



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 22, 2000

No. 64

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise You for new beginnings and fresh starts. Things never need remain the same. Because of Your grace, we need not perpetuate the problems of the past. Last week was a week of conflict, sharp disagreements, and acrimonious differences over the procedures and methods of managing the work of the Senate. Here we are, at the beginning of a new week. We know that we cannot remain deadlocked and debilitated by differences. Grant the Senators the willingness to listen to one another. May both parties be willing to place the highest priority and value on finding a way to move forward together. Remind them that there is nowhere else to go, no escape from the responsibility of leading the Nation together. Help all of the Senators to discern what is needed for the parties to function effectively together and then to commit themselves to doing everything they can do, not to defend a position but to discover Your plan for unity and oneness in the spirit of patriotism. Father, we need You. Our efforts have not worked. We need Your intervention, Your vision for a solution, and Your power to make things work. Extricate us from being part of the problem to becoming part of Your solution. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON KYL, a Senator from the State of Arizona, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

SCHEDULE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business with Senators DURBIN and THOMAS in control of the first 2 hours. For the information of all Senators, it is the intention of the majority leader to begin consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill during Tuesday's session. The leader has announced that the Senate will remain in session notwithstanding the Memorial Day recess in order to complete this important spending bill. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the week and into the weekend if necessary.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each. Under the previous

order, the time until 12 noon will be under control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to use as much of the time allocated to Senator DURBIN as I may use.

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

SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. DORGAN. I noticed in the Washington Post this morning an editorial I wanted to comment on briefly. Those noted experts on agriculture and the farm program who write editorials for the Washington Post have written an editorial today entitled "A Deal Too Sweet" about the sugar program. I can just see them sitting out there in their Big Ben coveralls dumping sugar into their coffee, cogitating about America's sugar program and America's farm program. I want to suggest to them to look in a different direction.

They see a program in this country where sugar prices are kept far too high, in their judgment. They believe the market for sugar would produce prices at just a fraction of what the sugar program currently provides sugar producers. I fear the Washington Post just does not understand the sugar program or the market.

Most sugar in this world is traded contract to contract between countries. Very little is traded in the open market. What is traded in the open market is the surplus or the dumped sugar. This dumped sugar is traded at very low prices, but that does not reflect the cost of sugar that is traded between countries.

For a number of reasons, the sugar program is not working as well as it had in the past. For a long period of time the sugar program provided both stable prices for consumers and also stable income, or stable support for

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4219

sugar producers. Is this a worthwhile goal? I think it is.

We have seen times in this country when the sugar prices spiked up, up, way up, which was a terrible disadvantage to America's consumers. We have seen circumstances as well where farm income has dipped way down. That was devastating to producers. At least with respect to this commodity, sugar, we developed a program that provides stability for both consumers and producers. This makes sense to me.

The sugar program has not worked as well in recent months and years. The reason, in my judgment, is because the current underlying farm program has not worked. As prices have collapsed for most other commodities, and as we have pulled the rug out from under producers with a farm program called Freedom to Farm, we have had more acreage put into sugar production in this country.

In addition to that, we have had molasses stuffed with sugar coming in from Canada, which is just another method of transporting sugar into this country in excess of the amount agreed to by our trade agreements. We have a significant threat from Mexico, despite what we thought was an agreement on sugar, so we have a whole series of threats to those who produce sugar—cane and beet—in this country.

The Washington Post would make the case: Let's just get rid of the sugar program. Others will probably make the same case. It would be interesting to ask the following question, and perhaps get an answer from the Washington Post and others who believe this. The question would be: While sugar prices have fallen by a fourth since 1996, has anyone seen a reduction in the price of sugar at the grocery store? Let me repeat, prices to the producer have fallen by one-fourth; has anyone seen a reduction in the price of sugar at the store? What about candy bars, cereal, ice cream, cookies?

The answer is no. In fact, during that same period of time, while the price of sugar to the producer has fallen by a fourth, those prices—candy, cereal, ice cream, cookies, and cake—are up 7 to 10 percent.

The point is this. This program has worked and can work again if we have a decent farm bill. But it will not work in the long term unless we amend and change the Freedom to Farm legislation which is the underlying problem with all farm commodity prices.

This is not the time, and we should not allow those who preach it to decide the sugar program ought to be repealed. The sugar program has worked, and it is good for sugar producers and consumers in this country.

I wanted to make the case that those who editorialize about it, including this morning's editorial, in my judgment, are wrong. I respect their opinion, but I think they are wrong. It is, once again, a question not just for those who produce sugar—in my part of the country, there are family farmers

who raise sugar beets—it is a question of do we want to have family farmers in this country's future.

Some say family farmers are a little old diner that got left behind when the interstate came through. Yes, it is nostalgic, yesterday's news, let's just get on with big corporate farms. I do not believe that. I believe family farmers contribute to the value and culture of this country in a significant way. If we decide there is no virtue between the crevices of mathematics and concentration—if we decide family farms do not matter—this country will have lost something significant, in my opinion.

One part of needed farm policy change, but an important part for those who produce sugar beets in our country, is the retention of a decent sugar program that provides some stability of income for producers. I hope my colleagues will understand this in the coming weeks and months as we begin discussing the farm program and related issues such as the sugar program.

TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, what piqued my interest last Friday and this morning was the announcement of the trade deficit. It is interesting to me, the deafening silence that occurs in this Chamber and around this town especially regarding the monthly announcement of our trade deficit.

I prepared a chart that shows our growing and alarming bilateral merchandise trade deficits. This is last year, 1999. As announced on Friday, our monthly merchandise trade deficit rose to \$37 billion. We have a surplus in our services trade balance, so if services are included the net effect is a \$30 billion merchandise and services deficit. In other words, we buy \$1 billion a day more from other countries than we sell to other countries—\$1 billion a day.

What does that mean? It means that is the debt we have and the liability we incur.

Does it matter? We had people doing handstands and having apoplectic seizures on the floor of the Senate for years and years about the fiscal policy deficit. They would come and talk about the Federal budget deficit, what a god-awful thing it was—and it was—\$300 billion a year and rising out of sight.

With respect to this merchandise and services deficit—\$30 billion a month net, \$37 billion with respect to merchandise or manufactured goods, over \$1 billion a day—one cannot find anybody who pays any attention to it or cares much about it. Why? Because the institutional thinkers in this country, once again on Friday, were genuflecting, as they always do when this news comes out, about how the deficit is not such a bad deal. This trade deficit means America is growing faster than other countries. If we are growing faster than other countries, then natu-

rally we will be buying more from abroad and perhaps selling less to them. We will therefore have this trade deficit.

These are the same economists, the same "thinkers," who told us in 1994: Why do we have a trade deficit? Because we have a fiscal policy deficit. If we get rid of the budget deficit, we will get rid of the trade deficit.

I can give names, but they are embarrassed when I read their quotes with their names. They are the same economists who said we have a trade deficit because we have a budget deficit. They said the trade deficit will be gone once the budget deficit is gone. No, that is not the reason at all. We do not have a trade deficit because we are growing faster than other countries. That is an absurd contention, just absurd.

We have a trade deficit with China because our country is growing faster than China? No, China has an economy which is growing very rapidly. Our trade deficit with China, which is very close to \$70 billion a year, is because we are buying more from China than they are buying from us. Is that because they do not need things? No, it is because they are buying from other countries instead of us.

Why do we allow that to happen? Because we are weak-kneed and do not have a backbone. Our country has never had the backbone to say to other countries: You must have a reciprocal trade relationship with us. If we are going to treat you in a certain way and we welcome you into our marketplace, then we must be welcome in your marketplace. We have never had the backbone to do that.

On Friday, the merchandise trade deficit with Japan increased from \$6.7 billion to \$6.8 billion. That means, with Japan, we have a merchandise trade deficit approaching \$80 billion. How many years do you have to have \$50 billion, \$60 billion, \$70 billion, \$80 billion trade deficits with the same country before someone will stand up and say: There is something wrong here. They keep selling us all of their goods, but they buy what they need from others.

I represent, for example, ranchers. I know I mentioned this before. I represent farmers and ranchers and others. Every pound of American beef going into Japan today has a 38.5-percent tariff on it. This is a country that has a nearly \$80 billion trade surplus with us, or we have a deficit with them. Send a T-bone steak from Dickinson, ND, to Tokyo, Japan, and there is going to be a 38.5-percent tariff on the T-bone steak. What is that about? Does one think we would be considered a massive failure in international trade as a country if we had 38.5-percent tariffs on products imported into our country? Of course we would.

Yet we have a trade relationship with Japan that allows them to have a 38.5-percent tariff on beef—this is after we reached an agreement with them, by the way. We had a big trade agreement for beef producers about 10 years ago.

At the end, one would have thought these folks just won the Olympics. They celebrated and had a day of feasting and rejoicing because this country had this great trade agreement with Japan. Yes, we have gotten more beef into Japan, but every pound of beef today that goes into Japan has a 38.5-percent tariff on it. That is outrageous.

I will go through a couple of other countries to close the loop.

Mexico. We have a trade agreement with Mexico called NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. I remember the two economists, Hufbauer and Schott. They said if we do this trade agreement with Mexico and Canada, this country will have 300,000 or so new jobs.

At the time, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. That trade surplus with Mexico is now over a \$20 billion trade deficit. Immediately after we passed NAFTA, signed a new trade agreement with Mexico, and reduced tariffs on United States goods going into Mexico, Mexico devalued its currency and washed out any gains. In fact, the devaluation was much higher in terms of its effect on the tariffs, so it more than washed out any gains. A trade surplus with Mexico was turned into a very large trade deficit. The trade deficit with Mexico in March was \$1.9 billion—for just a month.

What about Canada? Canada had a modest trade surplus with us, or we had a modest trade deficit with Canada, and then we passed NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. The announcement Friday said the goods deficit with Canada is now \$3.9 billion, almost \$4 billion. Our annual deficit with Canada is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 billion to \$40 billion.

With respect to the European Union, Friday the announcement was that the merchandise trade deficit with the European Union rose from \$3.5 billion in February to \$5.7 billion in March, the most recent month for which data has been reported.

I will comment on our trade deficits with Japan and Mexico a little later.

I taught economics briefly in college. I understand about economists. It is much less a discipline than it is some psychology pumped up with helium. It is just being able to say anything at any time about almost any subject.

This is what the economists say.

In today's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Wiegand says:

This deficit will start to shrink as the Federal Reserve continues to raise interest rates to slow the U.S. economy.

Oh, yes, that is probably a pretty good solution: Drive the economy into the ditch. That will probably take care of it. I do not dispute them. If Alan Greenspan continues to choke the neck of the American economy and drives this economy into the ditch, yes, I suspect we will probably be buying less from abroad. It is probably not very good medicine to kill what ails us, in my judgment.

The person who wrote this article in today's Wall Street Journal did not provide the name of the analyst. These are just anonymous analysts:

Analysts say they remain sanguine because the underlying fundamentals that fuel the deficit remain unchanged. America's economy is stronger than the economies of trading partners, and that's why we have these trade deficits.

That is absurd, just absurd. Why do we have a big trade deficit with Japan? It is because we lack a backbone. For 15 years, we have allowed Japan to throw their goods into our marketplace and keep their marketplace relatively closed to American goods. The same is true with China. The same is true with many other countries.

This country needs to have the backbone to say to other countries: Here is a mirror. Look closely because what you see in that mirror is what you will get. You are welcome to come into our country with your goods and services. Our consumers welcome them, and we welcome them. But you should understand, the price for admission to the American marketplace is that your markets be open to our producers, to the products of our workers and our production plants. If it is not, then you are going to pay a price for that.

About 30 to 40 percent of Chinese exports are sent to the United States. We are a "cash cow" for China's hard currency needs. There is no substitute on Earth for the American marketplace. China needs this marketplace. The closing of this marketplace would lead China to collapse immediately. Mr. President, 30 to 40 percent of their exports are to the U.S. economy.

So we say to China: That's all right. You keep shipping all your products here. Ship us your shirts and your shoes and your trousers and your trinkets. You keep shipping all the merchandise you want to the United States, and that's fine if you want to prevent us from accessing your marketplace.

We just negotiated a bilateral trade agreement with China. We had folks up all night over in Beijing and here. They were working back and forth and trading and doing the things you do when you negotiate a trade agreement. They finished a trade agreement. The vote we are going to have in the House this week, and subsequently, perhaps a week or two later in the Senate, is not about this trade agreement. We do not get the opportunity to vote on the bilateral trade agreement with China. The vote is going to be: Do we accord China permanent normal trade relations?

I have voted for normal trade relations in the past. The only difference in this vote is: Shall it be permanent? But it is not a vote on the bilateral trade agreement with China. Frankly, I do not know how I am going to vote on permanent NTR. At this point, I am leaning, perhaps, to vote in favor of it, but only if it includes a commission to monitor trade compliance—because

China has made other agreements with us and has not complied with them at all—and only if it provides some responsible monitoring of human rights in China.

But having said all that, these votes are not about the bilateral trade agreement. We do not need PNTR to do what we should do with China. In Washington, DC, because there are so many interests here that are working on this PNTR issue, you can't turn on the television without seeing another ad by big interest groups that are saying: You must vote for China PNTR.

Regrettably, they misstate it. They say: If we don't vote for PNTR, the Chinese marketplace will not be open. That is absurd. It does not make any sense at all.

The vote on China PNTR isn't about whether the Chinese marketplace is open; it is a vote on whether normal trade relations with China will be made permanent—just that; and only that. It is not even a vote on the bilateral trade agreement we reached with China last year.

Having said all that, as I said, I voted for normal trade relations previously. I think China is going to be a significant influence in our lives, and I prefer it be a good influence rather than a bad one. I happen to think that involvement is preferable to noninvolvement. But that does not excuse the relationship that exists between China and the United States in which our trade negotiators come so far short of reaching an agreement that is in our interest. I will give you an example.

China has 1.2 billion people. On the issue of automobiles in the recently negotiated agreement with China, after a phase-in period, there will remain in China a 25-percent tariff on any automobiles the U.S. would send to China. Any automobiles that China would send to the U.S. would have a 2.5-percent tariff. So China will retain a tariff that is 10 times higher than the U.S. on vehicles moving back and forth. This is a country that has a nearly \$70 billion surplus with us.

I ask the question: Why? Why would a negotiator sit across the table and agree to a proposition that China can have a tariff that is 10 times higher on automobiles than we can?

The answer? The answer is: It is so much better than it was. The old tariff on automobiles was so much higher. We brought it down so far.

I said: Why don't you sit down at the table, and hitch up your belt, and say, All right, let's begin negotiating reciprocal policies and the same tariff. Why can't our negotiators do that?

Our trade negotiators would say: Oh, you can't do that because we are starting from different points.

It is time we start from the same point. It is time we demand that our trade negotiators begin dealing with this trade deficit with respect to what is really causing it.

These economists are wrong when they say the problem is that our country is growing too fast, other countries

are growing too slow, and therefore we have a big deficit. The reason we have a big deficit is that when China wants to buy airplanes China says: We are going to manufacture the airplanes in China. That is not the way you do business. If they are going to sell us all their commodities, then they have a responsibility to buy from us what we have to sell. If they need airplanes, they ought to buy airplanes built in the United States of America. If they need wheat, they ought to buy wheat from the United States. In other words, trade relationships ought to be reciprocal. But our trade negotiators never require that.

Is this a criticism of the current administration? You bet—the past administration, and every administration for the last 20 years. None of them have had any backbone.

I stand here and talk about this because the trade deficit report came out last Friday, and it said that the merchandise and services trade deficit was \$30 billion in a month. That is roughly \$340 billion a year more in manufactured goods that the United States bought than it sold.

I know I will have people listening to this who will say: That guy is just a protectionist. They are wrong. I am not a protectionist in the definition of the word used pejoratively. One who seeks protection is somebody who wants to build a wall around the country and keep everybody out. That is not my view of it at all. We have a global economy. We have an expanding reach of opportunities around the world.

But this country has to understand that times have changed. After the end of the Second World War, for the first 25 years, our trade policy was almost universally foreign policy. We would engage with another country with one hand tied behind our back, and say: Do you want some help? Here is a trade policy that is concessional to you because you're struggling, you're flat on your back, your economy is devastated because of the Second World War. We want to help you get back on your feet. Therefore, our trade policy was largely foreign policy. That was fine because we could beat anybody with one hand tied behind our back.

But the second 25 years post-Second World War have been different. We have shrewd, tough, economic competitors. We have still tied the hands of America's producers and America's workers, and have provided concessional terms in trade negotiations to virtually every other country.

That is the only basis that you could excuse a recurring trade deficit with Japan that is \$50 and \$60 and, now, \$70 billion a year—year after year after year after year. The only thing you can call that is neglect—yes, by Republican administrations and Democratic administrations. That is neglect.

People who hear this will say: That guy just doesn't understand that you can't see over the horizon. He does not

understand all this. The problem is, I think I do understand it.

In the budget deficit debates, we used to have people come to the floor and say: Think of it in terms of your own family. If you're running up a deficit, you have to pay it sometime, don't you?

Think of the trade deficit in terms of your own family unit. If the country is your family, and you are buying much more than you are selling and, therefore, incurring a deficit that continues to grow, is that a problem? Will it at some point come back and bite you? Will that be a problem for this country? Will it inhibit America's economic growth? Will the fact that the current accounts' deficit—measured by recurring trade deficits—allows foreigners to hold American dollars with which they can make decisions about whether to invest in this country, and how to invest in this country, be a problem for this country?

I think it is. My only point is that last Friday should not pass without notice—a Friday in which we say the merchandise and services trade deficit is now \$30 billion this month alone. That news occurs at the same time the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board says our country is growing too rapidly and we need to slow it down with another one-half of 1 percent interest rate increase.

Well, I am telling you, I think the combination of those two pieces of economic news ought to be very sobering to all Americans. Yet, as I said when I started, there is this deafening silence in the Chamber. Almost nobody will come and talk about the trade deficit because they will be branded by especially the corporate world as people who don't understand, who want to build a wall around this country, people who are protectionists. Yes, I want to protect America's economic interests. Of course, I do. I am an American and, of course, I want to do that.

But I believe the protection of our interests involves understanding that the economy has changed. This is a global economy but we must have fair trade rules. If we decide as a country that nothing matters that we fought about for the last 100 years, and that the globalization of our economy somehow should pole-vault over all of those issues, then we will, in my judgment, have lost substantial ground. We had people die in the streets in this country. They were shot and clubbed to death because they fought for the basic principle of workers being able to organize. People died for that right in this country.

Some companies will say: I know was a problem in America because you have all these collective bargaining issues. The way to get rid of that issue is we will take our manufacturing plant and close it. We will move to a country where workers can't organize, and we will not have those problems. People in this country fought so long for a minimum wage and a livable wage. A com-

pany might say: We can solve that issue. We don't have to deal with minimum wages. We will move this plant from the United States to Bangladesh, and we won't have to pay minimum wages. People fought a long time over the issue of child labor. They may say: Well, we can solve that. We will move our plant overseas and we will put 12-year-olds in the plant and we will pay them 12 cents an hour. We will work them 14 hours a day, and we won't have to meet plant safety standards. That is an easy way to pole-vault over those issues.

How about dumping chemicals into the streams or into the air? A company can say: We can solve those issues. You know that plant where we are going to hire kids to work, and pay them 12 cents an hour, and work them 14 hours a day, and not worry about safety? We can also dump the raw chemicals into the water and into the air.

Well, that raises the question, I am afraid: Should there be an admission price to the American marketplace? Should the admission price be at least that there are fair rules of trade? I have asked folks, and one honestly said to me he thought it was fine. If the marketplace decided that you can amass the capital and employ kids in unsafe conditions and pay them pennies, if you can produce a product the consumer wants, it is fine for that product to be in our marketplace. I respectfully disagree with that perspective. Globalization requires the attendance of rules, in my judgment, that relate to the kinds of issues we fought over for 100 years in this country.

Others would say, well, you are trying to export American values. There you have it. That is exactly what is necessary in the global economy—exporting the values of saying that fair competition is not competition with 12-year-old kids being paid 12 cents an hour. Fair competition is not competition between a plant in Pittsburgh that has to meet air pollution standards and water pollution standards, competing with a plant owned by the same company somewhere that can dump all of their chemicals into the streams and into the air.

Those are our range of issues with which we have to deal. All of those issues, incidentally, relate to a very significant and unhealthy growth in this country's trade deficit.

Let me come back for a moment to the vote that will be very controversial on China's permanent normal trade relations. Last week—and I know I digress here—I was thinking of coming to the floor and submitting in a bill that says the Federal Reserve Board cannot go into a room and lock the door in something called the "Open Market Committee" and continue to call it open. I was thinking of putting in a bill that requires them to call this a "closed market committee." If they are going to lock the American people out, they should not call it an open committee. Just as I was thinking of

doing that—and I decided against it for the moment—we ought not to call it normal trade relations with China, or Japan, or, for that matter, Europe; we ought not to call normal trade relations a circumstance that give us a \$50 billion, \$60 billion, \$70 billion, or \$80 billion trade deficit. There is nothing normal about our trade relations with Japan. There is nothing normal about having a \$50 billion, \$60 billion, or \$70 billion trade deficit every single year. That is abnormal. Now, I could not get the votes, perhaps, to rename that “abnormal trade relations,” but it is not normal, and we ought not to consider it normal to have this sort of circumstance exist.

In the last decade, it has gotten worse, not better. The mantra of so-called “thinkers” who are quoted—incidentally, they are the same people because when reporters write the stories, they call the same people, “thinkers”. These same people have put the same quotes in the stories every month for 10 years. Even though the times have changed and the thinkers were demonstrated to not be accurate, they just change their story. That is why the story has changed now from their original saying that when we had a budget deficit you are therefore going to have a trade deficit. They say now that wasn't it; now it is because we are growing too fast. There must be some familial relationship here with the Chairman of the Fed because he also thinks we are growing too fast. It must be the same group of thinkers. There must be a genetic code that exists between these folks.

Again, I digress. I came to the floor to simply say I don't want Friday's notice of this dramatic increase in the trade deficit to not be discussed at least at some length in the Senate. It is important that we discuss it and begin to provide remedies for it.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes remaining.

ISSUES FOR THE SENATE TO CONSIDER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there are a lot of issues in the Senate with which we ought to be dealing. Most of the important issues we are avoiding. Now, there exists in this Congress something called a Patients' Bill of Rights. It is in conference and we can't get it back. Why? Because big money interests have decided they want to block it; they don't want a Patients' Bill of Rights. We ought to have that on the floor of the Senate and the House, out of this conference, and we should pass a decent Patients' Bill of Rights.

We ought to be able to employ the opportunities to offer amendments on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act when it is here and strengthen this country's education system. But are we able to do that? No.

We also have a juvenile justice bill that is trying to close a loophole in gun shows. When you buy a gun, you have to run your name through an instant check to see whether you are a felon. If you are a felon, you don't have the right to own a gun. It would close the gun show loophole. Now you can go to a gun show and buy a gun and you don't have to run your name against anything. A felon can buy a gun, regrettably. That is not anti-gun; it is a moderate, thoughtful step to extend the instant check. That is in the juvenile justice bill. That is not on the floor of the Senate.

This Senate has been at parade rest for some long while. It is time to take action on the things the American people want us to act on. We ought to deal with a Patients' Bill of Rights, and we ought to bring to the floor of the Senate the legislation that deals with the gun show loophole in the juvenile justice bill. We ought to have an opportunity to debate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act without somebody hovering and saying: Before you do that, I have to approve the amendments you offer. There are no gatekeepers here. The rules of the Senate don't provide for gatekeepers.

In the coming months, we have the opportunity to address health care, education, juvenile justice, and things that matter in this country. The only reason they are not on the floor of the Senate with extended debate, or out of conference which exists now, is because the leadership doesn't want them on the floor of the Senate. I must say that in the coming weeks and months we intend to do everything we can possibly do within the rules of this Senate to make sure those are the issues we debate in the Senate this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, or his designee.

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

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

A RECORD OF OBSTRUCTIONISM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this morning I listened to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, talk about what we ought to be doing in the Senate. I must tell you I couldn't agree more that we need to be moving forward. I also must tell you I have a totally different view as to why we are not.

We have actually been seeking to move forward for some time. The Republicans have had a number of critical

issues out here that the American people are interested in—marriage tax penalty relief, tax relief in other areas, farming, education, and critical needs of the men and women in the armed services. But, unfortunately, as each of these things has come up, we found ourselves being stopped from moving forward either by unrelated amendments or objections to moving forward. I really think we should analyze where we are and what we are seeking to do.

In my view, in general terms, what is happening is that there is more of an interest, particularly on that side of the aisle, in simply trying to create issues rather than create solutions. Each time we bring up a basic bill, we come back to amendments that have already been dealt with, and they insist on dealing with them again.

The majority leader is trying to deal with a number of issues. One of them, of course, is education. We are dealing with the whole question of elementary and secondary education. We are blocked by that side of the aisle from meaningful educational reform. We are trying to deal with the idea of moving forward with the kind of funding the Federal Government can provide for elementary and secondary education.

There is a difference of view. Yes, indeed, we have a difference of view. The basic difference of view is to the extent the Federal Government is involved in the funding of local schools. Those local schools, their leaders, the school boards, and the counties and States ought to have the basic right to make the decisions as to how that money is used. I think it is pretty clear that the needs are quite different.

Yesterday, I spoke at the commencement of a small school in Chugwater, WY. The sign on Main Street said “Population 197.” There were 12 graduates at this school. They come from, of course, the surrounding agricultural area. I can tell you that the educational needs in Chugwater, WY, are likely to be quite different from those in Pittsburgh. The notion that in Washington you set down the rules for expending the funds that are made available in Federal programs we do not think is useful. I understand there are differences of view.

But I guess my entire point is that we are always going to have different points of view and we should have an opportunity to discuss those and opportunities to offer alternatives. But we have to find solutions, and we have to move forward. That is why we vote. That is why there is a majority that has a vote on issues. But the idea that you have a difference of view and, because you don't get your view in, it is going to stop the process is not what we are talking about.

Education, of course, is just one of the areas. There is the question of the marriage tax penalty and the question of tax relief and tax reform. But, quite frankly, more than anything, there is the question of fairness—where a man and woman can work at two jobs before

they are married, earn a certain amount of money, and continue to work on those jobs and earn the same amount of money, but after they are married they pay more taxes. The penalty is approximately \$1,500 a year. We have been fighting to change this for a very long time. President Clinton pledged in his State of the Union Address in January to reduce those taxes. It would be a very large tax reduction for American families. However, we still have the playing of politics on the floor and that bill has not yet passed.

We will be seeking to do some things in agriculture. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota on some of the agricultural issues. We have been trying to deal with crop insurance. We have been trying to get that done. It is certainly something that ought to be done as we move forward towards more of the marketplace in agriculture. It has not been done because we have had objections on the floor.

I have to tell you we have had, and continue to have, a record of obstructionism that I think really needs to be reviewed and resolved. It took five votes before we could break the Democrat filibuster and pass the Ed-Flexibility bill in 1999.

Do you remember when the Republicans offered the lockbox idea where we were seeking to ensure that money which comes in for Social Security would be in the Social Security fund and not be expended on non-Social Security ideas? It was opposed six times by Senator Democrats, even after it had been passed in the House the year before by a vote of 416-12. In Roll Call, which is the House paper, in May of 2000, the Senator from Massachusetts promised to eventually work with his colleagues on the education plan. But then he was quoted as saying: We will do that when AL GORE is elected President. We will all sit down next year and have a consensus.

I don't think we are here to seek to establish those kinds of issues for Presidential elections and ignore what we can do here. We are sent here to resolve problems, to deal with them, and come to solutions. They have been out there on the floor. But, unfortunately, the whole idea of obstructionist tactics seems to be where we are, and we need to change that.

There are a number of issues, of course, that are of particular concern to people from the West, including myself. We have had a great deal of activity in the administration with regard to public land management. All of it seems to be oriented towards the effort on the part of this administration, on the part of the President, and on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to develop for themselves some kind of a legacy—a little like Theodore Roosevelt, apparently.

There are a number of things that have to do with access to public lands. Here again, it is quite different, depending on where you live in this country. In Wyoming, for example, 50 per-

cent of the land is owned by the Federal Government and is managed by the BLM or by the Forest Service or by the Park Service, and it is a good operation. In some States federally-owned land is as high as 86 percent.

It is quite different when we start to deal with the public land issue, of course. It is sometimes dealt with quite differently in the West than the East. That is proper. We have been faced with a number of things that make it very difficult to have access available for the people who own these public lands. We are dealing, for instance, with the operation of the Forest Service and 40 million acres of road lands. I have no particular objection to taking the road lands. We don't need roads everywhere, but we need to do it on an area-by-area basis to see what needs access. Sometimes the accusations suggest we help timber producers or grazers.

The fact is, we have heard from veterans who can't walk 17 miles with a pack on their back. If we don't have road access, they are not able to use the forests. We have heard from children, as well.

The administration puts out a block pronouncement that we will have 40 million acres of wilderness, without knowing what the plans are, without including Congress in the process, without holding hearings or providing an opportunity for people to respond. There was nothing there to respond to. Hopefully, that will be changed.

The Antiquities Act provides an opportunity for the President to declare large amounts of land for different uses and restricts uses exercised readily by this administration over the past year and a half. The BLM has a plan not to allow off-road use of BLM lands. We have bills before the Congress setting aside a billion dollars a year for the additional purchase of Federal lands on a mandatory basis as opposed to going through the appropriations. These are all designed, it seems to some, to reduce access to lands which are not only there for recreation, not only there for the use of everyone, but certainly there is a large impact on the economic future of States in the west.

We plan to have a hearing this week after a pronouncement from the Park Service that all parks will no longer allow the use of snow machines by winter visitors. Yellowstone Park and Grand Teton Park are in Wyoming. Many people in the winter enjoy these unique scenes on snowmobiles. The Park Service, without hearings, without input by the Congress or by anyone else, has announced there will be a total cancellation of the opportunity of people to visit their parks in the wintertime.

Again, I have no objection to taking a look and changing some rules. Some of the machines have been too noisy, some machines have excessive exhaust. But they can be changed. Rather than finding an alternative for people visiting the parks, which belong to them,

this administration simply says we are not going to allow their use anymore and ignores alternative techniques. Also, it ignores the fact it has been going on for 20 years in most parks.

We could separate cross-country skiers from snow machine operators and require through EPA that the machines be quieter and less polluting. Instead of seeking to manage them, we have been ignoring this for 20 years, and suddenly they abolish their use. I hope we have a hearing this week to take a look at how that might be resolved so people will still have the opportunity to visit facilities that belong to them, facilities that are unique, facilities that should be available to be used by whomever wishes to use them properly, hopefully, year round.

My friend from North Dakota mentioned the sugar program, one that needs to be examined and discussed. We have had large newspapers, including editorials, that have not told the story fairly. They talk about a program that has caused consumers to pay more for sugar than they would otherwise. I don't believe that is factual. The fact is the world price for sugar is not a world price established by the market but is a dump price from countries that have subsidies for sugar. When they have an excess, it goes in at a lower price. If we are going to talk about the program, we ought to be discussing facts. That information ought to be mentioned.

The sugar program has not been subsidized. The costs to consumers have not gone up but have gone down. The costs to producers have not gone up but, indeed, have gone down. We have a program that has worked.

My point is it is necessary to understand the purpose of the program, what it is designed to accomplish, and then do what is necessary in the interim to ensure that purpose is nurtured.

I think there are many issues we must cover. We have 13 appropriations bills with which to deal. We have approximately 60 legislative days remaining for the Senate to complete its work. We have 13 bills with which to deal. The appropriations, of course, are very much the basis for what we do in the Federal Government. There are all kinds of issues. But the amount of money provided and the way it is spent has a great deal to do with what we are doing in the Congress, what kinds of programs we are involved in, how much the programs cost, how much we want to invest in the programs. Right now, it has a great deal to do with what we do with overall revenues that come into the Federal Government.

Indeed, as it appears, we have a surplus. We have to make some tough decisions as to how much government we want. How do we divide the government between the responsibilities accepted and taken on at the Federal level as opposed to those taken on at the local level. The fact that there is money certainly is an encouragement to again expand the role of the Federal Government. Many believe that is not

the proper way to proceed; We ought to do the essential things.

Clearly, there is a difference of view about that. There is a difference of philosophy. There are those who genuinely believe the more money that can be spent through the Federal Government, the more it helps people, and that is what we ought to do—continue to always increase the size and activity of the Government.

Others, including myself, believe there are essential finances for the Federal Government to carry forth, but the best way to do it is to limit that Federal Government to allow local governments to participate more fully, to allow people to continue to have their own tax dollars.

The longer I am in Washington, the more I am persuaded the real strength of this country does not lie with the Federal Government. Obviously, it is essential. Obviously, it is important. Functions such as defense can only be performed by the Federal Government.

Communities are shaped by things people do through local government or voluntarily. These mean so much to the strength of communities. We have a program called the Congressional Award Program in which young people are urged to take on community activities. We give out medals. It is wonderful to see the activities in which the young people become involved. It is wonderful to see themselves in the future as doing volunteer things, as becoming leaders, taking the risk of leadership, and spending their personal time to strengthen that community.

We do have real differences of opinion. That is why we are here. We have a system for resolving those differences. Not everybody wins these debates. Some lose and some win. It is not a winning proposition to obstruct progress. I think that is where we find ourselves.

I hope the leaders and Members on both sides of the aisle will take a long look at our position. We need to have a system where everyone with different ideas gets to present their ideas, but we have to do it in an organized way, where the amendments are germane to the issue. Now we find ourselves with some amendments—gun control amendments, for example, as important as they may be—that come up on every issue. It stalls what we are doing in terms of the basic generic purpose of that discussion, invariably coming up with the same kinds of amendments over and over. I think we can find a way to resolve that. I think we should. We have a great opportunity to move forward on a number of things, whether it be education, whether it be Social Security, whether it be tax relief, whether it be strengthening the military. These are the kinds of things that are so important.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I was sitting in my office watching the floor on

C-SPAN and I heard my colleague from Wyoming speak out about some of his concerns as they relate to conduct of priority business on the floor of the Senate. I am pleased he would come this early afternoon to discuss what I think is really a very important and necessary issue for all of us to understand but, more importantly, for the public that pays close attention to what we do to understand.

During debate last week, after the vote concerning the Byrd-Warner amendment on the President's open-ended mission in Kosovo, several things were said by the minority leader that I feel need to be corrected. If you were to take the minority leader at face value last week, I think you would have gotten a distorted view of what we did in the Senate and what was an appropriate and necessary approach.

The day before the vote on the Byrd-Warner amendment, the Senate passed a rule that said only germane amendments could be offered to appropriations bills. "Germane" is a technical term for relevant. The following day, the minority leader stated before us:

No majority leader has ever come to the floor to say that, before we take up a bill, we have to limit the entire Senate to relevant amendments.

Those are the minority leader's words, straight out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When I heard that, I was surprised, and I began to think about past Senates, past Congresses. I began to do some research. I must tell you I was surprised that the minority leader would, in fact, make that statement. The minority leader also said that he would defy anybody to come to the floor and challenge the statement. I am here today, I did my research over the weekend, and I challenge the statement of the minority leader. I think it is time the American people understand exactly what he meant and why he meant it.

We have important and critical legislation that needs to be passed in a timely manner to deal with all that is important for the millions and millions of Americans whose lives are impacted by what we do here.

In the appropriations bills there is money for education, health services, agriculture, for the environment, for national defense, and for other essential Government services on which so many people rely. I want to take a few minutes to explain what the majority leader said last week and, more importantly, I want to spend more time saying why what the minority leader said last week was wrong.

The majority leader was clearly trying to expedite the activities of the Senate when he asked those of us on each side of the aisle, Democrat and Republican, to agree to unanimous consent requests that would cause the Senate to move along in a timely fashion. When the minority leader came to the floor and suggested that irrelevant amendments should be debated in full and this was an inappropriate thing

and had never been done before, then what he was saying simply was not an accurate statement.

The rules of the Senate are very easy to understand and fairly straightforward. For instance, a cloture vote, as far as its dictionary definition, is a petition to limit debate. The petition must be signed by 16 Senators. It is then voted on by the entire Senate, and it takes 60 votes to invoke cloture; in other words, to move on. Cloture is a formal way of ending a filibuster, or ending intentional debate that prolongs the proceedings of the Senate. A filibuster, of course, is a time-delaying tactic, a strategy used to extend debate, as I just mentioned, and ultimately to prevent a vote from being taken by Senators.

By the way, the term "filibuster" comes from the early 19th century Spanish or Portuguese pirates' term "filibusteros," meaning those who held ships hostage for ransom. Therefore, in order to stop a filibuster, a tactic used to hold the Senate hostage, a cloture motion must be filed. It is the formal beginning of the process to end a filibuster.

Let me go back to what the minority leader said last week. He said that "No majority leader has ever come to the floor to say that"—meaning we ought to limit debate and move to the relevant issues of the day. He said that—"before we take up a bill, we will have to limit the entire Senate to relevant amendments." In other words, shaping the debate, moving it along in a timely fashion.

That statement caused me to take a short walk down memory lane. Let me take us all back to the 103d Congress. The Senate was controlled by Democrats, not Republicans, under the watchful eye of the majority leader, George Mitchell. During the same Congress, almost 300 legislative measures were enacted into law. Of those 300 measures, Senator Mitchell considered 15 of them to be the object of a filibuster. In other words, Senator Mitchell feared that there would be a filibuster on a particular piece of legislation. Senator Mitchell's response to this imaginary threat was to file 43 cloture motions on these 15 measures.

Let me repeat: Senator Mitchell filed 43 cloture motions on 15 legislative measures he thought might be filibustered. Of these 43 cloture motions, 21 of them—almost half—were filed on the same day the Senate actually began debating a bill. In his attempt to break a filibuster, he filed cloture on bills 21 times before debate had even begun.

If there was any intent to intentionally limit debate—and once you have a cloture motion in place, and once you have proceeded to the bill postcloture, then only relevant amendments should apply—then, of course, George Mitchell was doing exactly what he intended to do as majority leader, Democrat majority leader of the Senate: Limit debate, shape debate to the particular bill involved.

Did Senator Mitchell say before a bill was even offered that the Senate would be limited to relevant amendments? He did not have to say it. His actions said it, and they were very clear, loud actions. He did 21 filings of cloture the same day the Senate actually debated a bill. He took a procedural step that would make the threat a reality. In other words, he did not come to the floor to suggest he might have to do something to limit debate to relevant amendments; he just did it. And that is the prerogative of a majority leader.

Clearly, Senator Mitchell went much further than the rule we passed last week. As the minority leader well knows, Senator Mitchell perfected the art of confrontational legislating. Not only would Senator Mitchell not allow nonrelevant amendments, he filed cloture on bills 43 times in the 103d Congress.

That is the record. That is setting the record straight. I say to Minority Leader DASCHLE, I took up your challenge. I did my research. I believe those are the facts. But Senator Mitchell's tactics of the past pale in comparison to the strategy of the minority leader in the Senate today. Again last week, the minority leader said on the floor in reference to an appropriations bill that:

Constitutionally, appropriations bills must begin in the House of Representatives. We are, in a sense, circumventing the rules of the Congress by allowing these bills to be debated and considered prior to the time the bill comes before the Senate.

I did some simple research, such as picking up a copy of the U.S. Constitution and turning to article I, section 7, clause 1, and reading it, just reading it:

All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Let me also turn to another provision, "Riddick's Senate Procedure, Precedents and Practices." This is, of course, one of the procedural booklets we follow:

Bills originate in the House:

In 1935, the Chair ruled that there is no Constitutional limitation upon the Senate to initiate an appropriation bill.

Obviously, the intent of what I am suggesting is that we can initiate appropriations bills, and we have, and we have held them at the desk. As the House sends its appropriations bills across, we attach a House number or we move through that process in a way that accommodates.

Why would the minority leader propose such an idea? I think it is really quite clear. It is to obstruct the action and the movement of the Senate.

Maybe there is another reason. Maybe there is a reason that is subliminal, that is not so clear. Maybe the reason was talked about this morning in the *Washington Times*: "CBO now predicts a \$40 billion surplus"—even a greater surplus of monies than the kind that was predicted earlier that the Budget Committee analyzed when it proposed its budget resolution.

Maybe it is why he wants to drag the feet of the Senate through June, July, August, and into September, so at the very end, a lame duck President, with his veto, can hold a Senate hostage and gain the spending of billions more dollars than were proposed in this present budget when he proposed total discretionary appropriations of about \$223 billion where our budget discretionary spending is around \$600 billion. Maybe he really wants to make good on not giving American citizens some tax relief by returning some of these surplus dollars to them. Maybe he really wants to make good on the idea that expanding Government and spending more money is really the mantra, the very foundation and the basics of the Democratic Party that he represents.

I am not sure, but what I am sure of is that what the minority leader said on the floor of the Senate last week does not ring true to past Senate actions practiced by Democrat and Republican majorities.

We operate on the rules of the Senate. We operate on past precedent. We also operate on a consistency that assures a motion of activity here that produces 13 appropriations bills in a timely fashion to fund our Government in a way that I think our American citizens and taxpayers expect us to perform.

What the minority leader said last week was we would not perform; he was going to draw a line and stop us, and he drew that line in the sand. He said, for example: We do not need to deal with the same bill twice; let's wait until the House gets its bill here. Yet he was saying that in the backdrop of a gun debate that had been dealt with numerous times on the floor of the Senate over the last year; in fact, a debate in which his side had won and passed legislation that moved to the House, and the House rejected it.

I am not quite sure I understand even that argument because it not only is inconsistent with the very actions that were taking place at the time, and that was, we were redebating for the fourth or fifth time an idea or a piece of legislation in which the Senate itself had been involved throughout the 106th Congress.

The reason I have come to the floor this early afternoon is to set the record straight. I think it is important for the Senate and for the United States as a whole to understand how we operate and that what we were doing and what we were proposing were clearly consistent within the rules. No rules had been bent. There was not a rules committee of a single individual but the action of a Congress and a Senate operating under unanimous consent and doing so in an appropriate and responsible way.

If there was a bad precedent set last week, it was not bad in the sense that it was one majority leader simply following the actions of another majority leader some sessions ago, recognizing the timely need to move legislation

along and to be able to do so by limiting certain types of amendments that were irrelevant to the fundamental debate and the consideration of a given appropriations bill.

I hope this clears the air. I hope what we experienced last week was but a thunderstorm, and now the clouds have cleared and the air is a bit fresher. I hope we can move on in a timely fashion, as we must, because if that does not happen, I and others will be coming to the floor on a very regular basis and I will not mind pointing a finger at those who object and those who obstruct.

We have a responsibility to cause our Senate to operate in an appropriate fashion, and certainly debate on one and all issues is important and can happen, but I do believe the citizens of this country expect us to get our work done; they expect us to balance our budget; they expect us to be fiscally responsible; and, most importantly, they expect and anticipate a limited Government that does the right things for its citizenry. That is what we are intent upon accomplishing. I hope we can move forward, and I hope we can do so in a timely fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I, like other Members of the body, read this morning's paper and read the comments of the Democratic leader. I have heard the comments on the floor of some of our colleagues, including the current occupant of the chair, and the Senator from Idaho. Since it is somewhat of a slow day, I decided to add my voice to the voices that have been raised here, perhaps from a slightly different perspective.

I know, in Senate terms, I am a relative newcomer. I am only in my second term. And around here, that counts for little more than being in your first term, but it does not put you in the rank of Senate historians or the old Senate "bulls," as they used to be called.

Nonetheless, if I might, I would like to go back and quote a little personal history because my first exposure to the Senate, up close and personal, came in the early 1950s.

If I may reminisce with you, I remember sitting in the family gallery, night after night, when the Senate would be debating, listening to the oratory that went on and the clashes of opinion that would occur, and falling in love with the place. I was a teenager.

My father had been elected in the election of 1950. I was here in the summer of 1953. Dwight Eisenhower was the President—the first time a Republican President had been in office since 1932. The Democrats were apoplectic about the idea that there was a Republican President, and carrying on with great frustration.

I remember the towering debates—and they were debates. They were not

speeches given to empty Chambers. They were debates between the two protagonists on the Finance Committee.

Paul Douglas, the Senator from Illinois, would come down here and thunder against the terrors of the Eisenhower administration. I would listen, in the family gallery, as a Republican, and wonder if anybody could respond. Then Eugene Millikin would enter the Chamber, bad back and all. He sat there in that seat in front of me. It was very difficult for him to move because of his back. So when he would turn, he would turn his entire body, and it would be slow. I remember, clearly, Senator Douglas recognizing what had happened when Senator Millikin had come on the floor. Senator Millikin was the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Senator Douglas said: The Republicans have brought up their heavy artillery in bringing in Senator Millikin. He said: In fact, I would even say they have brought their nuclear cannon.

I sat in the family gallery and listened to this, and thought: What is going to happen now?

Senator Millikin, with a few well-placed barbs, proceeded to destroy Senator Douglas' argument. And Senator Douglas got mad. He started complaining about the fact that the Senator from Colorado—because that is where Millikin was from—had as much authority in this body as he did, the Senator from Illinois. He pointed out how many people there were in Illinois and how few people there were in Colorado, and he got very indignant about it.

I remember Millikin's response. He said: Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is no longer opposed to the bill before us, he is now opposed to the Constitution. I must say, I am not surprised.

With that, he turned on his heels and walked out, leaving Senator Douglas sputtering a bit.

So I go back that far with my experiences with the Senate. I served in the Nixon administration as a lobbyist for one of the Departments. We did not call it that because under the law you are not allowed to lobby as a member of the executive branch; you conduct congressional liaison.

Again, because my father was still a Member of the Senate, I had access to the family gallery. When my Department had a bill before the Senate, I would come and sit in the family gallery and watch the debate as the bills would pass—or not pass—and I remember very clearly the pattern of debate in those days. This is now in the late 1960s because I served in the Nixon administration, and President Nixon took office in 1969.

Votes would be scheduled in advance, with a specific time. The time that sticks in my memory is that 11 o'clock was a fairly normal time for votes. We would get into the gallery around 10, because the debate would be winding

up in anticipation of the 11 o'clock vote.

Senators would start coming into the Chamber by 10:15. I would say, there would be 30 Senators in the Chamber listening to the final debate.

By 10:30, the Chamber would be almost full, because at 10:30, Everett Dirksen, as the Republican leader, would stand up to give the Republican position, the final speaker prior to the vote. Everyone wanted to hear Everett Dirksen. He would go on for 15 minutes, until a quarter to 11. By this time, the Chamber would be completely filled—every Senator in his or her seat.

Then Mike Mansfield would stand up, with the tremendous respect and dignity that he had. If I may say so, without diminishing that respect, Mike Mansfield, as an orator, was no match for Everett Dirksen. He was not as fun to listen to, but he had an earnestness and a determination about him that made him a towering giant of this body.

Then at 11 o'clock, when Mike Mansfield would be through, whoever was presiding would bang the gavel, and the Senate would proceed to vote, with every Senator sitting at his desk.

I remember watching my father, who sat on the front row to the right, go up to the table and get a copy of the names of all of the Senators, and keep track of how they were voting himself. He would mark it off, as did all of the other Senators, just the way the clerk marks it off.

The only time I have seen that happen since I have been in the Senate is when, during the impeachment trial, I went down and got one of those records, and I sat and made my own record of every Senator's vote in impeachment. I thought it was a significant enough event to revive that custom.

Why am I going through this history? For one reason. Because I read in this morning's paper the accusation made by the Democratic leader that what the Republican majority leader has been doing these last few days is leading to the erosion of the history and sanctity of the Senate, leading to a destruction of this institution.

I give you this history as my credentials, as one who wants to comment on this institution, who wants to talk about what is going on and what has gone on. No, I will not engage in a debate with the Democratic leader as to whether there was or was not precedent of what he has done. My friend from Idaho has done that, and that is appropriate.

But I am not here to do that. I am here to talk about this institution and what has happened to it in the roughly 50 years since I sat as a teenager in the family gallery and fell in love with it.

It is a little startling to me I can talk about that being nearly 50 years ago, but it was. As I say, I was a teenager. Now I am beginning to look forward to the time when I will be 70. I as-

sure my constituents it is a long way away, but in fact it is in about 3 years.

What has happened to the institution in a half a century of my observations of it? If I go back to the old institution—that is, the institution that I knew in those years—appropriations bills were the least controversial of any bills. Appropriations bills passed without discussion, debate, or confusion. The institution assumed that the Appropriations Committee knew what it was doing. The major debates were over authorization bills. Once something was authorized, it was the duty of the appropriators to come up with a legitimate amount of money, and there was no attempt to saddle appropriations bills with controversial riders or amendments. It simply was not done.

The appropriations process was considered the most routine of any process that was carried on around here. Oh, there was partisanship in those days. There were bitter speeches, as the kind I have just described between Senator Douglas and Senator Millikin, but there was no attempt to use the rules of the institution to slow down the appropriations process for political benefit. It simply wasn't done. It was simply not considered acceptable in this institution. Now we do it. Now it happens. I can't put my finger on the turning point at which it happened, but I think I can identify one important point along the road, and it happened while I was in the Senate.

In 1995, a gentleman for whom I have utmost respect as a political tactician and strategist, Newt Gingrich, made a serious miscalculation. I remember discussing it with him sitting over in what is now the Lyndon Johnson Room, as he came over from the House to tell us in the Senate what they were going to do in the House.

They were going to deliver the coup de grace to the Clinton administration by forcing the President to accept a balanced budget agreement, and the reason they would force the President to do that is that they would use the appropriations process to put leverage on him.

I remember a number of us saying to him, "Well, Newt, what happens if the President doesn't cave?" He said, "What do you mean, if the President doesn't cave? This President not caving in? Are you kidding me?" He went down example after example where President Clinton had caved under pressure from the Congress. He said, "This will be the final example that we have taken control in the Congress, we have seized it from the executive branch, and we will make him a lame duck for the last 2 years of his term. This is the crucial moment at which the Congress demonstrates its power."

I asked, and a number of others asked, "Wonderful, Newt, but what if it doesn't work?" He said, "What do you mean, what if it doesn't work? Of course, it will work. What do you mean, what if he doesn't cave? Of course, he will cave."

Speaker Gingrich, in a massive miscalculation, set in motion a series of actions that ultimately ended up in a partial shutdown of the Federal Government. As the shutdown went on, we Republicans did our best to try to explain that it was all Bill Clinton's fault. We did our best to say it was all the responsibility of the administration. And the press did its best to tell everybody it was all our fault.

Ultimately, the Republican leader on this side, Bob Dole, stood here and said, "Enough is enough, we are going to put the Government back to work." Senator Dole's instincts were right, and Speaker Gingrich's instincts were wrong, and the Republicans paid an enormous electoral price for Newt Gingrich's mistake in the 1996 election. We frittered away our opportunity to win back the Presidency, and we saw our margins in the House of Representatives go down in that election.

I think that was a watershed event because I think the people in the White House discovered that if they could use the appropriations process to create a crisis that would be seen as a Government shutdown by the Republicans, they could get political advantage. The appropriations process has never been the same. The White House negotiators have been much tougher since that happened. The demands coming out of the White House have been much more significant, and the threat is: We will veto, we will veto, we will veto; the Government will shut down, and you Republicans will get blamed for it. You have to give us what we want.

We have seen the appropriations power move from the legislative branch to the executive branch, under the threat of a veto and the threat of a Government shutdown. That is a sea change in constitutional structure and a sea change in politics that has happened while I have been in the Senate. That is part of what is going on right now. Right now, under instructions from the White House, the Democrats are saying: Let us do whatever we can to get ourselves in a situation where we can rerun the movie of 1995 in the fall of 2000. Look at how it helped us in the election of 1996 to keep Bill Clinton in office. Look at how it will help us in 2000 to get AL GORE into office.

So an appropriations bill comes along: Let's do everything we can to slow it down. An appropriations bill comes on the floor: Let's do everything we can to increase the amount of debate time. We may end up voting for the appropriations bill, but that is not the point. It isn't a question of, do we vote for it or do we vote against it? It is a question of, how much can we slow it down so as to create the opportunity to rerun 1995 one more time? That is part of what is going on.

Another thing that is going on that you never would find in the old Senate—again, by "old Senate," I mean that time I saw during my father's 24 years here. It used to be that when the Senate voted on an issue, it passed or

it failed, and it was done with. If it came back to be voted on again on the part of those who had lost, it came back in a new Congress when there had been an election and, presumably, people changed their minds. It never was the case that something was voted on again, and again, and again, and again, and again, and again, and again, and again in the same Congress. They never used to do that. Certainly, they never used to do it with rollcall votes.

I remember when Lyndon Johnson was the majority leader—this story has been told many times, but it is worth recounting here—a Senator came to him with an amendment, and Johnson said, "Fine, we will accept it." The Senator said, "I want a vote." Johnson said, "No, you don't want a vote. We will accept it." "No, let's debate it and have a vote." So they debated it, and it was defeated, with Johnson voting against it and using his power as the majority leader to kill it. The Senator came to him and said, "You said you would accept this." Johnson said, "Yes, but you didn't let me. You insisted on wasting the time of the Senate to have a debate and a vote, and I am telling you, you don't do that anymore. You don't do that ever again." The Senator learned.

We have rollcall votes around here on everything. We will have a resolution to memorialize Mother's Day, and someone will ask for the yeas and nays, and we will spend a half hour voting, 100-0, and it slows everything down. Why do we do that? Well, maybe on Mother's Day we all want to be on record saying we are for Mother's Day. I will tell you why we do it—and, again, it is something that never would have been done 30 years ago. We do it to build a record for campaign purposes, not for legislative purposes.

The Senate has become a campaign-focused organization rather than a legislative-focused organization. I will give you my own experience with this. When I ran in 1998, my opponent stood up before the crowds, on television, whatever, and said, "Senator Bennett is pro-tobacco." Pardon me? "Absolutely. Look at his record. He voted with the tobacco interests 12 different times." I did? I was there. I didn't remember voting with the tobacco interests once. "No, he is lying about his record. Here it is."

Then we go into the web site where he has all of this listed under the fetching title, "What Senator Bennett Doesn't Want You To Know," and here is the list of all of my "pro-tobacco" votes. What were they? They were procedural votes, votes on motions to table, votes in support of the leader moving legislation forward.

On the one tobacco vote that counted, which was a cloture vote on Senator McCain's bill, I was in the antitobacco forces; and, indeed, I had and used, during the campaign, letters thanking me for my strong antitobacco stand from the American College of Pe-

diatric Surgeons, et cetera, et cetera. All of the people who were involved in the tobacco fight knew I was on their side. They knew the process around here well enough to know these 12 votes about which my opponent was talking were meaningless as far as the real issue was concerned.

I will tell you what I said to him. We checked his FEC report, and I said to my opponent: You paid \$20,000 to a computer firm to research my voting record and come up with this list. I recommend you call them and get your money back because you wasted it. They gave you wrong information.

He said I was pro-liquor. He had a voting record that said I was in favor of alcohol. Pardon me? We got into it. We found out what the vote was that I supposedly cast that made me pro-alcohol. It had to do with Federal highway funds and the rights of the States to set their own levels of alcohol tolerance, and because I am in favor of States controlling that and voted against having the Federal Government dictate it, suddenly I had cast a pro-alcohol vote. He went on and on and on in this same vein.

I understand what is going on here. Amendments are not being offered for legislative purposes. Bills are not being called up for legislative purposes. Recorded votes are not being called for because someone wants to improve the legislation. Records are being built on issues that can be misrepresented as serious challenges to incumbents. They are being brought up again and again and again so that people can stand up in a campaign and say that the incumbent voted wrong 17 times. Lyndon Johnson would not have stood for it. Everett Dirksen would have had a quip about it that would make everybody laugh. But it is now the way things are done in this institution.

I said that I am responding to the suggestion of the Democratic leader that somehow what is going on here is destructive of the institution. I agree that what is going on is destructive of the institution. But I do not put it at the feet of the majority leader. I think it has historic roots that go back beyond this majority leader and that go back before the previous majority leaders. I don't know when it started happening, but we have come a long way from the day when the Senate would vote with a rollcall vote about 50 times in a session—that is how often my father voted on rollcall votes—a day when the Chamber would fill up to hear the debate because it was a significant vote. We have come a long way from that.

The institution has become primarily a campaign platform. Let us make no mistake about it. What is going on right now in the Chamber is all geared to November and not in any sense geared toward solving problems. It is not geared toward moving the Republic forward. It is all geared toward getting those multiple votes that a computer

can find and then put it on a web site that can be used in a campaign speech on the part of the challenger.

I agree with the Democratic leader that this cheapens the institution. I agree with the Democratic leader that it threatens the institution. But I disagree with him as to the solution.

I think all Senators need to back away from the idea that the primary purpose of being in the Senate is to give campaign speeches, and back away from the idea that the primary function of coming to the floor is to do things that will give you an advantage in November and so you can misrepresent and attack an incumbent. There is a time for partisanship, and there is a time to be very firm about the position that you take. But there is also a time to recognize that the institution is threatened if you let partisanship get out of hand.

It reminds me of the signature comment that comes to us out of the Vietnam War where, I believe, a captain was quoted as saying after a particular battle that it was "necessary to destroy the village in order to pacify it." If it is necessary to destroy the institution of the Senate in order to make it part of my party's control, I want no part of that activity. In my own campaign, I have refused to engage in negative advertising. I want no part of what I call "Carville-ism"; that is, the politics of personal destruction that has become so prevalent in the last 8 years. I want no part of it.

I remember a man saying to me: If you do not go negative, you will not win the nomination.

I said to him: The nomination is not worth it. I would rather retain my self-respect than gain a seat in the Senate. Fortunately, I have both.

I say to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—because Republicans campaign just as vigorously as Democrats—let's stop using the Senate as an institution solely for campaign purposes. Let's stop using the rules of the Senate that can allow votes and that can call up amendments solely for the purpose of creating campaign records. Let's recognize that the purpose of the Senate is for legislation, not campaigning.

If we can do that, we will not get back to the days that I have described, but we will at least get towards them in the sense that this institution will survive, as we like to call it, "the greatest deliberative body in the world" and not "the greatest campaign forum in the world."

I thank the Chair for his patience. I thank my colleagues for their indulgence as I have taken this memory trip. But I hope that all of us will recognize that we have something to learn from the past and from the kind of institution this once was, and we have a responsibility to see to it that it does not degenerate into what it could be.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I listened to Senator CRAIG's remarks

about Senator Mitchell's use of cloture in the 103d Congress. As to the cloture numbers the Senator mentioned, yes Senator Mitchell filed cloture 23 times on the first day of an item's consideration but what he failed to mention was that only one of those instances was on a bill. Let me repeat that—in only one instance in the entire 103d Congress did Senator Mitchell file cloture on the first day a bill was considered, and in that instance it was with the bill sponsor's permission. It was Senator ROCKEFELLER and the bill was product liability. In all but four of the other instances the Senate was not in an amendable situation, they were on motions to proceed, conference reports, or attempts to go to conference.

There were two instances where Senator Mitchell filed on amendments on their first day, the first was on Senator KENNEDY's substitute amendment to the national community service bill and the other was on the Mitchell-Dole Brady gun amendment, in each case a true filibuster was going to be waged. In other words members of the minority had indicated a willingness to try and kill the legislation by extended debate. This has not been the case this Congress', cloture is filed in attempt to stifle the ability of individual Senators to offer amendments and that is the crucial difference that I pointed out last week.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before we do the closing remarks, we are waiting to see if Senator DASCHLE has any remarks he would like to make at this point.

Just so Senators will be aware of the likely schedule this week, of course this is the week before the Memorial Day recess. We have a number of conferences that are completed or nearing completion, so we could have votes on a number of conference reports this week, including but not necessarily limited to bankruptcy reform, crop insurance, the satellite loan conference report, and the e-commerce digital signature conference report. Not all of those have been wrapped up, but we are hopeful that one or all four of those will be available during the process of the week's schedule.

We also are expecting to receive from the House early in the week the Agriculture appropriations bill. We had hoped to go to that bill tomorrow and then, of course, as soon as it was received from the House we would go to

the House-passed bill. If the House is not able to complete action on the Agriculture appropriations bill on Tuesday, then we will need to confer with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and decide exactly how we can go to that bill and have its consideration completed before the week is out. But I want to emphasize before we go home for Memorial Day, we must complete the Agriculture appropriations bill.

We are still hoping that the House will be able to act on the legislative appropriations bill and we will be able to complete action on it also before we leave.

So we will be having votes possibly into the night on Tuesday. We could very likely have a late session Thursday. Members should expect a session on Friday. If we are not through with the Agriculture appropriations bill, then we will keep going until we complete it. We could be in session Friday night or Saturday. This is work that has to be done. For reasons which I need not repeat at this point, we are behind schedule in getting that done. We need to complete it.

I am not going to propound a unanimous consent request at this time on nominations, but so everybody will know, we have now been discussing the possibility of an agreement to take up as many as 72 nominations. There may still be some objections to one, two, or three of those. Somewhere between 65 and 72 nominations have been offered by the majority that we could take up and consider. Most of them would be confirmed, without the need for debate, in wrapup or on a unanimous voice vote. In at least four or five cases, some time would be required, with regard to the FEC nominees and at least a couple judges, with recorded votes necessary on somewhere between four and six at the most.

We could complete up to as many as 72 nominations in the next 24 hours, including 16 new Federal judicial nominations. Again, three or four of those nominations for judgeships could require recorded votes, but I believe we could get them all done.

There has been objection from the minority. I discussed the situation with Senator DASCHLE this morning, and he is still working on it. We hope we can get this resolved shortly without having to spend the whole week just on nominations. This really should be done in 5 or 6 hours with five or six votes and the rest of them done without any objections. There are a variety of nominations: U.S. marshals, U.S. attorneys, IRS oversight board members; Administrator, drug enforcement; two National Transportation Safety Board members; one Nuclear Regulatory Commission member; eight various Department of State positions, including the special negotiator for chemical and biological arms control issues, and a number of other nominees.

I want it on the record that we are prepared to go to those at this point.

THE LATE CLARENCE HOLLAND "ICKY" ALBRIGHT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an old friend and one of South Carolina's most public minded citizens, Clarence Holland "Icky" Albright, who recently passed away at the age of 93.

To those who knew him, Icky Albright was synonymous with the town of Rock Hill, a small and charming city in the Olde English District of South Carolina. Though a native of Laurens, Icky Albright moved to Rock Hill in 1929, shortly after graduating from Clemson Agricultural College, and became Rock Hill's leading citizen and cheerleader. He essentially spent his entire adult life working tirelessly, as both a private citizen and a public official, to promote what is a quintessential southern and American town.

Icky Albright was fiercely proud of his adopted hometown and set his roots deep there, starting with his 1934 marriage to Rock Hill native, the former Sophie Marshall. Mr. Albright was one of the Rock Hill business community's leading citizens, for years, he was part owner of a hardware store established by his father-in-law and he later started his own business, "Albright Reality Incorporated". Furthermore, he was active in any number of civic and service organizations. His passion for making Rock Hill the best place possible to live prompted him to get involved in public service, running for and serving on the City Council from 1940-1944, as Mayor from 1948-1954, and as South Carolina State Senator from 1966-1968.

Beyond the many votes he cast as a public servant, the funds he raised for charity, or enthusiastically promoting commerce, Icky Albright's most enduring legacy was the creation of the "Come-See-Me Festival" held every April and timed to coincide with the blooming of the azaleas in the city's Glencairn Garden. A modest man, Icky Albright protested that this successful festival was the idea of many, though everyone knew that he was the one who was truly responsible for this popular event that draws more than 100,000 people each year.

Though it sounds a tad cliché, it is true to say that Icky Albright lived a long, full, and rewarding life, and that through his efforts he touched the lives of many and made a significant difference in his community and our state. All that knew him mourn his passing and our condolences go out to his widow, their two sons "Bud" and Ned, three grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

BRIGADIER GENERAL MITCHELL M. ZAIS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President. I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize the service of Brigadier General Mitchell M. Zais, who has dedicated the past three-decades to protecting

the security and people of our nation as a soldier and officer in the United States Army.

General Zais began his career when he graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1969 and accepted a commission in the Infantry. It was at this point in time that the American involvement in Vietnam was at its apex, and the newly minted officer quickly had the opportunity to put to the test the martial skills he had learned at West Point and Fort Benning. Heading to Southeast Asia, then Second Lieutenant Zais assumed command of an infantry platoon in the 101st Airborne Division and began what has been a long and distinguished career.

After emerging from the jungles of Vietnam, this officer held a variety of positions which were progressively more responsible and moved him up the Army's hierarchy. He has served in Asia, Europe, Central America, and the United States, has held command at the platoon, company, battalion, and brigade levels, and has held vital staff assignments including on the Joint Staff.

General Zais is currently serving as Chief of Staff, United States Army Reserve Command, but this will be his last assignment as he is due to retire from the military shortly, ending what has been an impressive career. Commendably, General Zais has decided to seek a second career which will allow him to continue to make a difference, that of an educator. I am pleased to report that this man will assume the duties of President of Newberry College in Newberry, South Carolina. I am confident that the General will enjoy his new hometown and his new job. As a former educator, I can assure him that there are few things more rewarding than working with young people.

I commend General Mitchell Zais on his many years of dedicated and selfless service to the nation and the Army, I welcome him to South Carolina, and I wish him the best of health, happiness, and success in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS FOUNDING

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of the American Red Cross by Clara Barton 119 years ago. This year's theme, "We Touch the World," describes the compassionate direction the Red Cross is taking locally, nationally, and internationally.

After the brutal battle of Solferino near Verona, Italy, Jean Henry Durant, a Swiss citizen, formed the International Red Cross in 1863 with the intent to alleviate suffering and promote public health. The first Geneva Convention was signed by 16 nations a year later, adopting the red cross as a sym-

bol of neutral aid. Clara Barton recognized the importance of the humanitarian efforts of the International Red Cross in Europe, and cultivated the fundamental principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence, voluntary service, unity, and universality into what we know today as the American Red Cross. In addition to alleviating suffering and promoting public health, Ms. Barton also envisioned a need for disaster relief and battlefield assistance.

Founded on May 21, 1881, in Washington, DC, the American Red Cross was able to lobby the U.S. Congress to ratify the Geneva Convention, providing an official basis to associate with the International Red Cross. The U.S. was the 32nd nation to sign the document, agreeing to protect the wounded during wartime. Ms. Barton then continued to serve the Red Cross as its volunteer president until 1904. Over the last 119 years, the American Red Cross has not only served Americans and our allies during wartime, but has brought help to anyone in need of aid.

Its thousands of volunteers provide the American Red Cross with the tools to carry out its vitally important task in times of need. Behind the scenes, in preparation for disaster situations, local Red Cross chapters provide their communities with CPR and First Aid classes and information on health issues, and promote blood donations to provide the medical field with an adequate supply should a crisis arise.

Just a few years ago, in my home state of Minnesota, the Red Cross left its mark by touching the lives of those affected by the floods of 1997 and the tornadoes that tore through towns in the southern part of the state. And during it all, the Minneapolis chapter was without a permanent home to help in the disaster relief. Last month, they opened their doors, the first permanent location since 1996, to a new facility that includes a blood-donor center, space to shelter and feed people in case of a disaster, and an emergency operations center with its own communications and power systems.

Mr. President, ninety-one cents of every dollar spent by the American Red Cross goes directly to programs and services that help people in need. All of the disaster assistance is free, thanks to the generosity of donors and volunteers alike. The ratio of volunteer Red Cross workers to paid staff is nearly 41 to one. I am honored to have this opportunity to commemorate the dedicated work of the late Clara Barton and the contributions of all those who continue to carry out her legacy in the American Red Cross. •

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OVERSEAS MILITARY PROGRAM

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to offer my congratulations and

very best wishes to all those gathered at the 50th Anniversary celebration of the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) serving the United States military in Europe. I am pleased to take part in recognizing the long-standing tradition that this institution continues to uphold in ensuring quality higher education for our servicemembers overseas.

It has always been my firm belief that a democracy cannot prosper and grow without an educated populace, and therefore the education of the individual is one of the most important tasks in our society. The success and growth of UMUC is a critical testament to the importance of educational opportunities for our military personnel in Europe. From its inception, this institution has viewed higher education from a global perspective, an approach which has put UMUC at the forefront of the larger higher education community.

Following World War II, when the United States military invited American universities to provide higher educational programs to servicemembers at military installations throughout Europe, UMUC was the only institution to respond. This began a historic 50 year partnership with the military in Europe and starting in 1956, in Asia as well. The noted British scholar Arnold Toynbee wrote that the UMUC program in Europe is "an American achievement from which the rest of the world has much to learn."

Since the first year, UMUC has offered educational opportunities to hundreds of thousands of our men and women overseas. Even now, it is wonderful to hear that this tradition continues in many locations at long established military installations in Germany, Britain, Italy, and Spain including temporary facilities in Kosovo and Bosnia.

I commend the University of Maryland University College for its 50 year history of unparalleled service and success in the field of education and I look forward to a continued close association with this exemplary institution.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES ORAN LITTLE

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my good friend and fellow Kentuckian Oran Little on the occasion of his retirement as dean of the University of Kentucky's College of Agriculture.

Oran taught at UK for 25 years, and served as a highly-respected and well-liked leader for UK's students and faculty for 12 years as Dean of the College of Agriculture. Under his tenure, new facilities were built, old facilities were renovated, and innovative educational programs were launched. An Agricultural Engineering Building, Regulatory Services Building, Animal Research Center, and Plant Science Building all took root during Oran's 12 years as dean. He also facilitated the creation

of international exchange programs, faculty and student councils, and numerous agricultural development programs. Oran may be leaving UK in body, but the school will benefit from his enterprising spirit and the tangible improvements he made as the College of Agriculture's dean for years to come.

Oran's long list of awards is as impressive as his lengthy list of accomplishments. His knowledge and experience have not gone unnoticed by other Kentucky agricultural institutions. Oran has received awards from the Kentucky Seed Improvement Association, Bowling Green/Warren County Chamber of Commerce, Greater Lexington Convention & Visitors Bureau, Soil and Water Conservation Society, UK Alumni Association, Kentucky 4-H, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, and the Kentucky Cattlemen's Association.

Oran has a long history with UK, serving as assistant professor, associate professor, professor, coordinator of animal nutrition research and teaching, associate dean for research, director of the Kentucky agricultural experiment station, coordinator of graduate programs in agriculture, and finally as dean of the College of Agriculture. Oran earned respect the old-fashioned way, through years of hard-work and a sincere concern for students, teachers and faculty at the University of Kentucky.

Over the years, Oran and I have worked together on many projects at UK. With Oran's wealth of knowledge about the University, he has been an essential resource in targeting the needs of UK and communicating how Congress can help meet those needs. It has always been a pleasure to work with Oran and I will miss him a great deal. I have no doubt, however, that he will stay involved with UK's College of Agriculture and that we will continue to hear from him in the future.

Oran, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, I wish you all the best as you enter retirement and I thank you for your many successful efforts to make UK a better place to work and learn.●

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, and still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight.

Following are the names of just some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago on May 19, 20, and 21.

May 19, 1999:

Clarence Arnold, 32, Knoxville, TN

Troy Blando, 39, Houston, TX
Don T. Huey, 32, Houston, TX
David Johnson, 31, Houston, TX
Booker Miles, 27, Louisville, KY
James Nash, 40, Atlanta, GA
Leon Pickett, Detroit, MI
Mark Thompson, 31, Baltimore, MD
Willie D. Watts, 39, Gary, IN
Cedric White, 19, Atlanta, GA
May 20, 1999:

Eric Michael Allen, 30, Detroit, MI
Roderick R. Brown, 27, Memphis, TN
John Cosgrove, 71, Miami-Dade County, FL

Paul Davis, 28, Chicago, IL
Stephen Entsminger, 49, Davenport, IA

Maria Josefina Eslava, 23, Houston, TX

Curtis O. Green, 17, Chicago, IL
Travis Johnson, 20, Rockford, IL
Demarcus Kelly, 26, Atlanta, GA
Aaron Murphy, Jr., 40, Macon, GA
Kevin Stokes, 27, Atlanta, GA
Male, 56, Honolulu, HI

May 21, 1999:

James Alberts, 35, Bridgeport, CT
Quan Bell, 28, Detroit, MI
Edward Belton, 18, St. Louis, MO
Richard Daniels, 27, Fort Worth, TX
Anthony Houston, 21, Detroit, MI
Michelle Jackson, 21, St. Louis, MO
Steven Jupiter, 19, Baltimore MD
Werner Muense, 81, Minneapolis, MN
John Minaya, 19, Providence, RI
Karl Paul Pitts, 22, Detroit, MI
Michael Marion Raymond, 22, Washington, DC

Osualdo Rodriquez, 23, Houston, TX
Sheri Thielen, 40, Minneapolis, MN
May 19, 1999 (Houston, Texas):

Police Officer Troy Blando was fatally shot while attempting to arrest an auto theft suspect. Jeffery Demond Williams pulled into a parking lot in a stolen Lexus, and the 39-year-old Blando, working on the auto theft task force, was undercover in an unmarked vehicle. Blando approached Williams after he had run a check on the license plate and discovered the vehicle had been stolen.

A struggle ensued, and Blando put away his gun as he tried to handcuff the suspect's wrists. At that point, Williams pulled out a gun and shot the police officer, who was pronounced dead later that evening after doctors were unable to save him.

Police Officer Troy Blando is survived by his widow who suffers from multiple sclerosis, and his 14-year-old son. Williams has been convicted and sentenced to die.

May 20, 1999 (Conyers, Georgia):

As students mingled before class at Heritage High School in Conyers, Georgia, on May 20, 1999, fifteen-year-old Thomas Solomon pulled out a rifle and a handgun and began to open fire. Six students were injured and an assistant principal had to talk Solomon out of killing himself after he put a gun in his mouth. This incident took place exactly one month after Littleton, Colorado.

May 21, 1999 (Providence, Rhode Island):

Twenty-four-year-old John Minaya was accosted and fatally shot outside a busy Dairy Queen ice cream shop in Providence's West End early on the evening of May 21, 1999. Officers found Minaya lying on the pavement in the parking lot shortly after 7:00 p.m. He had been hit more than once, and people were ministering to him. He was taken to Rhode Island Hospital, but he died within minutes.

Though it was still springtime, Minaya was Providence's 13th homicide victim of 1999, a year in which there were ultimately 26 murders in the city, up from 15 in 1998 and 13 in 1997. The majority of these killings were committed with firearms, and most of these were handguns.

The children and families who witnessed the shooting of John Minaya in broad daylight at a Dairy Queen in Providence will carry the horrific memory of that day with them for as long as they live. We should do our part to ensure that fewer Americans experience gun violence by passing common sense gun legislation without further delay.●

A TRIBUTE TO OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

● Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, Saturday, May 20th was Armed Forces Day and I can think of no better time to honor those who serve this great country in the United States military. The millions of active duty personnel who have so unselfishly dedicated their lives to protecting freedom deserve the highest degree of respect and a day of honor.

I recently had the privilege of being invited to tour the U.S.S. *Enterprise* during a training mission off the Florida coast. My experience abroad the *Enterprise* reminded me of the awesome power and strength of the United States military. But more importantly, it reminded me of the hard work and sacrifice of the men and women serving in our armed forces.

The U.S.S. *Enterprise* was commissioned on Sept. 24, 1960 and was the world's first nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. This incredible ship is the largest carrier in the Naval fleet at 1,123 feet long and 250 feet high. While walking along the 4.47 acre flight deck with Captain James A. Winnefeld, Jr., Commanding Officer, it was amazing to learn that "The Big E" remains the fastest combatant in the world.

Spending two days touring the *Enterprise* showed me what a hard working and knowledgeable military force we have. As I moved through the ship I was greeted with enthusiasm, as sailors explained the ship's equipment and their role as part of the *Enterprise* crew. At full staff, the "Big E," as it is affectionately known, has over 5,000 crew members from every state of the Union, most of whom are between 18 and 24 years old. These young adults are charged with maintaining and operating the largest air craft carrier in

the world and guiding multimillion-dollar airplanes as they land on a floating runway. I was in awe of these men and women who work harder and have more responsibility than many people do in a lifetime.

"The Big E" is a ship that never sleeps, it operates twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. I watched as a handful of tired pilots sat down for 'dinner' at 10:30 p.m. on a Sunday night. Hungry and tired, they wanted it no other way. I had the privilege of joining Captain Winnefeld in honoring the 'Sailor of the Day' for spending three consecutive days repairing broken machinery, taking only a few 30 minute breaks to sleep. I witnessed the same degree of commitment in a separate part of the ship as an eager technician showed me how the cables on the flight deck operate and are maintained below. His task for the past two days was to create the metal attachment which holds one of the four arresting tailhook cables together and his voice was filled with pride as he explained the entire 8 hour process. Between giving orders to his crew, he pointed out a few tiny air bubbles that formed during the cooling process of the metal attachment. Although he started his shift at 4:30 a.m. and probably won't sleep for the next 24 hours, he smiles and tells me it will be redone, that it must be perfect—the lives of our pilots are at risk if it is not. The amazing thing is, they all do it with a smile.

When I think about Armed Forces Day, I think about two events I experienced on the *Enterprise*. First, are the sailors from across Colorado who sat down for breakfast with me in the enlisted mess hall, who gleamed with pride for the job they do and the important role they play in our nation's defense. Second, was the "Town Hall meeting" I held, where I responded to questions and concerns ranging from military health care to Social Security, from members of the crew. These one on one interactions were extremely valuable to me and I learned as much from these events as the crew did.

I have never witnessed a more dedicated or hard working group of people than the crew of the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. It makes me proud when I realize that the "Big E" crew is representative of the millions of American military personnel throughout the world. Nevermind that many of them could be paid more money for less work in a civilian job, may not get eight hours sleep each night or see their families for weeks at a time—they make those sacrifices for the country they love.

I hope that Coloradans will join me in using Armed Forces Day to thank those who are serving in the best military force in the world.●

S. 2581

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor legislation introduced by Senator SESSIONS, S. 2581, the Historically Women's Public Colleges

or Universities Historic Building Restoration and Preservation Act.

There were seven historic women's public colleges or universities founded in the United States between 1884 and 1908 to provide industrial and vocational education for women who at the time, could not attend other public academic institutions. These schools are now coeducational but retain some of the significant historical and academic features of those pioneering efforts to educate women.

Let me take this time to tell you about one of these schools, Winthrop University, located in South Carolina. Winthrop's history dates back to 1886 when 21 students gathered in a borrowed one-room building in Columbia, S.C. David Bancroft Johnson, a dedicated and gifted superintendent of schools, headed up the fledgling institution whose mission was the education of teachers. Winthrop has changed considerably since moving to its permanent Rock Hill, S.C. home in 1895, growing from a single classroom to a comprehensive university of distinction. The institution became coeducational in 1974 and assumed university designation in 1992.

Like similar institutions founded as historically women's colleges and universities, the Winthrop University campus hosts numerous historic buildings—buildings that are expensive to adapt and/or maintain for modern-day uses essential to public higher education in the 21st century. Also, like similar institutions, many of Winthrop's alumni were women of modest means who were unable to make the kind of substantial private donations that would have enabled the University to build a strong endowment throughout its history. Nonetheless, this campus is significant and is worthy of federal support to assure that its distinctive role in U.S. history is not lost.●

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to America's small businesses—the backbone of our Nation's vibrant economy. As my colleagues may know, the week of May 21-27 is recognized as "National Small Business Week."

Small businesses have always been one of the leading providers of jobs in our country. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses employ 52 percent of the private workforce and account for 35 percent of federal contract dollars. Small businesses produce 38 percent of jobs in high-technology industries, and small- and medium-sized companies comprise 96 percent of all exporters and 30 percent of all exports. These statistics underscore the important role the small business community will have toward developing a 21st century economy that is global and technologically driven.

In particular, I am very pleased with the tremendous growth in women-

owned businesses over the last several years. According to the National Foundation for Women Business Owners, there are more than 9.1 million women-owned businesses in the United States, employing more than 27.5 million people and generating \$3.6 billion in sales. Between 1987 and 1999, the number of women-owned firms increased dramatically, by more than 103 percent.

During "National Small Business Week," I am proud to share with my colleagues the special recognition granted by the Small Business Administration to two of Minnesota's small business persons: the 1999 Minnesota Small Business Person of the Year, Nancy L. Fogelberg, President of American Artstone in New Ulm, Minnesota; and the Financial Services Advocate of the Year, Iric Nathanson, Project Coordinator for the Minneapolis Community Development Agency.

To be named a recipient of the Small Business Person of the Year award is not an easy task. The Small Business Administration has selected Nancy for this unique recognition based on her personal achievements and important contributions to our economy. Nancy has demonstrated growth in the total number of company employees; innovative products and services; growth in sales and financial position; an ability to effectively address problems confronting the company; and community service.

In 1993, Nancy Fogelberg became President of American Artstone, an 86-year-old manufacturer of architectural stone castings. Nancy quickly modernized her plant through financing provided by the Small Business Administration, and quickly made American Artstone more competitive and profitable. I also congratulate Nancy on recently being named president of the National Cast Stone Institute.

I am also proud to recognize the important achievements of Iric Nathanson, who has worked to provide financing opportunities for small businesses. Among his many achievements, Iric developed a capital-loan program that uses city-backed guarantees to help small businesses access revolving credit lines and working capital loans. Iric also coordinated the development of a micro-enterprise loan program in Minneapolis through the establishment of a partnership between the Minneapolis Community Development Agency and the Minneapolis Consortium of Community Developers. Small businesses in Minneapolis have been well served by Iric's efforts on their behalf.

I again congratulate the National Small Business Week winners from Minnesota and every small business owner who helps make our communities better places to work and live. I look forward to working with them on small business public policy issues during the 106th Congress.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANK A. AUKOFER

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President I rise today to honor the dean of the congressional print reporters here in Congress. Frank A. Aukofer has worked in the Washington Bureau of the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel and its predecessor, the Milwaukee Journal, since 1970. Frank has also served in other capacities for the paper since 1960. Sadly, for those of us who have read his stories through the years, Frank has decided to retire at the beginning of next month.

During his long and distinguished career, Frank has reported on the issues that have defined the last 40 years in America and around the world. He was the civil rights reporter for the Journal at the height of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Since arriving in Washington, Frank's coverage of State, national, and international issues has included stories on six Presidents, 15 Congresses, and the nomination hearings of 11 Supreme Court justices, including every member of the current Court.

Coverage of these important events has not kept Frank tied to his desk here in the press gallery. In the 1980s, he traveled to Mexico, Colombia, Cuba, and Central America to cover such stories as the trial of Eugene Hasenfus in Nicaragua which led to a nomination for a Pulitzer Prize. He was also one of the first journalists to report from Saudi Arabia in 1990 when U.S. troops were deployed after Iraq invaded Kuwait. On top of all this he has still found time to write a weekly automobile review column entitled, "Drive-Ways."

I thank Frank Aukofer for his years of service to the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel, and the people of Wisconsin and I wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER EDWARD RANDALL

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Father Edward Randall on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee and in recognition of 20 years of priesthood in Letcher County.

During Father Randall's 20 years in Letcher County, he has served at both St. George Catholic Church in Jenkins and Holy Angels Catholic Church in McRoberts. People throughout the community have come to know Father Randall for his dedication to parishioners and generosity to everyone, both inside and outside the Church walls.

The Letcher County community also boasts of Father Randall's artistic talent, which he graciously uses to enhance church buildings and to teach free art classes open for all to attend. Father Randall also helped establish, along with the late Mother Teresa, an order of the Sisters of Charity in Jenkins, which will endure as an honor to his philanthropic contributions.

Father Randall continues to display an unswerving commitment to his pa-

rishioners and possesses the love and respect of many in the community. Those who know him in Letcher County describe him as a man with great strength of character who demonstrates honesty and integrity, and who serves as a role-model to young and old alike.

I am certain that the legacy of commitment to faith that Father Randall has left will continue on, and will encourage and inspire those who follow. Congratulations, Father Randall, on 50 years of priesthood and 20 years of service to Letcher County. Best wishes for many more years of service, and know that your efforts to better the lives of your parishioners and those in Letcher County will be felt for years to come. On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the United States Senate, thank you for giving so much of yourself for so many others.●

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, May 19, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,673,912,681,580.44 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy-three billion, nine hundred twelve million, six hundred eighty-one thousand, five hundred eighty dollars and forty-four cents).

One year ago, May 19, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,593,798,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-three billion, seven hundred ninety-eight million).

Five years ago, May 19, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,883,152,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred eighty-three billion, one hundred fifty-two million).

Twenty-five years ago, May 19, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$520,328,000,000 (Five hundred twenty billion, three hundred twenty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,153,584,681,580.44 (Five trillion, one hundred fifty-three billion, five hundred eighty-four million, six hundred eighty-one thousand, five hundred eighty dollars and forty-four cents) during the past 25 years.●

TRIBUTE TO TODD ROSSETTI

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Todd Rossetti for receiving his high school diploma from Concord High School.

For some, a high school diploma is taken for granted. For Todd Rossetti, it is a celebration of the trials and tribulations that he has endured his entire life.

Although Todd was born with cerebral palsy, his illness has not prohibited him from accomplishing anything that he has set his mind to. In the Concord School System, Todd was immersed in a new "inclusion" program, allowing him to participate in the mainstream curriculum.

Though Todd's illness hinders his ability to communicate, his peers,

teachers and administrators have grown to love him and take pride in ensuring that he is able to remain in mainstream classes. This support web has enabled Todd to attend school, follow through with scholarly activities, and find employment.

When it was believed that Todd might not be able to receive his diploma with his class, it was that support network that spoke out. Because of the love and efforts of his peers, Todd will be able to graduate.

As a former teacher, I feel great compassion for his struggle. He is a courageous and dedicated student, and it is an honor to represent him in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGINA LELAND

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Mrs. Georgina Leland for being honored with Ossipee's Citizen of the Year Award for 2000. This award recognizes one who is dedicated to reaching out to his or her community. Georgina Leland is just such a person. She is noted for her gregarious nature, her gritty honesty and her love of her community.

Georgina has been a pillar of Ossipee's community for fourteen years. Over the course of these years, Georgina has made her name made known among both the young and the old. She is a member of both her church choir and her Bible study group, and she is a regular volunteer at church functions. Allowing elderly residents to experience life to its fullest, Georgina volunteers as a driver for the Clipper Home in Wolfeboro, for R.S.V.P. and for Families Matter. When this vibrant woman isn't in her car driving around the state of New Hampshire, she is consumed with her work at the Public Library and at the Mountain View Nursing Home.

Georgina, too, takes a special interest in her community's governmental affairs. She is a noteworthy volunteer at Ossipee's Concerned Citizens events where she never fails to make herself noticed with her efforts or her words. Acting as the Past President of the Ossipee Valley Women's Club for four years, Georgina was charged with bringing to life the scholarship program. In addition, Georgina volunteers her summers to the Chamber of Commerce's information booth.

Her efforts as a volunteer and as a citizen have earned Georgina numerous commendations. In 1998, she was named the Volunteer of the Year by the Clipper Home. She also received recognition from both R.S.V.P., Families Matter, VFW Post 8270 and Auxiliary for her efforts as a volunteer.

Georgina is a role model for us all. It is certain that she has set an example for those of her community, for all of us and for her seven children and fourteen grandchildren. Though her family is quite large, Georgina has made efforts to invite the entire community into her family fold. Her efforts and achievements are to be commended.

It is an honor to represent Georgina Leland in the United States Senate. Mary Jo and I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors. May you always continue to inspire those around you with your dedication to the community.●

TRIBUTE TO LAKES REGION GENERAL HOSPITAL

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Lakes Region General Hospital for their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under the leadership of President Thomas Clairmont, the Lakes Region General Hospital has become known for encouraging area agencies and organizations to work together, combining resources and taking risks in order to meet not only the health care needs of the Lakes Region, but of the entire state.

Mr. Clairmont has gone above and beyond the call of duty to give back to the group. In fact, he was recently honored with the American Hospital Association's PAC Award for outstanding service in the area of public policy, as well as the NH Hospital Association's Leslie A. Smith's President's Award. Mary Jo and I commend and congratulate him on his hard work and dedication to the Lakes Region General Hospital.

A key player in the Rural Health Coalition of New Hampshire, their HealthLink program has received national recognition as a model program that allows people to take charge of their own health, and provides health care for those individuals without health insurance. The efforts of the management and staff at Lakes Region General Hospital, in conjunction with this program, earned them recognition by the American Hospital Association through its 1994 NOVA Award.

Lakes Region General Hospital is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO TYCO INTERNATIONAL LTD.

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Tyco International Ltd. for their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under the leadership of Chairman Dennis Kozolowski and Senior Vice President Dave Brownell, Tyco has effectively continued their tradition of growth through increased efficiency and technology. With more than 100 acquisitions worldwide, they have truly become dominant on the international market as well as within the United States.

For all its growth, Tyco has not forgotten its role in the surrounding community. Tyco has donated money and time to United Way of the Greater Seacoast and the Greater Piscataqua Community Foundation's Jeffery Gutin Fund for Young Adults. Furthermore, Tyco's contribution of \$500,000 was critical in the transformation of the Strawberry Banke Museum into a year-round educational and community resource.

Their commitment to community does not end with donating money to worthy causes. Tyco's employees, from senior staffers to entry-level workers, volunteer their time and energy to many non-profit organizations across the state. Perhaps more important, Tyco makes this commitment to service possible by allowing its employees to incorporate volunteerism into their busy schedules.

Tyco's success is irrefutable proof that a company can give back to its community while improving its "bottom line." I commend the employees of Tyco for their efforts. It is an honor to serve them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO THE H.L. TURNER GROUP

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor The H.L. Turner Group for their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under the leadership of President Harold Turner, Jr., the Turner Group has truly struck a balance between business success and social responsibility. Incorporated in 1990, they have made significant inroads into the community and will surely continue to do so in the future.

The Turner Group has won national recognition for their commitment to the environment, a commitment that I echo as Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee of the Senate. They have been recognized for their Indoor Air Quality standards, and received the 1996 United States Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Merit Award in "recognition of demonstrated commitment and significant contributions to the environment" for their design of the Boscawen Elementary School. The Turner Group has pledged itself to achieving environmentally friendly designs at the same cost as less efficient designs with questionable air quality.

Employees of the Turner Group have donated countless hours to the Audobon Society as board members, the Silk Farm Center Building Committee as members, Concord's Conference and Trade Center as visionaries for planning and design, and as "educational consultants" for New Hampshire's Junior Achievement's collaboration with U.S. FIRST, the LEGO Corporation and three Manchester schools for the first-in-the-nation business and robotics program.

The H.L. Turner Group is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM T. FRAIN, JR.

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor William T. Frain, Jr., upon his recognition by Business New Hampshire Magazine as the "Business Leader of the Decade" in the state of New Hampshire.

William, or "Bill" Frain, is the President and CEO of a company that has seen New Hampshire through many of its most difficult economic periods, Public Service of New Hampshire. Although faced with adversity throughout his tenure with the company, Frain successfully pulled them through near bankruptcy, an acquisition by Northeast Utilities, and industry deregulation.

Bill is an extraordinary leader, the type that does not always manifest itself, but who motivates and encourages those around them to give above and beyond one hundred percent of themselves. As a result, over 150 of his employees sit on boards throughout the state, and many more volunteer their time to give back to communities throughout the state. In addition, employees at PSNH have contributed more than 1.3 million to the United Way since 1990.

Bill's most notable achievements include winning the Yankee Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America Yankee Award for demonstrating leadership during a crisis, earning the Special New Hampshire District Advocacy Award from the United States Small Business Administration, acting as a key facilitator in forming the Amoskeag Fishways Partnership in order to bring life back into the Merrimack River, and being a co-founder of the Junior Achievement of New Hampshire Advisory Council in 1995. A member of too many organizations to list, he has truly exemplified the qualities of strong leadership.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege of mine, during my time in office, to have worked with a leader as extraordinary as Bill Frain. His hard work, determination, and ability to motivate those around him to reach greater heights are truly commendable. Bill, it is an honor to represent you in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO EASTER SEALS

● Mr. SMITH, of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Easter Seals upon their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under the guidance of President Larry Gammon, Easter Seals has selflessly and stead-

fastly serviced individuals with a wide range of disabilities across the state. Perhaps their most notable achievement to date is their work to ensure that students with emotional and learning disabilities receive excellent schooling, housing and another chance to grow and become active community members.

Easter Seals services an average of 125 children a day through programs such as "Support to Families in Need," family mediation, parenting workshops and 24-hour emergency support access. They currently provide ninety percent of special needs transportation for Manchester and one hundred percent for the town of Londonderry, New Hampshire.

Although their hardest workers are often volunteers, Easter Seals has never wavered in the quality of the services they provide, and should be commended for their continued quality and caring in the state.

The accomplishments of this organization are simply too numerous to list. They founded Camp Sno-Mo, a program for children with physical and cognitive disabilities which has grown to include day camps as well as adult vacation programs. They also opened an Alzheimer's Day Program, allowing many family members a respite from caring for loved ones afflicted with the disease.

Easter Seals is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO CENTRAL PAPER PRODUCTS

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Central Paper Products for their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, and for many before that, under the direction and guidance of President Fred Kfoury Jr., Central Paper has donated time and experience to economic development and civic improvement projects across the state. They were actively involved in many of the major projects in the state, namely the Airport Initiative, the Civic Center, the Manchester Housing Authority, United Way, Easter Seals and the Manchester School System.

Central Paper, because of their ability to be flexible in the technological field, is often working at a rate more efficient than companies three times their size. Their dedication to technological advancement has brought them to the forefront of their field, and I commend them for it.

Employees of Central Paper Products helped to found the Science Enrichment Encounter and FIRST, and continue to work with these programs on a national scale. In 1991 and 1992, Central Paper Products was named "Best of the

Best" by the National Paper Trade Association for their commitment to community service, and President Fred Kfoury, Jr., was named "Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year" in 1998.

Central Paper Products is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO BELL ATLANTIC

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Bell Atlantic for their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under current President and CEO Michael Hickey, Bell Atlantic has faithfully upheld the cornerstones of their company: corporate responsibility, good citizenship, and core values. It has instilled this sense of giving back to the surrounding community not only in their management, but to their employees on every level.

Bell Atlantic's commitment to the surrounding community is evident through their participation in Kids Voting, their Adopt-A-School relationship with Beech Street School and their participation in Manchester's School-to-Work Program for electrical workers. They also worked with Cabletron and Project WINGS to ensure that schools throughout the state were wired to the Internet, sponsored the Smithsonian Folklife exhibit from New Hampshire and worked closely with various other community groups to educate and guide youths and adults throughout the state.

Additionally, Bell Atlantic has worked tirelessly over the past ten years to achieve the newest technological links for both businesses and homes across the state. Over the past five years, Bell Atlantic has invested nearly \$100 million in technological upgrades, and will continue to do so well into the future.

Bell Atlantic is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO FLEET BANK

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Fleet Bank upon their designation as one of the "Businesses of the Decade" by Business New Hampshire Magazine.

For the past ten years, under the leadership of President Michael Whitney, Fleet Bank has made phenomenal inroads to assisting the surrounding community, and I applaud the hard work and dedication of each and every employee of the company.

The greatest examples of this are "Team Fleet," a group of more than

200 staff members who have donated thousands of hours to over 375 non-profit organizations and efforts within the state from Special Olympics to NH Public Television, and their financing of one of the largest community development projects undertaken by the City of Manchester in order to rehabilitate one hundred low-income rentals on Elm Street.

Fleet Bank gives back to the community on a continual basis, forming the "Fleet All-Stars" in 1996, a company-funded, community-wide, public/private partnership developed in order to revitalize neighborhoods in various communities through volunteerism in youth organizations and other civic groups. In 1999 alone, they were able to reach out to over 30 youth programs and approximately 2,381 children throughout the state.

Fleet Bank is a true community leader and a friend to the people of New Hampshire. Their efforts over the past ten years are truly commendable, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4205. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4475. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment to the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3707) to authorize funds for the construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3629. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III.

H.R. 3707. An act to authorize funds for the construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4475. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times, and place on the calendar:

H.R. 4205. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-9052. A communication from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Motor Vehicle Trunk Entrapment"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9053. A communication from the National Credit Union Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "21 CFR Part 790", received May 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-9054. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Preparing for Drought in the 21st Century"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9055. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule entitled "Consolidation of Certain Food and Feed Additive Tolerance Regulations" (FRL # 6041-9), received May 17, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9056. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule entitled "Consolidation of Certain Food and Feed Additive Tolerance Regulations" (FRL # 6043-1), received May 17, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9057. A communication from the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to building project surveys for courts in Mobile, AL; Cedar Rapids, IA; Rockford, IL; Las Cruces, NM; Buffalo, NY; Nashville, TN; El Paso, TX and Norfolk, VA; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9058. A communication from the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a building project survey for San Francisco Bay Area, CA; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9059. A communication from the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an amended lease prospectus for the National Park Service, San Francisco or Oakland, CA; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9060. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Approval of Revised Maintenance Plan and Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets; Albuquerque/Bernillo County, New Mexico; Carbon Monoxide" (FRL # 6703-8), received May 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9061. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Operating Permits Program Interim Approval Expiration Dates" (FRL # 6703-3), received May 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9062. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL # 6704-1), received May 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9063. A communication from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9064. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; OPSAIL 2000, Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA (CGD05-00-002)" (RIN2115-AA97) (2000-0016), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9065. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL # 6704-7), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9066. Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, transmitting a revision to a previously submitted draft of proposed legislation entitled "Water Resources Development Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9067. A communication from the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "June 2000 Applicable Federal Rates" (Rev. Rul. 2000-28), received May 19, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9068. A communication from the Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Summary Forfeiture of Controlled Substances" (RIN1515-AC60), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9069. A communication from the Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Entry of Softwood Lumber Shipments from Canada" (RIN1515-AC62), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9070. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9071. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999, through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9072. A communication from the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to the physicians comparability allowance program; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9073. A communication from the Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to the use and distribution of the Western Shoshone Judgment Funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-9074. A communication from the Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and paying Benefits"; received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9075. A communication from the Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Permit Payment of Patent and Trademark Office Fees by Credit Card" (RIN0651-AB07), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-9076. A communication from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation P-Privacy of Consumer Financial Information" (Docket No. R-1058), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-9077. A communication from the Office of Thrift Supervision, department of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy of Consumer Financial Information" (RIN1550-AB36), received May 18, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-9078. A communication from the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled "Implementation of Positive Train Control Systems"; 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 times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 2600. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make enhancements to the critical access hospital program under the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the gross income of an employee any employer provided home computer and Internet access; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 2600. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make en-

hancements to the critical access hospital program under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITAL ENHANCEMENT ACT
• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Critical Access Hospital Enhancement Act of 2000. This bill provides some much-needed program flexibility and refinements to the Medicare Critical Access Hospital Program.

Congress created the Critical Access Hospital Program three years ago when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-33). Under current law, a Critical Access Hospital must be located at a distance of over 35 miles from the nearest hospital; have emergency room and inpatient services provided by physicians, physician assistants and nurse practitioners; have fifteen or fewer inpatient beds; and inpatient stays must be limited to an average of 96 hours (four days).

The Critical Access Hospital program enables eligible rural hospitals to receive higher reimbursement rates for acute medical care. Through special allowances for staffing and reimbursements, designation as a Critical Access Hospital means that a community may be able to maintain local health care access which would otherwise be lost.

Many rural patients are Medicare and Medicaid participants and reduced reimbursements hit hospitals and medical centers hard: for example, two-thirds of the patients at Blue Hill Memorial Hospital in my home state of Maine are enrolled in Medicare or Medicaid. Designation as a Critical Access Hospital is especially important to these small, rural hospitals because it provides higher reimbursement rates.

To date, there are 165 hospitals across the country that have been designated as Critical Access Hospitals, and three in Maine: Blue Hill Memorial in Blue Hill, St. Andrews Hospital in Boothbay Harbor, and C.A. Dean Memorial Hospital in Greenville. Without the Critical Access Hospital program many small, rural hospitals—many of which are often the only point of care for miles—will be lost. My bill seeks to strengthen this program; it is my hope that with passage of the legislation I introduce today, more of our nation's small, rural hospitals will be able to participate in this valuable program.

This bill will bring increased flexibility and programmatic refinements to the Critical Access Hospital Program through the restoration of bad debt payments, extending cost-based reimbursement to ambulance and home health services associated with Critical Access Hospitals, and modifying the provisions related to swing bed and laboratory services. In addition, I propose including a seasonality adjustment for hospitals that are based in communities that experience large seasonal population fluctuations.

Rural residents are often poorer and more likely to lack private health insurance when compared with their urban neighbors. As a result, rural hos-

pitals disproportionately incur bad debt expenses. The BBA reduced bad debt payments for hospitals and the Health Care Financing Administration has interpreted this provision to apply to Critical Access Hospitals. My bill restores bad debt payments as a way to improve participation rates in the Critical Access Hospital program.

Emergency medical care is a crucial component in the Critical Access Hospital health care delivery system. Congress clearly stated that all outpatient departmental services furnished by Critical Access Hospitals should be reimbursed on the basis of reasonable costs, but HCFA has carved out ambulance services. My bill extends cost-based reimbursement to ambulance services associated with Critical Access Hospitals as it follows Congress's original legislative intent.

Critical Access Hospitals are often the sole sponsor of home health services in remote areas. If a Critical Access Hospital is the only home health provider in a rural community, then it would be useful to reimburse those services on the basis of reasonable costs. This bill will extend cost-based reimbursement to home health services associated with Critical Access Hospitals and will help maintain access to post-acute medical care for Medicare beneficiaries.

Critical Access Hospitals are currently required to comply with extensive minimum data set standards under the skilled nursing facility (SNF) prospective payment system (PPS). This bill will provide cost based reimbursement to swing bed services furnished by Critical Access Hospitals to help alleviate some of the administrative expenses associated with SNF PPS.

Laboratory services furnished by Critical Access Hospitals have historically been reimbursed on the basis of reasonable costs. In an attempt to clarify the statute and eliminate the collection of beneficiary coinsurance, the Balanced Budget Refinement Act (P.L. 106-113) that we passed last November inadvertently referenced the fee schedule. Consequently, HCFA has interpreted the provision to mean laboratory services now will be reimbursed at the fee schedule rate. Correcting this provision is critical to ensuring that Medicare beneficiaries have access to important laboratory tests, and my bill does just that.

Seasonal fluctuations can occur in places like coastal Maine where tourism swells the population in an area or in a small town near a ski resort. This seasonal population increase makes many otherwise tiny hospitals ineligible for the Critical Access Hospital Program. We must ensure that hospitals are available year round for a community's permanent population. It seems to me that if a hospital generally serves a community with a population of 2,000 but is seasonally faced with substantially much larger population, it should not de facto be made

ineligible for the benefits of the Critical Access Hospital Program.

The final provision in The Critical Access Hospital Enhancement Act will allow a state flexibility in designating a hospital with more than 15 beds as a Critical Access Hospital if those additional beds are used only for seasonal fluctuations in admissions, and if the average annual occupancy is not more than 15.

Mr. President, small hospitals across the country are facing an increasingly uncertain future, and we must lend additional support to our rural health care providers. Refining the Critical Access Hospital program will ensure that the Critical Access Hospital designation is flexible enough for most rural areas. Expanding the Critical Access Hospital Program is critical to these small hospitals and the communities they serve.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the gross income of an employee any employer provided home computer and Internet access; to the Committee on Finance.

BRIDGING THE DIGITAL DIVIDE ACT OF 2000

● Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Bridging the Digital Divide Act of 2000, a bill to make it easier for working Americans to obtain computers and computer equipment so that no one is left behind in the new Internet economy. This legislation makes it possible for employees to accept computers offered by their employers without having to pay the IRS taxes on the value of the computer.

Mr. President, the high-tech sector is an increasingly important part of our economy, creating new synergies and opportunities for Americans of all ages. The more we can do to encourage every American to participate in the Internet revolution, the more productive we as a nation will be.

But the benefits of the high-tech revolution, while lucrative, must not be limited to only some of our citizens. The great promise of the Internet revolution is that the benefits and rewards are accessed at the individual level; not just reserved for big businesses or multinational corporations. Our government should facilitate, not hinder, bringing that promise to each American.

In the long term, I believe that being hooked up to the Internet will be as universal as television. It is important to remember that the Internet is a new technology, one that few people had heard of ten years ago. We have gone from 5.8 million U.S. households online in 1994 to almost 40 million in 1999. By 2003, it is projected that 60 million households will be hooked up to the Internet.

In the short term, however, it is important to facilitate the availability of the Internet to all Americans. While many citizens have been taking advan-

tage of the opportunities the Internet has to offer, too many Americans and Missourians have been left behind. Too many people are opting out or being left behind by the Internet economy.

According to Forrester Research, income is the main driver of Internet adoption. Americans who earn more, participate more, and thereby develop the ability to earn even more. According to a 1998 study by the Department of Commerce, households with income of \$75,000 and more are over 20 times more likely to have Internet access than those at the lowest income levels.

This divide among income levels also indicates a divide along racial lines as well. According to the same Department of Commerce report, black and Hispanic households are roughly two-fifths as likely to have Internet access as white households. Overall, according to Forrester Research, only 33 percent of African American households are online, ten percent fewer than the national average.

In my home state of Missouri, great progress has been made toward the goal of bringing the state on-line. Since 1989, during my tenure as Governor, Missouri has managed a statewide network that connects state government departments and transmits voice, data, and video between them. The state Department of Administration runs the network, which connects government offices statewide over 14 nodes. In addition, according to the Department of Commerce, 42 percent of Missouri households have computers.

Despite this progress, there is still more to do. In terms of Internet usage, Missouri ranks 32nd out of the 50 states, with only 24.3 percent of households connected to the Internet in 1998. Clearly, it is in Missouri's interest to promote increased connectedness.

Across the nation, those who appreciate the power and opportunities inherent in the Internet continue to increase their involvement in the high-tech world. 60 percent of computer sales are being made to households that have already purchased a computer, demonstrating that these households recognize the importance of remaining current and up to date with their computer equipment. At the same time, only 40 percent of computer sales are being made to households purchasing a computer for the first time. If we want more Americans to experience the high-tech economy, we should encourage first time computer purchases and find ways to make computer ownership easier for families who are currently without.

According to Dr. Mark Dean, a specialist in advanced technology development for IBM, the solution to the digital divide is to put computers in as many homes as possible. Unfortunately, when employers have tried to help bridge this gap by providing their employees with computers and Internet access, the Internet Revenue Service has widened the digital divide by treating the new equipment as a "tax-

able event," or in other words, requiring the employee to pay income tax on the value of the computer.

Recently, the Ford Motor Company began a laudable effort to increase involvement of its employees in the high-tech economy. In February, Ford announced that it would give all of its 350,000 employees free computers for their homes. Ford is doing this because they recognize the value of having a workforce that is computer literate and internet savvy. Ford understands that in the digital economy, on-line workers are more productive workers—whatever their responsibilities are with the company.

Unfortunately, the IRS does not see things the same way. The IRS approach is to tax everything it can get its hands on, including the computers Ford is providing to employees to help bridge the digital divide. According to the IRS, the employees who receive these computers from their employer are liable for tax on the value of the computers.

Mr. President, this is wrong. When companies make the move to bring all of their employees into the 21st century, the government should not make it harder on the workers to accept the technology by increasing their taxes. Ford's employees should not be penalized for having an employer that understands the importance of a computer-literate workforce. The fact is that computers are a vital business tool, for all employees, and Ford has demonstrated its understanding of this fact by providing these computers for every employee, from the newest worker to the CEO.

Ford's employees should not have to suffer as a result of the IRS's 19th century approach to tax policy. It is for this reason that my bill, the Bridging the Digital Divide Act of 2000, instructs the IRS not to treat computers provided to all employees by an employer as taxable income to the employee. This measure is in the interest of employees and employers alike. And because computers in the home will help increase our economic productivity and hence our output, we can expect that the long term impact of this provision will prove beneficial not just to workers and their families but to the nation's economy as well.

Mr. President, many politicians stand up and complain about the problem of the "digital divide." The Ford Motor Company has actually found a solution—a private sector solution—for its employees. The response of the government should be to thank Ford and encourage other companies to do what Ford has done—to take action that is in the best interest of its workers, not just for today, but for the future as well. But instead, the government response is to tax the recipients. I hope that other companies will follow Ford's example. By enacting this legislation, we may be making it possible for the private sector to help solve the digital divide, and will at least be ensuring

that the government will not put the taxman in the way of the bridge-builders of the new economy.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 534

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to expand the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Secretary to include firearm products and non-powder firearms.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farm rental income from net earnings from self-employment if the taxpayer enters into a lease agreement relating to such income.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to establish, wherever feasible, guidelines, recommendations, and regulations that promote the regulatory acceptance of new and revised toxicological tests that protect human and animal health and the environment while reducing, refining, or replacing animal tests and ensuring human safety and product effectiveness.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1909, a bill to provide for the preparation of a Governmental report detailing injustices suffered by Italian Americans during World War II, and a formal acknowledgement of such injustices by the President.

S. 2084

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for contributions of food inventory, and for other purposes.

S. 2099

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2099, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the registration of handguns, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), and the

Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.

S. 2297

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2297, a bill to reauthorize the Water Resources Research Act of 1984.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2419

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2419, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the annual determination of the rate of the basic benefit of active duty educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 100, a concurrent resolution expressing support of Congress for a National Moment of Remembrance to be observed at 3:00 p.m. eastern standard time on each Memorial Day.

S. CON. RES. 113

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 113, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in recognition of the 10th anniversary of the free and fair elections in Burma and the urgent need to improve the democratic and human rights of the people of Burma.

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the

presentation of such educational programs.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 23. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator GRAMS, or his designee, from 9:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, from 10 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.; Senator DURBIN, or his designee, from 11 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy luncheons.

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

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until 4 p.m. for the submission of statements by Members.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 11:30 tomorrow morning. Following morning business, it is hoped the Senate can begin consideration of S. 2536, the Agriculture appropriations bill. It is my intention to complete action on this important spending bill and the legislative appropriations bill, if it is available from the House. Senators can expect votes throughout the week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:34 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 23, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.