and recognizing the tremendous resource that workers are, that they can be to the competitive position of this country by outproducing, outworking, outthinking, outsmarting, and outcooperating workers anyplace else in the world.

Most Americans would believe, and it is because we are commonsense people, that it is OK for employees and employers to talk. If you would have listened to the debate in this Chamber, you would have heard from those on the other side of the aisle, ''Why, it's all right, it's all OK, it's perfectly legal right now. We don't need this.''

When opponents of the TEAM Act say it is perfectly legal now, we do not need this law, it confounds me. Let me read from a list of things that have been ruled inappropriate for nonunion employers to talk to their nonunion employees on, so the American people have an understanding of what the law is and whether it needs to be changed.

If you discuss the extension of the employees' lunch breaks by 15 minutes, that is illegal, from the case of Sertafilm and Atlas Microfilming; the length of the workday, to discuss how long each workday is going to be, that is illegal, from Weston & Booker Co. A decrease in rest breaks from 15 to 10 minutes, that is illegal to talk about with workers. What paid holidays you have—the Singer Manufacturing case held that was illegal to talk about. The extension of store hours during wheat harvest season—the Dillon's company case said you cannot talk with workers about that to get their input.

Workers know what kind of break they need. Workers know what kind of workday they would like to work. I know of one plant in my home State where workers decided they wanted to work 4 days of 10 hours a day instead of 5 days of 8 hours a day and have 3-day weekends every week. Why would Government stand between workers and manufacturers, between managers and employees or their associates to say you cannot discuss those things, and yet that is what the law is for 8 out of 9 American workers, because 8 out of 9 American workers are nonunion workers.

The National Labor Relations Act governs election of unions and collective bargaining. Section 8(a)(2) was passed in 1935 to prohibit the establishment of sham company unions, a tactic commonly used by employers to defeat union organizing. These organizations pretended to engage in collective bargaining, but followed management's dictates and typically were run by officers handpicked by management. Companies then pretended to enter into collective-bargaining agreements with these sham organizations so that when a union attempted to organize the workers, the companies could hide behind the exclusive representation and contract bar tenets of the law.

Vigorous enforcement of section 8(a)(2) resulted in the demise of the company unions by the early 1950's. While sham unions should continue to be prohibited under our labor laws—and would remain so under the TEAM Act—the broad prohibition that remains in effect today prevents the types of legitimate cooperative working relationships that encourage worker participation and decisionmaking.

Let me give you an example. When I was Governor of the State of Missouri, I had the opportunity to work with companies. Like I do today, I would go and work on the assembly line. I would go and work with people to learn about their jobs and talk to them about their concerns.

One of the companies that was hauled into the justice system of the Labor Department for cooperating with its employees was a company called EFCO Corp. It was a small company in Missouri, having approximately 60 jobs. Now it has over 1,000 jobs. Much of its capacity was to increase its on-time deliveries, which went from the low seventies up into the high nineties, and which allowed workers to start working 4 days a week instead of 5 days a week, get their 40 hours in 4 days and have long weekends, spend more time with their kids, accommodate the demands of their families. It all came from these programs.

What was most distressing was that when EFCO wanted to be involved, it was said to have dominated its discussion groups or teams because they provided employees with pencils and pens and allowed them to have access to the financial records of the company. That was what the NLRB said was a violation.

You would say this company is bending over backward. It opens up the books to the workers and says: How can we do better for and how can we, as a team, do better, how can we as a company have the kind of performance and productivity that will recommend us to the world? And indeed they are now a world-class company. But because they provided the pens and pencils and they allowed the workers to have access to the company's financial records, the NLRB filed charges

against the company. This is not the kind of thing that recommends America for leadership. It is the kind of thing that takes correction.

Opponents say if you talk about those things, the workers will think you have union when you don't. It will be a sham union. Frankly, I do not underestimate the American worker that severely.

Over the Christmas break I went to and worked in about five or six places in Missouri, actually on the job side-by-side with people. I never met a single worker who did not know whether he or she was in a union. They know. Workers know whether union dues are being deducted. The know whether they are in a separate organization. It is not hard. This is not above the capacity of the American worker. The idea somehow that if we allow managers to talk to employees, employees will be tricked into thinking they have a union when they do not have a union is ludicrous. It underestimates the intelligence of the American work force.

A second objective from the other side is, ''Well, maybe if we allow people to talk, they will be just talking to certain employees who only have limited views, and they will not reflect the views of employees generally.'' There is a safeguard. If there is an unfair system established where workers and employers are communicating with each other and it is working against the interests of the workers, it is easy. Workers have every right to unionize. They can form a labor union. They can petition for a labor union. They can ask that unions come in if they think it is unfair.

There is a structural guarantee of competition. If nonunion systems are not working well for employees, if these things are likely to be so distorted or so unfair, nothing in this law, nothing in this proposal, in any way derogates, undermines, erodes, or otherwise lessens the right of a worker to petition for an election to organize or unionize a plant.

There are about 30,000 employers that would like to have such employee-involvement programs. Why is it they would like to have such programs? Because they have seen that when we work together we succeed. Strange to me, that is basically a quote from President Clinton's 1996 State of the Union Address. He said, and I agree, ''When companies and workers work as a team, they do better, and so does America.''

The real truth of the matter is understood in the hearts and minds of everyone who has every worked on a team, knowing that when you work together, you do better than when you work at odds with each other.

The ability of union workers to collaborate with employers is well ensconced. It is fought for by the unions and protected by the employers, recognized as a great benefit. But why should we limit that great benefit to 11 or 12 percent of our society, to the 1 out of 9 workers in America that are in unions? Why not extend this benefit to all workers in America saying that it is entirely appropriate for nonunion workers, as well as union workers, to be involved in collaborating and cooperating, in providing their good judgment of how best to improve the situation for workers and to improve the productivity and profitability of the business?

No. I do not think we would send our teams to the NCAA tournament forbidding the players to talk to the coaches. We have too much sense to do that. No, I do not think that union companies are going to stop having team discussions between employees and the company owners and managers. They have too much sense to do that. And, no, I do not think that this Government should stand between the owners of corporations and their managers and the employees who work hard and want to succeed and want to be productive and keep them from talking to each other, because I believe the American people have too much sense to do that.

I urge my colleagues to extend this benefit which now inures to the benefit of 1 out of 9 workers in America to the rest of the working population. Let us give everyone an opportunity to contribute to a winning effort, to succeed. That will maintain America's position as the most productive and most profitable and most rewarding place, not just for companies, but for citizens, not just for institutions, but for individuals. It is, in fact, a reason that America continues to draw people from around the globe. It is the fact that we have recognized the worth and value of individuals. And for us to deny their value in a commercial setting would be a substantial error which we must not make.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 13

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 13, a bill to provide access to health insurance coverage for uninsured children and pregnant women.

S. 20

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the rate and spread the benefits of economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 61

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] were added as cosponsors of S. 61, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend eligibility for veterans' burial benefits, funeral benefits, and related benefits for veterans of certain service in the U.S. merchant marine during World War II.

S. 104

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 104, a bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

S. 124

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 124, a bill to invest in the future of the United States by doubling the amount authorized for basic science and medical research.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit the use of social security and medicare trust funds for certain expenditures relating to union representatives at the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to apply the act to a greater percentage of the U.S. workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to review, reform, and terminate unnecessary and inequitable Federal subsidies.

S. 219

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 219, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to establish procedures for identifying countries that deny market access for value-added agricultural products of the United States.

S. 220

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to require the U.S. Trade Representative to determine whether the European Union has failed to implement satisfactorily its obligations under certain trade agreements relating to U.S. meat and pork exporting facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 228

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 228, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for continuing appropriations in the absence of regular appropriations.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from New