

cover agriculture, services, and other key trade issues. Many of these issues are sensitive, and even controversial.

We must be confident that we will see everything that is negotiated in the new round before it can become law. The legislation Senator CONRAD and I wrote that is part of the Africa trade bill requires full disclosure to Congress of all agreements or understandings with a foreign government relating to agricultural trade negotiations—what we refer to here as agricultural trade negotiations, objectives, and consultation.

Anyway, our provision says that any such agreement or understanding that is not disclosed to Congress before legislation implementing a trade agreement is introduced in the Congress shall not become law. In other words, if Congress doesn't know about the agreement, it should not become law. That is very simple. It is very clear. It is a restatement of the principle of full disclosure. It is consistent with Congress' constitutional responsibility for foreign commerce, but I understand the administration opposes this common-sense provision. They want it removed from the bill.

Mr. President, it says in the Conrad-Grassley bill, no secret side deals. The Congress agreed that there should be fully submitted to Congress all of the provisions of any negotiations that must be approved by Congress. I don't know why the administration wants this language removed from the trade bill, but this is what they have sent to the conferees in the Congress of the United States. They list this section that says no secret side deals. They are suggesting we strike this subsection.

We cannot let this happen. I will do everything I can to make sure this physical disclosure provision becomes the law of the land when the House and Senate conferees finally consider the African trade bill. I believe our Government should live by the same standards we expect from farmers in my hometown of New Hartford, IA, or any businessman in Des Moines, IA. Tell us exactly what you mean. Show us everything in the agreement. Act in good faith.

I ask my colleagues to support this provision and vote for it when it comes back from the conference committee so we have physical disclosure of everything so Congress isn't asked to vote on something that is secret, that we don't know anything about. If we do that, we are violating our constitutional responsibility to the people of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement the Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

GOOD NEWS FOR RURAL NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I am happy to say there is good news in the omnibus budget bill for rural New

Yorkers in two ways. The Satellite Home Viewer Act will finally allow rural residents in rural areas to receive local television programming, and the dairy language in the omnibus final package allows both option 1-A and the New England Dairy Compact to continue. Let me touch on both of these. It is clearly two dollops of good news for rural New Yorkers.

On the satellite bill, I have had constituent after constituent in areas such as Allegany County and Chenango County and Steuben County and Ulster County, throughout New York State in rural areas, tell me all of a sudden they were unable to receive over the air signals to receive local satellite programming. Imagine being cut off. Imagine for years depending on the weather reports before you took your kids to school or because you are a farmer and then not being able to get them. Imagine having your local news shows cut off. Imagine not being able to see things your family was accustomed to seeing, all because of a court action.

Today, that bill, that court action, is being overruled in the omnibus act. I am delighted to say half a million New York residents will now be able to get their local signal from their satellite which they were not able to do before—half a million people, all back the way they should be.

I hope we will continue the progress of the Satellite Home Viewer Act. The Federal provision was taken out. I understand the Senate Banking Committee plans to hold hearings next year to ensure that multiservice providers are encouraged to extend competition. I want to work with my colleagues to make sure my constituents in upstate rural New York, central New York, the west and southern tier, and in the north country have the same viewing options as those in downstate.

The other bit of good news, of course, is the dairy language in the final bill. First, I know some of my colleagues from Wisconsin and Minnesota have labored long and hard on behalf of their constituents in this regard. I salute their hard work, their tenacity, and their diligence. I heard the Senator from Minnesota say the average dairy farm in his State has 60 cows. It is no different in New York. We don't have large farms, by and large. We shouldn't be pitting one against the other. Without 1-A and without the dairy compact we would have had desperate times in rural New York for our dairy farmers. We are the third largest dairy State. Dairy is a vital industry in much of New York.

If option 1-B were allowed to be implemented, New York would experience the single largest loss of any State, \$30.5 million a year. Compacts, of course, are necessary. The 1-A option passed both Houses. This is not something being done in the dark of night and not being debated. Both Houses, after full debate, passed both compacts.

I say with all due respect to my colleagues from Minnesota and Wisconsin,

it is they who seek to thwart the will of the majority of the House and the Senate when they try at the last minute to stop an omnibus bill from going through. We need this compact.

In New York and New England, the price of milk has not risen by more than 4 cents over the national average in every given year. I say to my downstate constituents, to keep an industry vital to all New Yorkers going, is it worth it to pay that 4 cents? Almost everyone says yes. With senior citizen centers, WIC, and other types of good programs being exempt, this is a worthy piece of legislation. I think it is a good day for the dairy farmers of New York.

It is not all we wanted; I admit that. We want New York to be added to the Northeast Dairy Compact, and we will fight like the devil to make that happen in future years. Without 1-A and the existing dairy compact, which still benefits New York dairy farms in the north country and places such as Washington and Warren Counties and in central New York, those areas without the New England Dairy Compact, we would have suffered dramatically. Adding insult to injury, not having option 1-A would have been devastating.

In the last decade, New York State has lost one-third of its dairy farms, 13,000 to 8,600. The dairy compact and option 1-A will help my State and region retain this vital and cherished industry. I believe that can be done not at the expense of our counterparts in the Midwest.

In conclusion, it is a good day for rural New Yorkers in this omnibus bill. No. 1, the Satellite Home Viewer Act will allow half a million New York families to receive local signal once again; and, an extension of the dairy compact, as well as extension of option 1-A, will allow our dairy farmers who have been struggling over the last decade to have a better chance to survive, to grow, and to prosper in one of the industries most vital to all of New York State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Maine is recognized.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Ms. COLLINS. For the information of all of our colleagues, I inform Senators that we are still working out some last-minute issues that will then allow the Senate to move a number of important bills that have been cleared on both sides. While we are waiting for these last-minute glitches to be resolved, I want to take this opportunity to respond to some of the comments made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle this morning.

I am disappointed in some of the process, and I do not support all of the provisions of the omnibus appropriations bill which we will consider later this day, but I very much disagree with the assertions made by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

that we have not accomplished anything during this Congress. We have, in fact, accomplished a great deal of which we can be proud. Rather than engaging in harsh partisan rhetoric, we should be coming together in these final hours of this session to celebrate what we have done for the American people.

First of all, I think we can take great pride in the accomplishment that we will be producing a balanced budget for the first time in decades, one which does not raid the Social Security trust fund. This is a tremendous accomplishment and it establishes a new milestone in fiscal responsibility. It has been the Republican caucus that has held firm in their determination to prevent one penny of the Social Security trust fund from being diverted to support expensive new unrelated Government programs. We have succeeded. We have kept that commitment. We have fulfilled our obligation to the senior citizens of this country. For the first time in 30 years, the Congress has produced a balanced budget which will result in a surplus that does not rely on funds from the Social Security trust fund. The raid on the Social Security trust fund has been stopped cold.

I give a great deal of credit to Senator DOMENICI, to Senator STEVENS, to Senator ABRAHAM, and to all colleagues in the Republican caucus who have united in their determination to secure the Social Security trust fund for our seniors and for future generations. That is an accomplishment of which we can be proud.

Second, I am delighted the omnibus appropriations bill includes what has been my highest priority in the last few months and that is to restore some of the unintended cuts made by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 as well as by onerous regulations imposed by the Clinton administration that have impaired the ability of our rural hospitals, our home health care agencies, and our nursing homes to provide much needed quality health care to our Nation's senior citizens.

The Presiding Officer has been an early supporter of legislation that I have introduced to provide financial relief to our distressed home health care agencies. America's home health care agencies allow our senior citizens and our disabled citizens to receive the health care where they want it, in the security and the privacy of their own homes. Unfortunately, under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and exacerbated by misguided policies of the Clinton administration, America's home health agencies have found their ability to provide this care has been jeopardized. This care is so important to our Nation's senior citizens, particularly those who are living in rural areas of our country where access to home health care may spell the difference between staying in their own homes and having to travel many miles to receive health care.

Unfortunately, since cutbacks in home health care have gone into effect,

there has been a devastating impact on the senior citizens of our country. Let me use the example of the State of Maine. As you can see, in just a year's time, more than 6,000 Maine senior citizens have lost their access to home care. In fact, it is 6,600 Maine seniors who have lost their access to home health care. The number of home health care visits in Maine has declined by more than 420,000. Reimbursements to Maine's home health agencies have declined in a year's time by more than \$20 million.

Maine's home health agencies have had a long tradition of providing low-cost compassionate care. We are not talking about home health agencies that were in any way abusing the system, making too many visits, or over-billing Medicare. We are talking about home health agencies that were cost effective and efficient, providing quality low-cost care throughout the State of Maine.

I have visited with many of these seniors who have lost access to home health care. One was a retired priest in my hometown of Caribou, ME. He relied on his home health services and has now had to dig deeply into his savings to provide for the care out of his own pocket because Medicare is no longer providing the services he needs.

In another case, I visited an elderly couple in rural Maine who were able to stay together in their own home rather than go into a nursing home because of the valuable services provided by home health care nurses. The woman in this case was severely diabetic. She was confined to a wheelchair and had a wound that was not healing. It was home health care nurses who came three times a week to clean the wound, to change the dressing, to take care of her other health care needs. Home health care allowed her and her elderly husband to stay together in their golden years.

It is that kind of service which has made such a difference to the quality of life of our senior citizens, and it was that kind of service which has been so jeopardized by the ill-advised Clinton administration regulations and the unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

The legislation I introduced was a bipartisan bill. It was cosponsored by more than 30 of my colleagues, to reverse these unintended consequences. The Balanced Budget Remedies Act that is included in the omnibus appropriations bill does not go as far as I would like, frankly, but it is a good and necessary first step. I commend the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, as well as Senator MOYNIHAN, for working with us to come up with legislation that we can enact to ensure our senior citizens do not lose access to much needed health care.

That is also a very important bill to our rural hospitals. In our hospitals, in States such as Maine, we have been suffering from the cutbacks that jeop-

ardize their ability to provide care. These hospitals, in most cases, are the only hospital in the community. If they are forced to close because of unfair and inadequate reimbursements from Medicare, it will devastate the communities. It will leave many of our senior citizens and others in the community without access to health care at all when they become ill and need hospitalization.

One of the features of the cutbacks in home health care troubles me. I wonder what has become of these nearly 7,000 Maine citizens. In some cases they have been forced to pay for the care themselves. Many of the seniors in Maine simply cannot afford that kind of out-of-pocket expense. They are living on Social Security, on limited incomes. They already have a very difficult time affording their prescription drugs. Some of them have become sicker because they have lost their access to home health care and have prematurely been forced into nursing homes or have been subject to repeated hospitalization which would have been avoided had the home health care services been provided. The irony and the wrongheaded effect of this policy is we are probably going to end up paying more for the care for these senior citizens who have lost access to their home health care because hospitalization and nursing home care is so much more expensive than home health care. Surely this has been a shortsighted policy.

I am pleased this legislation is going to take the first steps we need to provide much needed financial relief to our Nation's home health care agencies, our rural hospitals, and our nursing homes. It is going to make a real difference. There is much else that is very valuable in this legislation for our Nation's families. Not only our senior citizens but our children are going to benefit from this legislation.

When you hear the rhetoric in this Chamber about education, you would think that somehow there has been an attempt to slash education funding. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the Republican Senate increased—increased, Mr. President—education spending by \$500 million beyond what was requested by President Clinton in his budget.

The increase also represents a substantial hike in spending for education programs over last year's spending levels. In fact, the legislation we are about to consider increases education spending by \$2 billion over the last fiscal year, and, again, the increase is \$500 million over what the President proposed.

Clearly, there is a deep and heartfelt commitment in the Senate to increase education spending and to recognize its importance to the future of this country and to ensuring a bright future for our Nation's children. The issue has not been about money. The issue has been who is best able to make education decisions. That is the debate we will continue next year.

To me, the answer is obvious. We do need to increase the Federal investment in education, but at the same time we need to empower our local school boards, our parents, our teachers, and our principals to make the decisions and set the priorities. We need to hold them accountable for improved education achievement, but we do not need a Washington-knows-best, a one-size-fits-all approach to education policy.

There is other good news in the omnibus appropriations bill, and that is good news for students and their families who are pursuing higher education. Since I have come to the Senate, one of my highest priorities has been to increase Pell grants and student loans so that no qualified student faces a financial barrier that makes it impossible for him or her to attend college.

Prior to coming to the Senate, I worked at a small business and health college in Bangor, ME, known as Husson College. It was there that I first became aware of how critically important Federal financial assistance was for students who are attending college.

Eighty-five percent of the students at Husson College could not afford to attend college but for the assistance they were provided from student loans and from Pell grants. This assistance was absolutely essential in allowing them to attend college. Many of them were first-generation college students. They were the first people in their families to have the opportunity to attend college. They were taking a big step they knew would ensure a brighter future for them and more opportunities.

We know the vast majority of new jobs that are being created into the next century will require some kind of postsecondary education, either attendance at a technical college, a private college, or a university. We are going to need more and more skills, more and more education, if we are to compete for the jobs of the future. That is why I am so delighted the legislation provides a significant increase for Pell grants.

As you can see, the maximum Pell grant will be increased in the appropriations bill. Currently, it is \$3,125. The President proposed \$3,250. The appropriations bill passed by the Senate proposed \$3,325. Those are good steps. They will help make college a little bit more affordable for our Nation's young people; indeed, also for older adults who are returning to college because they realize they need additional skills.

Once again, it is important we emphasize, the Senate increased spending for these essential Pell grants beyond what the President recommended. This is a budget of which we can be proud. It does not include every provision each of us would like. It reflects hours, weeks, and months of work. It reflects compromise. That is what the system is all about.

Each of us would write this bill differently. Each of us wishes the process

could be cleaner, that we could work to get our legislation accomplished earlier, that we had more cooperation with the White House in achieving this goal. But the fact is, this legislation will ensure brighter futures for the families of America.

I appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight on these important issues. The bill, which will be before us later today, is not perfect but it is good legislation that deserves the support of all our colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DECEPTIVE MAIL PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 335) to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmailability of certain deceptive matter relating to sweepstakes, skill contests, facsimile checks, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 335) entitled "An Act to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmailability of certain deceptive matter relating to sweepstakes, skill contests, facsimile checks, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, and for other purposes", do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.

TITLE I—DECEPTIVE MAIL PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Restrictions on mailings using misleading references to the United States Government.

Sec. 103. Restrictions on sweepstakes and deceptive mailings.

Sec. 104. Postal service orders to prohibit deceptive mailings.

Sec. 105. Temporary restraining order for deceptive mailings.

Sec. 106. Civil penalties and costs.

Sec. 107. Administrative subpoenas.

Sec. 108. Requirements of promoters of skill contests or sweepstakes mailings.

Sec. 109. State law not preempted.

Sec. 110. Technical and conforming amendments.

Sec. 111. Effective date.

TITLE II—FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD RETIREMENT PORTABILITY

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Portability of service credit.

Sec. 203. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation from service for purposes of the thrift savings plan.

Sec. 204. Clarifying amendments.

TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Sec. 301. Transfer of certain property to State and local governments.

TITLE I—DECEPTIVE MAIL PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act".

SEC. 102. RESTRICTIONS ON MAILINGS USING MISLEADING REFERENCES TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)—

(A) in the first sentence by striking "contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement" and inserting the following: "which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking "or" at the end and inserting "and"; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) such matter does not contain a false representation stating or implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any purchase or nonpurchase; or";

(2) in subsection (i) in the first sentence—

(A) in the first sentence by striking "contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement" and inserting the following: "which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking "or" at the end and inserting "and"; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) such matter does not contain a false representation stating or implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any contribution or noncontribution; or";

(3) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

"(j)(1) Any matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails which is described in paragraph (2) is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs.