



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2000

No. 125

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, September 22, 2000)

The Senate met at 2:02 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, these days in the Senate are filled with crucial issues, differences on solutions, and vital votes on legislation. We begin this day with a question that You asked King Solomon, "Ask. What shall I give you?" We empathize with Solomon's answer. He asked for an "understanding heart." We are moved with the more precise Hebrew translation of an "understanding heart," meaning a "hearing heart."

Solomon wanted to hear a word from You for the perplexities that he faced. He longed for the gift of wisdom so that he could have answers and directions for his people. We are inspired by Your response: "See, I have given you a wise and listening heart."

I pray for nothing less as You answer this urgent prayer for the women and men of this Senate. Help them to listen to Your guidance and grant them wisdom for their debates and decisions. All through our history as a nation You have made good men and women great when they humbled themselves, confessed their need for Your wisdom, and listened intently to You. Speak Lord;

we need to hear Your voice in the cacophony of other voices. We are listening. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable GEORGE VOINOVICH, a Senator from the State of Ohio, 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 acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators DURBIN and THOMAS in control of the time. Following morning business, the Senate is expected to consider the VA-HUD appropriations bill. It is hoped that legislation can be completed in short order and without a rollcall vote. However, if a rollcall vote is requested, the vote will occur tomorrow at a time to be determined.

On Wednesday, there will be up to 7 hours of debate on the conference report to accompany the sex trafficking victims bill. Senator THOMPSON will

make a point of order against the report, and a vote is expected relative to appealing the ruling of the Chair. Senators can also expect a vote on the adoption of the sex trafficking conference report. The Senate may also begin consideration of the Agriculture appropriations conference report during tomorrow's session.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Under the previous order, the time of the leaders is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now be in a period of morning business for 2 hours.

CONGRESSMAN BRUCE VENTO

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was just informed by the Sergeant at Arms that BRUCE VENTO, a Member of the House of Representatives, died today, just a short time ago.

I served in the House with BRUCE. After I left the House, I saw him virtually every day; he and I worked out in the House gym every morning. He

NOTICE

Effective January 1, 2001, the subscription price of the Congressional Record will be \$393 per year or \$197 for six months. Individual issues may be purchased for \$4.00 per copy. The cost for the microfiche edition will remain \$141 per year with single copies remaining \$1.50 per issue. This price increase is necessary based upon the cost of printing and distribution.

Michael F. DiMario, *Public Printer*

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S10123

was very faithful. We had a very warm relationship.

When I served in the House, I can remember one of the first conversations we had was about a national park in Nevada. I had never contemplated a national park in Nevada. We did not have one. I, frankly, did not know the history of Nevada as it related to the area around Mt. Wheeler. I did not realize that Key Pittman, a longtime Senator from Nevada, had sent President Reagan's Director of the Park Service, William Penn Mott, there when he was a park ranger in the 1930s to find a site in Nevada for a national park, and this is the spot that he found and gave this information to President Roosevelt.

Over the years, many political battles ensued and the park never came into being. I did some wilderness legislation for Nevada. It was extremely controversial. But based on my conversations with BRUCE VENTO, I decided to peel off some of what we were doing in wilderness and go for a national park. It was one of the best things I ever did; we now have a national park in Nevada, Great Basin National Park, which is really a world wonder. It has a mountain peak over 13,000 feet high; it has Nevada's only glacier; it has the oldest living thing in the world, the bristlecone pine—over 5,000 years old. They were there before Christ came to Earth; they were there during the time the pyramids were built. In addition, Lehman Caves is located inside the park boundary.

Without talking more about the park itself, just the inception of that idea came to me as a result of a conversation I had with BRUCE VENTO as a new Member of the House of Representatives. He was very interested in things related to the environment.

BRUCE VENTO being dead now is hard to contemplate because he worked so hard on his physical body. A few years ago, while here at his home in Washington, he fell off the roof while doing some work and was broken up very badly. But it only kept him from his gym work for a short period of time, even though he had broken bones.

BRUCE VENTO died as a result of asbestosis which he contracted as a young man while working with asbestos. Out of nowhere he developed a lung problem. Last year he had a lung removed. They were hoping that they got it. They didn't. And a few weeks ago it was announced they did not. I am sure his family and those close to him knew that his life was not going to be long, but I didn't know.

I am really saddened at the death of BRUCE VENTO. He is somebody who I will always remember. I will always remember him for his smile and his love for the environment and, on a personal basis, for what he did to quicken my mind about the possibility of having a national park in Nevada.

Our country is less today than it was yesterday as a result of the passing of BRUCE VENTO. I expressed to his family the great affection that I and many

Members, those who work with me in the Congress, have for BRUCE. I wish them, no I don't wish them—I give them the knowledge that the passage of time will lessen the anguish they now feel. Hopefully, as the months pass by, only memories of their love and loss will be in their minds, and not the fact of their loss; the fact of the many things he contributed to this country will be paramount in their minds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I heard the remarks of our colleague from Nevada about our good friend, BRUCE VENTO. I also express my deepest sympathies to his family at their loss. It is a loss to them and it is a loss to America. BRUCE VENTO was a man who educated many of us, including myself, as to the great value of our national parks; that in many ways they are the repositories of America's dream, of what kind of a country we were and what kind of an America we wish to leave for future generations.

I had the opportunity to talk to Congressman VENTO just a few weeks ago on behalf of a national park that I feel very deeply about, Everglades National Park. As always, he was extremely solicitous of information and forthcoming in his willingness to be of assistance.

I am saddened today at the news of BRUCE VENTO's passing. America, and particularly our great natural treasures, have lost a tremendous friend and articulate advocate on their behalf.

THE BUDGETING PROCESS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I come this afternoon to the floor for two reasons. The first is to express my general dismay at the status of the budgeting process for this year. Second is to give a specific example of how this process has resulted in a program—which was clearly outlined and approved by Congress and signed into law by the President as the Equity Transportation Act for the 21st Century, generally referred to as TEA-21—has been convoluted.

Let me first talk about the general budgeting process for this year. We are now 10 days into the new fiscal year, and substantial parts of our budget have yet to be enacted and sent to the President for his consideration. Even more dismaying than that is what is in the budgets that we have passed and sent to the President. I use, as example, No. 1, the most recent budget this Senate has acted upon when, last Friday, we passed the Transportation appropriations conference committee report.

First, the process. I was very interested in this bill, as will become apparent as I move to point No. 2 of my remarks. Yet it was not available until Friday morning, the same morning that we were called to vote upon this very complex bill which will allocate some \$58 billion of our National Treasury. Even today, specific details are

yet to be discerned. So we are operating as alleged pilots of the national fiscal trust through dark clouds and fog and driving rain, unaware of where we are or where we have gone.

I am also very concerned about the specific numbers in this legislation. I know this has been an issue of great concern to our Presiding Officer, who has, in his period in the Senate, distinguished himself as one who is very concerned about our fiscal discipline.

For the fiscal year 2000, which ended September 30, we had a Transportation appropriations amount of \$50.7 billion. That is what we spent over the preceding 12 months. We have been operating under a budget resolution which, because of its own complexities, is difficult to align precisely with one of the specific appropriations bills, but we have had a general philosophy that the appropriations for fiscal year 2001 should not grow at a rate greater than the rate of inflation. According to the Consumer Price Index for the period July 1999 to July 2000, the rate of inflation for the United States was 3.5 percent.

If you add 3.5 percent to last year's Transportation appropriations, you would add, in rounded numbers, \$1.775 billion for a total of \$52.475 billion. That would have been the goal, the destination, the ceiling for spending under this Transportation account using the principle that the budget should be restrained to the rate of inflation.

The administration submitted a budget for this account that was \$54.6 billion. The Senate passed a Transportation bill which was \$54.8 billion.

But when the bill came back from the conference committee with the House, the total amount of the bill that we voted on favorably last Friday was \$58 billion, a 14-percent growth over the expenditure on the same account for the previous fiscal year. That is a staggering increase, and it is an increase which puts at risk many of the things upon which the political campaigns of the fall of 2000 have focused their attention: How are we going to spend the non-Social Security surplus? How will we utilize the \$2.2 trillion that is projected to come into the National Treasury over the next 10 years? I underscore that the \$2.2 trillion is on the assumption that we will hold spending for this 10-year period to the rate of inflation. That rate was 3½ percent. Yet in this one budget we have spent 14 percent.

If this budget were to be the standard by which we operated—this budget represents about 8 percent of the total discretionary spending of the United States. If we exceed every budget by the same amount that we have done with this one budget of Transportation, we will diminish that non-Social Security surplus in the range of 35 to 40 percent. This is serious business because we are making representations to the American people that we are going to protect that surplus; that we are going to use it either for targeted tax cuts, to

use it to build up our Social Security and Medicare program, and finance a prescription drug benefit or for large-scale tax cuts.

We are about to make all of those options unattainable if we do not exercise a greater degree of discipline over our spending this year and set the standard for what the spending will be over the next 9 years of this decade.

I first raise the alarm as to the process and the consequences of the budgets with which we are dealing as we conclude this session of Congress and lay out the fiscal plan for the Federal Government for the year 2001.

The second reason for my being here this afternoon is to bring to the attention of the Senate and the American people what we have done to one of the most innovative aspects of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, TEA-21.

In March of 1998, Congress overwhelmingly approved this groundbreaking transportation legislation to revamp the distribution of Federal highway funds. That legislation established, among other things, the intelligent transportation system, or ITS program, which sets aside money for research, development, and deployment of the components of an intelligent transportation system. The goal: to establish a sound policy for dealing with traffic congestion in the new millennium. The ITS program will work to solve congestion and safety, improve operating efficiencies in transit and commercial vehicles, and reduce the environmental impact of the growing travel demand.

The intelligent transportation systems use things such as modern computers, management techniques, and information technologies to improve the flow of traffic. ITS applications range from electronic highway signs that direct drivers away from accidents or other sources of congestion on the highways, to advanced radio advisories, to more efficient public transit.

Congress has sought to reward States that develop an intelligent transportation system. Demand for roads is increasing, particularly in the most populous and fastest growing areas of our country. Business commutes are getting longer, leisure travel options are becoming wider. States were encouraged to make use of advanced communications technology to ease gridlock.

This plan, developed by the Environment and Public Works Committee, where our Presiding Officer serves as chair of the subcommittee that has responsibility for this very legislation, was thoughtful and the plan had a specific purpose in mind: to foster the growth of intelligent transportation systems and, in a scientific manner, to gather results from the new ITS programs so that we could make wise decisions about the future direction of ITS when the next transportation bill is authorized in approximately 2003.

I am sad to report that this plan has come undone through the appropri-

tions process. Allow me to explain how this has happened.

The Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M University, in conjunction with many State departments of transportation, conducts a periodic study of the traffic conditions in our Nation. The latest annual mobility report produced in 1999 ranked the 70 most congested urban areas, cities, and small towns in America. It would seem reasonable, it would make common sense that those cities with the worst traffic congestion would receive Federal funds to implement, improve, or expand their intelligent transportation system. Indeed, the creators of the intelligent transportation system program in TEA-21 meant it to work that way. The law says that ITS projects must be selected through competitive solicitation and meet certain detailed criteria for program funding dollars.

I will read a few excerpts from that law. The authors set out the gathering of effective data as a goal in TEA-21:

To assure that Federal, State, and local transportation officials have adequate knowledge of intelligent transportation systems for full consideration in the transportation planning process.

To me, that means we need to be able to offer to Federal, State, and local transportation officials accurate and scientific data on ITS. The authors of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century spelled it out more precisely when they said:

The Secretary shall select for funding through competitive solicitations projects that will serve as models to improve transportation efficiency, promote safety. . . .

And for other reasons listed in the statute.

Unfortunately, the intent of the legislation has not followed. It was not followed first in the fiscal year 2000. Of the total \$221 million made available in the fiscal year 2000, the year that ended September 30 of this year, all but about 10 percent of that \$211 million was earmarked. For those who are not familiar with the jargon of the Congress, "earmarked" means there was a total amount of money available for a particular objective, in this case to fund the intelligent transportation systems, which, according to statute, was to be allocated based on competition. Of that \$211 million, 90 percent of it had a specific designation to a particular State or community within the United States.

According to the Texas report, the 15 most congested cities in the United States as of 1999 were: Los Angeles, Seattle, San Francisco, Washington, DC, Chicago, Miami, Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, San Diego, Houston, New York City, Portland, and San Jose.

Mr. President, would you be surprised, would you be stunned and appalled, if I were to tell you that in the fiscal year 2000, none of those 15 cities received any of the intelligent transportation system money? The 15 most congested cities in America, according to the national survey upon which we

rely, were allocated a penny for ITS money.

Of the other most congested cities highlighted in the Texas transportation study, only five received funds, while a sixth city probably will receive funds from an overall earmark to the State in which it was located. Those funds, for the five cities and the one State, totaled only \$7 million or 3 percent of the total ITS appropriation of \$211 million.

We have 75 of the most congested cities in America, cities in urban areas and smaller communities getting 3 percent of the money to assist them, through intelligent transportation systems technologies, in improving their traffic congestion. I was so offended by that that I, on September 15 of this year, wrote a letter to the Transportation appropriations conferees urging them, for the year 2001, which began October 1 of this year, not to repeat the mistake made in the previous year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I quote the concluding paragraph of the letter, which states:

I encourage you to adhere to the design created by TEA-21. The Congress has the opportunity, through ITS and other programs, to strengthen our national transportation infrastructure in a cost-effective, efficient manner. We undermine those efforts if we don't follow the criteria established and passed by Congress in TEA-21.

So in that context, it was with dismay that last Friday morning, when I finally had an opportunity to look at the Transportation conference report, I realized that again we were committing the same mistake. For the second year in a row, none of the top 15 traffic-choked cities got funding for intelligent transportation system technology to assist them in alleviating their gridlock.

Taking the list even further, none of the top 20 most congested cities received intelligent transportation system funding. Those additional five cities included Denver, Phoenix, San Bernardino, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Tacoma, WA. Those five cities are added to the 15 that I have previously read in the category of cities that are the most 20 congested cities in America, none of whom received any of the intelligent transportation system money. This suggests to me a total disconnect between the problem that led to the creation of ITS in the first place and the allocation of dollars by the appropriators.

In addition to that fundamental disconnect, I am also concerned that the amounts of money that have been earmarked appear to be nonscientific. If you look at the conference report, you will see round figures, such as \$200,000, \$500,000, \$1 million, \$2 million, and so

forth. Such figures are unlikely to be to the real dollar amount needed to fund well-designed, specific projects.

Investment in intelligent transportation technology pays huge dividends, but it is expensive. As an example, on February 17 of this year, I did one of my monthly workdays with the evolving ITS technology in and around Orlando, FL. Orlando has the most advanced intelligent transportation system program in my State. The first phase of the Orlando system cost nearly \$8 million. When complete, the Orlando ITS system will cost about \$14 million. In these earmarks, I wonder whether such small sums, such round numbers, are actually calculated to reach the critical mass needed to get a project underway and completed. Small sums, distributed widely across the Nation, are not the most effective, efficient way to use these precious dollars to alleviate priority congestion concerns.

Lastly and possibly most crucially, we are missing a critical opportunity: the opportunity to gather data in a scientific, meaningful way about an evolving technology, a technology which has the potential to mitigate traffic congestion and make our highways safer.

Gathering this information is important because TEA-21 was the first surface transportation bill to focus to such an extent on intelligent transportation systems. The authors of TEA-21 wanted to push the envelope and emphasize the use of technology as a strategy to ease traffic gridlock.

In 2 or 3 years from now, when we are reauthorizing the next surface transportation bill, we will need to ask: Did these ITS programs work? If so, what are the key elements in their successes? Should we expand ITS as a strategy to reduce traffic congestion? If we do not use the resources that we have devoted to ITS in a prudent, rational, scientific way, will we have the experience and information necessary to answer those questions in an informed way?

The short answer to that is, no.

The 2-year history of ITS causes concern for other Senate action. We have just finished debate on the Interior appropriations bill, a thoughtful piece of legislation. The Conservation and Reinvestment Act, CARA, was sidetracked by that Interior appropriations bill and replaced with language which assures that the appropriators will control specific allocations. The CARA bill had a vision, a vision to provide the American people with a permanent, dedicated source of funding to invest in our children's futures by preserving and protecting our natural resources—the very cause for which our departed friend, Congressman BRUCE VENTO, spent so much of his life and his congressional career.

This bill would have bolstered the Federal Government's relationship with our State governments by maintaining the Federal side of a respectful

partnership, with the States to develop and support natural treasures, from urban parks and historic sites to the preservation of our coastal resources.

But instead of this carefully constructed program, which enjoyed widespread support, we were left with the following by the appropriations conference report. Quoting from that conference report for the Department of the Interior:

This program is not mandatory and does not guarantee annual appropriations.

Continuing to quote:

The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have discretion in the amounts to be appropriated each year, subject to certain maximum amounts as described herein.

With that language, we have declared failure. We have failed to take advantage of our opportunity to enact landmark conservation legislation. We would be wildly optimistic to expect that the goals of the CARA legislation will be met.

With what we now see has happened to ITS, to intelligent transportation systems, what confidence can Americans have that the goal of protecting our natural resources will be met? What reason do we have to expect a different outcome, with the dream of sustained investment in protecting our natural resources, than the shredded results of reduced traffic congestion through intelligent transportation systems? The short answer is, none.

Returning to the Transportation appropriations bill, earmarks, in my view, are more acceptable in mature transportation programs than where we are attempting to learn about new technologies and policy approaches. We can and should address the needs of specific communities. ITS, however, is an evolving resource in transportation, and we should adhere to the intent of the law in seeking a competitive, scientific process to distribute these ITS funds.

This appropriations process, with respect to ITS, has foreclosed the valuable information which a rational distribution of funds would have given us.

In conclusion, I am concerned about the broad path upon which we are traveling as we conclude the consideration of the appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. We are dramatically overspending the standard we set for ourselves just a few months ago. By that overspending, we are putting at risk the opportunity to use a significant Federal surplus for a variety of very beneficial purposes which will aid our people not only this year but for decades to come. And, within our appropriations, we are losing the opportunity to intelligently allocate funds against the targeted goals, such as the reduction of traffic congestion or the protection of our natural resources. Rather, we are succumbing to the temptation to earmark, to specify, based on considerations other than what is in a rational, long-term plan of prioritization of our Nation's needs.

We have but a few days left in this session, I hope. It would be my fondest

expectation—or at least my optimistic dream—that we would use these few remaining days in a more constructive manner than has been demonstrated in the past few days, that we would use these to exercise principles of fiscal discipline and vision and the willingness to put aside our personal and parochial interests for what is in the broader national interest.

That is our challenge. That is what the American people expect of their elected representatives. It is a goal on which we have faltered in recent days. Let us use the remaining days to regain our solid fiscal footing.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2000.

DEAR CONFERE: I have been concerned about the distribution of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) money in the Transportation Appropriation process.

The Environment and Public Works Committee designed TEA-21 so that ITS projects would be selected through competitive solicitation and meet certain detailed criteria. There was an overall plan: a portion of the money would specifically go to rural areas, and no state could receive more than \$35 million per fiscal year. Other than that, the competitive process would be used to ensure the most efficient, effective use of the dollars. Essentially, the ITS theory is to make our highways, especially in high congestion areas, as efficient as possible, recognizing the tremendous costs of building additional lanes or other high capacity improvements. The intent is to make our existing highways serve to maximum capacity.

There are two major concerns about the current manner of distribution of ITS funds. First, the current earmarks appear to be allocated on a non-scientific, non-competitive basis. The Texas Transportation Institute in the Texas A&M University System is the organization that the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Congress look to for a professional assessment of highway congestion in our nation. Comparing recent appropriations bills with the institute's annual traffic congestion study show how far apart reality is from what is needed. For example, the ten most congested cities in the United States are: Los Angeles, Washington, DC, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, Detroit, Atlanta, San Diego and San Bernardino. Looking at the ITS FY01 earmarks, none of these most congested cities got funding for ITS technology to alleviate gridlock. Of the other 60 most-congested-cities featured in the study, only 5 receive funds, while a sixth city probably receives funds from an overall state earmark. These six funds total only \$7,000,000 or 3% out of a total ITS appropriation of \$211,200,000.

Second, the amount of money that has been earmarked appears to be non-scientific. They are round figures of \$200,000, \$500,000, \$1,000,000, \$2,000,000 and the like. Investment in intelligent transportation technology pays huge dividends, but it is expensive. We wonder whether such small sums, while helpful, actually reach the critical mass needed to get a project underway. Small sums, distributed widely across the nation, are not the most effective, efficient way to use these funds in alleviating priority congestion concerns.

This is important because TEA-21 was the first surface transportation bill to focus to such an extent on ITS. We wanted to push the envelope and emphasize the use of technology to ease traffic gridlock. In two to three years from now when we reauthorize

the next surface transportation bill, we will need to ask: did these programs work? If we do not use the resources that we have devoted to ITS in a prudent, rational, scientific way, we will not have the experience and information necessary to answer that question in an informed way. Earmarks, in my view, are more acceptable in mature transportation programs. We can and should address the needs of specific communities. ITS, however, is an evolving resource in transportation, and we should adhere to the intent of the law in seeking a competitive, more scientific process to distribute ITS funds.

I encourage you to adhere to the design created by TEA-21. The Congress has the opportunity, through ITS and other programs, to strengthen our national transportation infrastructure in a cost-effective, efficient manner. We undermine those efforts if we don't follow the criteria established and passed by the Congress in TEA-21.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

BOB GRAHAM,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN HEALTH CARE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are nearing the end of the 106th Congress. No one is quite sure where the finish line is. My expectation is that within a week or two this Congress will be history.

Many will ask what this Congress did and what it did not do. There will be some people who will be joyous about its accomplishments and some who will be sorely disappointed over its failures. I think its accomplishments, however, will be a rather short list, and the areas where we could have and should have done better will represent a very long list. I rise to briefly discuss two of those areas before we near the end of the session.

I have spoken many times in the Senate about health care, and especially the two issues this Congress has a responsibility to address. One issue is providing a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program. We have talked about providing a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program for some long while. We are near the end of this session, and it looks as though it will not get done. Why? Because some people don't want to do it well. Everybody here talks about wanting to do this, but somehow they are not willing to support a plan that really accomplishes it.

On the second issue, we are nearing the end of the legislative session and we are apparently not going to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. The Patients' Bill of Rights has been an issue over

which we have battled for 2 to 3 years, and it has been a tough battle. I don't think there ought to be room left for those who believe there is not a need for a Patients' Bill of Rights. All we have to do is look at the evidence. The evidence is overwhelming that we need to pass a real Patients' Bill of Rights. The House did it; we have not. This Senate has dug in its heels and has not moved on either of these issues.

I will talk first about the issue of a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program. When the Medicare program was developed, many of the miracle drugs that now exist weren't available. People got old. They did what they were expected to when they got old. They retired and led a more sedentary life. Then something might happen to them. They would be hospitalized. They would stay for long periods in acute care beds in the hospital. It was very expensive. The kinds of prescription drugs that are available now were not available then.

So when Medicare was created, a prescription drug benefit was not made a part of the Medicare program. When Medicare was developed, that too was fairly controversial. In the early 1960s, a fair number of Members of this Senate said: No, we can't do that. We can't provide health insurance for older Americans. We oppose that. That is some sort of encroachment of government into our lives.

I wasn't here at the time of that debate. But when they had that debate, fully one-half of all senior citizens in this country had no health insurance coverage at all. Why? Because it was too expensive.

Insurance companies aren't running around this country trying to find old people to sell health insurance to. That is just a fact of life. They want to find somebody who is 22 years old and healthy as a horse and isn't going to need any health care treatment for a long while. There are not people running around trying to figure out how they can attract a 70-year-old or a 75-year-old to buy their health insurance policy. They are not doing that because it is much more expensive to insure people who are 70 and 80 years of age. The result was, nearly 40 years ago half of the senior citizens in this country had no health insurance coverage at all.

So this Congress had a big debate. As is typical, those progressive voices who said this is something we should do were met by those voices of negativity who oppose everything for the first time. There are always people who just dig in their heels at any suggestion and say, no, this can't be done; no, it won't work.

Well, enough votes prevailed in the Congress over time that it passed a Medicare proposal. Now 99 percent of America's senior citizens are covered with health insurance under the Medicare program. What a remarkable success. People are living longer, better, healthier lives.

Now we know, however, that there is a deficiency in the Medicare program. The deficiency is that it does not cover prescription drugs. Let us me read some letters from North Dakotans. We could name a different State, and we would get exactly the same letters. My colleague from Florida just spoke. His constituents, I am sure, are writing exactly the same letters.

This is from a woman who lives in Bismarck, ND. She writes:

Dear Senator Dorgan: I am writing in regard to the medication I take. I think something has to be done about the prices they charge. I get \$303 each month in Social Security. I pay \$400 a month for my medication. I have had heart surgery and I have osteoporosis and this medicine is very high-priced. We are using our savings now and I am 86 years old so I can't work. Can you help?

This is a letter from a fellow in Rolla, ND. He writes:

Between me and my wife, we pay \$350 to \$400 a month on prescription drugs. We receive less than \$900 a month in combined Social Security benefits. We have trouble paying for our prescription drugs.

A person from Rocklake, ND, writes:

One-fourth of my Social Security check goes for my prescription drugs, so that doesn't leave a lot for household and personal expenses. It would sure help if Medicare covered these.

A man from Cavalier, ND, writes:

Our drugs for the two of us—he is referring to his wife and himself—just about tripled last year from the year before. The total for last year was near \$2300, and it only gets worse. We need a little help.

A woman from Williston, ND, who titled her letter "Message In A Bottle," writes:

I have asthma and my medications and inhalers cost me over \$100 each month, and my health insurance does not cover prescriptions. I am 84 years old, and it would be a great help to me to get Medicare coverage on my medications.

A woman from Bismarck, ND, writes:

Dear Senator Dorgan: Enclosed please find my prescription bottles. I just had these medicines filled today. I am having a hard time financially with a Social Security check of \$400 a month. My medicines cost \$175 per month. That doesn't leave much to pay for food, rent, utilities and gas. Something has to be done with the high cost of prescription medicines. I am thinking of stopping some of my medicines. Please help!!!

These letters could have come from any State, from senior citizens everywhere struggling mightily to pay for their prescription drugs. Senior citizens make up 12 percent of America's population, but they consume one-third of all the prescription drugs in our country because they have reached that age where they have various ailments and problems and they need prescription drugs.

We need to add a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare Program. We have been trying very hard to do that. Some have said, well, let's not put it in the Medicare program, let's pay the insurance industry so they will sell an insurance policy providing for prescription drug benefits. The problem with

that is, the Health Insurance Association of America says insurance companies will not be able to put together a policy like that which is affordable. In fact, I had CEOs from two insurance companies come to my office, and one said: In order to provide \$1,000 worth of benefits to a senior citizen for prescription drugs, I would have to charge \$1,100 for the premium. Do you know anybody that will pay \$1,100 for an insurance policy that provides \$1,000 worth of benefits? Not where I live.

I say to those who say we can have the private insurance industry deal with this: it won't work. Even if they could offer the policy, it would not be affordable. We must, it seems to me, put a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program, and we ought to do it now.

We are nearing the end of this session and this ought to have been one of the top priorities for the Congress. It just should have been one of our top priorities. We live in good economic times, we have unprecedented economic growth, and we are going to have some surpluses this year and, we hope, in the years ahead. But do you know what the priority was for the surpluses? The priority was to run out here on a big trolley a huge batch of tax proposals that would give big tax cuts really fast. Let's provide very large tax cuts, most of which will go to the upper-income folks in this country, and let's do it even before we experience these surpluses.

My feeling is that we ought to have a more balanced approach. First, if we have surpluses, let's use some of those funds to pay down the Federal debt. Yes, we can use some, perhaps, for middle-income tax cuts, and we could use some of it to make the other investments we need to make. We should put a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare Program that is optional, has a copayment, and provides Medicare recipients protection against these high drug prices.

The proposal I support also has the ability, through purchasing power, to drive down prescription drug prices. So I say to those who schedule the Senate: Time is wasting here. Let's see if between now and the end of this week or next week we can perhaps get a prescription drug benefit bill to the floor of the Senate and get it passed. Those who want to give tax cuts to the top 1 percent of the income earners were certainly quick to get that to the floor of the Senate. Let's see if we can't do something similar in terms of legislative speed to try to add a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program. We have time to do that. The question is, Do we have the will to do it?

Just one other point. I want to talk for a moment about the issue of a Patients' Bill of Rights. A Patients' Bill of Rights is not some theory that represents our interests or a wish. It is an absolute necessity to provide protection for patients in this country. Some managed care plans—although not all

of them—have decided that health care is a function of their profit and loss. They administer their health care plans that way. The result has been devastating to some patients in our health care system. In fact, in some cases an HMO will not tell you all of your options for medical treatment, only the cheapest options. That is not fair.

Every patient in this country ought to have a right to understand all of his or her options for medical treatment, not just the cheapest one. There are some HMOs that don't give you the opportunity to have emergency room treatment when you have an emergency. That ought to be a patient's right. There have been instances of people hauled into an emergency room unconscious who are denied coverage because the HMO said they didn't get prior approval for the emergency room. It ought to be a patient's right, if you have insurance through an HMO, to have emergency room treatment when you have an emergency.

How about oncology care? In the case of a woman who has breast cancer and whose spouse's employer switches to a different health care plan, should that woman not be able to continue with her same oncologist and with the same cancer treatment under the new plan? Of course she ought to be able to. That ought to be a right.

I had a hearing recently with some of my colleagues on this subject, and a woman named Mary Lewandowski came. It was the third time Mary has come to Washington, DC, at her own expense. I want, for Mary's benefit, to put in the RECORD her complete testimony from this hearing. I ask unanimous consent that her entire testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF MARY MUNNINGS LEWANDOWSKI
BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 21, 2000

My name is Mary Munnings Lewandowski. I reside in Scottsville, NY. The picture that I have brought with me, is my youngest daughter Donna Marie at age 18.

This is my third trip to Washington to plead for passage of a bill that will protect patients rights. I've pounded on doors, handed out pictures of Donna and a picture of her headstone. I've done most anything I can to make people here aware that the Patients Bill of Rights is a Life and Death issue.

The week of February 3rd, 1997 Donna went to our PCP 4 times in 5 days. With each visit her symptoms were worsening. She was told that she had an upper respiratory infection and panic attacks. On Saturday Feb 8th, she could barely get off the couch. I assisted her up the stairs to get cleaned up at 8 PM. At 8:30 she started crying that she was very ill. I tried repeatedly to reach our PCP but only reached the answering service, as this was a Saturday evening.

I called the hospital at 9 and was told I couldn't bring her in unless her doctor authorized it or if I thought it was a life and death situation.

I am a school bus driver and a mom not a doctor or a nurse. At 9:10 I called 911, at 9:12 she screamed that her back hurt and that

she thought she was going to die. She lapsed into a coma. My husband tried in vain to do CPR on her. She was pronounced dead at 10:45 PM at the young age of 22.

I went to our PCP on Monday and the very first thing that was told to me, was "they couldn't justify to her HMO to send her for the diagnostic tests that would have shown what was wrong with her".

22 year old kids, don't die. There were no tests done, none. In my subsequent research I found that HMO's can and do penalize and sanction doctors for ordering tests which HMO's feel are unnecessary.

I found out on Tuesday, February 11th, that she died from a bloodclot on her lung, literally the size of a football. A \$750 lung scan would have shown this. But all for the sake of money, we lost a vital beautiful young lady that had only begun her life.

We were at the cemetery in August and my 6 year old granddaughter was with me. She went to Donna's grave and started crying. "Grandma, I shouldn't have to come here to see my Aunt Donna" Why did God take her.

Please, it is up to you, the Senators, our elected officials to change things. Health insurers should not be able to put profits before a person's life.

There is evidence that lives have been lost because of HMO decisions. Isn't that enough reason to pass legislation that would provide direct protection to patients?

Please, pass legislation that ensures that patients like my daughter get the test they need and access to emergency care before it is too late.

It could be your loved one.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. DORGAN. Mary lost her youngest daughter, Donna, at age 22.

She said:

The week of February 3, 1997, Donna went to our PCP—that is her primary care provider—4 times in 5 days.

With each visit her symptoms were worsening. She was told she had an upper respiratory infection and panic attacks. On Saturday, February 8th, she could barely get off the couch. I assisted her up the stairs to get cleaned up at 8 p.m. At 8:30 she started crying that she was very ill. I tried repeatedly to reach our PCP, but only reached the answering service, as this was a Saturday evening.

I called the hospital at 9 and was told I couldn't bring her in unless her doctor authorized it or if I thought it was a life and death situation.

Mary continued:

I am a school bus driver and a mom, not a doctor or a nurse. At 9:10 I called 911, at 9:12 she screamed that her back hurt and that she thought she was going to die. She lapsed into a coma. She was pronounced dead at 10:45 p.m. at the young age of 22.

I went to our PCP on Monday and the very first thing that was told to me was they couldn't justify to her HMO to send her for the diagnostic tests that would have shown what was wrong with her. Twenty-two-year-old kids don't die, so there were no tests done. None. In my subsequent research, I found that HMOs can and do penalize and sanction doctors for ordering tests which HMOs feel are unnecessary. I found out on Tuesday, February 11, she died from a blood clot on her lung literally the size of a football. A \$750 lung scan would have shown this. But all for the sake of money, we lost a vital beautiful young lady that had only begun her life.

I have about 50 stories just like this which have been compiled from all around the country—people dealing with HMOs and discovering they have

to fight their cancer and their health plans at the same time. That is not a fair fight.

We should pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. Now, the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights and this Senate passed what I call a "patients' bill of goods." It is a hollow vessel, one of those charade-like things that doesn't do anything. In fact, the Republican Congressmen from the House have said the Senate passed proposal is a step backward, even worse than nothing. It is a charade. We still have an opportunity to enact a real Patients' Bill of Rights. This legislation is still in conference. This Congress can, in its final days, pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. When Mary Lewandowski comes to Washington, DC, three times because her daughter died—and this young woman should not have died—and says, "Do something, please," we have a responsibility to respond. We ought to do it now.

If the past is prologue, of course, we will end this session and we will not do the kinds of things we should—putting a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program or enacting a real Patients' Bill of Rights. The American people will have lost. We will be back in January organizing as a new Congress and many of us will reintroduce exactly the same legislation. We will, once again, engage in this battle. The battle will not be over until we get done what needs to be done. Go back 40 years and the same people who stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed Medicare, oppose doing these important tasks. They do not think the Federal Government should do it. This same mentality is what is now providing the roadblock for doing what we should and adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare and passing a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

We can alter that result. We can do it this week, if there is the will. There is a way. The question for the Members of this body is, Does the will exist in the Senate to do the right thing in these final days? I hope so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from North Dakota that I very much agree with him that we should be taking up the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation. I hope he will join those of us on this side of the aisle when we bring a conference report to this body which will report a very important Patients' Bill of Rights piece of legislation. We would then hope to pass it in the Senate, send it over to the House of Representatives, and have the President sign it.

I am very much hopeful that we can get such a conference report to the Senate and that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will help us to pass it.

CHINA'S THREAT TO U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to talk about something this afternoon that I think is of great importance to this country and one of the biggest challenges we are going to face in the coming years; that is, the challenge of how the United States manages our relationships with countries that potentially present threats to our national security.

While few would like to admit it, I think China cannot be omitted from this scrutiny, and I, therefore, would like to discuss that question with respect to China today.

As my colleagues know, it was not long ago that the bill to grant permanent normal trade status to China passed through the Senate without amendment. I voted for this bill because I recognize the economic benefits it will have for many American workers, businesses, and consumers. That said, it is of utmost importance that we not lose sight of the fact that trade alone does not define our relationship with China. The actions and the heated rhetoric of China's communist leaders should be of great concern. So now, in the aftermath of our recent decision to grant PNTR to China, we are obligated to face the other challenges presented by the communist Chinese government.

Time and time again, Chinese officials and state-sponsored media have made bellicose and threatening statements aimed at the United States and our long-standing, democratic ally, Taiwan. They have even gone so far as to issue implied threats to use nuclear weapons against the United States. The question is, will we take them at their word on these defense matters as we did when they made trade commitments.

For example, in 1995, General Xiong Guangkai warned a visiting U.S. official that China could use military force to prevent Taiwan's gaining independence without fear of U.S. intervention because American leaders "care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan." An editorial in a military-owned newspaper this March was more blunt, warning that, "The United States will not sacrifice 200 million Americans for 20 million Taiwanese."

In February of this year, a state-owned paper again warned the United States against becoming involved in a conflict with China over Taiwan. The People's Liberation Army Daily carried an article which stated, "On the Taiwan issue, it is very likely that the United States will walk to the point where it injures others while ruining itself." The article went on to issue a veiled threat to attack the U.S. with long-range missiles, stating, "China is neither Iraq or Yugoslavia * * * it is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. Probably it is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which U.S. policymakers know fairly well also."

Not only has China warned against U.S. military intervention in the event that Taiwan declares its independence, Chinese officials have also issued threats against U.S. sale of theater missile defenses (TMD) to Taiwan. In February 1999, China's top arms control official, Sha Zukang, was interviewed by a reporter for the publication Defense News. When asked if U.S. assistance on theater missile defense for Japan, South Korea and possibly Taiwan could cause damage to U.S.-China relations, he replied, "If the U.S. is bent on its own way on this issue, it will not, to put it lightly, be conducive to the development of legitimate self-defense needs of relevant countries." When further questioned about theater missile defense for Taiwan, he stated, "In the case of Taiwan, my God, that's really the limit. It constitutes a serious infringement of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It also represents a deliberate move on the part of the United States to provoke the entire Chinese people. Such a move will bring severe consequences." (Emphasis added) According to the Washington Post in July, that same Chinese official warned that the sale of U.S. technology to Taiwan for a smaller scope theater missile defense system would "lead to serious confrontation" because it would be tantamount to restoring a military alliance between Taipei and Washington. He stated, "This is of supreme national interest. It will be defended at any cost." (Emphasis added)

These are not examples of isolated threats. They are a small sample of the bellicose statements that China's government has made recently. I have compiled dozens of such statements and am disappointed at the sparse attention they have received. Mr. President, I have compiled a document containing 14 pages of threats issued by communist Chinese officials. It is by no means a comprehensive compendium of such statements, and is merely a sample. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the rhetoric from Beijing has also been accompanied by troubling actions. China has long-range nuclear-tipped missiles targeted at American cities, and is already increasing its arsenal of such weapons. It is greatly increasing the number of short-range missiles aimed at Taiwan, and has taken steps to improve its ability to invade or blockade the island.

China has also been the world's worst proliferator of missiles and weapons of mass destruction. It has sold ballistic missile technology to Iran, North Korea, Syria, Libya, and Pakistan, despite promising to adhere to the Missile Technology Control Regime. It has sold nuclear technology to Iran and Pakistan. It has aided Iran's chemical

weapons program and sold that nation advanced cruise missiles. Because of China's assistance to rogue nations and its military advances, the American people, and our forces and friends abroad, face a much greater threat.

Mr. President, as we craft effective national security policies for the United States, it's important that we look for warning signs of problems. As Winston Churchill said, in his "Iron Curtain" speech in 1946, less than one year after the end of World War II, "Last time, I saw it all coming and I cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her * * * There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe * * * but no one would listen * * * We surely must not let that happen again."

Now, more than 50 years later, we live in a very different world. The collapse of the Soviet empire, the spread of democracy and civil society in Eastern Europe and the Baltics, and the emergence of the United States as the sole-surviving superpower could lead some to mistakenly assume that the world is no longer a dangerous place.

To the contrary, the threats we face today are even more complex and harder to predict than those we faced during and before the Cold War. We must now be more clear than ever in our own minds about our strategic intentions, and just as clear in signaling these to our potential aggressors.

Obviously, China is not Nazi Germany, and it presents different challenges, yet the message delivered by Churchill about the need to heed warning signs is timeless. Many are quick to dismiss the rhetoric from Beijing as empty threats. This could be true, but I believe we must be prepared for another possibility—what if China's leaders mean what they say?

China's proliferation of the technology for ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction has increased the threat faced by the United States and our allies. China is increasing the size and capabilities of its strategic nuclear force targeted on the United States. And furthermore, China has tried to use the threat of missile attack to coerce the United States into staying out of any future conflict in the Taiwan Strait.

These are but three of the many compelling reasons why we need a national missile defense system to protect the United States and to guarantee our freedom of action. I disagree with those who claim China's objection to our proposed national missile defense, NMD, system will lead to an arms race with that country. As Secretary of Defense William Cohen testified to the Senate in July of this year, "I think it's fair to say that China, irrespective of what we do on NMD, will in fact, modernize and

increase its ICBM capability." Of course, that is precisely what China has done. Left with this reality, we have no option but to deploy a national missile defense system that will protect the United States.

Frankly, I am disappointed that for the last eight years, the Clinton-Gore Administration has failed to pursue the most promising forms of missile defense and has underfunded the limited programs it has authorized due to loyalty to the ABM Treaty. For example, one of the Administration's first decisions in early 1993 was to return unopened proposals the Defense Department had requested from three teams of companies that had bid to develop a ground-based national missile defense interceptor. In 1993, the Clinton Administration also cut the budget for missile defense for fiscal year 1994 by \$2.5 billion over the amount requested in President Bush's final budget, and has continued to underfund missile defense programs every year.

I believe that the ABM Treaty is obsolete. It was made with an entity that no longer exists. In the words of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, this treaty "constrains the nation's missile defense programs to an intolerable degree in the day and age when ballistic missiles are so attractive to so many countries." Dr. Kissinger has also stated that, "Deliberate vulnerability when the technologies are available to avoid it cannot be a strategic objective, cannot be a political objective, and cannot be a moral objective of any American President." We must not allow loyalty to an outdated piece of paper called the ABM Treaty to stand in the way of a sound defense given the threats we face.

In addition to the deployment of a national missile defense system, it is important for the United States to use the full range of economic and diplomatic tools to halt China's proliferation of the technology for missiles and weapons of mass destruction. I believe the Senate missed an opportunity when we failed to pass an amendment offered by Senator THOMPSON to combat this problem. I hope this legislation will be considered and passed next year. In addition, we need to ensure that strong export controls on U.S.-made products are in place so we don't inadvertently help China modernize its military.

It remains to be seen whether the rhetoric from Beijing will become reality, but in light of China's troubling actions, prudence demands that we take steps to address China's behavior. We ignored warnings in the past and paid a high price. We surely must not let it happen again.

THREATENING OR BELLICOSE STATEMENTS BY CHINESE OFFICIALS OR DRAWN FROM OFFICIAL STATE-RUN MEDIA

MISSILE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

The PLA could use military force to prevent Taiwan's gaining independence without fear of U.S. intervention, because American leaders, "care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan."—Remark by an offi-

cer in the People's Liberation Army (PLA) to former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas Freeman, Jr., "As China Threatens Taiwan, It Makes Sure U.S. Listens," New York Times, January 24, 1996.

"On the Taiwan issue, it is very likely that the United States will walk to the point where it injures others while ruining itself. As is known to all, if the 'Taiwan independence' elements openly and brazenly advocate separatism, the PRC government will be forced to resort to the use of force ultimately to resolve the Taiwan issue. Once the cross-strait war breaks out, the U.S. government will face a dilemma: If it chooses not to intervene, the United States has to consider the 'Taiwan Relations Act'; besides, U.S. allies will doubt whether the promises made by the United States will hold. If the United States chooses to engage in substantial interventions, U.S. policymakers will be left with no choice but to consider the possible enormous pressure to endure and the possible exorbitant price to pay. *China is neither Iraq or Yugoslavia, but a very special country: on one hand, China is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council; on the other hand, it is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. Probably it is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which U.S. policymakers know fairly well also.*—"Safeguarding the One-China Policy is the Cornerstone of Peace in the Taiwan Strait—Splitting the Motherland by 'Taiwan Independence' Elements is Bound to provoke a War," People's Liberation Army Daily, February 28, 2000. (Emphasis added.)

"The United States will not sacrifice 200 million Americans for 20 million Taiwanese."—Excerpt from article in Chinese state-owned Haowangjiao Weekly, "Chinese Military Paper Warns Taiwan and U.S.," as reported by Philadelphia Inquirer, March 21, 2000.

"China is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. [If the United States intervenes in Taiwan it would lose the conflict and] even be forced to have a complete withdrawal from the East Asian region as they were forced to withdrawal from southern Vietnam."—Commentary in the People's Liberation Army Daily, "Threat By China Downplayed," Philadelphia Inquirer, March 1, 2000.

"Entitled, 'The United States Will Suffer Disastrous Blows,' the signed article [in a Chinese military journal] quotes an expert as saying that if the United States dares to obstruct China's reunification, China is bound to employ its nuclear weapons, and that for the sake of its national interests, China has made full preparations to fight a nuclear war with the United States."—"Beijing Military Journal: Nuclear War Will Certainly Break Out If United States Gets Involved," Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao, April 11, 2000.

MISSILE DEFENSE

In reference to provisions in the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Defense Authorization Act regarding theater missile defense cooperation with allies in East Asia: "The US Congress has gravely violated the fundamental norms of international relations, interfered in China's internal affairs and seriously hurt the feelings of the Chinese people."—Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Tang Guizhang, "Beijing Rains fury on Defense Umbrella," South China Morning Post, October 30, 1998

When asked if U.S. insistence on theater missile defense for Japan, South Korea and possibly Taiwan could cause irreparable damage to US-Sino ties, he replied, "If the

U.S. is bent on its own way on this issue, it will not, to put it lightly, be conducive to the development of legitimate self-defense needs of relevant countries." When further questioned about the TMD for Taiwan, he stated, "In the case of Taiwan, my God, that's really the limit. It constitutes a serious infringement of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It also represents a deliberate move on the part of the United States to provoke the entire Chinese people. Such a move will bring severe consequences."—Ambassador Sha Zukang, Director-General of the Chinese Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, Interview with Defense News staff writer Barbara Opall-Rome, February 1, 1999.

"The US global strategy in Europe is to contain Russia's revival and in Asia to contain China's growth, and is to preserve US hegemony in the world . . . [NMD is a] hangover from the Cold War . . . [the political cost of its deployment will be] tremendous for the United States."

"The rest of the world is wondering if the United States could break the treaty it signed, shouldn't other countries do the same? In other words, the United States will set an example for others to dump other arms-reduction agreements if it presses forward with NMD."—Remarks by Luo Yuan, Director of the Second Office of Strategy Studies, Chinese Academy of Military Science, "Experts: US plan could start new arms race," China Daily, August 16, 2000.

In reference to a national missile defense system: "We believe this idea of the United States will inevitably support a new round of arms race and will compromise international peace and stability. This issue is by no means a dispute between China and the United States, but between the United States and the international community."—Remark from Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, "Asian Forum Ends in Chorus of Criticism of U.S. Missile Defense Plan," Washington Post, July 30, 2000.

"China's government is standing up to U.S. attempts to set up both a national anti-ballistic missile system and a theater of war anti-ballistic missile system. Attempts [by the U.S.] to make Taiwan join the creation and unveiling of a theater of war anti-ballistic missile system are a serious interference into China's internal affairs and will necessarily be seriously repulsed by the Chinese people."—Remark by Chinese Defense Minister Chi Haotian, press conference, January 17, 2000.

"For its own defense needs, if the United States wants to develop a [theater missile defense] system, that's its own business. What we don't want to see is TMD covering Taiwan. That would . . . damage U.S.-China . . . relations."—Remarks by an unidentified senior Chinese official quoted in the Washington Post, January 27, 2000.

Placing TMD in Taiwan "seriously infringes on China's sovereignty and territorial integrity and will certainly meet with strong opposition from the Chinese people."—Remark from Chinese Embassy spokesman Cui Jianjun, "Chinese Warn U.S. on Defense: Missile Umbrella Would Aid Taiwan," The Washington Times, March 6, 1999.

"The inclusion of Taiwan into the theater-missile defense system will severely harm the stability of the region, and finally threaten bilateral relations."—"Chinese Warn U.S. on Defense: Missile Umbrella Would Aid Taiwan," Washington Times, March 6, 1999.

ARMS CONTROL

"Any amendment, or abolishing of the [ABM] treaty, will lead to disastrous consequences. This will bring a halt to nuclear

disarmament now between the Russians and Americans, and in the future will halt multilateral disarmament as well."

"We are not rejecting the concept of missile defense completely, such as air defense to protect troops. But it is the advanced systems, in space and elsewhere, that are the problem. These are a violation of the ABM Treaty. These may disturb or destroy the strategic balance."

"[The] United States . . . has been teaching the international community that the ABM Treaty, though bilateral, is a cornerstone for strategic stability, that it's a precondition for further nuclear disarmament. Now suddenly they are attempting to amend it and threaten to abolish it. We have no words for this. Should we assume that the United States monopolizes all the truth in the world? This cannot be the case, I believe. So this will erode U.S. authority and credibility."—Excerpts of Remarks by Sha Zukang, Chinese Director-General of the Arms Control and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, press interview, November 10, 1999.

"This decision by the United States [deployment of an NMD system] goes against the trend of the times and is detrimental to international arms control and disarmament efforts. It will have an extensive and profound negative impact on the global and regional strategic balance and stability in the 21st Century. The Chinese side expresses serious concern."

"The Chinese side expresses serious concern over this [U.S. deployment of NMD]. China believes that the development, deployment, and transfer of anti-missile systems with strategic defense potential will not enhance security or curb missile technology proliferation. On the contrary, it will only undermine security, and spur missile technology proliferation. Moreover, it violates the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The ABM Treaty is of great significance for safeguarding the global strategic balance and stability and for maintaining the momentum in the nuclear disarmament process. It should be observed strictly."

"This [the UN General Assembly resolution on the ABM Treaty] demonstrates the international community's near-unanimous opposition to or disapproval of the attempts by relevant countries to revise the ABM Treaty or to develop anti-missile systems. China urges relevant countries to take a serious approach toward the strong appeal from the international community, think carefully before making any move, and abandon the aforementioned programs for developing anti-missile systems."—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Zhu Bangzao, press conference, January 13, 2000.

"The creation of such a system is strictly prohibited by the ABM. Russia and China have suggested that the United States is motivated by the ambition to gain unilateral superiority in the military sphere and in security issues. The realization of such a plan would undermine the security of not only Russia, China and other countries, but also the security of the US itself and global strategic stability in the world. That is why China and Russia resolutely oppose the plan."

"The collapse of the ABM would lead to a resumption of the arms race. Such a situation is not in the interests of any country. Those countries, which support the US' proposal to modify the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, would be held responsible for undermining international stability and security and for all the consequences of that decision."—Excerpts from the joint statement of Russian President, Vladimir Putin, and Chinese President, Jiang Zemin, July 21, 2000.

When asked if China is setting the stage to recant on commitments to the Chemical Weapons Convention, he replied, "What we object to is the existence of the Australia Group, a smaller, more stricter group of nations with its own legal provisions that have created a de facto split among to the Convention. This has caused confusion, has undermined the Convention, and has affected the normal international trade of chemicals. This problem is compounded by the seemingly irresistible inclination of certain countries to impose their own standards or even their own domestic legislation onto other countries, thus giving rise to unnecessary international disputes."

"There are only two ways I see to rectify this situation: One is to do away with the Australia Group and the other is to do away with the Chemical Weapons Convention."—Ambassador Sha Zukang, Director-General of the Chinese Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, Interview with Defense News staff writer Barbara Opall-Rome, February 1, 1999.

"China will never be involved in any arms race at any level. However, it has to consider necessary means to defend its national security."—Remark by Sha Zukang, Chinese Director-General of the Arms Control and Disarmament Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, reported by Beijing China Daily, January 14, 2000.

"In pursuit of its own strategic interests and military superiority and in disregard of the authority of the already concluded international arms control legal instruments, a certain country attempted to rectify the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. In light of this dangerous tendency, China, Russia and Belarus co-sponsored the draft resolution of Preserving and Observing the ABM Treaty which was adopted by an overwhelming majority in the Committee of Disarmament and International Security and the UN General Assembly respectively. China's efforts to safeguard world peace and security garnered the extensive support of the international community."—Excerpt of article by Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, posted on the official home page of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 14, 2000.

"We have always maintained that, as a country with powerful military strength, the United States' development of missile defense systems in violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty does not benefit global and regional strategic balance and stability. I would like to point out once again that the 54th UN General Assembly has passed, by an overwhelming majority, a resolution on preserving and abiding by the ABM Treaty, which shows that the international community almost unanimously opposes or does not approve of attempts by relevant countries to amend the ABM Treaty and develop anti-ballistic missiles. We urge relevant countries to take seriously the strong call of the international community, to think carefully before acting, and to abandon the aforementioned anti-ballistic missile plan."—Remark by Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Zhu Bangzao, press conference, January 20, 2000.

"A certain country . . . practices expediency and double standards toward arms control and disarmament agreements, even trying to weaken or abolish relevant treaties."

"The CTBT has been trampled on and faces an uncertain future."

"People cannot but ask: Do we prefer the common security for all or the absolute security enjoyed by a single state at the expense of all others?"—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Ambassador Hu Xiaodi, speech to the 66-nation Conference on Disarmament, January 27, 2000.

"In an attempt to seek absolute security for itself, a certain country is stepping up its

research, development and deployment of sophisticated anti-missile systems, even at the expense of violating the international legal obligations to which it has committed itself."

"This move [U.S. violation of the ABM Treaty] will undoubtedly inflict severe damages on global strategic balance and stability, undermine the international security environment, make it difficult to carry on the international non-proliferation regime and may even trigger a new . . . arms race."

"For this, the international community cannot but express deep apprehension."

"China will never be a superpower or seek hegemony."

"I hope that others will not overestimate Chinese influence on North Korea."—Remarks by Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Wang Guangya, Speech to the 36th Munich Conference on Security Policy, February 6, 2000

"All these facts have demonstrated that China adopts a clear-cut policy against the proliferation of WMD. This policy will remain unchanged in the future."

"[The U.S.] takes advantage of its economic and scientific strength to develop a national missile defense system, in an attempt to disrupt the global strategic balance, and to seek absolute security and hegemony for itself."

"It is a widely known fact that during the Cold War years, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty constituted a cornerstone of global strategic stability, paving the way for the limitation and reduction of offensive strategic weapons between the United States and the former Soviet Union. Despite the drastic changes in the international situation following the end of the Cold War, the crucial role of the ABM Treaty to international security remains unchanged. Pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, any substantive amendment to this treaty will undermine global strategic stability."

"It is true that what the ABM Treaty maintains is 'the balance of terror' and can only offer relative security—not an ideal situation." "[A]ny violation of this treaty is bound to give rise to strong opposition from other countries, and will inevitably have severe negative impacts on international cooperation in arms control and non-proliferation."

"Everyone is equal before the law. And treaty obligations should be honored."

"Yet one country takes a cynical view on arms control and nonproliferation treaties and their legal obligations undertaken therein."

"The fundamental way to prevent the WMD proliferation lies in the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of such weapons."—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Director General of the Department of Arms Control and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sha Zukang, interview with Beijing Review, February 21, 2000

TAIWAN

"Our policy on Taiwan is a consistent one. That is, one, peaceful unification, one country-two systems. However, if there were to be any foreign intervention, or if there were to be Taiwan independence, then we would not undertake to renounce the use of force."—Remark by Chinese President Jiang Zemin, exchange with reporters prior to discussions with President Clinton, September 11, 1999

This threat, reportedly on the front page of almost every newspaper in Asia, was aimed at turning Taiwanese voters away from opposition candidate Chen Shui-bian: "Do not just act on impulse. Otherwise you will regret it very much and it will be too late to repent."—Chinese Prime Minister Zhu

Rongji, "Bully in a China Shop," The Wall Street Journal, March 17, 2000

. . . the sale of U.S. technology to Taiwan for a smaller-scope theater missile defense system would "lead to serious confrontation" because it would be tantamount to restoring a military alliance between Taipei and Washington. "This is of supreme national interest. It will be defended at any cost."

"Instead of enhancing your security, your security policy will be further compromised. The United States will play the role of a fire brigade. Rushing from one place to another to extinguish fires."

Asked if China would reconsider its commitment to nuclear disarmament and a halt in sensitive weapons sales, Sha responded, "To say the least, our enthusiasm and our participation in all of those regimes, particularly in cooperating with the United States, our mood, let me say, would be severely dampened."

When asked if a decision to deploy missile defenses would also affect China's existing arms control treaties, Sha responded, "To say the least, it would seriously dampen our interest . . . We have not yet reached a stage to say we will forget our commitments . . . yet."—Remarks by Chinese Director General of the Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament Sha Zukang, "China: Missile Shield Threatens Arms Control," Washington Post, July 13, 2000

A U.S. shield against ballistic missiles would "aim to absorb Taiwan into the American sphere of protection, which we consider a gross interference into China's domestic affairs."—Remark by Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji in Rome, "US Ready to Discuss Objections to its Missile Defense Shield," Agence France Presse, July 6, 2000

In reference to TMD: "The system would aim to put Taiwan in a sphere of protection. This would be blatant interference in Chinese affairs."—Remark by Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji, "Taiwan May Get Anti-missile Technology," Washington Post, July 9, 2000

"If a grave turn of events occurs leading to the separation of Taiwan from China in any name, or if there is foreign invasion and occupation of Taiwan, or if Taiwan authorities indefinitely refuse to peacefully resolve the cross-strait unification problem through negotiations, then the PRC government will only be forced to adopt all possible drastic measures, including the use of force, to safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and fulfill the great cause of China's unification."—"The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue," English version published by Xinhua, February 21, 2000

Washington "bears unshakeable responsibility for the tension in the Taiwan Straits" and it was vital the US stopped arms sales to Taiwan.—Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, Agence France Presse, March 16, 2000

The Chinese military made the statement that it would "spare no effort in a blood-soaked battle" to protect China's territorial integrity and that China would not be tricked into negotiations with Taiwan leaders who secretly apposed rejoining the motherland.

Prime Minister Zhu Rongji stated that China "will not sit idly by and watch and serious separatist activity."

General Zhang Wannian, a top military leader, echoed this thought stating, "The two sides of the strait cannot remain perpetually divided," and "Taiwanese independence means war."—"China Army Renews Threat Against Taiwan," New York Times, March 7, 2000

"Taiwan Independence means war and splitting (with the mainland) means no peace."

"Anyone who pays no heed to this important information from us and insists on Taiwan independence will push Taiwan into the abyss of war and bring disaster to the Taiwan people."

It warned those who "underestimate the strong determination of China's government and the People's Liberation Army to safeguard national territorial integrity and put at stake the happiness of 23 million Taiwanese people that the great strength of the PLA will solve the Taiwan problem."

"The consequence will be worse than anything imaginable. We are not willing to see that."—Editorial in People's Liberation Army Daily, Agence France Presse, "China keeps up war-rhetoric as Taiwan prepares changing of guard," April 15, 2000

"If the Taiwan authorities indefinitely refuse to peacefully settle the reunification issue through dialogue, the Chinese government will be forced to adopt all possible drastic measures, including military force."

Proposals to extend a theater missile defense system to Taiwan are "a gross interference in China's internal affairs and a grave threat to China's security . . . no country maintaining diplomatic relations with China should provide arms to Taiwan or enter into military alliance of any form with Taiwan."—"White Paper issued by China's State Council, as reported in Chicago Tribune, February 22, 2000

"Beat them till they hurt, beat them till they obey, beat them until they're scared! Beat them until the Taiwan separatists admit total defeat!"—An article carried on the state-run Yangcheng Evening News' web site said this to describe China's option of striking Taiwan with missiles and warplanes, "China Goes to War with Words Against Taiwan," AP, July 26, 1999

"We must make it crystal clear. No matter who comes to power in Taiwan, Taiwan will never be allowed to be independent. This is our bottom line. This is also the will of the 1.25 billion Chinese people."

Dismissing widely held views by foreign military analysts that China lacks enough aircraft, missiles and ships to attack Taiwan, Zhu said, "By such calculations, Hitler would long ago have conquered the whole world. The Chinese people will use all their blood and even sacrifice their lives to defend the unity of our motherland and the dignity of the Chinese nation." Zhu accused U.S. political leadership of delaying China's unification with Taiwan, declaring, "They always have taken China as their imaginary or potential enemy and have always wanted to use Taiwan, which in their view is an unsinkable aircraft carrier, to oppose China."—Remarks from Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji, "Chinese Premier Warns U.S. Over Taiwan, PNTR Vote," National Journal's Congress Daily, March 15, 2000

"A handful of American politicians, who are holding a Cold War mentality, have pushed the House to pass the act in an attempt to provide a legal basis for the buildup and expansion of military contacts and exchanges between the United States and Taiwan."

The Taiwan Security Enhancement Act is "a complete violation of the three Sino-U.S. joint communiques, a serious encroachment on China's sovereignty, a gross interference in China's internal affairs, and an attempt to make 'two Chinas'."—Remarks by Chinese Ambassador to the United States Li Zhaoxing, ChinaOnline, February 3, 2000

"Although a handful of U.S. legislators claim that the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act was aimed at 'protecting' Taiwan's 'security,' their real motive is to split China, and prevent China from becoming stronger . . . some U.S. lawmakers have ignored International Law and tried to make legislation on the 'security' of another country's

territory, and this has fully exposed the arrogance of the U.S. hegemonists."—Editorial in the *People's Daily*, as reported by ChinaOnline, February 3, 2000.

"The move [Taiwan's effort to join the United Nations] constitutes a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the U.N. Charter, a distortion of the nature of the U.N. and a gross interference in China's internal affairs."—Remark by Zhu Bangzao, Spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry, "China Objects to Taiwan Leader's U.S. Visa," *New York Times*, August 5, 2000.

"If we were to take military action, it should be sooner rather than later."—Jiang Zemin, "Act soon if force is needed, says Jiang," *South China Morning Post*, March 28, 2000.

"At the special Politburo meeting called on the evening of the election, what the senior cadres were debating was not whether some degree of force would be used against Taiwan, but when."—"Military pressure builds over Taiwan," *South China Morning Post*, March 29, 2000.

"The [recently-acquired] Sovremenny destroyer is equipped with eight SS-N-22 missiles, which can carry nuclear missiles."—Beijing Jiefangjun Bao, March 22, 2000 (Emphasis added).

"The new Chinese-made super Kilo-class diesel attack submarine was quietly put into service recently with the South China Sea Fleet for the mission of combat readiness against Taiwan."—"Chinese-made Kilo-class attack submarine goes into service, starts undertaking combat readiness task," *Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao*, April 4, 2000.

"A-Category Group Armies in Nanjing and Guangzhou War Theaters Have Been Equipped With Naval Vessels To Enhance Sea-Crossing and Landing Operations Capability"—*Hong Kong Ming Pao*, April 10, 2000.

"In order to deal with the military crisis that might occur in the Taiwan Strait, the Central Military Commission has decided to set up a Fujian Joint Operational Headquarters. On 11 February the headquarters for the first time directed the 'routine military exercise' of using submarines to block the Taiwan Strait."—*Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao*, February 17, 2000.

"The Taiwan authorities actually have only two roads to take: The first is to identify with the one China principle, peaceful reunification, and one country, two systems; the second is to force Beijing to resolve the Taiwan issue by military means. There is no third road, nor is it possible for the confrontation to go on for a long time."—Zhang Wannian, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, July 6, 2000.

"In the process of settling the Taiwan issue, we will do whatever we can to bring about peaceful reunification. But, in the event that any serious incidents to split Taiwan from China under any pretext occur, that a foreign country invades Taiwan, or that the Taiwan authorities refuse for an indefinite time to settle the issue of cross-strait peaceful reunification through talks, then we will be forced to take all possible drastic measures to accomplish the great cause of the motherland's reunification."—General Zhang Wannian, the PLA's highest-ranking officer, a vice chairman of the Central Military Commission, and a Politburo member, "The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue," February 21, 2000 (English version published by Xinhua).

"A possible interference by the United States has already been taken into account in our military preparations; in fact, we have taken into account all possibilities in our preparations. If the United States really interferes in the matter, the question is how far the United States can go in its interference. The Taiwan side should also get a

clear idea of this issue. Making a big country like China as its opponent, the United States will surely lose more than it gains. The United States suffered losses in every war it fought in Asia in the past, and I believe it will surely learn from all its bitter lessons. Even if the United States or U.S.-led U.N. troops are involved in the matter, in no way will the United States afford a loss in the war; putting all other things aside, a slight increase in its casualties will lead to domestic pressure that will prove too much for it to bear. What is more, we also have other strategies to use in such a war, for example, a China-Russia alliance is also a move that can touch the United States on its sore spot. Therefore, we are not afraid of the involvement of the United States or any other foreign forces, for we are assured that we can win the war in the end."—Unnamed PLA general, "Discussing Taiwan Strait Crisis with a General," *Ta Kung Pao*, May 15, 2000.

ANTI-U.S. STATEMENTS

In reference to the relationship between Russia and China: "The partnership is an effort to oppose hegemony and supremacy, and one single country dominating the world."—Remark by Zhao Huasheng, Director of the Russian Studies Department at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies, "Putin Visits China in Hope of Strengthening a Strategic Axis," *New York Times*, July 17, 2000.

"U.S. a Threat to World Peace."—"China Demonizes," title of editorial from PRC state-owned *China Daily*, as reported by *Washington Post*, July 17, 2000.

"On June 22, 1999, the People's Daily fed a general anti-American campaign related to the accidental bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade with a long, hysterical piece accusing the United States of 'acting like Nazi Germany' by leading the NATO campaign to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo."—"China Demonizes," *Washington Post*, July 17, 2000 (article excerpt).

In reference to the relationship between Russia and China: "The partnership is an effort to oppose hegemony and supremacy, and one single country dominating the world."—Remark by Zhao Huasheng, Director of the Russian Studies Department at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies, "Putin Visits China in Hope of Strengthening a Strategic Axis," *New York Times*, July 17, 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wyoming.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN BRUCE VENTO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate to speak about Congressman BRUCE VENTO from Minnesota, the Fourth Congressional District, who passed away today.

BRUCE VENTO was a fierce advocate for justice and a true representative, in the best sense of that word, of the people of the 4th District. He was generous and good-humored, with a seriousness of purpose that energized his work and inspired others. A gentle teacher and great friend, we were all ennobled, challenged and made greater by his

presence among us, and will be less for his absence. The model he offered, of a life of public service for the common good, beckons us forward, toward the light, and for that we are grateful.

From working to protect our nation's vulnerable homeless, to fighting to protect and preserve earth's natural treasures from the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness to South American Rain Forests, BRUCE's legacy will last many generations. His leadership resulted in enactment of hundreds of conservation-related measures through the years, and protected millions of acres of our nation's parks, forests and wilderness areas. Close to home, when we look at a map of Minnesota we literally are looking at an image created in part by BRUCE VENTO. Our state's parks and green spaces are as healthy as they are in large part because of BRUCE's work over these many years.

Sheila and I will miss him terribly, and our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an AP story by Frederic Frommer from today, a piece in the *Minnesota Star Tribune* by Greg Gordon, and a piece from Tom Webb from the Pioneer Press.

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

[From the Associated Press]

MINNESOTA REP. BRUCE VENTO DEAD AT 60

(By Frederic J. Frommer)

WASHINGTON (AP).—Minnesota Rep. Bruce Vento, a 12-term liberal Democrat who championed environmental and homeless causes, died Tuesday after a bout with lung cancer.

Vento, who was diagnosed in February, died at 12:20 p.m. at his home in St. Paul, Minn., surrounded by his family, spokesman Rick Jauert said. He had malignant mesothelioma, a rare type of cancer caused by inhaling asbestos fibers.

Vento, who was 60, announced in February that he had cancer and would not seek reelection. His treatment included the removal of one lung, chemotherapy and radiation, but doctors discovered more cancer last month.

As a young man, Vento worked as a state-paid laborer in several St. Paul-area facilities that he claimed exposed him to asbestos fibers. Two weeks ago he filed a lawsuit against 11 companies that allegedly supplied or installed asbestos products at those job sites.

Vento made his most significant legislative contributions on environmental issues, which he called his "true passion."

"I have been a member of Congress for the past 24 years, dedicated to making the federal government work for the people, to do for our community and state—and, yes, even internationally—that which we cannot do for ourselves," Vento said in February. "The federal government can and should make a difference."

When Democrats controlled the House, Vento was chairman of the Natural Resources subcommittee on national parks, forests and lands for 10 years, pushing for more money for national parks and other environmental priorities.

"I think Bruce Vento has been one of the most impressive and effective congressmen in modern Minnesota history," said former

Vice President Walter Mondale. "It's hard to think of an environmental issue where his leadership has not been found."

Vento worked on efforts to ban oil drilling on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and on preserving tropical rain forests. The Wilderness Society recognized Vento's work in 1994 with the Ansel Adams Conservation Award.

"He's been a hero," said Debbie Sease, legislative director for the Sierra Club. "He's done more for parks than anyone I know."

Vento also helped establish the emergency shelter grants program and preserve the Federal Housing Authority.

President Clinton paid tribute to Vento at a dinner in June for his environmental record and work on behalf of the homeless.

"He has steered into law more than 300 bills to protect our natural resources," Clinton said. "The thing I like even more about Bruce Vento is he cares about people, especially people without a voice—the homeless."

Vento was born Oct. 7, 1940, in St. Paul and attended the University of Minnesota and Wisconsin State University. He worked as a science and social studies teacher before winning a seat to the state House in 1970. He was first elected to Congress in 1976.

For the last decade, Vento pushed a bill to make it easier for the Hmong—an ethnic group in Laos—who fought with U.S. forces during the Vietnam War to become U.S. citizens by waiving the English-language requirement for them.

After he was diagnosed with cancer, Vento made passage of the bill a top priority. His effort ended successfully when Congress approved the measure in May.

"This bill would have never been conceived or passed if it had not been for Bruce Vento," said Philip Smith, Washington director of Lao Veterans of America, which lobbied on behalf of the legislation.

"He reached across the aisle and worked and persevered to make this happen. He is our hero. He is a champion of the Hmong people."

Vento is survived by his wife, Susan Lynch Vento, whom he married in August, and three sons.

[From the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Oct. 10, 2000]

REP. VENTO DIES IN ST. PAUL
(By Greg Gordon)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rep. Bruce Vento, D-Minn., died at his St. Paul home this morning after an eight-month battle with mesothelioma, a rare form of lung cancer usually associated with asbestos exposure.

Vento, a longtime environmental champion who planned to retire when his 12th term in office ends in January, celebrated his 60th birthday on Saturday.

Rick Jauert, Vento's press secretary, said the congressman died at 11:20 a.m. Twin Cities time at his home in St. Paul with his family by his side. He said he had no further details, and that Vento's chief of staff, Larry Romans, was flying to Minnesota, apparently to be with Vento's family and help with funeral arrangements.

Vento underwent surgery at Rochester's Mayo Clinic last February for removal of his left lung and diaphragm shortly after the fast-moving disease was discovered. But despite months of chemotherapy and radiation treatments, a person familiar with Vento's condition said in late September that the cancer had spread to his remaining lung. Doctors had drained fluid from Vento's remaining lung on at least two occasions.

"It's too bad he died so fast," former U.S. Sen. Eugene McCarthy, who held the same Fourth District congressional seat as Vento

from 1948-58, said this afternoon. "It's too bad to lose him. He was such an established person in the Congress, but cancer is pretty impartial."

The former school teacher and state legislator leaves behind one of the most tangible legacies of any Congress member: He shepherded more than 300 laws that preserved natural lands from the Florida Everglades to the Alaska wilderness.

Since February 2000, Vento had been treated for malignant mesothelioma, a virulent form of cancer usually caused by asbestos exposure. Yet his final year in office included some of his most important legislative accomplishments, including easing citizenship requirements for Hmong veterans living in the United States.

Vento approached his ailment and last months in office with a graceful determination that won him the admiration of political friends and foes in Washington.

President Clinton hailed his fellow Democrat at a testimonial in June as a man who "never stops being a teacher. As he fights a disease that has not yet yielded all it secrets to science, he's our teacher again. He's shown us all a lot about courage."

Clinton made the comments at a bipartisan tribute dinner that Vento helped turn into a fund-raiser for scholarships to train future high school science teachers.

Vento was like that. As a legislator he was known for using every opportunity to pursue causes he held dear: Directing more resources to poor city neighborhoods, helping Hmong veterans, promoting public schools, raising the minimum wage and, always, protecting the environment.

Throughout the Reagan, Bush and Clinton years in Washington, he never gave up his belief in activist government.

SAVING WILDERNESS

In his first year in Congress he worked with others for the establishment of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. In every one of his 23 years in Congress, his name was associated with wilderness preservation legislation. He was best known in Minnesota as a defender of the ban on the use of motorized vehicles in the BWCA. At the beginning of his last term in Congress he ended up having to embrace a painful compromise that allowed two motorized portages there.

Vento was at the center of similar fights in dozens of other states because, before the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994, he was chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands.

In relentlessly pushing that legislation, Vento became better known in some parts of the West than he was in Minnesota.

"He spends all of his waking hours working against our interests," complained Charles Cushman, president of an organization of private property owners in Washington state in 1993. "The name Bruce Vento is without a doubt a very dirty word in many communities in the West," Cushman said in an interview. "Any place there's a national park, they fear Mr. Vento with a passion."

Indeed, the Sierra Club credits him in part for preserving and protecting 5 million acres of wild lands during the decade he was chairman of the subcommittee. In addition, he tended the designation of 76 "wild and scenic" rivers. His passion for parks came to him through personal experience. His father, a Machinists union officer, was not wealthy and couldn't afford fancy holidays or a lake cabin.

"We depended on the parks along the St. Croix River," Vento recalled in an interview a few years ago. "That was our Sunday picnic, our vacation."

HIGH RANKINGS

If Vento received poor marks from conservative property rights groups, he was gen-

erally adored by environmentalists, though his occasional willingness to compromise—as on the motorized portages in the BWCA—cost him support from a few die-hards.

At the June testimonial dinner, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt called him "a hero of the nation's parks" and said Vento coached him on how to handle the Republican takeover of Congress, which threatened continued investment in some national parks.

"Bruce said to me, 'Don't panic. Don't make a deal with these guys,'" Babbitt recalled. The interior secretary said the GOP threat to cut parks funding evaporated after Vento advised him to draw a chart of national parks units in the districts of congressional opponents, including House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

It wasn't just the environmentalists who considered Vento a hero. He also received 100 percent rankings most years from labor and liberal interest groups, while getting extremely low ratings from conservative and Christian fundamentalist organizations.

In 1992, Vento, a Catholic, shifted his position on abortion legislation, saying his views had "evolved" to the point that he would support abortion rights while remaining personally opposed to abortion.

That shift brought him fully in line with the dominant views of the DFL in Minnesota and the liberal wing of the Democratic party nationally.

From his seat on the House Banking and Urban Affairs Committee, Vento in 1982 became one of the first members of Congress to urge action to deal with homelessness. His proposal that year to provide \$50 million to repair derelict buildings for temporary shelter was never brought to a vote by the full House.

Vento persevered, however, and eight years later he was the prime sponsor of the \$1.3 billion McKinney homeless aid bill, which won approval and was signed into law.

Vento's work on low-income housing was enhanced when he became chairman and later ranking member of the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee.

On the Banking Committee he was an advocate for smaller banks and credit unions and for community reinvestment requirements for major financial institutions.

Before coming to Washington, Vento served several terms in the Minnesota House, where he was assistant majority leader under Speaker Martin Sabo, who would later be Vento's close colleague in Congress.

The two Twin Cities congressmen were twins only in voting record. In demeanor they couldn't have been more different. While the Scandinavian Sabo was reticent and disinclined to give speeches, Vento was known as a ceaseless orator who didn't seem to know how to end a sentence.

When St. Paul's nine-term congressman Joseph Karth decided to retire in 1976, he endorsed the voluble Vento for his seat. That and strong labor support got Vento the party endorsement despite opposition in the primary from St. Paul attorney John Connolly and State Auditor Robert Mattson. Vento won that year with 52 percent of the vote, and would win reelection 11 more times.

FIGHTING FOR HMONG

After St. Paul became one of the major centers of Hmong immigration in the 1980s, Vento embraced the needs of the former Laotian hill tribespeople who had fought for the CIA's Secret Army during the Vietnam War. He pushed for federal housing and educational assistance and to waive the English-language requirement for citizenship for those who had fought with the United States in Laos.

In the 1990s, Vento's office became an informal Washington headquarters for this new

group of Americans. His office wall was decorated with an enormous Hmong tapestry given in appreciation. And, on occasion, his inner and outer offices were lined with former Hmong soldiers in fatigues using his phones and desks to plan their lobbying assault on Washington.

After years of persistent advocacy by Vento and others, the bill easing citizenship requirements of Hmong veterans was passed by both Houses and signed into law in 2000 by President Clinton.

Lee Pao Xiong, a Hmong member of the Metropolitan Council, called Vento's decision to leave Congress at the end of his 12th term "a great loss to our community. Bruce Vento was a strong advocate for the Hmong community, always willing to bear our concerns."

The advocacy of the latest immigrant group by a man who was himself the descendant of immigrants was in the tradition of St. Paul, said Garrison Keillor, Minnesota's homegrown humorist. He said at the testimonial dinner that Vento never seemed like a slick Washington pol. "Bruce is like St. Paul," he said, later describing Vento as a man of "modesty and courage and passion."

PERSONAL LIFE

Vento's final year in Washington was not filled with funereal sentiment. In August he married a fellow educator, Susan Lynch of Chatfield, Minn.

It was the first wedding for Lynch but not for Vento, who has three adult sons from his first marriage, Michael, Peter and John.

A week before the nuptials, Vento, smiling but wan, attended the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, appearing with former Vice President Mondale and Minneapolis Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton as the Minnesota delegation cast its ballots for Vento's friend from their first days together in the House, Vice President Al Gore.

Vento's energy astonished his colleagues. After his cancer was diagnosed in February, he underwent surgery at the Mayo Clinic for removal of his left lung and diaphragm. He lost 25 pounds and some of his hair as he completed a draining regimen of chemotherapy and radiation treatment.

"I'm looking forward to fishing," Vento told reporters and supporters who asked what he planned to do next. "That's the ulterior motive in all the environmental protections I've fought for."

His longtime colleague and partner in liberal Democratic legislative ventures, Sabo, seemed stunned by Vento's news, saying over and over, "I can't imagine this place without Bruce around."

In the weeks after Vento announced his illness and his plans to retire, Republicans—from former Rep. Vin Weber to Sen. Rod Grams—acknowledged his 24 years of service.

"Put the partisan differences aside," said St. Paul Mayor Norm Coleman. "He delivered a lot for this community, and his passion will be missed."

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Oct. 10, 2000]

U.S. REP. VENTO DIES (By Tom Webb)

U.S. Rep. Bruce Vento, St. Paul's unwavering voice in Congress for 24 years, died Tuesday morning at his home in St. Paul after a long bout with cancer. He was 60.

A native of St. Paul's East Side, Vento was famed as a champion for wilderness, consumers, working people and the homeless, who never forgot the everyday struggles of average folks fighting to build a better life.

Vento died at 11:20 a.m., with his family at his bedside, his staff announced.

Vento was elected to Congress in 1976 from the Fourth Congressional District, covering Ramsey County and a sliver of Dakota County. He was the longest serving of a trio of notable DFLers who for a half-century have served the Fourth District in Congress, a group including Eugene McCarthy and Joseph Karth.

He was suffering from mesothelioma, a form of cancer usually linked with exposure to asbestos.

He is survived by his wife, Susan Lynch; his three sons, John, Peter and Michael; their spouses, four grandchildren; his parents, Frank and Anne Vento; and seven brothers and sisters and their families.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, BRUCE was elected to the State legislature in 1970 and to the House of Representatives in 1977. Before that, he had been a science teacher on the lower east side of St. Paul. He is a true product of the lower east side.

His family is wonderful. Sheila and I have had the chance to spend a lot of time with his family. It is a wonderful, caring, Italian Catholic family. I believe Frank and Annie had eight children; BRUCE was the second oldest.

I want to say two or three things if I may. One, I want to say to BRUCE's family and to his wife Sue: Sue, you have been a gift from Heaven for BRUCE and his family.

I talked to BRUCE Saturday. He turned 60. Today he passed away. When he passed away, all of his family were with him. All of them said: You can let go.

What a beautiful, caring, loving, wonderful family. And what a beautiful, loving, caring man. BRUCE has done so much for so many people. He was so committed to public service. But most important of all, to me, he was a friend whom I will miss.

I remember once he was going to come over to our home in St. Paul to talk about a big dispute over the Boundary Water Wilderness Area. We were supposed to meet early in the morning, but there was a huge snowstorm and all the weather reports were that all the schools were closed. People weren't going to be able to go to work. Everything was shut down. It was impossible to get around. We were supposed to meet at 8 o'clock in the morning. At 5 minutes to 8 o'clock, there was a knock on the door. There was BRUCE. He was in seventh heaven. This was like the outdoors, this was snow, this was Minnesota, and he was there. He loved the environment and did so much for our State and our country.

I say to BRUCE's family, what a great Congressman. It is easy to say that when someone has passed away, but he truly was. People in Minnesota loved this man. They always will. They will never forget him, will never forget all he has done for our Fourth Congressional District and for our State. Sheila and I will never forget BRUCE.

BRUCE is like my friend, Mike Epstein, about whom I spoke. Mike was here for all these years, so committed to public service. Two men, they died too young, from the horrible disease of

cancer, two men who were so committed to public service, so committed to people.

From this day on, my belief is I have two friends who are looking down from heaven. I will be talking to them every day. I know BRUCE's children and grandchildren will be talking to him every day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I certainly commend the Senator on his moving tribute to BRUCE VENTO. Certainly we can tell how emotionally attached the Senator was to that gentleman.

I knew him also. I served with him on the Resource Committee in the House. Certainly he was a fine gentleman. The Senator has described him well. We are all very sad at this loss.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to go back to the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota as he talked about some of the issues that all of us are concerned about, issues such as pharmaceuticals—how we make that work; issues such as Medicare—which needs, after these years, some real, examination, some changes so over time we can ensure provision of health services to all who are beneficiaries. No one argues with that.

He also mentioned the Patients' Bill of Rights, which is interesting. I do not know of anyone in the Senate or the other body who is not for some form of the bill of rights. The unfortunate part is that there are some defining issues within that subject, defining issues that mean a lot in terms of where it goes in the future. The Senator failed to mention that. This is sort of the technique of those who favor more government. That is to simply talk about the title without talking about what is involved.

We have had in the Senate for a good long time—the Presiding Officer has participated—in a conference report, language designed to bring out a Patients' Bill of Rights that we could pass. Frankly, the Senator from North Dakota and others have opposed that.

One of the questions that is very important is whether or not it is going to be a bill of rights for patients or whether it is going to be a bill of rights for tort lawyers. If you have to go to court whenever there is a controversy, that is, of course, not what we seek to do.

So I want to make the point that you can talk in general terms about many issues. Everyone embraces those issues. But when you talk about the kinds of things that are important, within those issues, to implement them in a manner in keeping with the philosophy that you have over time, then that becomes quite a different matter. Of course, that is why we find ourselves at some loggerheads from time to time.

I have spoken before, and will again, about the amount of effort we have seen from the other side of the aisle to put obstacles in front of these issues and to, really, be more interested in making an issue rather than a solution. I am sorry for that. We are, of course, down now to the end, and we need to do something.

Let me talk for a moment or two about some of the things I think we face, not only in this body right now but that we will face in the future, we will face in this election. We need to make decisions as to where we are going. The key to those decisions in my view, regardless almost of what the decisions are—whether they are business decisions, whether they are personal decisions, whether they are political decisions—is to get some idea of what we want the result to be and where we are going to go over a period of time, and then measure whether or not what we are doing in the interim leads us to the accomplishment of those goals. It seems to me that is one of the most important things we can do.

So we are going to find ourselves, I think—I half hope, maybe—with some different philosophies from this past year, and we are going to have to choose.

I just returned from my State. I am going to get back, I hope, pretty soon and spend some time in schools with a voting program to get kids involved in politics, involved in elections; to talk about the issues and begin to get some feel about what it means to have a government of the people and by the people and for the people. I am excited about that because there are differences in philosophy.

Sometimes we find it difficult to define them, as we have these debates, as we will have tomorrow night. It is true; politicians have a little affinity for making things a little bit blurred. But it is up to us, then, as voters, to really separate those things and decide where we want to go; do we want more Federal Government in our lives or do we want less? It is up to us to define what we think the role of the Federal Government is and how it impacts us as citizens. What is the role of local and State governments? What is the role, then, really of individuals? That is what it is all about: individual freedom—opportunities for success.

We talk about taxes. Do we want more taxes and more Government? Do we want less Government so people can keep more of the money they earn? The real issue, of course, is Federal control down into communities, down into counties, down into schools. Or, indeed, do we want county commissioners and school boards and State legislators to make decisions that fit the decisions made by the people who have to live with them. There is a great deal of difference between the needs we have for the delivery of services in Philadelphia and in Greybull, WY. So those are the kinds of things that are taken into account.

We have talked about a surplus. There are reports of a surplus, certainly. I might say, it is more difficult to control the size of Government when you have a surplus than it is when you do not because, regardless of what the issues are, why, where we have a surplus we ought to spend the money. The other side of that, of course, is if we have a surplus there are certain priority things we ought to do but maybe we ought to put some of those surpluses back with the people who own them. They will be very important there.

We have different plans to deal with them. One of the plans that is out there takes about half of those surpluses and puts them into Social Security. One of the real issues before us is young people who are in their first jobs and pay 12.5 percent of their income, along with their employer, into the Social Security fund. In 40 years, are they going to have any benefits accruing to them? Not unless we make some changes.

The options are just to continue what we are doing and take more tax money to put into it, or to make some changes—for instance, to give some opportunities, based on the choice of the recipient, to put some of that money into the private sector, to get the return on that investment up from 2.5 to 3 percent, up to 4 percent or 5 percent or 6 percent, which certainly would make it more likely that those benefits are going to be there when their benefits are earned and ready to serve them.

When the Senator from North Dakota talked about tax cuts for the top 1 percent, that is not what is being proposed. Indeed, regarding the proposal that is out there that has caused all the 1 percent talk, the people who make the 1 percent, who make the most money in this country, will have a higher proportion of taxes on them than they have had before. Those taxes are for everyone who pays taxes. I think that is an excellent way to do that, to have marginal cuts and double the tax credits. Let's get rid of the estate tax. That doesn't do away with tax on the value, by the way, because that will be taxed when that asset is sold with the capital gains tax. But why should death cause you to have to sell the farm to pay the taxes? It should not.

These are some of the decisions that are out there to be made. Certainly they are important ones. I will not argue about what is right. We hear a lot of this: Let's do the right thing.

That depends on about whom you are speaking, what the right thing is, of course. So there are choices we have to make, legitimate choices. I hope all of us have a chance in this election to sort those out for ourselves and be able to do something with them.

Medicare is another one. I mentioned that before. You know, what we have is a Medicare program that, unless it is changed, cannot continue either.

There is something on which all of us can agree: We want to continue. If that is the goal, what do we have to do in the interim to ensure that happens?

One of the things we have to do is give people some choices. The way it is now, when you are 62, 63, 65, you have to take what is there, and that is the only choice.

There are people who have supplementary policies. My mother has a supplementary policy that provides pharmaceuticals. She is perfectly happy with that and wants to continue with that. There are people who do not have supplementary policies. They cannot afford them. They ought to have pharmaceutical coverage, and there ought to be choices in the way that is done. That is very possible. People ought to be able to choose. The alternative to what we suggested has no choice.

Education: It has been a very long time since we have been able to do something quite different on elementary and secondary education. We talked about it. We have had 5 weeks of discussion in this Congress on education. Again, everyone is for education. I do not know anyone who does not want to make education more effective, who does not want to make it better for everyone. What holds it up is who makes the decisions.

This administration has insisted on those dollars that go from the Federal Government to the States, regardless of what the needs are in a particular school district, that they either be for 100,000 more teachers or they be for buildings. Both of those are legitimate needs, but there are school districts that do not need more teachers and the school buildings are in pretty good shape. What they need is high-tech equipment, for example, and they should have an opportunity to spend that money as their needs dictate. That is the debate.

Sometimes it is a little hard to cut through: "Those guys are against education." That is not so. These are the choices and these are the choices of how we get around to resolving the problems. I hope we will soon.

There are always going to be differences of view. That is why we vote. The problem is we have not been able to bring those things to the floor, and every time we bring up education, someone brings up one of the issues on which we have already voted three or four times—gun control, minimum wage, whatever—to make sure that what we are focusing on does not happen.

Here we are now 1 week past our dedicated time to adjourn. Frankly, I am one who thinks that if we have business to do here, we ought to be here until we get it done. That is our job. We ought to get the bills out here, vote on them, move them on up. If the President wants to veto them, if he wants to try to use leverage to threaten and shut down the Government, let him do that, but he is the one who is going to shut down the Government. That is where we are.

It is an interesting time, an important time. I am confident we will move more quickly to resolve these items this week than perhaps we have over the last couple of weeks.

ACCESS TO NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to express my views on a more parochial issue—not entirely parochial, as a matter of fact; it has to do with access to national parks. I have served over the last 6 years as chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee. We have been very involved with where we are going and have hopefully some idea where we want to be with parks.

Everybody recognizes the value of the national assets. It is one of the neat things. In the United States, we have 379 national parks that work in conjunction, of course, with State parks and local parks. The reasons for having a park, it seems to me, are, No. 1, to preserve the resource, of course, and, No. 2, to allow that resource to be enjoyed by the people who own it—the taxpayers.

We have a little difficulty from time to time with both of those things. We passed a bill, Parks 2020, last year which puts more emphasis on inventory, taking care of the resources. We need to put more effort into that, and we are working on that.

We have had a lot of talk about infrastructure in some of the larger parks and the things that need to be done, the money that needs to be spent for preserving the resource, such as on sewers. In the last budget that came from this administration, there was more money for acquisition of new parks than there was for maintenance of the parks we have. To me that is a problem.

If you want to enjoy it, you have to have access. One of the things that is controversial in our part of the world—in Yellowstone, Teton Park—which is equally true in New England and other places, is access for snow machines. For 3 years we have had an ongoing study in Yellowstone Park prompted by a lawsuit. Today they are coming out with their report on the environmental study and their recommendations as to what we should do. It is out for public comment for 30 days. I am going to ask that the 30 days be extended to 60 so people have an opportunity to review it.

There are difficulties with snow machines. There is difficulty with the noise. There is some difficulty with the pollution. The problem is the Park Service for 20 years has not sought to manage that growing industry and has simply avoided doing anything with it. Then suddenly there is a lawsuit filed against them, and there are some things that need to be changed. Instead of seeking to manage it, instead of seeking to find some remedies, instead of seeking to make some changes, they simply want to eliminate it. That is a mistake. There are ways the Park

Service can manage those things. They can separate cross-country skiers from snowmobilers. They can limit the number if there are too many. But the EPA and the Park Service have never looked toward establishing standards for these machines.

I have visited a number of times with the manufacturers, and they are willing to change those machines. They did some experimental work in Jackson Hole, WY, last year and had machines that are only as loud as normal voices. Of course, no one is going to invest in those unless they have some idea that there are standards, and if they comply with them, they will be useful.

I hope we can change the idea of either nothing or no management and give some time to move toward the adjustments that can be made, toward some management in the parks so people can continue to enjoy them.

I see my friend from Kansas. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Wyoming allowing me to speak on a topic that we will be taking up fully tomorrow. Tomorrow this body will take up the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. That will be the business of the day. Tomorrow we will vote on two bills associated therewith. The development of this legislation has been in progress for most of this year, and there are several pieces in this bill.

What I will do today is discuss with my colleagues what is in this bill, why it is important, why it passed the House of Representatives 371-1, and why it is important that we address this important issue at this particular time.

Senator WELLSTONE and I have been working on this legislation for this past year. It is the companion piece to a bill that passed in the House, sponsored by CHRIS SMITH and SAM GEJDENSON. The House bill is known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.

Our antitrafficking bill is the first complete legislation to address the growing practice of international trafficking worldwide. This is one of the largest manifestations of modern-day slavery internationally. Notably, this legislation is the most significant human rights bill of the 106th Congress if it is passed tomorrow as is expected. This is also the largest anti-slavery bill the United States has adopted, arguably, since 1865 and the demise of slav-

ery at the end of the Civil War. Therefore, I greatly anticipate this vote tomorrow in the Senate on this very important legislation.

Senator WELLSTONE's and my trafficking bill, which passed in the Senate on July 27 of this year, was conferred to reconcile the differences with the House bill. The conference report was filed on October 5, Thursday of last week. The final conference package contains four additional pieces of legislation which are substantially appropriate to our bill.

Most significant among those bill amendments is the Violence Against Women Act, which is part of this overall conference report—it is known as VAWA—which provides relief and assistance to those who suffer domestic violence in America. It is an important part of the package. It is a key piece of legislation that this body has previously passed. I am glad that it is part of this package. And it will pass as well with this overall package so we can help people caught in domestic violence.

Thus, the overall four bills included in this conference report are: The sex trafficking bill that I mentioned at the outset; VAWA, the Violence Against Women Act; Aimee's law, which provides for interstate compensation for the costs of the incarceration of early-released sex offenders who commit another sex crime in a second State. The 21st Amendment Enforcement Act is also in this overall conference report. It allows for State attorneys general to enforce their State alcohol control laws in Federal court, including laws prohibiting sales to minors, which strengthens the grant of authority to States under the 21st amendment to the Constitution. The final piece of legislation in this conference report is the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act, which authorizes the payment of foreign seized assets to victims of international terrorism.

The last step to adopting this legislative package rests with the Senate tomorrow. As I stated previously, it cleared the House on Friday by a vote of 371-1.

This legislation is our best opportunity to challenge the largest manifestation of current slavery worldwide, known as trafficking. I want to describe that term and what this bill does to get at what is taking place in the form of trafficking.

This practice of trafficking involves the coercive transportation of persons into slavery-like conditions, primarily involving forced prostitution, among other forms of slavery-like conditions.

Trafficking is the new slavery of the world. These victims are routinely forced against their will into the sex trade, transported across international borders, and left defenseless in a foreign country.

This bill also addresses the insidious practice known as "debt bondage," wherein a person can be enslaved to the money lender for an entire lifetime because of a \$50 debt taken by the family

for an emergency. This is a common practice in countries such as India and Nepal, among other places throughout the South Asian region.

People of conscience have fought against the different manifestations of slavery for centuries.

I might note that my State came into the Union under the fight of whether or not it would be a free or slave State in the 1860s. That was the big fight. In my State, we had bleeding Kansans, where they were referred to as those who were pro-slavery and those who were abolitionists.

The freedom forces fought guerrilla warfare to determine whether the State would be slave or free. The first election was actually stolen by the slave-State proponents, and there was a constitution they put forward that would allow slavery in Kansas. The free-State forces overtook them. They had a free election. The free-State ballot was elected and won. Kansas came in as a free State—probably one of the decisive events in setting off the Civil War—because then the balance of power in Washington shifted.

Under the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Nebraska was thought to come in as a free State, Kansas as a slave State, and Washington's balance of power would be maintained. When the abolitionists moved out of the Northeast to Kansas to settle, and to make sure it would be a free State, that tipped the balance of power and clearly led, according to historians, to the start of the Civil War. That is the history of my State. It is a noble one of fighting for freedom.

This anti-slavery legislation is in the tradition of William Wilberforce and Amy Carmichael of England, who were ardent abolitionists against slavery in the 19th and 20th centuries. Amy Carmichael was a British missionary to India at the turn of the last century and in the early 1900s. Upon arriving in that country, she was mortified to discover the routine practice of forced temple prostitution taking place. This was and continues to be a practice where young girls, from age 6 onward, are dedicated to the local temple, and are then forced into prostitution against their will to generate income.

Upon this morbid discovery, Amy Carmichael began to physically steal the young girls away from this incredibly degrading form of slavery. She would then hide the girls so they would escape the inevitable backlash of violence against these little girls. Eventually, the government outlawed this practice of forced temple prostitution as a result of Amy Carmichael's efforts. However, it bears noting that this terrible practice continues today in some rural villages throughout South Asia.

This bill challenges the myriad forms of slavery, including sex trafficking, temple prostitution, and debt bondage, among other forms.

This new phenomenon of sex trafficking, unfortunately, is growing exponentially. Some report that it is, at

least, a \$7 billion-per-year illicit trade, exceeded only by the international drug and arms trade in the illegal category.

Its victims are enslaved into a devastating brutality against their will, with no hope for relief or justice, while its perpetrators build criminal empires on this suffering with impunity. Our legislation will begin to challenge these injustices.

This is the new slavery of the world. As hard as it is to believe, women and children are routinely forced against their will into the sex trade internationally. They are usually transported across international borders so as to "shake" local authorities, leaving the victims defenseless in a foreign country, virtually held hostage in a strange land. The favored girls are in the age range of 10 to 13 years old.

I hope some people here can look at their own children or grandchildren and ask how this could possibly happen to somebody so young.

This bill is the first complete legislation to address this practice known as sex slavery, which has risen dramatically in the past two decades. It has risen dramatically with the increase of child pornography, sex tours in Eastern Asia, and the general popularizing of the sex industry worldwide. This mass trafficking of women and children, which includes both girls and boys, has been compared to some of the slave trade practices in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Professor Laura Lederer of Johns Hopkins University has identified the trafficking routes internationally. I want to put some of these routes up on a chart so my colleagues will be able to see where she has tracked these routes to take place.

You can see on the chart the trafficking routes from Russia and the Newly Independent States to other places around the world. We actually had a lady in the Foreign Relations Committee who testified she had been trafficked out of the Ukraine into Israel.

You can see all these routes being described going into Canada, into the United States, into Mexico, into Europe, and into other places in South Asia, into Australia and into South Africa.

These are the trafficking routes on which Professor Lederer has worked. She has studied this for nearly 10 years, describing and trying to put a finger on where these routes go.

This chart shows trafficking routes going into the United States. By our own Government estimates, about 50,000 girls are trafficked into the United States annually by this sex trafficking, this sex prostitution business. These are the routes shown here on this chart, with 50,000 girls per year trafficked into the United States. According to the State Department estimates, these are the routes coming in from Asia, the ports of entry they come in to the United States. Here on

this chart is shown the routes coming from Central America and South America.

Shown here on this chart are the routes coming in from Europe and Africa and the ports of entry where they have been trafficked. Again, Dr. Lederer's Protection Project work showcases the same. Here is where they are coming from.

It is of note to say, as well, that by our Government estimates this is a growing practice. It is growing more because organized crime is getting more and more into it. We heard testimony in committee that organized crime is actually favoring going into this over drugs because they can sell their product more than one time. And in some places where they traffic in prostitution it is not illegal. So they are going into it in a nonillegal category, where it is a legal business. The category of sex trafficking is growing rapidly.

Other routes that have been discussed with us in committee include girls sold or abducted from Nepal into India. Nepalese girls are prized because of their beauty and their inability to defend themselves given the situations out of which they are coming.

In Eastern Asia, most abductees are innocent tribal girls from isolated mountain regions; they are forced into sexual service, primarily into Thailand and Malaysia.

I met with some of these Nepalese girls as they had returned, being taken back from the brothels of India. I met with them in January of this year in Katmandu. It was despicable to see these girls, many of them taken at 11, 12 years of age, coming back 16, 17 years old, two-thirds of them having AIDS and/or tuberculosis. It is a deplorable situation.

This is how the traffickers obtain their unsuspecting victims. Fraud is commonly used by traffickers against villagers in underdeveloped areas. Typically the buyer promises the parents that he or she is taking their young daughters to the city to become a nanny or domestic servant, giving the parents a few hundred dollars as a down payment for the future money she will earn for the family. Then the girl is transported across international borders, deposited in a brothel and forced into the trade, until she is no longer useful, having contracted some disease. She is held against her will on the false premise that she must work off her debt which was paid for the cost of her transportation, which typically takes several years. In fact, in India it is common for indentured laborers generally, not even sex workers, simply manual labor, to work 10 years or more to pay off a \$50 debt.

The use of force to obtain the victim is common in the cities, where a girl is physically abducted, beaten, and held against her will, sometimes in chains. I have talked with these girls myself, as they appeared in two hearings that Senator WELLSTONE and I held before

the Foreign Relations Committee. Some of them came in disguise because they feared the retribution their families might suffer back home, for reason of their testimony in exposing the slave trade mafia. That is how insidious and widespread this practice is.

Existing laws internationally fail to make clear distinctions between victims of sexual trafficking and the perpetrators. Also, the victims frequently do not have legal immigrations status in the countries into which they are trafficked, and the victims are punished even more harshly than the traffickers.

Our legislation establishes an entirely different approach of punishing the perpetrators but not the victims. Our legislation also facilitates important and badly needed advocacy to raise awareness regarding sexual trafficking throughout the world.

Additional legislative measures include:

Providing new criminal punishment with enhanced sentences for persons convicted of operating such slavery enterprises in the U.S., as present criminal statutes are inadequate to obtain sentences commensurate with this new form of sex trafficking and slavery;

Establishing a reporting and advocacy mechanism at the State Department which would monitor efforts taken by foreign countries to criminalize, punish and combat international sex trafficking within their borders; and

Assistance for victims in the U.S., including authorization of grants to shelter and rehabilitation programs.

The legislation further includes the creation of a new form of visa for trafficking victims. This will substantially allow for more aggressive prosecution, as well as the protection of these witness victims.

It enhances cooperation and assistance with law enforcement agencies in foreign countries for the investigation and prosecution of international sexual trafficking, as well as promoting assistance in drafting and implementation of legislation.

And it promotes the creation of worldwide awareness programs to alert unsuspecting, potential victims of this practice.

Senator WELLSTONE and I believe this is the first sex trafficking legislation to pass around the world. We are hopeful it will become a model for other countries to deal with this pernicious, insidious practice that is part of the dark side of the new globalization of the economy.

I support the expansion of the economy. The globalization taking place can be a very positive thing, such as what is taking place today with the signing of permanent normal trade relations with China by the President that this body passed. But we also have to recognize that there are dark aspects of globalization; this being one of them. We need to deal with that as well.

Trafficking victims are the new enslaved of the world. Until recently,

they had virtually no advocates, no defenders, no avenues for escape, except death, to release them from their obscene circumstances. This is changing rapidly, and a new human rights movement is forming on behalf of these victims and against the trafficking networks.

This growing movement runs from right to left, from William Bennett and Chuck Colson to Gloria Steinem; all are involved in supporting this legislation. Our legislation is part of that movement, providing numerous protections and tools to empower these brutalized people towards re-capturing their dignity and obtaining justice.

Trafficking has risen dramatically in the last 10 to 15 years with experts speculating that it could exceed the drug trade in revenues in the next few decades. It is sadly observed that drugs are sold once, while a woman or child can be sold 20 and even 30 times a day. This dramatic increase is attributed also to the popularizing of the sex industry worldwide, including the increase of child pornography and sex tours in Eastern Asia that I previously mentioned.

A Washington Post article entitled, "Sex Trade Enslaves East Europeans," dated July 25th, vividly captures the suffering of one Eastern Europe woman who was trafficked through Albania to Italy:

As Irina recounts the next part of her story, she picks and scratches at the skin on her face, arms and legs, as if looking for an escape—she says the women were raped by a succession of Albanian men who stopped by at all hours, in what seemed part of a carefully organized campaign of psychological conditioning for a life of prostitution.

This awful practice must be challenged, and our legislation would do exactly that.

In closing, there is a unique generosity in the American people, who are respected internationally for their love of justice. As we challenge this dehumanizing trade, an inspired movement is growing in America and worldwide, a modern-day abolitionist movement. Please make this legislation a reality for the countless people who are presently lost to this modern day slave trade. Please vote for passage of this historic anti-slavery legislation and move forward this modern abolitionist movement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period

for morning business be extended until 4:30 under the same terms as previously ordered.

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

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order of business is that the Senate is in morning business until 4:30.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RICHARD BRYAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we have all heard the phrase that in this world—especially in this body—there are workhorses and there are show horses. That is very true. I would like to reflect on one of the workhorses of the Senate who will be retiring at the end of this Congress, someone who has served his State, served his country, and served in this body with distinction.

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Far and away the best prize that life offers is the chance to work hard at work worth doing." Senator BRYAN, one of the workhorses of the Senate, has made the most of his chance to work hard at work worth doing.

In addition to serving his constituents well, Senator BRYAN also has served the Senate well. He was asked to serve on the ad hoc committee that took testimony in the impeachment trial of U.S. District Judge ALCEE L. HASTINGS in 1989. In 1991, in the aftermath of the Keating Five scandal, Senate leaders named Senator BRYAN to a new task force to decide where to draw the line of propriety in such situations. His steady service helped to restore public confidence in the Senate, shaken by that troubling incident.

During the 103rd Congress, he was chairman of the Ethics Committee when the committee began an investigation into charges of sexual harassment leveled against former Senator Bob Packwood. Serving on the Ethics Committee is a thankless task. No Senator ever asks to serve on that committee. It does not generate the appreciation of constituents, nor does it particularly endear a Senator to his colleagues. This is important work, however—work that protects the integrity of this body. And as one who has great respect for this institution, I appreciate the exemplary job that Senator BRYAN did in steering the Senate through some tumultuous times.

Senator BRYAN has used his position in the U.S. Senate not only to advocate for his constituents in the great State of Nevada but also to protect consumers across the Nation. Ten years

ago, as the chairman of the Commerce Committee's Consumer Subcommittee, Senator BRYAN oversaw the first stand-alone reauthorization of the Consumer Product Safety Commission since 1981. This was a hard-earned victory for consumers nationwide. Senator BRYAN was also successful in securing passage of legislation that he authored requiring the installation of passenger-side airbags in all automobiles sold in this country, a safety feature responsible for saving hundreds of lives.

Senator RICHARD BRYAN's career has been one of true and diligent public service. I am told that his experience in elected office began when he was chosen to be president of his eighth grade class at John S. Park Elementary School. He served in the U.S. Army, completing his military service in the Army Reserves as a captain. Upon completion of law school, RICHARD BRYAN returned to Nevada and began a career in public service that has spanned more than three decades. In 1964, Mr. BRYAN became a deputy district attorney in the Clark County District Attorney's Office. Two years later, he was appointed Clark County's first public defender. His legislative service to Nevada began in 1968 when he was elected to the Nevada State Assembly. Following a second term in the State Assembly, he was elected to the Nevada State Senate in 1972 and was reelected in 1976.

Senator BRYAN won his first statewide election to become Nevada's attorney general in 1978. He served as the State's chief law enforcement officer until 1982, when he was elected to the first of two terms as Nevada's 26th Governor. In 1988, Senator BRYAN ran for the U.S. Senate, defeating the incumbent Senator, and went on to be reelected to the Senate in 1994. That is a very respected and impressive record, Mr. President—a life devoted to public service at virtually every level of our government.

Senator BRYAN leaves the Senate as a young man—youth being relative. As I look back on his many years of public service, I am confident that in whatever endeavor he chooses next, we can expect more fine work—work worth doing—from Senator BRYAN. He is a man who can always be proud to look at himself in the mirror each morning. He will see a reflection of fine work in the past, as well as the great opportunity to do well each day.

Mr. President, I wish RICHARD BRYAN and his lovely wife every good thing in the years ahead. I hope he will come back to see us often.

Mr. President, before I was recognized, I saw another Senator on the floor and I think he was about to seek recognition. I suggested that he go ahead and get recognition. But he suggested that I get recognition. So I did. If my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, wishes to be recognized, I will be very glad to yield the floor. I have a couple of other speeches, but I will be happy to listen to him before I continue.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I have a few articles on U.S. policy that I would like to have printed in the RECORD and make a couple of comments on them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield the floor with the understanding that I retain the floor when the distinguished Senator has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Thank you, Mr. President.

NATIONAL POLICY ISSUES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, over the last couple of weeks we have had several debates on this floor that dealt with national policy, and, of course, with the debates on television, there are many issues related to national policy. I take this opportunity to relate how those policy issues are being viewed in Wyoming. I know that is kind of the melting pot and the test center for the United States. I say that in all sincerity because I talk to these people every weekend when I go home, and I know it is a real center of common sense with a real concern about a lack of national policy on some very important issues.

They talk about foreign policy and how we don't appear to know how to go into a war. They talk about energy policy, the price of gasoline, and how long we have been addressing that. They talk about Social Security policy.

They hear about the lockbox, and they have watched six or seven filibusters against the lockbox to protect Social Security. They hear about needing to save Social Security first and then not seeing any action on that.

I want to suggest, too, that our country needs policy. We are not talking about hindsight; we are talking about foresight. We are not talking about polls; we are talking about leadership.

There were a couple of editorials in Wyoming that dealt with the recent tapping of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. One of them was in the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle, which is the main paper in Cheyenne, WY, the State capital of Wyoming. It starts off by saying:

President Bill Clinton's decision to direct the Department of Energy to release 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is viewed by the White House as a way to lower fuel prices and reduce our country's dependence on foreign oil.

Nice try, Mr. Clinton.

Each day, the world oil market produces 77.1 million barrels of oil and consumes 75.6 million barrels. The United States consumes 20 million barrels per day. The additional 30 million barrels is equal to about a 36-hour supply.

Higher energy prices fall squarely on the shoulder of the American people, the government's strangle-hold on refineries and the White House.

Let's not forget our country's thirst for oil. Since 1991, the amount of oil imported by

the United States has increased an average of 5.3 percent per year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD. I hope everybody will read it. It gets into more detail about policy and suggests some things that need to be done.

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

OUR VIEW

OIL RESERVES—TAPPING THIS SUPPLY WON'T SOLVE ENERGY DEPENDENCY

President Bill Clinton's decision to direct the Department of Energy to release 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is viewed by the White House as a way to lower fuel prices and reduce our country's dependence on foreign oil.

Nice try, Mr. Clinton

Each day, the world oil market produces 77.1 million barrels of oil and consumes 75.6 million barrels. The United States consumes 20 million barrels per day. The additional 30 million barrels is equal to about a 36-hour supply.

What Mr. Clinton did was wrong. Releasing the oil from the reserve to influence market prices sets a dangerous precedent. The oil reserve was created in 1975 to protect Americans from countries that decide to cut off oil exports to the United States, not to manipulate prices. Any unexpected cold snap, natural disaster, cutback in OPEC production or political unrest that leads to a disruption in world supply could quickly overwhelm any short-term benefit from tapping into our oil reserves.

Granted, releasing the oil may have a short-term effect on prices, but markets eventually will refocus on the long-term conditions—influenced primarily by world supply and demand for oil—that have driven up prices during the past years.

Higher energy prices fall squarely on the shoulder of the American people, the government's strangle-hold on refineries and the White House.

Since 1983, access to federal land in the West—where 67 percent of America's onshore oil reserves are located—has declined by 60 percent. Mr. Clinton has used his executive powers to severely limit oil and gas activity on government land, and the search for new domestic offshore oil has been limited to parts of the Gulf of Mexico and Alaskan waters.

Let's not forget our country's thirst for oil. Since 1991, the amount of oil imported by the United States has increased an average of 5.3 percent per years.

While American refineries are operating at a 95.4 percent utilization rate, up from 94.1 percent a years ago, there is little margin for error. It's uncertain if American refineries will be able to process the oil released from the reserves fast enough to make a difference in gasoline prices or home heating oil inventories. The newest oil refinery was built nearly 25 years ago. That's because the Clean Air Act and other environmental requirements tied to upgrading or building new refineries restrict private business from building additional refining capacity.

The administration's failure to establish a long term domestic energy policy that guarantees America's energy independence is largely to blame for high gas prices at the pump.

The next president will need to address this nation's dependence on foreign oil that leaves both the economy and national security at risk. Unless the White House is ready to encourage the development of domestic energy resources, America will remain overly depend on foreign production.

That's the real tragedy.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I also cite an editorial that appeared in the *Riverton Ranger*, Riverton, WY, with some of the same sentiments:

The Clinton-Gore administration has announced its intention to sell 30 million barrels of oil from the nation's strategic reserve.

This amounts to less than a two-day supply of oil for a country that uses 19 million barrels of oil a day.

The rationale for the release of oil from the salt mines is that the administration wants to make sure that no Americans are cold this winter, due to a shortage or too high prices for home heating oil.

The image of householders backing up to their burned-down home comes to mind. The optimist in the family warmed by the glowing embers as the fire dies down after consuming the house, remarks that "at least we'll be warm tonight."

That is about what the energy policy amounts to—burning down our strategic house to take care of a little blip that doesn't solve the problem at all—again, lack of an energy policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete editorial from the *Riverton Ranger* be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Clinton-Gore administration has announced its intention to sell 30 million barrels of oil from the nation's strategic reserve.

This amounts to less than a two-day supply of oil for a country that uses 19 million barrels of oil a day.

The rationale for the release of oil from the salt mines is that the administration wants to make sure that no Americans are cold this winter, due to a shortage or too high prices for home heating oil.

The image of households backing up to their burned-down home comes to mind. The optimist in the family, warmed by the glowing embers as the fire dies down after consuming the house, remarks that "at least we'll be warm tonight."

How ironic that the same administration that continues to lock up more of the public land from whence comes much of the nation's oil, designates more acreage as national monuments, classifies more of the public lands as defacto wilderness through roadless designation, would then provide temporary relief from an oil shortage by selling a few barrels of reserves, on the condition the oil companies replace the borrowed oil within a short period of time.

President Carter made quite a fuss when the domestic supply of oil dropped perilously close to 50 percent. Now we think nothing of having foreign sources 75 percent of our U.S. oil supply.

The same situation applies to uranium, or even worse. We have a law on the books of Washington that requires the maintenance of a viable domestic uranium industry, for strategic defense purposes, and for our nuclear utility industry.

With uranium mines closing and throttling back in Wyoming, the last of the 50 states still mining uranium, our domestic companies can supply less than 15 percent of the uranium needed by our nuclear utilities which supply now 23 percent of the nation's electricity. The rise from the traditional 20 percent share comes from the greater availability of the remaining almost 100 nuclear power stations for generation of electricity.

If our national leadership wanted to help our people stay warm, other than by backing

up to our burning houses, a national policy ought to be developed that encourages domestic exploration and production, rather than impeding it at every turn.

The promised release of oil from our reserves appears to be politically timed and motivated.

Any hope for a sound national energy policy that will keep more companies finding oil on our own continent seems faint, indeed.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, finally, in the area of forest fires and forest fire policy, Mr. H.B. Davis writes the letter to the editor where he explains in some detail how we are failing on our forests.

Well, the West is again being managed by nature because a few people block the true management of our replenishable environment. Ignorance has again led us to ashes. Some of the very forests that have been "protected" against harvesting for years, have this summer burned. To those who wanted their homes surrounded by the pristine (I'm sorry), do they look better in ashes? The pristine that we admire will never remain, for it changes by growing old, weak, and ravaged, by nature, not just man. We can help it by maintenance, with harvest, common sense use, and stewardship. Nature does it by random (and sometimes violent) ways but we (some) have the intelligence to do it selectively and sensibly unless our hands are tied.

He goes on to explain how a sensible forest policy will allow us to enjoy the beauty of the forests rather than the devastation of forest fires, and even though forest fires help to rejuvenate forests, they do it in a very poor stewardship way.

As one lady at a hearing recently said: The difference between the clear-cutting that my little family business does and what Mother Nature does, we respect 200 feet from a stream. We protect against erosion. We don't kill the fish. Mother Nature often does.

I ask unanimous consent that his entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

IGNORANCE TO ASHES

EDITOR: Well, the West is again being managed by nature because a few people block the true management of our replenishable environment. Ignorance has again led us to ashes. Some of the very forests that have been "protected" against harvesting for years, have this summer burned. To those who wanted their homes surrounded by the pristine (I'm sorry), do they look better in ashes? The pristine that we admire will never remain, for it changes by growing old, weak, and ravaged, by nature, not just man. We can help it by maintenance, with harvest, common sense use, and stewardship. Nature does it by random (and sometimes violent) ways but we (some) have the intelligence to do it selectively and sensibly unless our hands are tied.

I fought timbering many years ago, thank God I failed, for the timbered areas are now beautiful and what I wanted to keep now has or needs to burn, for it is of no value except for wildfire fuel. We want clean air and to stop the greenhouse effect so we promote wildfire. Does it do the job?

Some people have the idea you can keep a living organism from growing old. Maybe some people, through money and surgery appear not to age, but they do age. That "stop-

aging" or use attitude leads to fuel for wildfires, disease and starvation in animals, and imbalance in nature. To the people who take on a specific issue, you appear to forget an issue is not the book of life but a single page and until you can see all of life don't kill it with an issue, as is now happening. Closure does not guarantee protection, only lack of observation, thus allowing good conditions to go bad until it is all destroyed. On the other hand, careful harvesting, replanting, and maintenance does protect. It keeps it renewing and healthy. The cartoon, in *Wed, Aug. 23*, by Deering would have had a better caption of "what is this stuff?" "It is what's left when the environmentalists" protect the environment." I'll bet the burned bear cub (Signey) would prefer his mother protecting him and not some short sighted environmentalists.

We can't use and abuse, but we can harvest, replant, and maintain so Mother Nature doesn't have to do on a big scale what we should have done a little at a time.

Personally, I'd rather see the timber used to build (at a reasonable price, with jobs) than as smoke, ashes and charred pieces in mud to smother our wildlife and fish come the next rain. If our "do-gooders" would quit looking at a single page of aging life and work with the folks who would, with responsibility, harvest, replant, and maintain, we'd not need the tears of regret when Mother Nature has to manage.

H.R. DAVIS,
Riverton.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I will take an opportunity at a later time to talk about lack of policy on Social Security. I would like to address the type of accounting we have where we are kind of fudging some things that will cost future generations their Social Security unless we take some action now.

We also need to take some action in the area of paying down the debt, tax policy, and education policy. If we don't address these policies using foresight instead of hindsight, if we don't do policy instead of polls, we are going to run into a situation similar to what we had when we hired 100,000 new teachers and then discovered we didn't have buildings to put them in. That was easy to solve; we just threw in a little more money. We put more buildings in there, except we are putting buildings in places where the voters themselves chose not to put buildings.

I hope we will look at policy.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy in letting me put those letters in the RECORD.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

RETIREMENT OF ARTHUR MALAN "TINKER" ST. CLAIR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my State of West Virginia has provided to our Nation numerous individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service. Some have appeared, for a time, in the national spotlight. Others have labored quietly behind the scenes. One such individual, who has for more than 50 years contributed to the betterment of his community, his State, and his country, sits among us today in this

Senate Chamber. Arthur Malan St. Clair, the senior Doorkeeper of the Senate, caught me by surprise recently when he handed me a letter informing me of his decision to retire from his post after serving this body since 1979. Arthur St. Clair, better known to us Senators as "Tinker," has served the Senate with distinction for 21 years.

But that is just a small part of his remarkable story. Now, speculation as to the age of another person is always something to be approached with some temerity, and not often approached, as a matter of fact. But there has been speculation as to Tinker's age. It has been a hot topic of debate among some Senators and Senator's staffs for a number of years. I understand, however, that Tinker is finally willing to let that particular cat out of the bag.

So, for the benefit of the curious, I shall start at the beginning: Tinker St. Clair was born in Pageton, McDowell County, West Virginia, in 1916. As his colleagues on the doors may be quickly calculating, that will make Tinker 85 years come next January.

Tinker was the son of a coal miner, small businessman, and local school board member. He was reared in what he is often heard to call the "free State of McDowell."

It is a county located in southern West Virginia right on the borderline there. It used to have a population of about right at 100,000 people. Today it has probably 30,000. It was a great coal mining county. When the mines took on mechanization and huge mining machines took the place of men, the population dropped. Many of the mines were worked out and are no longer mining coal. So it has become a county that, unfortunately, has many unemployed people who still live there.

That county is represented by NICK JOE RAHALL, who claims to be my Congressman because my voting residence is still at Sophia, WV, which is located in the congressional district represented by NICK RAHALL. NICK RAHALL has a lot of friends in those counties, and they are very proud of him as their representative. NICK and I often talk about Tinker St. Clair.

Tinker is from that great free state of McDowell. Back in those days, when McDowell County had almost 100,000 people, West Virginia had 97,600 farms and had 90,000 horses. The State of West Virginia had 90,000 horses and 6,000 mules. That was back in the days when Tinker was younger, I was younger, and McDowell County was more highly populated. Many of those 6,000 mules were used in the mines to pull the cars of coal.

I was trying to remember how much money was required to build that first capitol in West Virginia—not the first capitol; the first capitol burned down, but the capitol that replaced the capitol that burned down had gold leaf put upon it. That capitol was completed in February 1932. I will tell you what that capitol cost in 1932. Pay close attention: \$9,491,180.03. That was the total

cost of that capitol. Any person traveling in West Virginia must stop and see that beautiful capitol. It would cost many times that much to build it today. It was completed in the heart of the Great Depression: \$9,491,180.03. That was a real bargain.

Well, McDowell County is in the heart of a region that is rich in coal and, more importantly, rich in the old values. It was in that environment that Tinker grew up. That was the environment in which he was raised. That was the environment in which he was instilled with patriotism and loyalty, honesty and determination and drive, and a strong sense of community.

Tinker graduated in 1937. That was the year in which I married. That was the year in which Erma and I married. I paid a hard-shell preacher \$10 to marry her and me. We have been married ever since, 63 years ago. Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven was the year Tinker graduated from Gary High School where he played football and baseball.

Upon graduation, Tinker worked as a schoolbus driver and later worked as a driver for the Consolidated Bus Lines. He came to own a taxi business that operated in the towns of Welch, Oceana, and Pineville. For anyone unfamiliar with those communities, I should note that driving a bus or a taxi along those particular local roads, around the winding hills and in the gulches and the valleys and the hollows, requires a real talent, courage, and certainly a strong stomach.

It was at about that time in his life—in fact, on May 25, 1940—that Tinker married Elnora J. Hall and they later became the proud parents of two daughters, Patty and Linda.

As we have all observed in the Senate, and as I have known for many years, Tinker is always cheerful—always cheerful. He always has a nice smile on his face. He is always a very personable individual. He is just down to Earth, a plain, honest, hard-working, fine Christian gentleman.

He is a "people person." We hear a lot of talk these days about "people persons." Well, he is a "people person." His entrance into the realm of politics and public service, therefore, was just plain natural. Beginning in 1948, Tinker's career included service as a deputy sheriff. When Tinker came to get you, you better go—you better go. He had that big .45 slung on his hip and he was an excellent marksman. You just better go; better get ready. That fellow, the smiles, was the real Matt Dillon of McDowell County—Matt Dillon. And he was a court bailiff, criminal investigator for the prosecuting attorney, and justice of the peace.

In 1968, Tinker was elected county clerk, and he has held all the offices at the county level. That is where government starts, you know, at the county level. And he was overwhelmingly re-elected in 1974, with 89 percent of the vote; 89 percent of the votes in a county that never, ever heard of a political machine.

Well, I better take that back, the part about a political machine; if there ever was a political machine, that was it, in McDowell County.

Well, anyhow, Tinker didn't need any machine. He had the votes—89 percent of the vote while running on the slogan, "The man to give the office back to the people." How about that for a slogan? If I had my political career to start over again, that is the slogan I would use, "The man to give the office back to the people."

It was in 1979, after serving 4 years of a 6-year term as county clerk, I received a telephone call. I will never forget that call. It came from Tinker. Over the phone, Tinker related to me a conversation that he had just had with Elnora. Elnora, as I recall it, had told Tinker that she was coming to Washington to visit their daughters and their grandchildren.

"Fine," said Tinker. "When will you be coming back?"

"I'm not," was the answer. "I'm not." She went on to say, "I miss the girls and the grandchildren and I'm going to Washington to stay."

Well, Tinker and I both knew that she meant business. And so I said to Tinker, "Well, you just come on up to Washington with Elnora, and we'll find work in my office somewhere for you."

That conversation took place during the first week of July, 1979. And on July 9, 1979, the Senate employed Tinker St. Clair as the newest member of our Senate family, and he has been a member of the Senate family ever since.

During his career, Tinker has played an important role in escorting leaders of this Nation throughout southern West Virginia. Nobody can escort one through southern West Virginia quite like Tinker. He walked with President Truman through the coal fields. He stood with candidate John F. Kennedy and campaigned with him in the hills and the hollows of West Virginia. And one time back home, he greeted a helicopter that was landing and he welcomed its passenger, Lyndon Baines Johnson. He was with another Kennedy—Bobby Kennedy—in 1968.

He traveled with another West Virginian, many times, day and night: ROBERT C. BYRD. He traveled with JAY ROCKEFELLER. And JAY can tell of trips to Welch where he was greeted by the dapper and dedicated Tinker. And the late Senator Jennings Randolph often found at Elnora's supper table some fine pastries and goodies. And so was NICK RAHALL there, from time to time, in Tinker's house.

Many a campaign strategy was cooked up at Elnora's supper table. Tinker and Elnora, in fact, serve as proof that anyone with the determination and the desire to make a difference in this Nation can play a valuable role in the political arena.

It was on April 24, 1996, that Tinker lost his beloved Elnora. I was concerned for my friend. The sudden loss of his dear wife had to have been quite

a blow. Yet Tinker handled that difficult personal tragedy with tremendous inner strength that is so indicative of people who have come up the hard way in West Virginia's coal mining communities.

So now it has come to pass, Mr. President, that Tinker St. Clair will be retiring, and I am glad for him that he will be able to spend more time with his daughters, Patty and Linda; and with his grandchildren, Kimberly and Eddie and Mack; and with his two great-grandsons, Nicholas and Jack.

But I must admit, it does sadden me to think of our daily labors in this Chamber without Tinker; He has given so much. We will all miss Tinker's ready smile, his warm handshake, his full head of white hair, and his warm and reassuring presence in the Senate Chamber.

He won't be leaving for a while yet, but the day will come when Tinker will walk out of the door for his last time. So I say goodbye to my fellow West Virginian, and my dear friend, with these words of verse:

WORD TO THE LIVING

It isn't enough that we say in our hearts
That we like a man for his ways;
And it isn't enough that we fill our minds
With psalms of silent praise;
Nor is it enough that we honor a man
As our confidence upward mounts;
It's going right up to the man himself
And telling him so that counts.
Then when a man does a deed that you really
admire,
Don't leave a kind word unsaid,
For fear to do so might make him vain
Or cause him to lose his head;
But reach out your hand and tell him, "Well
done",
And see how his gratitude swells;
It isn't the flowers we strew on the grave,
It's the word to the living that tells.

I will say this to Tinker. I hope to serve 6 years more after this year in this Senate, but the sight of him back there on that bench will never fade from my view. I will always see him there. I will always see him returning my gaze and always with a smile. We will never, never forget him because he is the true symbol of service. And as the old saying goes: Service with a smile. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I consider myself very lucky to be on the floor right now. I thank Senator BYRD for his words. I cannot even come close to matching what my colleague from West Virginia said. I have not known Tinker a whole lifetime, but I will say this: What I know about Tinker today and every day, I say to Senator BYRD, is that he is the kind of person who, when we debate, when we come out on the floor to speak, and sometimes we do not necessarily get the votes we want—that happens sometimes; with me, more than sometimes—Tinker is the person who is always there to give encouragement, always there to say: You keep speaking out for what you

believe; you keep at it; everything will be all right.

I appreciate Tinker's wisdom. I appreciate his help. I appreciate his commitment to service. I appreciate his commitment to West Virginia. Most important of all, I appreciate his patriotism, because to me he is a true patriot. A patriot is someone who takes a part of their life and gives it to their country, and he has done that. So I am honored to be on the floor at this time.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BRUCE F. VENTO OF MINNESOTA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I leave today, I will finish with some words about another man, a former colleague of the Presiding Officer, Congressman VENTO.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 369 relating to the death of Congressman BRUCE VENTO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 369) relative to the death of Representative BRUCE F. VENTO, of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the resolution goes on to read:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Bruce F. Vento, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns or recesses today, it stand adjourned or recessed as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

This is in behalf of the majority leader, Senator LOTT, Senator DASCHLE, myself, and Senator GRAMS. I also add Senators DURBIN and FEINGOLD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 369) was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague, Senator BYRD.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

EULOGY FOR MURRAY ZWEBEN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate has lost an honored and esteemed friend. I rise to pay tribute to Murray Zweben, former Senate Parliamentarian, Senate Parliamentarian Emer-

itus, who passed away on a Sunday recently.

A few years before his own death, Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to John Adams:

It is of some comfort to us both that the term is not very distant at which we are to deposit in the same cerement our sorrows and suffering bodies, and to ascend in essence to an ecstatic meeting with the friends we have loved and lost, and whom we shall still love and never lose again.

As we reflect upon and mourn the passing of Murray Zweben, these words remind us that death is but a temporary separation between this life and the next life. While we regret the loss of dear friends, and especially one who so ably served this body for many years, we can contemplate with assurance that there is the promise that we can be reunited.

A Parliamentarian emeritus of the Senate, Murray Zweben served this body as Assistant Senate Parliamentarian from 1963 to 1975. He served as the Senate Parliamentarian from 1975 until 1981, a position he held when I became majority leader. Murray Zweben first came to the Parliamentarian's office as Secretary to Parliamentarian Charles L. Watkins. He served 3 years as communications officer in the Communications Office of the Chief of Naval Operations following his graduation from naval officer candidate school in September 1953.

While serving as Secretary to the Parliamentarian, Murray Zweben attended the George Washington University Law School and achieved the honor of being on the Law Review there.

After clerking for Judge Laramore of the U.S. Court of Claims, and practicing law, he was called again to the Senate to fill the newly created position of Second Assistant Parliamentarian in January 1963. He was promoted to Assistant Parliamentarian in December 1964 where he served for 10 years under the tutelage of Dr. Floyd Riddick.

In 1974, Mr. Zweben was appointed Parliamentarian of the Senate, and he served in that post with distinction. He served as Parliamentarian during some turbulent years in the Senate. In his first year, Nelson Rockefeller, then Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, relied heavily upon the advice of the Parliamentarian as he presided over the fight to amend the rules of the Senate.

Also during Mr. Zweben's first year as Parliamentarian, the Senate was faced with the unprecedented debate over the rightful claim to a Senate seat from New Hampshire, which required great skill to resolve.

The Senate saw other battles during Murray Zweben's tenure as Parliamentarian. Through all of those encounters, Mr. Zweben was fair, impartial, and judicious in the conduct of his duties. His unfailing good humor, even under stressful circumstances, will be remembered by all who knew him. Murray was unflappable in a post where a cool head is essential.

He was a shining example of public service. Although public service in general and public service careers in Washington have in some quarters fallen out of favor, I believe Murray Zweben's work represents a compelling case against the cynicism about the many fine people who serve in the Senate in various capacities. Their names are never in the papers, they experience few public kudos, and yet they work as many long hours—probably more so—than we Members do. They are dedicated, capable, patriotic individuals who represent the best that America produces from all over this Nation. Murray Zweben served this institution and his country well. His love of the institution, and his zest for politics, and for life made him a pleasure to know.

My thoughts and prayers are with Murray's family. When we lose friends and loved ones, we may lose the mortal companion, but this is but a temporary—but a temporary—one.

For as the rolling seasons bring
The hour of fate to those we love,
Each pearl that leaves the broken string
Is set in Friendship's crown above.
As narrower grows the earthly chain,
The circle widens in the sky;
These are our treasures that remain,
But those are stars that beam on high.

Those words were penned by Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the 106th Congress winds to a close, I want to take just a moment, as it were, to say farewell and to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, who, after serving three terms, will be retiring from the United States Senate. He has dutifully served the people of New Jersey, and served them well, for 18 years, and he has often been outspoken about the value of government and its ability to improve people's lives.

This belief stems from personal experience. As the son of immigrants who fled poverty and religious persecution, he raised himself from poverty to become a world leader in computer services. FRANK did well. He well understood the words of Thomas H. Huxley, who said, "The rung of a ladder was never meant to rest upon, but only to hold a man's foot long enough to enable him to put the other somewhat higher." Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG has never rested, and I am sure that, for him, retirement from the Senate simply means that he is moving on to the next rung on his life's ladder.

FRANK LAUTENBERG was born in Paterson, NJ, on January 23, 1924, and during his childhood moved about a dozen times with his parents in their pursuit of work in New Jersey. After graduating high school, FRANK enlisted and served in the Army Signal Corps in Europe during World War II. Benefiting from the GI bill following the war, he attended the Columbia University

School of Business, where he earned an economics degree in 1949. In 1952 he co-founded a company called Automatic Data Processing and, by 1982, when he was elected to the U.S. Senate, his company employed 16,000 people. Think of that. His company employed more people than today work in the coal mines of West Virginia. And it was a company that processed the payroll for one of every 14 non-Government workers in the entire country. It had become one of the largest computing services companies in the world.

Because of his working-class roots and the values instilled in him by his parents, Senator LAUTENBERG came to realize that America really was the land of opportunity. America had provided him with many opportunities, and Senator LAUTENBERG decided that it was time to give something back to this wonderful country. He therefore launched his career in public service, and during his tenure of three terms, FRANK LAUTENBERG has fought hard to protect the health, safety, and security of American families.

Senator LAUTENBERG has an appreciation of the Senate and its special place in our Nation. He has fought to preserve the prerogatives of the Senate and of the Congress as a whole. As the senior member of the Budget Committee, he actively resisted the so-called balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Senator LAUTENBERG was also one of a minority of Senators to oppose the Line Item Veto Act.

As ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator LAUTENBERG helped to craft the 1997 balanced budget agreement that helped to put our national finances in order. His work helped to demonstrate that the Constitution did not have to be amended to balance the budget and that hard work and hard choices are what is needed in budgets, as in life.

Senator LAUTENBERG and I share a commitment to our transportation infrastructure and we have made it one of our top priorities. He is the ranking member of the Transportation Appropriations subcommittee. I have worked very closely with my friend from New Jersey, who serves with me on that subcommittee. We have toiled together on a wide variety of projects important to West Virginia and the Nation. And we have been doing this for a long time. When we were in the majority, when I was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, FRANK LAUTENBERG was the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee. For too long, the Federal Government has underinvested in our Nation's highways. As a key member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, FRANK LAUTENBERG played an active role in crafting TEA-21, the historic transportation bill that was enacted last Congress which is an important step toward fixing past mistakes and assuring Americans of safer, more modern highways and improved public transit. We share the belief that a

strong infrastructure is vital and makes a profound and positive difference for hundreds of millions of Americans by saving lives, reducing injuries, increasing business investment, expanding employment opportunities, and producing savings to the public and to the private sectors.

Senator LAUTENBERG has also worked to make transportation safer. He championed laws to make 21 the national drinking age, which has saved an estimated 12,000 lives since 1984. And he has sponsored legislation—and I have been proud to cosponsor it with him—to make .08 blood alcohol content the national standard for the illegal operation of a vehicle. In addition, Senator LAUTENBERG and I have worked together on efforts to combat underage drinking.

Senator LAUTENBERG is a strong environmental leader who helped to write the Superfund, Clean Air, and Safe Drinking Water Acts. Most Americans take safe drinking water for granted; however, the sad fact is that, in this, the most prosperous Nation in the world, millions of people rely on possibly contaminated water supplies. FRANK LAUTENBERG understands that. He understands that like improved highways and bridges, effective and efficient and clean water systems are vital to the continued economic expansion of our Nation and the health and safety of our people.

In his statement on February 17, 1999, announcing his plans for retirement, FRANK LAUTENBERG cited as one of the main factors of his decision his frustration with the overwhelming amount of financial resources needed for his upcoming reelection campaign. That is a shame; that is a shame. He believes—and has so stated—that without meaningful campaign finance reform, special interest funding will grow substantially, and even larger amounts of money will be necessary. That is a shame and a disgrace. I regret that we have not been able to address campaign financing in a meaningful way. I regret that the deplorable influence of money—filthy lucre—in politics has had such a detrimental impact on the Senate.

Senator LAUTENBERG knows what it is like to start from nothing and less than nothing and make the most of every opportunity. He has worked to make the lives of his constituents, and all Americans, better. From building up our country's infrastructure, to battling those who would attack our constitutional liberties, to protecting our environment, Senator LAUTENBERG has worked to provide a brighter future for our Nation. He has worked to improve our public schools. I have no doubt that my good friend and colleague will not rest on his laurels after he leaves the halls of Congress. FRANK LAUTENBERG will continue to serve so that others will have the opportunities that have lifted him to a place where he could serve the greatest Nation on Earth.

I thank Senator LAUTENBERG for his service to the Senate and to the Nation. I tried to talk him out of retirement. I urged him to think again, change his mind, change his decision for the good of the Senate and for the good of the country and, I am sure, for the good of New Jersey, but I know that it would be for the good of the Senate. I wish he could still change his mind. I am sorry he made that decision, but he had his reasons. He did what he thought was best, I am sure.

I thank him for his service to the Senate. He won't be leaving this afternoon or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, but the time for him with us is all too short. The Senate will have lost a good man and a fine, fine Member. America will have lost a good servant. But, as I said, it may be that he will serve elsewhere. In any event, I wish him good health and happiness in his retirement.

As I say farewell to him, I recall these words from the great American author of the 19th century, Ralph Waldo Emerson. It is entitled "A Nation's Strength."

What makes a nation's pillars high
And its foundations strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
It is not gold. Its kingdoms grand
Go down in battle shock;
Its shafts are laid on sinking sand,
Not on abiding rock.
It is the sword? Ask the red dust
Of empires passed away;
The blood has turned their stones to rust,
Their glory to decay.
And is it pride? Ah, that bright crown
Has seemed to nations sweet;
But God has struck its luster down
In ashes at His feet.
Not gold but only men can make
A people great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.
Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from New Jersey.

SERVING IN THE SENATE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what a wonderful coincidence it is that I came to the floor to hear my good friend, Senator BYRD, make such exaggerated remarks about my accomplishments but never about our friendship.

Around here, our seats are based on seniority. You kind of move to the middle or to the front as your seniority improves. But it is not where you sit that counts; it is where you stand.

Senator BYRD has stood for the right things for this country for more years than any of the people in this room will remember because it has been such a long history. It is not newly emplaced.

There is a commercial around that is often seen on television and radio that says—I think it is for PaineWebber—when PaineWebber speaks, everybody

listens. That is an adaptation because when Senator BYRD speaks, everybody listens. And everybody can read Senator BYRD's books on the history of the Senate to learn what it really takes to be a Senator.

It takes more than just getting a slice of the largess that we call funds; it takes more than the incredible loyalty, as profound as it is, such as Senator BYRD has to this State—it transcends those things—that, frankly, has made a difference in the world in which we live. Whenever there is a question, whenever Senator BYRD speaks—and my experience is principally on our side of the aisle because we have our weekly meetings and occasional get-togethers—people listen because he is the historian of the Senate. He is, in many ways, the conscience of the Senate. He is a spokesman for the Senate, not just because he is an eloquent speaker but because of his knowledge and character.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, my friend, ROBERT C. BYRD, for his comments. There is always a degree of eloquence and recall when he speaks. And if you have some spare time, if you ever want to hear about the history of battles that took place in Roman times or the list of Kings and Queens of the UK from a time earlier than William the Conqueror to the present date, how they died and what they stood for or what counts in terms of the Constitution of this country, Senator BYRD has that knowledge. Senator BYRD walks around with the Constitution in his pocket just as people walk around with phone numbers, and it is used and remembered.

It was a happy day for me when I was able to get on the Appropriations Committee and join Senator BYRD on so many issues for which we have fought. He reminds us that there is kind of a cultural aspect in the United States that so many of us want to give something back. I learned to give back by watching my parents as they struggled to raise a family in very tough times, with very modest wages and opportunities. I understood it in the Army when my father was on his deathbed, my mother was 36 years old, and my sister was 12. That was our family. My father was 42. I did it because it was my duty. At that time, I saw what happened to a family that was without health insurance, without any Social Security, without any kind of a benefit that would really help a widow with a small family.

Not only did my father die and leave the grief that followed, but his sickness, which lingered for a year, took any and all resources the family had. As a matter of fact, debts piled up as my father disintegrated. So I saw what happens to people who don't have a way of taking care of these needs. I saw what happens when a family is bereft of the opportunity to recover from that kind of a challenge.

I was lucky in some ways because as we lost a great man in our household,

I was the beneficiary of an opportunity to help my family later on. The GI bill allowed me to go to a university that otherwise would have been out of my reach, no matter how far we stretched. We didn't have student loans and the kind of scholarships that exist now. I was a soldier and I had the GI bill. It armed me with an avenue to the future not simply because, as I have said here before, of the subjects I studied but because of the horizons that were opened to me about what could be, not that to which I was accustomed.

My experiences taught me about giving back. It is an honor and a privilege to be able to give back, whether it is to help create an industry—Senator BYRD referred to our business success. Two colleagues and I started a business, as they say, without a dime. Today, that company employs not 16,000, as it did when I came to the Senate in 1983, but 33,000 people. It is a business that was begun by three kids, literally, who came from the wrong side of town—the right side of the street but the wrong side of town. On our side of the street there were hard-working people. Most of them were immigrants, I would say. They knew they had to work with their hands to make a living. They weren't the scientists, the doctors, and the professionals we see today coming out of colleges. They didn't even have a chance, for the most part, to get to high school. So we created an industry, not just a company. What good fortune there was in our lives. The fact is that we are all healthy and we have terrific grandchildren. I have eight of them and the oldest is only 6, and they are more satisfied to see and talk to Senator BYRD than anything else in life.

The next great honor to me, after fatherhood, was to come to the Senate and to be able to be in this body—even with all of its defects—which reflects the structure of man and the structure of community. But if you look beyond the defects, you can see how many great people have come through this place and how many great people have yet to be recognized who are now Members of this great institution.

Mr. President, I leave with considerable misgivings. I am not happy about the decision I have made to leave. I do know this: Just as we came at different times in our lives, others will follow us who will also make contributions, who also will do the right thing for the people of our country. This country is in good hands. Every moment may not be a great moment, but this country's fundamentals are in place to make sure society will continue to grow and progress and harmonize in the years ahead. When we look at the defects, we see problems here and there and everywhere. But look beyond that. Look at the number of great people we have in our country who are fair-minded people. Look at what is happening now in the Presidential race, where one fellow is an Orthodox Jew who has been accepted and embraced across the country because the country is so fair. They

are looking at this person as an individual and judging him on his ability to serve. That is what tells us about the character of our people. When you look at places in Government, you see people who, though listed as minorities, are great achievers, whether in administrative posts or law or science. That is what we are looking at as we look ahead into this 21st century.

I thank all of my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats. I believe that I am considered at times an argumentative fellow by some of my colleagues on the other side. That doesn't mean there is no affection.

One of the things that Senator BYRD portrays is character—a very special kind of character.

It is amazing to me how much respect and admiration one can have for people with whom one can have enormous differences and yet have incredible affection for them because they are respected for their beliefs, even though those beliefs may differ at times with the ones you hold. Whether it is the most ardent progressive or liberal or the most ardent conservative, they are done honestly. They are expressed honestly with respect for people.

That should be our mission—not to try to overturn or lecture people at various stages, but when someone comes here, having been selected by his or her State to serve, that is their entrance to the debate; their entrance to legislate; their entrance to decision-making and how this country is going to function.

I don't want to leave here with a tear in my eye. I may feel that way, perhaps, but I am so proud that I was able to serve my country and to be a part of the Senate.

Senator BYRD could give you the statistics immediately. I round it off. I think it is about 1,820 people—1,853. I knew Senator BYRD would be precise—1,853 have had the privilege of serving here since the founding of this country.

Think about it. Millions of people have lived and passed through society, and, in all those 200 years, 1,853 have been granted the honor and the privilege of serving here.

When it comes time to pack up the bags and leave, I will not do it necessarily willingly, but I will do it gratefully, knowing that I have had a chance to be here to witness history in the making, which occurs almost daily, and to know that someday one of my grandchildren—the oldest is six; he has some way to go before he goes to college—will be able to look in the database from his home, from his school, and say: There was my grandfather. He was the one who stopped smoking on airplanes. He was the one who raised the drinking age to 21—saving thousands of families from having to mourn the loss of a child. But he was the one who did other things to help this country that will last way beyond his service in the Senate.

I say to Senator BYRD that when he gives testimonial, it has meaning and

credibility. It is special, and I truly appreciate it.

Mr. President, I ask whether the Senate is going to remain open for a while or do we have an order that would have us be closing down soon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no such order.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am thoroughly upset about what is happening in the Middle East—watching people cower in fear, and some dying moments later as violence escalates. It is a terrible sight to see on television. It is a terrible sight to see in pictures and in the newspapers. It is terrible news to hear reports that after so much effort and so much concern for peace there is this carnage.

I think everyone probably knows that I have had a longtime interest in Israel. I have been there many times. But I also have an active interest in a peace resolution. I got to know some of our friends in the Palestinian community. I got to know Mr. Arafat and the people who assisted him—and the Palestinian Authority.

Whether a child is Jewish or Moslem or whether he or she is an Israeli citizen or whether he or she is someone out of the refugee camps in Palestine and the surrounding areas, or from the nation of Lebanon, I don't like to see any child taken from a family.

I want to make a point. I visited Gaza. I was at the airport just weeks before it opened—maybe days. It was very close in time. I was very enthusiastic about giving help to the Palestinians to get their economy going and providing some hope and vision for them so their lives could be improved and their freedoms expanded.

I think it is fair to say that Israel is taking enormous risks in that promotion, particularly the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Barak, who went further, I believe, than anybody else in Israel. We all know that Prime Minister Rabin was assassinated because of his beliefs by someone in the Israeli community of the same faith—Jewish. He died for his interest in peace.

But I don't understand how there can be joy expressed in the destruction of Joseph's tomb or to see books and artifacts destroyed and burned, and people taking joy and gloating over the killing of an Israeli. They are people who are beyond control. We condemn their acts of violence against the Arabs in the area and within the state of Israel. I condemn that violence. It is not acceptable wherever it occurs.

However, I say to the Palestinian Authority, they have no right to use weapons that were given to provide police and law enforcement against the country that gave it to them in the first place. They have no right to promote violence, no right to have television programs coming over Palestinian television that talk about it being necessary to kill people in Israel, to destroy the country.

That kind of action, that kind of encouragement, is antithetical to the possibilities of peace or the possibilities of life. Anti-Semitic articles, cartoons, and newspapers, whether it be in Syria or even with our friends in Egypt or Lebanon, are unacceptable. Those are the kinds of things that ultimately promote violent action from one people to another.

I want our friends—Mr. Arafat, the people in the Palestinian Authority—to understand they will get nowhere by promoting assaults on Israel, whether they be on person or territory. It is not going to do them any good in the final analysis. A state of conflict, of war, is going to be painful to people on both sides. There will be no victors.

Help came from the United States to try to elevate the standard of living in the Palestinian community because people such as I promoted it. I was active on the issue. I wanted to show good faith and provide funds for the Palestinians to get their airport open. I visited the economic settlements they were erecting, development settlements to give jobs to people, to give hope to people. I supported it enthusiastically.

I think what is going on is unacceptable by any standard. The United Nations resolution issued last week was so lopsided that it looked as if they were trying to eliminate Israel from the family of nations. I don't understand it—encouraging the criticism of Israel and denigrating Israeli efforts to make peace, at some considerable risk again, as we have seen. Those young men captured and taken someplace in Lebanon or wherever, captured by a group that considers violence the way to resolve things—Hezbollah is proud of the fact they kidnap people. That is not the way peace is going to evolve or relationships develop.

I hope sense will come to the area very soon because what we see there is not, in my view, a limited conflict but, rather, a possibility that we will be seeing a conflict that will be very hard to put out. I hope we will soon hear better news from that area. I urge Mr. Arafat to curb violence where he sees it among his people. It cannot be fostered. It cannot be encouraged and at the same time gain the advantages that I am sure he would like to see for his people; that is, a peaceful existence and an improved quality of life.

I yield the floor and 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. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of

the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2000 budget through September 30, 2000. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2001 concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 290), which replaced the 2000 concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 68).

The estimates show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by \$19.3 billion in budget authority and by \$20.6 billion in outlays. Current level is \$28 million below the revenue floor in 2000.

Since my last report, dated September 5, 2000, the Congress has cleared, and the President has signed, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-259). This action changed the 2000 current level of budget authority and outlays.

This is my last report for fiscal year 2000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following material.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2000.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2000 budget and are current through September 30, 2000. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, which replaced H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000.

Since my last report, dated July 26, 2000, the Congress has cleared, and the President has signed, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-259).

This action changed budget authority and outlays.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosures.

TABLE 1.—FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2000

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget resolution	Current level ¹	Current level over/under resolution
On-budget:			
Budget Authority	1,467.3	1,486.6	19.3
Outlays	1,441.1	1,461.7	20.6
Revenues	1,465.5	1,465.5	(?)
Debt Subject to Limit	5,628.3	5,579.2	-49.1
Off-budget:			
Social Security Outlays	326.5	326.5	0.0
Social Security Revenues	479.6	479.6	0.0

¹ Current level is the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest information from the U.S. Treasury.

² Less than \$50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES, AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,465,480
Permanents and other spending legislation	876,140	836,751	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	869,318	889,756	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-284,184	-284,184	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions	1,461,274	1,442,323	1,465,480
Enacted this session:			
Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176)	7	3	0
Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act (P.L. 106-181)	2,805	0	0
Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200)	53	52	-8
Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-224)	5,500	5,500	0
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 106-246)	15,173	13,799	0
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 106-259)	1,779	0	0
Total, enacted this session	25,317	19,354	-8
Entitlements and mandates: Adjustments to appropriated mandates to reflect baseline estimates	-35	0	n.a.
Total Current Level	1,486,556	1,461,677	1,465,472
Total Budget Resolution	1,467,300	1,441,100	1,465,500
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	19,256	20,577	n.a.
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	28
Memorandum: Emergency designations for bills enacted this session	35,261	16,108	0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L.=Public Law; n.a.=not applicable.

SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has, again, thwarted the will of a bipartisan majority of the Congress.

After strong votes in both the House and Senate to lift sanctions on the sale of food and medicine to Cuba, the Republican conferees on the Agriculture appropriations bill have added a provision to prohibit public financing which makes it virtually certain that few, if any, sales will actually occur.

It is bad for America's farmers, bad for the people of Cuba, and bad foreign policy.

Even worse, the conferees would codify the restrictions on travel to Cuba, a position which is at odds with the fundamental right of every American to travel freely.

Senator DODD and I introduced legislation earlier this year that would lift the ban on travel to Cuba. It is ironic—

or I should say it is outrageous—that Americans can travel to North Korea, or Syria, or Vietnam, but not Cuba. What a hypocritical, self-defeating, anachronistic policy.

Senator DODD spoke eloquently last Friday about this misguided provision and I want to associate myself with his remarks. I will not take more time today.

But I want to say that this is a terrible decision, a partisan decision, a decision driven by politics, and one of the many, many reasons why the election on November 7 is so important. It is far past time that we inject some intelligence and bipartisanship into our foreign policy.

This Congress has had its chance. It has fallen short in too many ways to count. This decision on Cuba is just another example of the 106th Congress' failures to do what is right for America, and right for the American people.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge that October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

During this month, a number of public and private agencies, organizations, and foundations will increase their efforts to make Americans more aware of the impact of this disease, as well as the need for early detection and increased resources to search for better treatments and ultimately for a cure.

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among all women, and the leading cause of cancer death among women aged 40 to 55. By age 80, women have a 1-in-12 chance of developing the disease. This year alone, an estimated 175,000 women and 1,300 men will be diagnosed with breast cancer. Of those diagnosed, more than

41,000 women and 400 men can be expected to die from the disease. 41,000 women, that is about 117 per day—117 mothers, daughters, wives, and sisters whose lives will be cut short and whose families will be devastated by their loss. And, as I noted, the disease can also affect men with no less impact on them and their families.

But many of these deaths can be prevented, through regular screening and early detection and treatment. In fact, if detected early through self-exams and mammograms, the survival rate for most types of breast cancer exceeds 90 percent. And, while the number of breast cancer diagnoses continues at an unacceptably high level, the overall survival rate is increasing. We are beginning to turn the tide against breast cancer.

Though the phenomenal activities of private groups like the Susan G. Komen Foundation, of which I am proud to have been a founding supporter, more and more women are getting the message: get smart and get screened. Through events like the wildly popular "Race for the Cure," the Komen foundation has also raised over \$215 million to help fund breast cancer research. My friend Nancy Brinker, sister of the late Susan G. Komen, has led the group from an idea to a leading force in health care that has, without doubt, helped to save and improve thousands of women's lives.

Many other groups and individuals are also helping to further the cause. The National Alliance of Breast Cancer Organizations has worked to expand research and public education in this area. The Y-ME National Breast Cancer Organization is another group that has been very active in supporting those directly and indirectly affected by breast cancer.

With regard to research, I have worked with my colleagues in the Senate, leaders like Senator MACK of Florida and Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania, to ensure that our Federal commitment to disease research, and particularly that for breast cancer, continues to grow.

We have made remarkable progress. While federally-supported breast cancer research was not a large part of our overall federal disease research budget even a few years ago, that has changed dramatically in recent years. NIH funding alone on breast cancer totaled almost \$500 million last year, and is expected to top \$525 million this year. In fact, over the last decade, NIH breast cancer research funding has increased by 600 percent.

In addition, I have worked hard as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to ensure that our breast cancer research that is conducted under the auspices of the DOD health research infrastructure continues. This contributes an additional \$175-plus million per year to this cause.

Most recently, I was proud to have joined forces with my colleague, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, to extend the

issuance of the Postal Service's new Breast Cancer Awareness Stamp. To date, over 214 million of these stamps have been sold, generating \$15.1 million for research. The first round of grant announcement using these funds was actually just made. These funds will support innovative and promising new research opportunities in understanding and treating breast cancer.

These efforts have begun to pay off. Through the development of ever-more effective diagnostic tools, like digital mammography, and through the development of innovative new treatment and preventative drugs, like Tamoxifen, we are slowly but surely beginning to get the upper hand on this disease.

But early detection remains the key. That is why the American Cancer Society recommendations on screening are so important: women aged 40 and above should have annual mammograms and clinical breast examinations; women aged 20 to 39 should have clinical examinations every three years; and all women 20 and over should conduct a breast self-examination every month.

Finally, I would note that the Senate just this week passed the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, a bill that ensures that women who do not have health insurance and who are found to have either breast or cervical cancer through the Federal Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, will get the follow-up care they need.

We have come a long way from the days when former First Lady Betty Ford brought breast cancer out into the national discourse, beginning the long overdue dialogue and public awareness campaign to save women's lives. But we still have much to do to match her courage and to live-up to her vision of the day when all women are appropriately screened and when we defeat breast cancer once and for all.

During this month, I urge my colleagues in Congress and all Americans to reflect upon this issue, to support research and efforts, and to arm themselves with the knowledge they need to respond should the unthinkable occur in their lives or in the lives of a loved one. Working together, we can and will beat breast cancer.

CHINA'S CONVENTIONAL FORCE MILITARY MODERNIZATION

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I call attention to a report prepared at my request by the Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service entitled "China's Foreign Conventional Arms Acquisitions: Background and Analysis." As ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I have been keenly interested in the implications of Chinese conventional force modernization on Asian stability.

I am providing copies of this excellent analysis, which was authorized by

Shirley Kan, Christopher Bolkcom, and Ronald O'Rourke, to all Senators. I believe my colleagues will find the report useful and insightful as we assess American policy towards China.

The report examines the major foreign conventional weapon systems that China has acquired or has committed to acquire since 1990, with particular attention to implications for U.S. security concerns. It pays special attention to Chinese air and naval acquisitions and describes how Chinese leaders began to pay greater attention to modernizing the People's Liberation Army, PLA, in the early 1990s, transforming it from a force mainly oriented towards domestic security to one focused on modern warfare. Since then, China has ranked among the top 10 leading arms buyers among developing nations.

According to the analysis, the catalyst for PLA modernization, including the procurement of advanced foreign military equipment, was China's view that its top security problem was preventing Taiwan's permanent separation and securing unification as "one China." However, additional security goals may be precluding Japan's rise as the strongest Asian power, ensuring Chinese influence over the Korean Peninsula, supporting Chinese claims to territory in the East and South China Seas, subduing India's quest for power, and countering American power in the region.

As China modernizes its forces, it is clear that arms sales from Russia are essential, providing advance aircraft, including Su-27 fighters, missile systems, submarines, and surface ships. The report is unclear as to the strategic advantage derived by Russia in selling such advanced systems to a country with which it historically has had difficulty along a shared border.

The report concludes that the operational significance of these major qualitative upgrades through foreign arms acquisitions remains to be seen and will depend in large measure on the PLA's ability to demonstrate an ability to conduct effective joint military operations.

The report also does an excellent job of comparing Chinese new conventional weapons to American capabilities, suggesting that in most cases—with some critical exceptions—American forces still retain a tactical and strategic edge. For example, the report mentions the potential threat from a nuclear armed SS-N-22, an anti-ship cruise missile, and the superior capabilities of the Su-27 fighter aircraft. Obviously, the United States should not be complacent. The Chinese are, for the first time in modern history, developing a capability to project air and naval forces beyond their coastal areas. The United States needs to seek ways to address any threat to American interests as a result of that capability not only through pursuing our own military modernization program but also through a strategic dialogue with China which reassures China that we

have a shared desire in regional stability. Indeed, in many ways, initiating a productive diplomatic dialogue with China on Asian security may be more difficult than maintaining our qualitative edge on power projection.

Again, I commend this excellent report by the Congressional Research Service which was coordinated by Shirley Kan, a specialist in National Security Policy. It is one of the most comprehensive, unclassified assessments currently available on Chinese conventional arms acquisitions.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but 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 the names of some of those who have 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 some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

October 10, 1999:

Delbert Deaton, Dallas, TX; Sedric Gillespie, 24, Denver, CO; Julian Lanier, 31, Denver, CO; Maria-Teresa Marquicias, San Francisco, CA; Dexter Lamont McKee, 19, Washington, DC; Cherry L. Minor, 22, New Orleans, LA; Donald Nelms, 56, Hollywood, FL; Jack Nowlin, 63, Miami-Dade County, FL; Joseph Ridual, San Francisco, CA; Noel Ridual, San Francisco, CA; Cliff Roberts, 22, Bloomington, IN; Baltazar Torres, 18, Wilmington, DE; Craig Watkins, 23, Baltimore, MD; Derrick White, 30, Oakland, CA; Anthony M. Witt, 27, Chicago, IL; Unidentified Male, 26, Norfolk, VA; and Unidentified Male, San Francisco, CA.

One victim of gun violence I mentioned, 22-year-old Cherry Minor of New Orleans, was pregnant when she was shot and killed one year ago today. Cherry was at home with her two small children and a friend when her husband forced his way into her house and shot her in the head. Cherry was separated from her husband, who police say had a history of domestic violence.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

CUBA POLICY AND SENATE PROCESSES

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish we were here on the Senate floor discussing and debating the important issues that are in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill. I strenuously object to the fact that we are not

doing just that. This bill will not be debated on the floor today, or probably any day this session. In fact, we will likely have no opportunity to debate this bill, to offer amendments, or to vote on it. The plan is to wrap it up in an omnibus bill of some sort as the session ends.

This is no way to legislate. This is no way to lead. This goes against the very basis of what our country is about. Our Government is based on principles of transparency and openness. Our processes are supposed to be open to public scrutiny and comment.

Robert Hutchins, former President of the University of Chicago and one of the most esteemed American intellectuals of the 20th century, wrote:

The death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush. It will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference, and undernourishment.

Senators have been disenfranchised because of a distorted legislative process. And that means the American citizens who sent us to represent them have also been disenfranchised. I object to how this Congress is being run.

There are many important issues that should be of concern to Senators in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill. I will take a few moments today to address one of those issues. It needs public vetting, even if we are being deprived of our rights to debate it and vote on it.

The issue is TV Marti. This is a television station owned and operated by the U.S. Government. It broadcasts daily to Cuba. For more than a decade we beamed TV signals to Havana. The problem is that no one watches TV Marti. No one. And under this appropriations bill, we will spend another \$9.5 million next year on a television station that no one watches. Let me explain.

The creation of TV Marti and Radio Marti was a good idea conceptually. With no freedom in Cuba, the United States Government would beam into Cuba uncensored news about the world and about what was really going on inside Cuba. The Cuban people, deprived of their freedoms, would have a source of news.

What has TV Marti accomplished since its creation in 1989? Has it penetrated the Cuban television market and provided the Cuban people with information that Castro wants to hide from them? The answer is a resounding no. Virtually nobody in Cuba has even heard of TV Marti. According to research commissioned by the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the agency that runs TV Marti, 9 out of 10 Cubans don't even know it exists.

The same research by the Broadcasting Board of Governors asked over 1,000 adults whether they had watched TV Marti in the past week. The answer was no one had watched. Not a single person. How many had watched TV Marti in the past year? One. One person out of a thousand.

Most Cubans watch television. None watches TV Marti. There are two major reasons.

First, TV Marti is on the air when Cubans are asleep. It broadcasts only from 3:30 in the morning until 8:00 A.M. TV Marti has to respect international broadcast rules which require that it not interfere with Cuban TV transmissions. So TV Marti can broadcast only when no Cuban station wants to use the same frequency. That is, it broadcasts when nobody watches television.

Second, there is nothing to see. It is just snow on the screen. The Cuban government has effectively jammed the video portion of TV Marti since its inception.

So, for \$9.5 million in the coming fiscal year, \$139 million over the last decade, another \$100 million over the next decade, we ask Cubans to get up in the middle of the night to watch snow on a blank screen. This makes no sense at all.

Last year, some changes were made in TV Marti, although they are not likely to result in Cuban citizens watching.

Defenders of TV Marti contend that it is a long-term investment. They say that someday Fidel Castro will be gone. When that happens, we will want to get accurate information to the Cuban people. Defenders of TV Marti claim that we will save money by having TV Marti up and running at that point.

I don't buy this argument. So far we have spent \$139 million to have TV Marti in place in case Castro suddenly leaves the scene. At the rate of spending in this appropriations bill, we will spend more than \$100 million over the coming decade. That is, total spending of a quarter of a billion dollars for a contingency when Radio Marti is already operating and can get information to Cuban citizens. Is this cost effective? Hardly.

TV Marti is a dinosaur, a relic of the Cold War. We should not spend another \$10 million to preserve a worthless skeleton. We should bury it once and for all this year.

I am compelled by the events of last week in the Agricultural Appropriations conference to raise another aspect of our Cuba policy. Earlier this year, both the Senate and the House agreed, by overwhelmingly majorities, to end the ban on food and medicine sales to Cuba. The votes clearly reflected the will of the American people. Yet the Republican majority on this conference rejected the House and Senate votes and thwarted the will of the people. They agreed to maintain restrictions on the sale of food and medicine that make any significant progress virtually impossible.

Then, to make matters worse, the Republican conferees converted current administrative restrictions on travel to Cuba into legal restrictions. The result is that the right of Americans to travel freely, and the right of

Cuban Americans to visit family members in Cuba, are going to be abridged more than ever.

This is a travesty of our democracy. How can we allow a small group in the Republican leadership to flaunt the overwhelming will of the Congress, to maintain an anachronistic, Cold War policy toward Cuba that harms the average Cuban and risks great danger once the transition from the Castro regime begins, and to abridge the rights and freedom of Americans? I am profoundly unhappy with this result, and I protest the way this legislative process is being conducted.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ANNIVERSARY OF THE LITHONIA FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

• Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, in my lifetime, I have witnessed many changes, experienced fantastic joys, and seen countless faces. It is easy in today's fast-moving society to find yourself caught in a perpetual whirlwind. With days full of appointments and meetings, life sometimes seems to lose all semblance of stability. Luckily, I have always had a source of peace and inspiration in my life, Lithonia First United Methodist Church.

With great personal pride and happiness, I come before you today to commemorate an anniversary that is of particular importance to my family and me. One hundred-forty years ago, on Sunday, October 14, 1860, a small group of Lithonians convened for the first time to worship under the leadership of the Reverend Newdaygate B. Ousley. From its humble beginnings in a one room meeting house, Lithonia Methodist Episcopal Church, the forerunner to Lithonia First United Methodist Church began its ministry and a tradition of service that continues even today.

It is ironic that a church that grew during the tumult of the Civil War has lasted as long as Lithonia First has. In fact, it is perhaps even more astounding that over the years since its first meeting, during a time that has seen two world wars and countless technological innovations, the church has pulled even closer together and taken on a significant leadership role in its Georgia community.

For 140 years, Lithonia First United Methodist Church has provided services and leadership for the surrounding region. Through personal outreach, family ministry, and organizing events like flea markets and barbecues to raise money for the needy, Lithonia First has solidified its place of leadership in its community.

Since its simple beginnings, Lithonia First United Methodist Church has grown and become a source of stability and inspiration for its congregants. Under the ministry of its Pastor, Dr. Lawrence E. Wilson, the church has

proven how important faith is to our prosperity, and illustrated the power of a community united. It is my pleasure to honor Lithonia First United Methodist Church for its historic anniversary. I am forever grateful for the church's acceptance, dedication, and commitment, I am truly blessed to be a part of such a wonderful community.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TERRY WILCUTT

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Kentuckian Terry Wilcutt on the occasion of his recent journey to the International Space Station as commander of the space shuttle Atlantis.

Congratulations to Colonel Wilcutt, on achieving the kind of academic and professional success it takes to receive the honor of commanding a flight into space. Colonel Wilcutt has flown to space not once, but four times, and on two such flights he has held the title of mission commander. I, along with my fellow Kentuckians, am certainly proud to call him one of Kentucky's own. His accomplishments speak well for his home state as well as his alma mater, Western Kentucky University.

Colonel Wilcutt is a Kentuckian, born and bred. He was born in Russellville, KY, graduated from Louisville's Southern High School in 1967, and is a 1974 graduate of Western Kentucky University with a bachelor of arts degree in math. Colonel Wilcutt taught high school math for 2 years and then entered the Marine Corps. While in the Marine Corps, he attended the notorious "Topgun" Naval Fighter Weapons School, achieved honors at every level of pilot training and has logged over 4,400 flight hours in more than 30 different aircraft.

Colonel Wilcutt's career in aeronautics began in 1990 when he was selected by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, to become an astronaut. Prior to his September 2000 trip to space, Colonel Wilcutt flew on three missions to space and logged more than 724 hours in space.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the Senate, I congratulate you on your accomplishments. Only a handful of Americans reach the level of excellence required and receive the honor of being selected to lead missions into space. Colonel Wilcutt, I am proud of you, your fellow Kentuckians are proud of you, and your alma mater of Western Kentucky University is proud of you. Thank you for your brave service to our country, and best wishes for further success in the future.●

PRAISING THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS EXECUTIVE ORDER PROMOTING FEDERAL CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I speak today to commend the President for

issuing Executive Order 11625, designed to help strengthen the Federal Government's commitment to providing contracting opportunities to disadvantaged businesses.

In 1998, I took to the floor to successfully defend the Transportation Department's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program from those who sought to weaken it. Today, I am pleased to speak out in favor of the President's efforts to strengthen programs like the DBE, along with all minority-owned business government contracting programs.

It should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber familiar with small businesses, especially minority owned firms, that government contracting can help provide a strong foundation to build a prosperous small business. As any successful graduate of the Small Business Administration's 8(a) program will tell you, it provides the opportunities, but you have to supply the entrepreneurial spirit and hard work.

And this hand-up approach is what I mean by assisting minority-owned firms. These programs are not a hand-out. Rather, they exist to help level the playing field and to combat the inequities in our society that may prevent these firms from receiving the same opportunities available to other businesses.

These contracts are beneficial not just because they provide initial contracts to small disadvantaged firms, they also help minority firms establish a record of providing goods and services to the Federal Government. This is of critical importance because it assists these businesses in obtaining future contracts. In turn, these firms help provide jobs and competition to larger businesses, saving the taxpayers money through reduced costs and time saving innovations. Thus, these programs have direct and indirect benefits to our economy at all levels.

The Executive Order signed by President Clinton on Friday will help strengthen minority business ownership by directing Federal agencies to take affirmative steps to increase contracting between the Federal government and Small Disadvantaged Businesses, 8(a) Businesses, and Minority Business Enterprises. The Executive Order also holds Federal agencies accountable for carrying out the terms of the Order by requiring them to develop a long-term strategic plan and to submit annual reports to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) of their efforts to increase contracting with disadvantaged businesses; requires Federal agencies to ensure the participation of small and disadvantaged businesses when procuring information technology and telecommunications services; and directs Federal departments and agencies to ensure that all creation, placement, and transmission of federal advertising are fully reflective of the nation's diversity.

I applaud President Clinton's action to help ensure the vitality of minority-

owned small businesses. As the Senior Democrat on the Senate Committee on Small Business and a long time supporter of these programs, I urge OMB to forward the agencies' plans and their implementation reports to the House and Senate Committees on Small Business for further review.●

HEALTHIER BABIES MONTH

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, today I rise to applaud the support the March of Dimes provides for the Campaign for Healthier Babies Month. This month focuses attention on the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation and its many efforts to reduce the more than 150,000 birth defects which occur every year.

Debilitating birth defects leave our kids unable to walk, hear, think, or fight off disease. However, with the support of organizations like March of Dimes, community health programs, and especially local advocacy groups, the number of children affected by some 5,000 different types of birth defects continues to steadily decline. Since 1960, infant deaths related to birth defects have been cut in half due to increased awareness and medical advances in both surgery and specialized care in neonatal intensive care units.

The March of Dimes Foundation has played a major role in increasing the likelihood that children with birth defects will live to see their first birthday. Over the last decade, scientists have discovered that women who take a daily supplement of B vitamin folic acid in combination with a healthy diet—especially before pregnancy—greatly reduce the chances of their child being affected by birth defects.

Another vital step in reducing the chances of birth defects is the accessibility of prenatal care. My own state of Minnesota has one of America's finest health care systems and, as a result, ranks in the top ten states with regard to low birth-weight and infant mortality. But there are many states that are not as fortunate, and I firmly believe recognition of this campaign will help drive change which can have a profound impact on prenatal and perinatal care.

In the 105th Congress, the March of Dimes was instrumental in the passage of the Birth Defects Prevention Act, which established the first nationwide network of birth defects monitoring programs. I am confident the law complements March of Dime's efforts in the areas of both alcohol avoidance in preventing Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and the folic acid vitamin supplement program in preventing neural tube defects, NTDs. NTDs are among the most serious and common birth defects in the United States affecting some 2,500 babies each year, and are a result of an underdeveloped brain and spinal cord. The most common NTD is spina bifida, a leading cause of childhood paralysis.

Birth defects like these can affect any family. As we head into the new

millennium, filled with endless possibilities, I am proud and honored to be able to pay tribute to those whose tireless efforts result in dramatic reductions in the number of birth defects in the United States every year.●

TRIBUTE TO FORMER GOVERNOR LEROY COLLINS

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, amid the violence and uncertainty of the Civil Rights movement, many people distinguished themselves while fighting for fairness and justice. Men and women risked great personal harm and displayed unparalleled courage in a struggle none of us must ever forget. Although many of the names of those who fought for fairness have been lost to history, it is important to honor these selfless warriors of equality.

Although his name is not as familiar as those of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and James Farmer, Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida, played an instrumental role in preventing violence and ensuring the success of demonstrations one fateful Spring day in Selma, AL, 35 years ago. As marchers arrived at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, they hoped against hope that a repeat of "Bloody Sunday" was not waiting for them.

President Lyndon Johnson, having witnessed the unconscionable violence initiated by Alabama State troopers on March 7, 1965, sought to stave off another potentially bloody day, and entrusted LeRoy Collins with the delicate task of easing the extremely tense situation.

Over the course of the day, Mr. Collins crisscrossed the Pettus Bridge, negotiating at either end with Dr. King and representatives of the Alabama police. After a tireless effort, Mr. Collins eventually secured an agreement that not only allowed the marchers to cross the bridge, but also prevented the violent clash so many people had feared. Later that day, with Alabama State troopers and the entire Nation looking on, 2,000 people led by Dr. King peacefully marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

In an era known for its heated violence, peaceful encounters were a welcome surprise. The nonviolent nature of the second march across the Pettus Bridge was in no small measure a result of LeRoy Collins diligence and courage. One can imagine that had a deal not been brokered, an encounter, possibly more violent than the one on "Bloody Sunday," could very easily have taken place.

LeRoy Collins' work illustrates why it is important to go beyond the stories printed in the history books. His hard work and selfless effort saved lives and empowered the movement led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In a world seemingly devoid of real heroes, it is important to honor those who have made truly significant contributions to our Nation. It took a great man to accomplish what Mr. Collins did. As Dr.

King once wrote, "Human progress never rolls on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God."●

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today, October 10th, is the 89th observance of National Day in the Republic of China on Taiwan. From its early days of struggle on the Chinese mainland to the establishment of the vigorous democracy and free market economy that we know today on Taiwan, the Republic of China has made great strides since its founding on October 10, 1911.

The vision of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the Republic of China, was expressed in what he called the "Three Principles of the People"—nationalism, democracy, and the people's well being. We all hope that Dr. Sun's vision, which has been realized so impressively on Taiwan, will some day be equally as true on the Chinese mainland.

Taiwan held its most recent parliamentary election in December 1998 and, of course, conducted its most recent presidential election just this past March. The election of Chen Shui-bian as president marked Taiwan's first transition of power from one party to another at the national level. Even more important, it marked the first time in the 5,000-year-long history of Chinese society that one democratically-elected head of state was succeeded by another.

In the economic and social fields, Taiwan's success is well known. The 22 million people of Taiwan are responsible for the 19th largest gross national product in the world. Japan is the only country with a larger population in all of Asia that has a higher standard of living than Taiwan's. Taiwan has an extraordinarily diversified economy: all the way from being virtually a "silicon island" and the world's third largest supplier of computer chips to being a major manufacturing power in such heavy industries as steel and shipbuilding.

All of this has not come about by accident. Wise leadership, dating back to the 1950's, laid the groundwork for the dynamic nation we see today. With strong and continued American support—and this is ever more crucial to the security and stability of the entire East Asia region—Taiwan will thrive and prosper far into the future. Believe me, the world is watching to see how the United States treats democratic Taiwan, because the future of every other democracy in East Asia is ultimately contingent on the stand we take.

The success of Taiwan must also continue to serve as an example—as well as a challenge—to the people and government on the Chinese mainland. The free, prosperous, democratic society that Taiwan has become is a glimpse of what can come to be on the mainland if

the dictatorship in Beijing would get out of the way.

And so I salute the Republic of China on Taiwan on the occasion of National Day. And I look forward to many more celebrations to come.●

THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SPARTAN MARCHING BAND

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to give recognition to one of Michigan State University's oldest institutions, the Spartan Marching Band. The Spartan Marching Band was formed in 1870 at the then Michigan Agricultural College, by Civil War Veteran and student Ransom Mc Donough. The band consisted of ten members and was all brass. The small group participated in drills and parades.

Throughout its 130 years, the band has evolved tremendously with the times as any successful organization must. And throughout its long history, the band has exemplified excellence and has represented the university with great pride and honor. The Michigan State University Marching Band welcomed the football team and fans for over 100 years and has accompanied the team to numerous bowl games, including four Rose Bowl appearances. The band has played for four presidents and appeared at the New York World's Fair.

The person who had perhaps the most significant impact on the Spartan Marching Band was Leonard Falcone. Mr. Falcone was appointed band director in 1927 and served Michigan State university and the Music program for 40 years. Mr. Falcone was affectionately known as "The Dean of Big Ten Bands." Aside from his unprecedented tenure, Mr. Falcone is credited with arranging the music to the MSU Alma Mater, "MSU Shadows" and composing the music to the greatest college fight song in the world, the "MSU Fight Song." So revered was Mr. Falcone that on the eve of his death in 1985, former and present members of the Spartan Marching Band visited him and serenaded him with the "MSU Fight Son" and "MSU Shadows."

The Spartan Marching Band has continuously set the standard for the Nation's marching bands. It is well known throughout our State and Nation for its innovative and intricate marching style and excellent musical arrangements. Through its long legacy, which continues today under the fine leadership of band director John T. Madden, the Spartan Marching Band continues to set the standard for Michigan State pride.

Through its achievements the Spartan Marching Band has represented the face of Michigan State University for the past 130 years. From its street beat cadence called "The Series," to the traditional "Kick-Step" entrance into the stadium for pregame, to the singing of "MSU Shadows," to Military regimental traditions adhered to by all

members, the Spartan Marching Band is a true ambassador of Michigan State University. As a Michigan State University Alumnus, I would like to thank the Spartan Marching Band for its contributions to MSU pride and congratulate all members of the 300 plus-member band of today and all past members of the Spartan Marching Band on 130 years of tradition, excellence, innovation, and pride. Go Green!●

TRIBUTE TO ELLEN WILLIAMS

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my good friend Ellen Williams for her tremendous work as chairwoman of the Kentucky Republican Party.

To say that Ellen Williams is a busy woman is quite the understatement. Besides being a wife, Mom, soccer coach, and part-time career woman, Ellen is chairwoman of the Republican Party of Kentucky. She has a history of service spanning more than 15 years, which includes work in President Reagan's 1984 reelection campaign, Larry Forgy's 1995 gubernatorial campaign, and as state executive director of the Kentucky Republican Party in 1992-93. Ellen has shared her time, knowledge, and spirit with Kentucky Republicans over the last several years, and she continues to share her able leadership skills with us now as chairwoman of our party.

Ellen is a confident, capable leader. In her position as chairwoman, one of her many responsibilities is to be the voice of the Kentucky Republican Party. Ellen makes it her business to have her finger on the pulse of the State's Republicans. Considering the liberal leaning nature of the Kentucky press, I am fully aware of the challenge that being a spokesperson presents. Ellen is a true professional when it comes to dealing with the media, and handles each statement she gives and each press conference she holds with style and grace.

Another part of Ellen's job is to rally Kentucky Republicans for local, State and national races. This responsibility requires her to do a great deal of traveling—a recent Anderson News article says that Ellen has driven nearly 30,000 miles in the last year going to meetings and party events across the State. The fresh enthusiasm Ellen has brought to her post as chairwoman is invaluable, and I thank you, Ellen, for all that you do.

I also thank your husband, Greg, whom you have referred to as your "co-chairman," and to your two young sons, Sam and Joey. I thank them for sharing you with Kentucky's Republicans, and for the love and support they provide which makes it possible for you to do the excellent job you do.

Ellen leads the party during an exciting time in Kentucky politics and in national politics. Our great state boasts two Republican U.S. Senators, five Republican Members of the U.S. Congress, a Republican majority in the

State senate, and a promising November election for our Presidential nominee, Gov. George W. Bush. As chairman of Bush/Cheney 2000 in Kentucky, I want to say a special thank you, Ellen, for all of your hard work thus far. Thank you in advance for all of the hours of work yet to come before November 7.●

WEB PORTAL ALLIANCE—ZURICH MEDNET

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a recent alliance which has been made between two internationally recognized biomedical web-portals or web-based information exchanges. This alliance, I believe will have a dramatic impact on the way biomedical information is exchanged and used in developing new medical devices, pharmaceutical products, and life-saving medical techniques.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, I, along with my staff, had the pleasure of participating in an event hosted by the Swiss ambassador to the United States, Alfred DeFago, introducing the newly created alliance between MBBNet and Zurich MedNet.

MBBNet, a web portal, administered by the University of Minnesota, together with over 900 medical biotech companies and programs, have been the driving forces behind the accumulation and distribution of medical research and open source information for academicians, medical professionals, and corporate researchers in Minnesota and the United States. Zurich MedNet shares the same history, being the largest medical and biotech cluster in Europe. Together these two exchanges, Zurich MedNet and MBBNet by electronically combining resources, are setting international boundaries aside and taking meaningful strides toward the development and improvement of medical education and innovative medical technologies both here in the United States and abroad. I am convinced that alliances like this will help shape the research and development strategies across all industries in the future and I am pleased that Minnesota has again stepped to the fore and provided that kind of leadership. We all stand to benefit.

I look forward to other industries following the lead that Zurich MedNet and MBBNet have established, and I believe it is a positive step toward international cooperation others should seek to emulate. Mr. President, I would again like to thank Ambassador DeFago, and my colleagues that have helped and supported this endeavor, and I look forward to doing all I can to ensure the future success of this important alliance.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, during the recess

of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4444. An act to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 2:13 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5362. An act to increase the amount of fees charged to employers who are petitioners for the employment of H-1B non-immigrant workers, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JEFFORDS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2725: A bill to provide for a system of sanctuaries for chimpanzees that have been designated as being no longer needed in research conducted or supported by the Public Health Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-494).

By Mr. SMITH, of New Hampshire, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3671: A bill to amend the Acts popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects and increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating opportunities for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and execution of those Acts, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-495).

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 Mr. HAGEL:

S. 3181. A bill to establish the White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 3182. A bill to amend laws relating to the lands of the citizens of the Muscogee (Creek), Seminole, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, historically referred to as the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. Res. 369. A resolution relative to the death of Representative Bruce F. Vento, of Minnesota; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 370. A resolution to increase the authorization for expenditures relating to Senate activities in connection with participation in interparliamentary institutions and the facilitation of foreign interchanges in the United States, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 3182. A bill to amend laws relating to the lands of the citizens of the Muscogee (Creek), Seminole, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, historically referred to as the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

FIVE NATIONS CITIZENS LAND REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill by request of the members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Nations, historically referred to as the "Five Civilized Tribes," who still own individual Indian restricted land or "restricted property."

The proposed bill would repeal aspects of the Stigler Act of 1947—the 1947 Act—and the Act of June 14, 1918—the 1918 Act—which subject the transactions of restricted property to the jurisdiction of Oklahoma's district courts and leave such lands open to adverse possession.

By way of background, the issue of individual restricted Indian lands has had a long legislative history. Between 1906 and 1970, Congress enacted numerous laws dealing specifically with the individually allotted lands of the "Five Civilized Tribes." Collectively, these laws have created a complex system of Indian land tenure in eastern Oklahoma. These laws are unique to eastern Oklahoma and are not applicable either in western Oklahoma or elsewhere in the United States.

Due to these laws, thousands of acres of Indian lands in eastern Oklahoma have gone unprobated for years, causing ownership of these lands to be increasingly fractionated and more difficult to manage for the benefit of the devisees or undetermined heirs. Indian allotments elsewhere in the United States, on the other hand, are generally held in trust under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior. The goal of this legislation is to provide the remaining restricted Indian allotments in eastern Oklahoma, to the greatest extent feasible, with the same kind of protections as are afforded trust allotments in western Oklahoma and all other reservations in the United States. The bill would also include these lands in the national efforts to alleviate the growing problem of fractionated ownership.

Notwithstanding these goals, great lengths have been taken to draft the bill so that it would be "tax neutral" as to the county tax rolls. The bill is written to help preserve what is left of the individual Indian restricted land base, reducing the rate at which the current inventory of restricted property in eastern Oklahoma passes out of restricted status. The bill would not allow Indian members of the Five Civilized Tribes to simply acquire fee land and have it placed in restricted status.

With time very limited in the remaining days of the 106th Congress, I do not intend to rush this bill through Congress, denying adequate hearings and oversight, but simply to demonstrate to all interested parties that this legislation is a serious effort to reform the 1947 act. This bill has been through many drafts in recent months and much progress has been made to achieve a workable bill. I am hopeful that Congress can enact this reform next year.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1020

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

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1536, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act, to modernize programs and services for older individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2608

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2608, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers.

S. 2725

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2725, a bill to provide for a system of sanctuaries for chimpanzees that have been designated as being no longer needed in research conducted or supported by the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

S. 2841

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2841, a bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 3040

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3040, a bill to establish the Commission for the Comprehensive Study of Privacy Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 3071

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3071, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. 3089

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3089, a bill to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

S. 3091

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3091, a bill to implement the recommendations of the General Accounting Office on improving the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 by the Department of Agriculture.

S. 3101

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3101, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow as a deduction in determining adjusted gross income the deduction for expenses in connection with services as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States.

S. 3145

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3145, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment under the tax-exempt bond rules of prepayments for certain commodities.

S. 3147

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3147, a bill to authorize the establishment, on land of the Department of the Interior in the District of Columbia or its environs, of a memorial and gardens in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass.

S. 3152

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3152, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for distressed areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3155

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Oskar Schindler and Varian Fry in recognition of their contributions to the Nation and humanity.

S. 3178

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3178, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the mandatory separation age for Federal firefighters be made the same age that applies with respect to Federal law enforcement officers.

S. RES. 292

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 292, a resolution recognizing the 20th century as the "Century of Women in the United States."

S. RES. 365

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 365, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding recent elections in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 369—RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BRUCE F. VENTO, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 369

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Bruce F. Vento, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns or recesses today, it stand adjourned or recessed as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

SENATE RESOLUTION 370—TO INCREASE THE AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES RELATING TO SENATE ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH PARTICIPATION IN INTERPARLIAMENTARY INSTITUTIONS AND THE FACILITATION OF FOREIGN INTERCHANGES IN THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HELMS submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 370

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FOREIGN INTERCHANGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of Senate Resolution 247, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to February 7, 1962 (as amended by section 3(c) of Senate Resolution 281, Ninety-sixth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1980) is amended by striking "\$25,000" and inserting "\$30,000".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date on which this resolution is agreed to and shall apply to fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

LEAHY (AND CAMPBELL) AMENDMENT NO. 4304

Mr. BROWNBACK (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2413) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests; as follows:

On page 5, redesignate subsection (e) on line 18 as subsection (f) and insert after line 17 the following:

(e) INTERIM DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—For purposes of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, the meaning of the term "armor vest" (as defined in section 2503 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796611-2)) shall, until the date on which a final NIJ Standard 0115.00 is first fully approved and implemented, also include body armor which has been found to meet or exceed the requirements for protection against stabbing established by the State in which the grantee is located.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an associate in my office, Chad Luck, be granted the privilege of the floor during my discussion of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000.

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

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES RELATING TO SENATE ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH PARTICIPATION IN INTERPARLIAMENTARY INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 370, submitted earlier by Senator HELMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 370) to increase the authorization for expenditures relating to Senate activities in connection with participation in interparliamentary institutions and the facilitation of foreign interchanges in the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 370) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 370

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FOREIGN INTERCHANGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of Senate Resolution 247, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to February 7, 1962 (as amended by section 3(c) of Senate Resolution 281, Ninety-sixth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1980) is amended by striking "\$25,000" and inserting "\$30,000".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date on which this resolution is agreed to and shall apply to fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 4302 TO H.R. 2389

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that previously agreed to amendment No. 4302 to H.R. 2389 be modified with the change that is at the desk.

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

The modification is as follows:

Add the following subsection at the end of Section 102:

"SEC. 102(e). TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The payment to an eligible State under this section for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year."

Add the following subsection at the end of Section 103:

"SEC. 103(d). TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The payment to an eligible county under this section for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year."

INCREASE OF FEES CHARGED TO EMPLOYERS RELATIVE TO H-1B NONIMMIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5362 which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5362) to increase the amount of fees charged to employers who are petitioners for the employment of H-1B non-immigrant workers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 5362) was read the third time and passed.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 652, S. 2413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2413) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4304

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, Senators CAMPBELL and LEAHY have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACk], for Mr. LEAHY, for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL, proposes an amendment numbered 4304.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4304

(Purpose: To provide an interim definition for armor vests)

On page 5, redesignate subsection (e) on line 18 as subsection (f) and insert after line 17 the following:

(e) INTERIM DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—For purposes of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, the meaning of the term "armor vest" (as defined in section 2503 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796ll-2)) shall, until the date on which a final NIJ Standard 0115.00 is first fully approved and implemented, also include body armor which has been found to meet or exceed the requirements for protection against stabbing established by the State in which the grantee is located.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 4304) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2413), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2413

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the number of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty would significantly decrease if every law enforcement officer in the United States had the protection of an armor vest;

(2) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, 709 law enforcement officers in the United States were killed in the line of duty;

(3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing an armor vest is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest;

(4) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, bullet-resistant materials helped save the lives of more than 2,000 law enforcement officers in the United States; and

(5) the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements reports that violent crime in Indian country has risen sharply, despite a decrease in the national crime rate, and has concluded that there is a "public safety crisis in Indian country".

SEC. 3. MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ARMOR VESTS.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 2501(f) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The portion" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion";

(2) by striking "subsection (a)" and all that follows through the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting "subsection (a)—

"(A) may not exceed 50 percent; and

"(B) shall equal 50 percent, if—

"(i) such grant is to a unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents;

"(ii) the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance determines that the quantity of vests to be purchased with such grant is reasonable; and

"(iii) such portion does not cause such grant to violate the requirements of subsection (e)."; and

(3) by striking "Any funds" and inserting the following:

"(2) INDIAN ASSISTANCE.—Any funds".

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Section 2501(g) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Funds available under this part shall be awarded, without regard to subsection (c), to each qualifying unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents. Any remaining funds available under this part shall be awarded to other qualifying applicants."

(c) APPLICATIONS.—Section 2502 of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) APPLICATIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PURCHASES.—If an application under this section is submitted in conjunction with a transaction for the purchase of armor vests, grant amounts under this section may not be

used to fund any portion of that purchase unless, before the application is submitted, the applicant—

“(1) receives clear and conspicuous notice that receipt of the grant amounts requested in the application is uncertain; and

“(2) expressly assumes the obligation to carry out the transaction, regardless of whether such amounts are received.”.

(d) DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—Section 2503(1) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll–2(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “means body armor” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) body armor”;

(2) by adding “or” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) body armor that has been tested through the voluntary compliance testing program, and found to meet or exceed the requirements of NIJ Standard 0115.00, or any revision of such standard;”.

(e) INTERIM DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—For purposes of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, the meaning of the term “armor vest” (as defined in section 2503 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796611–2)) shall, until the date on which a final NIJ Standard 0115.00 is first fully approved and implemented, also include body armor which has been found to meet or exceed the requirements for protection against stabbing established by the State in which the grantee is located.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(23) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004”.

WATER POLLUTION PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 934, S. 2417.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2417) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase funding for State nonpoint source pollution control programs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Environment and Public Works with an amendment, as follows:

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic.]

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Water Pollution Program Enhancements Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

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

(2) NAPA STUDY.—The term “NAPA Study” means the study required to be carried out under section 4(b).

(3) NAS STUDY.—The term “NAS Study” means the study required to be carried out under section 4(a).

SEC. 3. FUNDING FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL MEASURES.

(a) STATE GRANTS.—Section 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1256) is

amending by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2007, to remain available until expended, for grants to States and interstate agencies to be used in carrying out this section, including—

“(A) the administration of programs for the prevention, reduction, and elimination of pollutants; and

“(B) enforcement carried out directly or through appropriate State law enforcement officers and agencies.

“(2) STATE ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, \$50,000,000 shall be made available to States for—

“(A) the collection of reliable monitoring data; “(B) the improvement of lists prepared under section 303(d)(1);

“(C) the preparation of total maximum daily load allocations under section 303(d); and

“(D) the development of watershed management strategies.

(b) NONPOINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1329) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsections (h) and (i) \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2007, to remain available until expended.

“(2) GROUNDWATER QUALITY.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, not more than \$7,500,000 may be made available to carry out subsection (i).

“(3) PROJECT GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, \$200,000,000 shall be made available to States to provide grants to landowners to develop and implement nonpoint source pollution control projects or activities to restore or improve the water quality of impaired water that has been identified by a State as a priority for restoration.

“(B) COST SHARING.—

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of any project or activity funded under this paragraph shall not exceed 90 percent.

“(ii) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The recipient of a grant under this paragraph may use funds from other Federal programs and eligible in-kind contributions to satisfy the non-Federal share.

“(C) LIMITATION.—Grants under this paragraph shall not be made available for projects or activities that are required to be carried out under Federal or State law.”.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of—

(A) the scientific basis underlying the development and implementation of total maximum daily loads under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); and

(B) the availability and effectiveness of alternative programs or mechanisms in producing quantifiable reductions of pollution from point sources and nonpoint sources to achieve water quality standards.

(2) SUBMISSION OF NAS STUDY TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a copy of the NAS Study.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry

out the NAS Study \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall contract with the National Academy of Public Administrators to conduct a study of—

(A) the effectiveness of existing voluntary and other programs, activities, and practices being implemented as of the date of enactment of this Act in producing quantifiable reductions in pollution from point sources and nonpoint sources and attaining water quality standards; and

(B) the costs and benefits associated with the programs, activities, and practices described in subparagraph (A) that are incurred by State and local governments and the private sector.

(2) SUBMISSION OF NAPA STUDY TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a copy of the NAPA Study.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the NAPA Study \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2417), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 915, S. 2688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2688) to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, as follows:

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic.]

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Native American Languages Act Amendments Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) encourage and support the development of Native American Language Survival Schools as innovative means of addressing the effects of past discrimination against Native American language speakers and to support the revitalization of such languages through education in Native American languages and through instruction in other academic subjects using Native American languages as an instructional medium, consistent with United States policy as expressed in the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.);

(2) demonstrate the positive effects of Native American Language Survival Schools on the

academic success of Native American students and their mastery of standard English;

(3) encourage and support the involvement of families in the educational and cultural survival efforts of Native American Language Survival Schools;

(4) encourage communication, cooperation, and educational exchange among Native American Language Survival Schools and their administrators;

(5) provide support for Native American Language Survival School facilities and endowments;

(6) provide support for Native American Language Nests either as part of Native American Language Survival Schools or as separate programs that will be developed into more comprehensive Native American Language Survival Schools;

(7) support the development of local and national models that can be disseminated to the public and made available to other schools as exemplary methods of teaching Native American students; and

(8) develop a support center system for Native American Survival Schools at the university level.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 103 of Public Law 101-477 (25 U.S.C. 2902) is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 103. In this Act:

"(1) **INDIAN.**—The term 'Indian' has the meaning given that term in section 9161 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881).

"(2) **INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term 'Indian tribal government' has the meaning given that term in section 502 of Public Law 95-134 (42 U.S.C. 4368b).

"(3) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

"(4) **INDIAN RESERVATION.**—The term 'Indian reservation' has the meaning given the term 'reservation' in section 3 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452).

"(5) **NATIVE AMERICAN.**—The term 'Native American' means an Indian, Native Hawaiian, or Native American Pacific Islander.

"(6) **NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE.**—The term 'Native American language' means the historical, traditional languages spoken by Native Americans.

"(7) **NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE COLLEGE.**—The term 'Native American Language College' means—

"(A) a tribally-controlled community college or university (as defined in section 2 of the Tribally-Controlled Community College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801)) or a college applying for a Native American Language Survival School in a Native American language which that college regularly offers as part of its curriculum and which has the support of an Indian tribal government traditionally affiliated with that Native American language; or

"(B) Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikolani College.

"(8) **NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION.**—The term 'Native American Language Educational Organization' means an organization that—

"(A) is governed by a board consisting primarily of Native Americans and as many speakers of 1 or more Native American languages as possible;

"(B) is currently providing instruction through the use of a Native American language to at least 10 preschool, elementary, or high school students for at least 700 hours of instruction per year per student;

"(C) has provided such instruction for at least 10 preschool, elementary, or high school students through a Native American language for at least 700 hours per year per student for not

less than 3 years prior to applying for a grant under this Act; and

"(D) may be a public school that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

"(9) **NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE NEST.**—The term 'Native American Language Nest' means a site-based educational program enrolling families with children below the age of 7 which is conducted through a Native American language for at least 700 hours per year per student with the specific goal of strengthening, revitalizing, or reestablishing a Native American language and culture as a living language and culture of daily life.

"(10) **NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE SURVIVAL SCHOOL.**—The term 'Native American Language Survival School' means a Native American language dominant site-based educational program which expands from a Native American Language Nest, either as a separate entity or inclusive of a Native American Language Nest, to enroll families with children eligible for elementary or secondary education and which provides a complete education through a Native American language with the specific goal of strengthening, revitalizing, or reestablishing a Native American language and culture as a living language and culture of daily life.

"(11) **NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER.**—The term 'Native American Pacific Islander' means any descendant of the aboriginal people of any island in the Pacific Ocean that is a territory or possession of the United States.

"(12) **NATIVE HAWAIIAN.**—The term 'Native Hawaiian' has the meaning given that term in section 9212 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7912).

"(13) **SECRETARY.**—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

"(14) **TRADITIONAL LEADERS.**—The term 'traditional leaders' includes Native Americans who have special expertise in Native American culture and Native American languages.

"(15) **TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.**—The term 'tribal organization' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)."

SEC. 4. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE NESTS AND SURVIVAL SCHOOLS.

Title I of Public Law 101-477 (25 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"GENERAL AUTHORITY

"NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE NESTS

"SEC. 108. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds, through grant or contract, to Native American Language Educational Organizations, Native American Language Colleges, Indian tribal governments, organizations that demonstrate the potential to become Native American Language Educational Organizations, or a consortia of such organizations, colleges, or tribal governments for the purpose of establishing Native American Language Nest programs for students below the age of 7 and their families.

"(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A Native American Language Nest program receiving funds under this section shall—

"(1) provide instruction and child care through the use of a Native American language for at least 10 children below the age of 7 for at least 700 hours per year per student;

"(2) provide compulsory classes for parents of students enrolled in a Native American Language Nest in a Native American language, including Native American language-speaking parents;

"(3) provide compulsory monthly meetings for parents and other family members of students enrolled in a Native American Language Nest;

"(4) provide a preference in enrollment for students and families who are fluent in a Native American language;

"(5) receive at least 5 percent of its funding from another source, which may include feder-

ally funded programs, such as a Head Start program funded under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9801 et seq.); and

"(6) ensure that a Native American language becomes the dominant medium of instruction in the Native American Language Nest within a period of 6 years of receiving funding under this Act.

"NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGE SURVIVAL SCHOOLS

"SEC. 109. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds, through grant or contract, to Native American Language Educational Organizations, Native American Language Colleges, Indian tribal governments, or a consortia of such organizations, colleges, or tribal governments to operate, expand, and increase Native American Language Survival Schools throughout the United States and its territories for Native American children and Native American language-speaking children, including through the provision of direct educational services and school support services.

"(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—As a condition of receiving funds under subsection (a), a Native American Language Educational Organization, a Native American Language College, an Indian tribal government, or a consortia of such organizations, colleges, or tribal governments—

"(1) shall—

"(A) have at least 3 years experience in operating and administering a Native American Language Survival School, a Native American Language Nest, or other educational programs in which instruction is conducted in a Native American language; and

"(B) include students who are subject to State compulsory education laws; and

"(2) may include students from infancy through grade 12, as well as their families.

"(c) **PRIORITY.**—In making grants or entering into contracts, the Secretary shall give priority to—

"(1) the provision of direct educational services;

"(2) applicants with the support of the appropriate tribal government or governments; and

"(3) applicants that have researched language revitalization and the unique characteristics and circumstances of the languages of their schools.

"(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

"(1) **REQUIRED USES.**—A Native American Language Survival School receiving funds under this section shall—

"(A) consist of not less than 700 hours of instruction per student conducted annually through a Native American language or languages for at least 15 students for whom a Native American Language Survival School is their principal place of instruction;

"(B) provide direct educational services and school support services to students that may also include—

"(i) support services for children with special needs;

"(ii) transportation;

"(iii) boarding;

"(iv) food service;

"(v) teacher and staff housing;

"(vi) purchase of basic materials;

"(vii) adaptation of teaching materials;

"(viii) translation and development; or

"(ix) other appropriate services;

"(C) provide direct or indirect educational and support services for the families of enrolled students on site, through colleges, or through other means to increase their knowledge and use of the Native American language and culture, and may impose a requirement of family participation as a condition of student enrollment; and

"(D) ensure that within 3 years of enrollment, all students achieve functional fluency appropriate to the unique circumstances and endangerment status of that Native American language with the ultimate goal of academic or cognitive fluency.

"(2) **PERMISSIBLE USES.**—A Native American Language Survival School receiving funds under this section may—

“(A) include Native American Language Nests and other educational programs for students who are not Native American language speakers but who seek to establish fluency through instruction in a Native American language or to reestablish fluency as descendants of Native American language speakers;

“(B) provide instruction through more than 1 language;

“(C) provide instruction through a regional program (as opposed to 1 site) to better serve geographically dispersed students;

“(D) include a program of concurrent and summer college or university education course enrollment for secondary school students enrolled in Native American Language Survival Schools, as appropriate;

“(E) provide special support for Native American languages for which there are very few or no remaining Native American language speakers;

“(F) develop comprehensive curricula in Native American language instruction and instruction through Native American languages including—

“(i) curricula that can be used by public schools for instruction through a Native American language or teaching Native American languages as subjects;

“(ii) community Native American language use in communities served by Native American Language Survival Schools; and

“(iii) knowledge of a specific Native American language gained through research for the purpose of directly aiding the development of curriculum materials;

“(G) provide programs in pre-service and in-service teacher training, staff training, personnel development programs, programs to upgrade teacher and staff skills, and community resource development training, that shall include a program component which has as its objective increased Native American language speaking proficiency for teachers and staff employed in Native American Language Survival Schools and Native American Language Nests, which may include—

“(i) visits or exchanges among Native American Language Survival Schools and Native American Language Nests of school or nest teachers, staff, students, or families of students;

“(ii) participation in conference or special nondegree programs focusing on the use of a Native American language or languages for the education of students, teachers, staff, students, or families of students;

“(iii) full or partial scholarships and fellowships to colleges or universities for the professional development of faculty and staff, and to meet requirements for the involvement of the family or the community of Native American Language Survival School students in Native American Language Survival Schools, and to develop resource persons for Native American language programs in public schools, provided that a recipient of a fellowship or scholarship awarded under the authority of this clause who is enrolled in a program leading to a degree or certificate shall—

“(I) be trained in the Native American language of the Native American Language Survival School, if such program is available through that Native American language;

“(II) complete a minimum annual number of hours in Native American language study or training during the period of the fellowship or scholarship; and

“(III) enter into a contract which obligates the recipient to provide his or her professional services, either during the fellowship or scholarship period or upon completion of a degree or certificate, in Native American language instruction in the Native American language associated with the Native American Language Survival School in which the service obligation is to be fulfilled;

“(iv) training in the language and culture associated with a Native American Language Sur-

vival School either under community or academic experts in programs which may include credit courses;

“(v) structuring of personnel operations to support Native American language and cultural fluency and program effectiveness;

“(vi) Native American language planning, documentation, reference material and archives development; or

“(vii) recruitment for participation in teacher, staff, student, and community development; or

“(H) rent, lease, purchase, construct, maintain or repair educational facilities to ensure the academic achievement of Native American Language Survival School students.

“DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS REGARDING LINGUISTICS ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 110. (a) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall provide funds, through grant or contract, for the establishment of 3 demonstration programs that will provide assistance to Native American Language Survival Schools and Native American Language Nests. Such demonstration programs shall be established at—

“(1) Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikolani College of the University of Hawaii at Hilo, in consortium with the ‘Aha Punana Leo, Inc., and with other entities if deemed appropriate by such College, to—

“(A) conduct a demonstration program in the development and operation of the various components of a regional Native American Language Survival School program and college level Native American language teaching and use that is supportive of Native American Language Survival Schools; and

“(B) provide assistance in the establishment, operation, and administration of Native American Language Nests and Native American Language Survival Schools by such means as training, hosting informational visits to demonstration sites, and providing a national clearinghouse for data and information relevant to teaching Native American languages, outreach, courses, conferences, and other means;

“(2) Piegan Institute of Browning, Montana to demonstrate the operation of a Native American Language Nest and Survival School; and

“(3) the Alaska Native Language Center of the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, in consortium with other entities as deemed appropriate by such Center, to conduct a demonstration program, training, outreach, conferences, visitation programs, and other assistance in developing orthographies, resource materials, language documentation, language preservation, material archiving, and community support development.

“(b) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—The demonstration programs authorized to be established under this section may employ synchronic and asynchronous telecommunications and other appropriate means to maintain coordination and cooperation with one another and with participating Native American Language Survival Schools and Native American Language Nests.

“(c) DIRECTIONS TO THE SECRETARY.—The demonstration programs authorized to be established under this section shall provide direction to the Secretary in developing a site visit evaluation of Native American Language Survival Schools and Native American Language Nests.

“(d) FOLLOWUP AND DATA COLLECTION.—The demonstration programs authorized to be established under this section may conduct followup data collection and analysis on students while they are in school to assess how Survival School students are performing in comparison to other students, as well as identify instructional methods that are working and those methods which may not be working.

“(e) ENDOWMENTS AND FACILITIES.—The demonstration programs authorized to be established under this section may establish endowments for the purpose of furthering their activities relative to the study and preservation of Na-

tive American languages, and may use funds to provide for the rental, lease, purchase, construction, maintenance, and repair of facilities.

“AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

“SEC. 111. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities authorized by this Act for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2006.”

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2688), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING RECENT ELECTIONS IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 365 and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 365) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding recent elections in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statement relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 365) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 365

Whereas the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia held municipal, parliamentary, and presidential elections on September 24, 2000;

Whereas Slobodan Milosevic, President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, is an indicted war criminal;

Whereas Slobodan Milosevic is largely responsible for immeasurable bloodshed, human rights abuses, ethnic cleansing, refugees, property destruction, and environmental destruction that has devastated southeast Europe in recent years;

Whereas Slobodan Milosevic has arrested, intimidated, and harassed opposition figures; Whereas Slobodan Milosevic has prevented the freedom of assembly;

Whereas Slobodan Milosevic has prevented the freedom and independence of the press through intimidation, arrests, fines, the destruction of property, and jamming;

Whereas Slobodan Milosevic and his supporters refused to allow independent international election monitors into the Federal

Republic of Yugoslavia before the September 24, 2000 elections;

Whereas reliable reports indicate that Slobodan Milosevic and his supporters intentionally ignored internationally accepted standards for free and fair elections in order to control voting results and violated the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's new election law in the tabulation of the vote;

Whereas reliable documented reports indicate that 74 percent of the eligible voters of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia participated in the September 24, 2000 elections;

Whereas reliable documented reports based on official voting records indicate that Vojislav Kostunica, President, Democratic Party of Serbia, defeated Slobodan Milosevic with more than 50 percent of the vote; and

Whereas the people of Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia, and Croatia have been the victims of wars initiated by the Milosevic regime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby—

(1) congratulates the people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for the courage in participating in the September 24, 2000 elections;

(2) applauds the clear decision of the people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to embrace democracy, the rule of law, and integration into the international community by rejecting dictatorship and isolationism;

(3) reasserts its strong desire to reestablish the historic friendship between the American and Serbian people;

(4) expresses its intention to support a comprehensive assistance program for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to speed its economic recovery and European integration once a democratic government that respects the rule of law, human rights, and a market economy is established; and

(5) expresses its support for full economic integration for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including access to international financial institutions, once a democratic government that respects the rule of law, human rights, and a market economy is established.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 761, S. 1687.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1687) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment, as follows:

(Omit the part in boldface brackets and insert the part printed in italic.)

D. 1687

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Trade Commission Reauthorization Act of [1999] 2000".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 25 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57c) is amended—

(1) by striking "and not to exceed" and inserting "not to exceed"; and

(2) by striking "1998." and inserting the following: "1998; not to exceed [\$149,000,000]

\$164,600,000 for fiscal year 2001; and not to exceed [\$156,000,000] \$177,460,000 for fiscal year 2002."

SEC. 3. INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTARY REQUESTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall each designate a senior official not directly having supervisory responsibility for the review of any enforcement recommendation under section 7A(e)(1) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a(e)) concerning the transaction at issue to hear any petition filed by the acquiring person or the person whose voting securities or assets are to be acquired, to determine—

(1) whether the request for additional information or documentary material is unreasonably cumulative, unduly burdensome or duplicative; or

(2) whether the request for additional information or documentary material has been substantially complied with by the petitioning person.

(b) *EXPEDITED REVIEW.*—Internal review procedures for petitions filed pursuant to subsection (a) shall include reasonable deadlines for expedited review of any such petitions filed, after reasonable negotiations with investigative staff, in order to avoid undue delay of the merger review process.

(c) *INTERNAL REVIEW.*—The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall conduct an internal review and implement reforms of the merger review process in order to eliminate unnecessary burden, remove costly duplication, and eliminate undue delay, in order to achieve a more effective and more efficient merger review process.

(d) *Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall issue or amend their respective industry guidance, regulations, operating manuals and relevant policy documents, where appropriate, to implement each reform in this subparagraph.*

(e) *REPORT.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall each report to Congress—

(1) what reforms each agency has adopted under this subparagraph;

(2) what steps each has taken to implement such internal reforms; and

(3) the effects of those reforms.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS.

The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall include in the report to Congress required by section 7A(j) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a(j))—

(1) the number of notifications filed under this section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a);

(2) the number of notifications filed in which the Assistant Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission requested the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition;

(3) data relating to the length of time for parties to comply with requests for the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition;

(4) the number of petitions filed pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act regarding a request for the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition and the manner in which such petitions were resolved;

(5) data relating to the volume (in number of boxes or pages) of materials submitted pursuant to requests for additional information or documentary material; and

(6) the number of notifications filed in which a request for additional information or documentary materials was made but never complied with prior to resolution of the case.

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, the

bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1687), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1687

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Trade Commission Reauthorization Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 25 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57c) is amended—

(1) by striking "and not to exceed" and inserting "not to exceed"; and

(2) by striking "1998." and inserting the following: "1998; not to exceed \$164,600,000 for fiscal year 2001; and not to exceed \$177,460,000 for fiscal year 2002."

SEC. 3. INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTARY REQUESTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall each designate a senior official not directly having supervisory responsibility for the review of any enforcement recommendation under section 7A(e)(1) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a(e)) concerning the transaction at issue to hear any petition filed by the acquiring person or the person whose voting securities or assets are to be acquired, to determine—

(1) whether the request for additional information or documentary material is unreasonably cumulative, unduly burdensome or duplicative; or

(2) whether the request for additional information or documentary material has been substantially complied with by the petitioning person.

(b) *EXPEDITED REVIEW.*—Internal review procedures for petitions filed pursuant to subsection (a) shall include reasonable deadlines for expedited review of any such petitions filed, after reasonable negotiations with investigative staff, in order to avoid undue delay of the merger review process.

(c) *INTERNAL REVIEW.*—The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall conduct an internal review and implement reforms of the merger review process in order to eliminate unnecessary burden, remove costly duplication, and eliminate undue delay, in order to achieve a more effective and more efficient merger review process.

(d) *Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall issue or amend their respective industry guidance, regulations, operating manuals and relevant policy documents, where appropriate, to implement each reform in this subparagraph.*

(e) *REPORT.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall each report to Congress—

(1) what reforms each agency has adopted under this subparagraph;

(2) what steps each has taken to implement such internal reforms; and

(3) the effects of those reforms.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS.

The Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission shall include in the report

to Congress required by section 7A(j) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a(j))—

(1) the number of notifications filed under this section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a);

(2) the number of notifications filed in which the Assistant Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission requested the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition;

(3) data relating to the length of time for parties to comply with requests for the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition;

(4) the number of petitions filed pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act regarding a request for the submission of additional information or documentary material relevant to the proposed acquisition and the manner in which such petitions were resolved;

(5) data relating to the volume (in number of boxes or pages) of materials submitted pursuant to requests for additional information or documentary material; and

(6) the number of notifications filed in which a request for additional information or documentary materials was made but never complied with prior to resolution of the case.

RURAL ACCESS TO EMERGENCY DEVICES ACT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2528, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2528) to provide funds for the purchase of automatic external defibrillators and the training of individuals in advanced cardiac life support.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering S. 2528, the Rural Access to Emergency Devices Act of 2000, which I introduced with my friend from Wisconsin, Senator Russ FEINGOLD. Our bill is intended to improve access to automated external defibrillators in small communities and rural areas to boost the survival rates of individuals in those communities who suffer cardiac arrest. Joining us as cosponsors of the bill are Senators JEFFORDS, MURRAY, ABRAHAM, WELLSTONE, HUTCHINSON, DORGAN, GRAMS, BINGAMAN, CHAFEE, ENZI, SNOWE, GRASSLEY, BIDEN, LEAHY, ROBB, KERRY, and DURBIN. I particularly want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, Senator JEFFORDS, for all of his assistance in helping us to expedite action on this important measure.

Heart disease is the leading cause of death both in the state of Maine and in the United States. According to the American Heart Association, an estimated 250,000 Americans die each year from cardiac arrest. Many of these deaths could be prevented if automated

external defibrillators—or AEDs—were more accessible. AEDs are computerized devices that can shock a heart back into normal rhythm and restore life to a cardiac arrest victim. They must, however, be used promptly. For every minute that passes before a victim's normal heart rhythm is restored, his or her chance of survival falls by as much as 10 percent.

We have a number of new and improved technologies in our arsenal of weapons to fight heart disease, including a new generation of small, easy-to-use AEDs that can strengthen the chain of survival for cardiac arrest victims. These new devices make it possible for not only emergency medical personnel, but also trained lay rescuers, to deliver defibrillation safely and effectively. The new AEDs are safe, effective, lightweight, low maintenance, and relatively inexpensive. Moreover, they are specifically designed so that they can be used by non-medical personnel such as police, fire fighters, security guards and other lay rescuers, providing they have been properly trained. According to the American Heart Association, making AEDs standard equipment in police cars, fire trucks, ambulances and other emergency vehicles and getting these devices into more public places could save more than 50,000 lives a year.

Last December, the Bangor Mall installed an AED that is one of the first of these devices in Maine to be placed in a public setting outside the direct control of emergency medical personnel and hospital staff. Both the AED and an oxygen tank are kept inside a customer service booth, which is in an area of the mall where there is a high concentration of traffic and where heart emergencies might occur. Mall personnel have also received special training and, during mall hours, there is always at least one person who has been certified in both CPR and defibrillator use.

For at least one Bangor woman, this has been a lifesaver. On January 12th, just weeks after the AED was installed, two shoppers at the Mall collapsed in a single day. One was given oxygen and quickly revived. But the other shopper was unconscious and had stopped breathing. The trained mall staff—Maintenance Supervisor Larry Lee, Security Chief Dusty Rhodes, and General Manager Roy Daigle—were only able to detect a faint pulse. They quickly commenced CPR and attached the AED.

It is important to note that defibrillation is intended to supplement, not replace standard CPR. These devices, which are almost completely automated, run frequent self-diagnostics and will not allow the administration of shock unless the victim's recorded heart pattern requires it. When the AED is attached, it automatically analyzes the victim's vital signs. One of two commands will then be voiced and displayed by the unit: "Shock advised—charging"; or "Shock not advised—continue CPR."

In the Bangor Mall case, the shock was not advised, so CPR was continued until the emergency medical personnel arrived. The EMT's told Mr. Daigle, the General Manager of the mall, that the woman—who had had a heart attack and subsequently required triple bypass surgery—simply would not have survived if they had not been so prepared. As Mr. Daigle observed, "Twelve to fifteen minutes is just too long to wait for the emergency services to arrive."

Cities across America have begun to recognize the value of fast access to AEDs and are making them available to emergency responders. In many small and rural communities, however, limited budgets and the fact that so many rely on volunteer organizations for emergency services can make acquisition and appropriate training in the use of these life-saving devices problematic.

The legislation we are considering today is intended to increase access to AEDs and trained local responders for smaller towns and rural areas in Maine and elsewhere where those first on the scene may not be paramedics or others who would normally have AEDs. Our bill provides \$25 million over three years to be given as grants to community partnerships consisting of local emergency responders, police and fire departments, hospitals, and other community organizations. This money could then be used to help purchase AEDs and train potential responders in their use, as well as in basic CPR and first aid.

The Rural Access to Emergency Devices Act has been endorsed by both the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross as a means of expanding access to these lifesaving devices across rural America, and I urge all of our colleagues to join us in supporting this important measure.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2528) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2528

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rural Access to Emergency Devices Act" or the "Rural AED Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States.

(2) The American Heart Association estimates that 250,000 Americans die from sudden cardiac arrest each year.

(3) A cardiac arrest victim's chance of survival drops 10 percent for every minute that passes before his or her heart is returned to normal rhythm.

(4) Because most cardiac arrest victims are initially in ventricular fibrillation, and the

only treatment for ventricular fibrillation is defibrillation, prompt access to defibrillation to return the heart to normal rhythm is essential.

(5) Lifesaving technology, the automated external defibrillator, has been developed to allow trained lay rescuers to respond to cardiac arrest by using this simple device to shock the heart into normal rhythm.

(6) Those people who are likely to be first on the scene of a cardiac arrest situation in many communities, particularly smaller and rural communities, lack sufficient numbers of automated external defibrillators to respond to cardiac arrest in a timely manner.

(7) The American Heart Association estimates that more than 50,000 deaths could be prevented each year if defibrillators were more widely available to designated responders.

(8) Legislation should be enacted to encourage greater public access to automated external defibrillators in communities across the United States.

SEC. 3. GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Rural Health Outreach Office of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award grants to community partnerships that meet the requirements of subsection (b) to enable such partnerships to purchase equipment and provide training as provided for in subsection (c).

(b) COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.—A community partnership meets the requirements of this subsection if such partnership—

(1) is composed of local emergency response entities such as community training facilities, local emergency responders, fire and rescue departments, police, community hospitals, and local non-profit entities and for-profit entities concerned about cardiac arrest survival rates;

(2) evaluates the local community emergency response times to assess whether they meet the standards established by national public health organizations such as the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross; and

(3) submits to the Secretary of Health and Human Services an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts provided under a grant under this section shall be used—

(1) to purchase automatic external defibrillators that have been approved, or cleared for marketing, by the Food and Drug Administration; and

(2) to provide defibrillator and basic life support training in automated external defibrillator usage through the American Heart Association, the American Red Cross, or other nationally recognized training courses.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing data relating to whether the increased availability of defibrillators has affected survival rates in the communities in which grantees under this section operated. The procedures under which the Secretary obtains data and prepares the report under this subsection shall not impose an undue burden on program participants under this section.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2003 to carry out this section.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2000

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 11. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3244, the Sexual Trafficking Victims Protection Act, as under the order.

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

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I note for Senators, this bill, the Sexual Trafficking Victims Protection Act, is an amalgam of several pieces of legislation. It is the sex trafficking bill that

we have held several hearings on that passed this body previously, and that passed through the House. I believe in the House the vote was 371-1. It also has in it the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, and several other pieces of important legislation. We will be on this most of the day tomorrow.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12:30 p.m. the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m. in order for the weekly party caucuses to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWNBAC. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin consideration of the sex trafficking conference report tomorrow morning. Under the order, there will be up to 7 hours of debate, with Senator THOMPSON raising a point of order against the report in regard to Aimee's law. A vote in relation to the point of order is expected during tomorrow's session, as well as a vote on adoption of the conference report itself.

Senators should also be prepared to vote on the VA-HUD appropriations bill and the conference report to accompany the Agriculture appropriations bill. Senators will be notified as votes are scheduled.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BROWNBAC. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the provisions of S. Res. 369.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:58 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, October 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.