



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2000

No. 16

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2000

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

PRAYER

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

Today, on George Washington's birthday, it seems appropriate to repeat a prayer that he prayed for the Nation exactly as it is reproduced on the wall of the chapel at Valley Forge. Let us pray.

"Almighty God: We make our earnest prayer that Thou would keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou will incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to the government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And, finally, that Thou would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion and, without a humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MIKE ENZI, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows.

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOYNIHAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Under the order of January 26, 2000, the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, will now read Washington's Farewell Address.

The Senator from New York.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President and my revered mentor, the Senior Senator from West Virginia, in his life, George Washington did two things without equal in the history of Government.

The American Colonies having revolted against the rule of King George III, Washington assumed command of a makeshift army and in 6 years fought his way to victory, whereupon he resigned as Commander in Chief and turned over the army to the civil authorities, such as they were. Fourteen years later, having served two terms as President of a new Government, he announced he would retire, although his reelection was not in doubt. These two actions, said George III, "placed him in a light the most distinguished of any man living, the greatest character of the age"—looking back, we might say "the greatest character of the ages"—for these two actions laid the foundations of republicanism which in his Farewell Address he presciently foresaw and fervently predicted would strengthen and grow across the world.

And now to the address proper.

Mr. MOYNIHAN, at the rostrum, read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken without strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country—and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S649

that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise and as an instructive example in our annals, that, under circumstances in which the passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your

union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by

birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint councils and joint efforts—of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The *North*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *South*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The *South*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *North*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The *East*, in a like intercourse with the *West*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The *West* derives from the *East* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must

derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourself too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen, in the negotiation by the executive—and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate—of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with

Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by

which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions, that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country, that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of

some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it in the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, forments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true—and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let

it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that the public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can

be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others should be excluded and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity, or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation's subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads

also to concessions, to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity gilding with the appearances of virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the pe-

riod is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that is must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affec-

tionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress, without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I

ferently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senator for his reading of the farewell address of George Washington.

MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. The first half of the time will be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN; the second half of the time will be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

Who yields time?

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. HUTCHINSON. 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. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, noting that Senator DURBIN is not on the floor, I ask unanimous consent to proceed up to 10 minutes.

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

IN SUPPORT OF THE TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

MR. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I was deeply distressed with the news over the weekend of China's new ultimatum regarding Taiwan and the front-page, above-the-fold story in the Washington Post today. I think the headline summarizes the situation:

China Issues New Taiwan Ultimatum: Delay in Reunification Would Spur Use of Force.

It seems that mainland China cannot stand democracy. It is almost as if they have a visceral antipathy to freedom. I went to Taiwan last month—the Presiding Officer accompanied me on that visit to the Pacific rim—and had the opportunity to visit with the President of Taiwan and numerous officials. One of the things that struck me as we disembarked the plane and I looked off the tarmac was a whole press contingent, more than we had seen in, say, Japan or South Korea; a media contingent—cameras, reporters—shouting questions at us. I thought, even as we walked toward them, democracy has certainly arrived and democracy has blossomed in Taiwan because one of the signal signposts, I believe, of democracy is an independent and a vigorous and aggressive media. That was certainly evident in Taiwan.

One of the first questions shouted to our delegation, the Senator from Wyoming will remember, was: Will China attempt to disrupt our Presidential elections as they did before?

My answer was: I certainly hope not because it did not succeed before and it won't succeed this time.

Four years ago, China launched missiles off the coast of Taiwan, hoping to disrupt a cornerstone of democracy in Taiwan, its Presidential elections. That effort failed both because of American aircraft carriers and the determination of the Taiwanese people not to be intimidated out of their freedom.

Next month, on March 18, the thriving democracy of Taiwan will once again hold Presidential elections, and once again it seems that the Chinese Government hopes to disrupt those elections.

Just yesterday, China issued a new threat to democratic Taiwan. In an official new white paper on Taiwan, the Chinese Government stated that:

If the Taiwan authorities refuse, *sine die*, the peaceful settlement of cross-Straits reunification through negotiations, then the Chinese government will be forced to adopt all drastic measures possible, including the use of force.

In other words, "Negotiate or face invasion" was effectively the ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government.

No longer is the bar set at a declaration of independence or occupation by a foreign power; now it includes refusing to negotiate reunification—a dialog that was broken off by the Chinese Government. This is, in effect, a blank check that the Chinese Government has written themselves, making a subjective judgment on this new, ambiguous standard they have established.

Taiwan is not a military threat to China, and no one in the world believes it is. If it is a threat, it is an ideological threat. A burgeoning Chinese society, less than 100 miles across the Strait, with increasing freedoms of religion, speech, and press—freedoms that are stifled on the mainland—the Chinese Government can't stand this shining contrast to its own totalitarian

system. That is why China is pulling down the threshold for invasion and building up its arms pointed at Taiwan.

I suggest it is no accident that earlier this month the first of four Russian *Sovremenny*-class guided missile destroyers sailed into Chinese waters. I suggest it is no accident this destroyer is equipped with surface-to-surface missiles designed specifically to destroy American Aegis ships and aircraft carriers, America's ships that would come to the defense of Taiwan.

It is no accident that China has ordered *Kilo*-class submarines equipped with torpedoes designed to evade detection. It is no accident that China has deployed short-range ballistic missiles in the provinces just across the Taiwan Strait. It is no accident that China has flown over 100 sorties over the Taiwan Strait, many with Russian-bought SU-27s.

We must not tempt intimidation with ambiguity. We must not tempt aggression with weakness.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1838, the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act.

Opponents of this act have held this out as being somehow bellicose, somehow threatening. I suggest to all my colleagues in the Senate they simply read what the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act says. Our colleagues in the other body passed this legislation by an overwhelming vote of 341-70 earlier this month. The Taiwan Security Enhancement Act will bring greater clarity to our relations with Taiwan and China by increasing military exchanges with Taiwan, by establishing a direct military communications link with Taiwan, and by reestablishing Congress as a consultant in the annual arms sales process—as intended and required by the Taiwan Relations Act—which at least, supposedly, governs our relations with Taiwan.

Just last month, General Xiong Guangkai, the Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army and a former head of Chinese intelligence said, "... we will never commit ourselves to renouncing the use of force." The irony is that this general did not make this statement while he was in China. He said this right here in Washington while he was being hosted by the Clinton-Gore administration.

This reveals the irony of the situation. We have greater military exchanges with a country that points ballistic missiles at us than we do with a democratic ally. The State Department prohibits our senior military officers from meeting with their Taiwanese counterparts. Instead, the focus is on their Chinese counterparts.

Isn't it ironic. I was visiting—I will not mention their names—with leading Army officials, some of whom had served in Taiwan many years ago, and they pointed out to me the irony that while they can hold talks with leading Communist Chinese military leaders, they cannot so much as go to Taiwan

and meet with the military leadership in Taiwan, a democratic entity.

It is only a matter of common sense that in the event of a crisis—a crisis now more likely—we should be able to communicate with the Taiwanese military—the people we may be called to defend.

Opponents of this bill claim that ambiguity is good. But there is nothing ambiguous about the Chinese position. The Chinese White Paper even specifically opposed the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act.

I suggest we should not be ambiguous about our support for democracy in Asia, nor should we apologize to China for helping Taiwan to defend itself.

I believe China has made itself clear on the Taiwan issue. So should we.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

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

TRIBUTE TO JEANNE SIMON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to a great friend who passed away on Sunday. Her name was Jeanne Simon, the wife of my friend and former colleague in the House, my predecessor in the Senate, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois. Jeanne Simon passed away in the early morning hours on Sunday in her home in Makanda, IL, in the southern part of our State.

She had been suffering for several months from a brain tumor, and the end was obvious when I last saw her a few weeks ago. As Paul Simon told me when I called and asked if we could get together: Her spirits are good. He was certainly right. We laughed over dinner and reminisced over old political experiences and had a great time, as we did for over 30 years in similar meetings and dinners.

Jeanne Simon was an extraordinary person. She was one of the first women to serve in the Illinois House of Representatives. She was a graduate of Northwestern Law School and served as an assistant State's attorney when very few women were involved in the profession, let alone as prosecutors.

She met another young legislator when she served in Springfield, IL, a State representative named Paul Simon. The two hit it off and decided to get married in 1960. Jeanne Simon put her legislative and professional career aside to become a wife and a mother and to become a help mate, not just at home but in the political career of her husband, Paul Simon.

President Clinton was wont to say when he was elected: America got two—buy one, get one free—in terms of the First Lady and her contribution to the Nation. We felt the same in the State of Illinois. Whenever we looked at the Simon package, it was Paul and Jeanne Simon and the kids wrapped up in a very attractive package with a

polka dot bow tie. Time after time, election after election, the people in Illinois turned to Paul Simon as Congressman, as Lieutenant Governor, and finally as Senator and bought the package.

Politics is a game of individual statistics. We talk about who won, who lost. In sports we talk about team statistics, but when it came to the Simons, we were dealing with a team statistic. We knew that whenever Paul Simon was there fighting for Illinois and the causes in which he believed, Jeanne Simon was right at his side.

She had special passions and commitments to literacy and to education. She served as chair of the National Commission on Libraries, and one of the last things I ever heard from her was a call late in the session last year: Check on that appropriation for libraries. She was committed to it.

Jeanne Simon was the kind of person, too, whom I trusted in terms of her judgment. She was honest and forthright and you knew when she stood up for a cause it was because she really believed in it.

How many people, men and women, in Illinois political life were inspired and encouraged by Jeanne Simon over the years. She has left a great legacy. I consider myself to be one of the beneficiaries of that legacy. Now that she has passed away, we can reflect on the fact that even as a wife and mother of a great politician like Paul Simon, she left an enduring contribution to the State of Illinois and to the Nation.

Jeanne Simon will be missed, and many in this Chamber who knew her and worked with her on so many important issues will appreciate, as I have, what a great and enduring legacy she left with her life.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

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

BIENNIAL BUDGETING

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, the administration released its budget for fiscal year 2001—its last and its biggest, totaling \$1.8 trillion and proposing a whole host of new programs.

So begins our annual budget process.

From now until September 30, Congress will conduct dozens of hearings and hold countless meetings, while members of both Houses deliver innumerable speeches and spend long hours of debate over every subtle nuance of the Federal budget process.

Over the next 8 months, Congress will consider a budget resolution, a budget reconciliation package and as many as 13 separate appropriations bills—the latter only if we do not combine those appropriations bills into one massive spending bill, as has been the practice in recent years.

By the time Congress adjourns—currently scheduled for October 6—a ma-

ajority of votes taken in the Senate will relate to the budget process.

Indeed, as my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, has pointed out, 73% of the Senate's votes in 1996 were budget-related, 65% in 1997, and 51% in 1998. It is no wonder—each year, it is quite common for the same subject to be voted upon 3 or 4 times during the course of the entire budget process.

Despite the inordinate amount of time and effort that Congress will put into fashioning a budget that will meet our Nation's spending needs in a fiscally responsible way, a veto threat still looms on each of the appropriations bills if spending does not approach what the President wants.

At that point, high-stakes negotiations between the Congress and the President will ensue. In an effort to avoid a Government shutdown—and the blame that goes with it—these negotiations inevitably yield a spending compromise that neither Congress nor the President particularly likes, but both agree is necessary.

It is a heck of a way to run a railroad, but what is really unbelievable is this whole process is repeated each year.

I say enough is enough. It's time to bring rationality to our nation's budget process.

It's a fact that Congress spends too large a portion of its time debating and voting on items related to the Federal budget. Meanwhile, most other Congressional functions are not given proper attention.

We need to reestablish our priorities so we may effectively do the work of the people, make sure that the Federal Government is running at peak efficiency and deliver value, which is quality service for the least amount of money.

I believe we have an excellent opportunity to do that this year.

One of the first bills I cosponsored when I became a Senator was a measure introduced by Senator PETE DOMENICI that would establish a 2-year budget—just like we have in about 20 States including the State of Ohio. I believe enactment of this bill, S. 92, will provide an important tool in the efficient use of Federal funds while strengthening Congress' proper oversight role.

Because Congress produces annual budgets, Congress does not spend nearly as much time as it should on oversight of the various Federal Departments and agencies due to the time and energy consumed by the budget resolution, budget reconciliation, and appropriations process.

Not only is this a problem for Congress, but each executive branch agency and department must spend a significant amount of its time on each annual budget cycle.

Again, as my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, pointed out in his statement on S. 92, the executive branch spends 1

year putting together a Federal budget, 1 year explaining that Federal budget before Congress, and 1 year implementing the budget eventually passed by Congress.

Even the most diligent Cabinet Secretary cannot keep track of all the oversight he or she is supposed to accomplish if they are trapped in this endless budget cycle.

A biennial budget will help Congress and the executive branch avoid this lengthy process. Since each particular Congress lasts only 2 years, a biennial budget would allow us to consider a 2-year funding proposal during 1 year, while reserving the second year for the Government oversight portion of our job.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and Restructuring in the Governmental Affairs Committee, I have noted that even though the General Accounting Office conducts numerous reports documenting Government inefficiencies that need to be corrected, most GAO reports sit on the shelf because there is no time to conduct detailed hearings.

When oversight hearings are held, nearly everyone in the executive branch knows—from career bureaucrats to Cabinet Secretaries—that they need only weather the immediate storm when they are asked to come to the Hill to testify.

That is because once they answer the criticisms that have been leveled in these GAO reports, and explain how they are going to improve the situation, it is over; the worst has passed. Rarely do they have to worry about followup hearings to make sure they have implemented the proper remedies because they know Congress just will not have the time to conduct future hearings.

Unfortunately, that reality can lead to problems later on that impact public safety or national security.

Last year, the Governmental Affairs Committee held hearings regarding Dr. Wen Ho Lee and the security situation at the Los Alamos National Lab. I was shocked to learn that for 20 years we have had a problem with security at the Department of Energy, and no one did anything about it. But GAO knew: they had released 31 major reports on nuclear-security problems at the Department since 1980.

Congress needs the time to conduct proper oversight—including followup investigations—in order to make sure that situations like this do not repeat. Without having to devote the majority of its time and energy to annual budget bills, Congress will be able to make sure that the Federal Government operates harder and smarter and does more with less. I am confident that the Senate will pass S. 92—biennial budget legislation—during this session of Congress.

Regardless of the Senate's actions on passing this bill, I believe the House of Representatives needs to be more en-

gaged in this process. Unfortunately, the news reports that I have seen indicate that there is not much support at the leadership level in the House for such a bill.

I urge my colleagues in the House to reconsider their views on biennial budget legislation, or in the alternative, pass a better legislative proposal. Congress should not continue to come up with reasons why budget reform can't pass, but find ways to make sure that it can.

It should be plainly obvious to my colleagues in both Houses—including those on the Appropriations Committees—that the annual appropriations process is not working. As I stated earlier, each year Congress ends up negotiating a spending deal that is higher than Congress wants in order to avoid the Presidential veto pen. If we are ever going to get a handle on our debt, we have to end this bad public policy. It would definitely be in the best interest of our Nation.

I believe this biennial budget legislation, S. 92, is one of the most important pieces of legislation we could consider this year. I will continue to press for its passage.

For my colleagues who are tired of the seemingly endless budget and appropriations cycles and are frustrated at the inability to devote enough time to the oversight duties of their committees, I urge them to join in cosponsoring this legislation. I also urge my House colleagues to review the merits of the biennial budget process and act upon legislation as expeditiously as possible for the good of America.

The point I am making is this. It is time for this Congress to adopt a 2-year budget cycle instead of the one we have had for too many years. It will help us do a better job in terms of budgeting and certainly get us to do the oversight that is so badly needed by this Congress.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

PREScription DRUG AFFORDABILITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, similar to many of our colleagues, I have been back home in my State at townhall meetings. One of the very consistent themes I heard is that folks want to see us address some of the key issues of our time, particularly the economic issues.

I have heard again and again—and it is clear—that millions of senior citizens cannot afford their prescription medicine. I heard again and again that millions of married couples are being shackled by this marriage tax penalty. It seems to me Congress can fashion a prudent, well-crafted bill that addresses this marriage tax penalty and also responds to the concerns of seniors—

without blowing up the budget, without violating the principles of fiscal responsibility, and by prudent use of the surplus.

Democrats want to see—and Democrats are anxious to work with Republicans on this—an effort to help the many seniors and families who are walking on an economic tightrope trying to afford their prescription drug bills. We want to see meaningful tax relief for married couples. What we have to do is work together, in a bipartisan way, to fashion that.

I will spend just a minute talking about how serious this prescription drug problem is for the Nation's older people.

When I was home recently, I heard from an elderly woman in Yoncalla, OR. She lives by herself. She lives in southern Oregon. She has an income of about \$500 a month. When she is done paying her prescription drug bill, she has just a little bit over \$200 to live on for the rest of the month. She lives a long way from pharmacies, so she cannot very well comparison shop.

She wants to know, why isn't it possible for this Congress to enact a prescription drug benefit for her and for others similarly situated? My view is, if we do not enact a prescription drug benefit for this person, she is going to end up a lot sicker and with a lot more health problems than she has today. That will be much more expensive to the taxpayers.

In addition, I recently heard from an elderly couple from Baker, OR, who have to take a great many prescription drugs. After their monthly medication, together they have less than \$200 on which to get by. They said in their letter: "That is not living. That is existing."

Colleagues, it is very clear that in a country as rich and as strong as ours, we clearly are capable of doing justice to the vulnerable older people, such as the elderly folks I described from rural Oregon who are struggling to make ends meet and cannot afford their prescription drugs.

People ask us all the time: Can we afford prescription drug coverage? My message is: We cannot afford not to cover prescription drugs.

One of these anticoagulant medicines that helps prevent strokes in older people might cost \$1,000 or \$1,500 a year—certainly pricey—but you prevent that stroke with the medication and you save upwards of \$100,000 that an older person might incur in expenses for problems associated with the stroke.

What we need to do—and the President has one approach; Senator KENNEDY has another approach; Senator SNOWE and I have worked together on a bipartisan basis—is bring these bills together and make sure we use marketplace forces to hold down the costs of prescription drugs for older people. Each one of these bills—the kind of approach the President is talking about, as well as the approaches Senator KENNEDY and Senator SNOWE and I are

talking about—each one of these approaches makes sure the dollars we earmark for this program are used to pay the prescription drug portion of an older person's private health insurance bill.

You hear a whole lot of talk these days about how the insurance companies would not possibly be interested in this. Of course they are going to be interested in this. I have talked to them from my area. They are anxious to see the Government in a responsible, prudent program, for which I believe there is now bipartisan support. They are anxious to see Medicare pick up the prescription drug portion of a senior's private health insurance bill.

With a lot of my colleagues on the Democratic side—and I know Senator SNOWE and others on the Republican side want to address this as well—I intend to keep coming to the floor of the Senate and keep reading these letters and describing the circumstances of older people who want to see this Congress enact meaningful relief for prescription drug costs before we adjourn.

Medicare did not cover prescription drugs when it began. Right now, the senior citizen who does not have prescription drug coverage is basically subsidizing other people in this country who do have coverage whose plans are able to negotiate discounts. That is not right. It is not fair.

We can enact meaningful prescription drug coverage under the Medicare program in this session of Congress. Until we do, I and other Democrats are going to keep coming to this floor, reading the accounts of seniors who are facing these staggering prescription drug costs they cannot afford.

I intend to keep working with Senator SNOWE and Senator KENNEDY, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, so the legacy of this session of the Congress can be that we stood up for a fair shake for the millions of vulnerable older Americans and their families.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1883

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 on Tuesday, February 22, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 375, H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 1999, and it be considered under the following limitations: debate until 4:30 on Tuesday be equally divided in the usual form; the only amendment in order will be a managers' amendment to be offered by Senator LOTT or his designee.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of time, the managers' amendment be considered agreed to, the bill then be read the third time, and at 4:30 today the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill as amended.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1883, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1883) to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed in morning business.

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

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my first elected job was as a member of the board of trustees of then the largest hospital district in the State of Nevada, Southern Nevada Memorial Hospital. During the time I was on the board, we were gratified to see Medicare come into being because 40 percent of the senior citizens coming to our hospital had no insurance. People arrived at the hospital with their husbands, their wife, their sons and daughters, and they had to sign papers agreeing to pay the bill. If patients did not pay the bill, a collection company pursued people to see that the bills were paid. We garnished wages and made sure the government institution received the money to which it was entitled.

Approximately 35 years later there are some problems, but of course it is a great medical program. Now instead of 40 percent of seniors having no health insurance when they come into a hospital, virtually all seniors have some type of health insurance when they come to the hospital. That is a result of Medicare.

In 1965, when I was a member of that hospital board, coverage was important to pay a hospital bill and to be able to

see a doctor. What we did not cover and was not necessary when Congress passed the act was prescription drug coverage. Now we need prescription drug coverage. It is a tremendous lacking in the Medicare program.

We have had breakthroughs in the interim years in the pharmaceutical industry that are among the greatest advances in medical history. Today, prescription drugs alone have the power to reduce heart attacks by lowering cholesterol and blood pressure, using all kinds of drugs, including aspirin. Drugs such as Zocor, Mevacor, Inderal, Corgard, and Calan are great in lowering cholesterol and blood pressure. These are lifesaving. Drugs can minimize death from cancer. These include Taxol and Tamoxifen. They slow the progress of AIDS with AZT and other protease inhibitors. They treat depression and mood disorders with Prozac and Zoloft. Bacterial infections can be cleared up, including ear and bladder infections, with a string of antibiotics called Cephalosporin. We can reduce the possibility of organ rejection. We could not have organ transplants until they came up with something called Cyclosporin. Now people can have kidney transplants almost routinely. Other transplants are becoming more common.

The Presiding Officer and I served in the House of Representatives with a Member of Congress who had a heart and lung transplant many years ago. He leads a very productive life. That is because of the pharmaceutical industry.

For migraine headaches, I am sure, Mr. President, you have, as I have, had family members who benefited tremendously from something called Imitrix. People would go to doctors and use all kind of special pillows and heat and cold and all kinds of things, but what has worked well is this thing called Imitrix. It really, basically, takes away headaches.

For enlarged prostate, there is something called Proscar. To treat arthritis pain, one wonder drug is called Imuran; for allergies, Caritan, Allegra, and other things. Allergies take tremendous amounts of time away from the workplace. At certain times of the year they can be debilitating.

To slow the progression and control the symptoms of Parkinson's disease—we have a long way to go; about 50 percent of the people in rest homes are there because of Parkinson's disease and Alzheimer's—but we have made some progress treating Parkinson's disease with drugs called Amatadine and Deprenyl. There are drugs to reduce muscle spasticity associated with multiple sclerosis.

There are things there we need to work on, but we are making progress. I had a hearing a number of years ago where a doctor said we are making great progress, and indeed progress has been made since then.

Mr. President, 75 percent of older Americans, 3 out of every 4 seniors,

lack decent, dependable private-sector coverage for prescription drugs, and at least 13 million Medicare beneficiaries have absolutely no prescription drug coverage at all. That is wrong. That is why the Medicare legislation, which passed in 1965, needs to be updated.

Many seniors, and especially senior women, struggle to meet the rising cost of filling their prescriptions. Why do I say women? Because, according to the Older Women's League, total prescription drug spending for women on Medicare averages about \$1,200 a year, 20 percent more than that for men. In many cases, seniors simply do not take the drugs their doctors prescribe because they cannot afford them.

You do not have to be a doctor to understand this is bad medicine. Without access to important medication, seniors run the risk of developing complications that require expensive treatments and hospital stays. While some seniors enroll in Medicare managed care plans because they provide some drug coverage, we cannot depend on this option, and many of these plans are no longer around. The Medicare managed care plans have found they cannot afford them, so they are dropping seniors. This is an unstable source of coverage because many Medicare managed care plans have decreased their drug coverage. The number of beneficiaries enrolling in these Medicare plans is declining because the promises are not what they are supposed to be.

Prescription drugs are the largest out-of-pocket health costs for seniors. On average, seniors fill 18 prescriptions a year and take 4 to 6 prescription drugs a day. Because of the high cost and lack of coverage, one study shows that one in eight seniors is forced to choose between buying food and buying medicine. That is drastic. One in eight seniors is forced to choose between buying food or medicine. Every day this takes place in America. To make matters worse, studies show that seniors without drug coverage pay more for drugs than those who have insurance.

Prescription drugs are a necessary component of modern medicine, and our seniors are dependent on them to maintain a healthy, active lifestyle. This is something that has come about in the last 35 years. The special health needs of our seniors are often those that respond best to treatment by prescription drugs. For millions of seniors, prescription medicines are lifesavers. It is time to show our seniors we are serious about creating a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and I hope we can work together to do that as quickly as possible. We need Medicare to include prescription drugs.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for one moment, and then I will call up the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999—RESUMED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, I call up amendment No. 2820, which is already at the desk. This is the so-called managers' amendment. I understand the amendment will be agreed to and the motion to reconsider will be laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2820

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2820.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike "1999" and insert "2000".

On page 5, beginning on line 7, strike "No. 12938" and all that follows through the period and insert "No. 12938".

On page 5, beginning on line 9, strike "The United States" and all that follows through "shall terminate" and insert "Prohibition on United States Government sales to that foreign person of any item on the United States Munitions List as in effect on August 8, 1995, and termination of".

On page 5, beginning on line 16, strike "The President shall deny licenses and suspend" and insert "Denial of licenses and suspension of".

On page 8 between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(b) OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Congress urges the President—

(1) in every appropriate case, to contact in a timely fashion each foreign person identified in each report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, in order to afford such person, or governments, the opportunity to provide explanatory, exculpatory, or other additional information with respect to the transfer that caused such person to be identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a); and

(2) to exercise the authority in subsection (a) in all cases where information obtained from a foreign person identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or from the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, establishes that the exercise of such authority is warranted.

On page 8, line 24, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 9, line 11, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 9, beginning on line 12, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 10, beginning on line 11, strike "through the implementation of concrete steps".

On page 10, beginning on line 16, strike "including through the imposition of meaningful penalties on persons who make such transfers".

On page 10, line 19, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 10, line 21, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 11, line 25, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 12, line 2, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 6, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 8, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 10, insert after "Service Module" the following: "and for the purchase (at a total cost not to exceed \$14,000,000) of the pressure dome for the Interim Control Module and the Androgynous Peripheral Docking Adapter and related hardware for the United States propulsion module,".

On page 13, line 15, insert "credible" before "information".

On page 17, beginning on line 15, strike "RUSSIAN SPACE AGENCY" and insert "RUSSIAN AVIATION AND SPACE AGENCY".

On page 17, beginning on line 17, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 18, beginning on line 1, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 6, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 10, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 18, beginning on line 13, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 15, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 16, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The amendment (No. 2820) was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. As a reminder to all Members, passage of this bill either by roll-call vote or voice vote is to occur in the 4 p.m. timeframe. We are trying to accommodate Senators who have a number of other meetings they need to attend, but it will be either at 4 or 4:30 at the very latest. Members will be notified, via hotline, as soon as the exact time has been determined.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this very important legislation, H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 1999.

Let me say at the beginning, this legislation has always had strong bipartisan support. It passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives last year by a vote of 419-0, and it has always had strong support in the Senate from Senators LIEBERMAN, FEINSTEIN, and HELMS—a very broad, bipartisan group.

I also have to acknowledge the cooperation of Senator LEVIN, who has been working with me on the managers' amendment. I think it is important, we now go forward with this legislation.

I am pleased I have been joined in this effort by Senator LIEBERMAN, who he is on the floor to participate in the discussion of this legislation. Senator LIEBERMAN is a long-time expert in nonproliferation and Middle East matters, and he certainly deserves a lot of the credit for making this legislation possible.

The purpose of the bill is to express once again our deep concern regarding the transfer to Iran of dangerous technology, principally from Russia, China, and North Korea, as well as from other foreign entities, and to recommend additional steps to halt this deadly trade.

Again, let me go into a little history. This legislation passed the House and the Senate in 1998. The President vetoed it, but, at the request of the administration, efforts were ongoing to work with Russia. That veto was not overridden. We did not vote on it. But the hope that progress would be made has not paid off; we have not achieved the results we hoped for. You can say it was because they had changes in the leadership positions in Russia. They are trying to make progress, but the fact is, they are not making progress and this dangerous transfer of the technology that could lead to proliferation of nuclear weapons continues.

This bill requires the President to report to Congress when credible information exists of a transfer of dangerous technology to Iran. The President must also inform Congress whether he has imposed certain penalties on foreign persons as a result of such transfers. If such penalties are not imposed, the President must report the reasons why he decided against taking this step.

The bill will also create new incentives for the Russian aviation and space agency to cooperate with the United States in efforts to stem the proliferation of weapons technology to Iran by precluding certain payments to that agency if entities under its jurisdiction and control engage in such transfers.

Think about that. The United States is assisting the Russian aviation and space agency at a time when entities under its jurisdiction may, as a matter of fact, be involved in transferring this dangerous technology to Iran. It is absurd, and the American people would rightly be horrified to find that is the case.

As I noted, this bill passed the House last September by a unanimous vote, and that vote occurred despite an explicit veto threat by the President. The overwhelming bipartisan vote in the House and the strong bipartisan support the bill enjoys in the Senate underscores the seriousness with which the Congress views Iran's continued quest for long-range missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction.

I can think of few international developments that would be as damaging to U.S. national security and to stability and security in the Middle East as the acquisition by Iran of long-range, nuclear-tipped missiles.

We know already Iran has been the most notorious state sponsor of terrorism, including attacks on Americans, and we know Iran remains a steadfast opponent of peace between Israel and her neighbors, and Iran supports those whose violence is aimed at undermining prospects for a genuine lasting peace.

Some of our colleagues might observe that they had elections in Iran last week, and I believe those elections continue now. It appears reformers have been making some gains. That may be the situation in Iran, and the relations with Iran will change as a result of that. Let me assure my colleagues that the danger is still there. Those who are in charge of this nuclear proliferation in Iran have a very strong grip on what is being done, and there is very little likelihood they are going to let go of it anytime soon, in spite of what appears to be encouraging election returns. In fact, one can argue that to continue to send a strong signal against Iran's acquisition of weapons of mass destruction actually bolsters the reformers in their efforts to change the approach of Iran, both internally and externally.

While we are pleased to see what appears to be encouraging results—and I think the Senate should express itself on that, and I will suggest to the Democratic leadership we perhaps have a resolution acknowledging what has happened there and are hopeful about what that may mean—I do not think by any stretch of the imagination that should lead us to think everything is going to change immediately and we should not go forward with this very important legislation.

If my colleagues think about it, it is quite scary: Iran's leaders, now and in the future, will be in possession of nuclear-tipped ICBMs capable of reaching Washington or Los Angeles or New York. America's security and that of our friends and allies in the region will be unalterably affected by such a horrific development.

Yet that day of reckoning is coming and much sooner than we prefer, unless something is done to stop the transfer of this technology and other forms of assistance to Iran by Russia, in particular, but also by China and North Korea.

My colleagues will recall we have been working on this for 3 or 4 years. We have tried mightily to be of help to the administration in trying to put pressure on Russia in particular, but that strategy has failed to slow the flow of this dangerous technology.

Let me point out what CIA Director George Tenet said recently in a report to Congress on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction over the previous 6-month period. In that report, Director Tenet wrote:

Entities in Russia and China continued to supply a considerable amount and a wide variety of ballistic missile-related goods and technology to Iran.

The report also stated:

Iran's earlier success in gaining technology and materials from Russian companies accelerated Iranian [missile] development.

Director Tenet also noted:

Russian entities continued to interact with Iranian research centers on various [nuclear] activities. These projects will help Iran augment its nuclear technology infrastructure, which in turn would be useful in supporting nuclear weapons research and development.

The report also highlighted China's development in their programs. For example, the report stated:

Firms in China provided missile-related items, raw materials, and/or assistance to . . . Iran.

I had occasion to meet personally with Director Tenet recently because I wanted to hear what information he had that he could provide to me and other Senators who wished to have a private briefing about what is going on in this area, and also to discuss the recent U.S. counterterrorism activities.

Director Tenet reaffirmed that the flow of dangerous technology to Iran from Russia and China is, in fact, continuing and on a significant scale. It has not dropped. If anything, it has become worse. I urge those Senators who have not had a chance to review this classified record to go up to room S-407 to get this briefing. It is a sobering reminder that despite the end of the cold war, serious threats to U.S. security and our critical allies around the world remain.

I commend Director Tenet and the entire U.S. intelligence community for their heroic efforts to uncover the truth about these dangerous transfers. What makes the intelligence community's successes so much more astounding is that they come in spite of significant denial and deception by Russia, China, and others.

Director Tenet's report underscores the administration's current strategy for dealing with this growing problem. I know they worked at it. I discussed this with National Security Adviser Sandy Berger. They have tried. They acknowledged it has been difficult. They have had to deal with changing people and the laws in Russia, of while their intentions, as they provide them to us verbally, appear to be in the right direction, the results are just not there.

The administration had hoped that by engaging Russia, China, and North Korea in a dialog, they could persuade those nations to cease and desist from their provocative behavior. The administration, I understand, did get the Russian Government to take some steps, such as adoption of export control law and regulations, but despite this fact, not a single Russian has been successfully prosecuted for transferring weapons of mass destruction or missile technology to Iran. Not one. I repeat, the intelligence we get is it is probably growing worse. So action against an individual, action against companies or academicians and professors, if there is anything in that nature going on, we do not see any results.

Thus, it appears the Russian Government either supports this clandestine transfer of dangerous technology to Iran or is unwilling to take strong necessary steps to halt it.

The same can be said for the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea; therefore, I join with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in believing that it is time to send a strong signal to the administration but, more importantly, to Russia, China, and North Korea, and to other countries that may be contemplating the transfer of this dangerous technology to Iran, or to Iraq, for that matter.

The message is simple: The Congress and the American people are not content with the status quo. We are not content with the dialog that produces even more promises on the one hand and scant or no real reduction in the flow of technology on the other. Some might say this bill is not strong enough, and I would be hard pressed to disagree with that. I would prefer it to be even stronger. After all, the bill provides the President with the authority to impose sanctions, but it does not require them. We may want to look at doing that if we do not see some changes. If we do not see some actions by the administration, if we do not see some actions being taken to impose sanctions, then we may want to go that next step.

I believe bolder action is going to be needed, that this will not be enough. It is a signal that is worth providing at this time. Because of its strong bipartisan support and because I believe it will become law, I am willing to go forward with it in this fashion at this time.

The bill before us now reflects a continuing commitment in both parties to take a tough stand in the fight against nuclear proliferation.

With this in mind, I urge the President not to veto this bipartisan bill but instead to sign it into law as soon as it lands on his desk.

Again, I thank Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator HELMS, and the many other Senators who are involved in the process of crafting this important legislation. I strongly urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before the leader leaves the floor, I say it is important that we, on matters relating to foreign policy, do as much as we can on a bipartisan basis. I think moving this legislation along speaks well of that. I am confident that the legislation will be signed.

I also extend my congratulations to the Senator from Connecticut, who has worked on this for a long time, well more than a year. It is because of him, working with the full committee, that we have been able to move this measure along.

I also say to the leader, I think when the votes are counted in Iran, we should consider a resolution congratulating the people of Iran for what appears to be the moderate tone of the election results. I think that is very important. That is a positive sign, as it is a positive sign today that there appears to be developing in Russia a stable government.

I extend my appreciation to the leader for the manner in which this measure is moving along. On an issue such as this, we should not have acrimonious debate. We have been able to avoid that with the work that has been done behind the scenes. That is very important.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator will yield, I think it is important the Senate take note of the fact that for the first time in 20 years reformers may have been making some gains and that maybe internally and the way they deal with the rest of the world things may change in Iran. We hope that is the case.

I ask that you join me in talking to Senator DASCHLE to see if we can craft some legislation that would express the resolution's views on this. Hopefully, we can also take that up, if not today, maybe later this week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support this legislation. I particularly wish to thank the majority leader for his steadfast and very strong support for this important piece of legislation. The majority leader has recognized the serious threat that the proliferation of ballistic missile capacity and weapons of mass destruction to rogue nations, such as Iran, represents to our forces in the Middle East, to our allies in the Middle East, and in the not-too-distant future—maybe real soon—to our allies in Europe, and, heaven protect us, to the United States of America, to our homeland.

We have talked a lot in this Chamber, and outside, about national missile defense. We crossed a bridge on this issue last year, I think, with the bipartisan legislation sponsored initially by the majority leader's colleague from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN.

But if we are now involved in an effort to develop a national missile defense, does it not make sense to use whatever authority we have to deter, to retard, and, if possible, to prevent a rogue nation, such as Iran, from developing the capacity to strike us and our allies?

This is to me the other side of the American effort to protect us and our people and our allies from what, in the years ahead, I am afraid will be the single most serious threat to our security, which is, the proliferation of ballistic missile capacity and weapons of mass destruction.

The majority leader has been the leader on the bill we are considering

today, and I have been privileged to work with him on it. I appreciate the broad bipartisan support we have on this measure. As the majority leader said, this legislation could have been stronger. It started out stronger when we introduced the initial legislation, but in the process of trying to get something done, we modified it.

It still makes an important statement to the world about the steadfast commitment of the Congress of the United States to do everything we can to diminish the threat of weapons of mass destruction carried by ballistic missiles. It sends a message to our friends in Russia about the intensity of our concern about their part in helping Iran develop weapons of mass destruction. I believe it sends a message to the Administration of the United States about the broad bipartisan support in Congress for tougher actions against any nation, including Russia—with whom we have a developing relationship—if they are supporting Iran in the development of this destructive capacity.

A reporter stopped me earlier today on the way to the Chamber and asked: Aren't you worried about the effect that passage of the Iran Nonproliferation Act will have on the Government of Russia or in the Presidential elections coming in Russia? My answer, directly, is no. But, obviously, we are all concerned and hopeful that the forces of reform will take hold in Russia and bring stability and progress to that country. But our first concern has to be not what happens in Russia, but what we can do to protect the security of the American people in this country and our forces abroad from the threat of weapons of mass destruction carried by ballistic missiles. If the Russian Government will be true to its own statements about working against proliferation, then there will be no problem for Russia as a result of the passage of this legislation.

My colleagues have talked about changes in Iran. The developments are most remarkable in Iran. There is a whole new generation of Iranians and, if I am not mistaken, more than half of it was not of age when the extreme Islamic revolution, led by Ayatollah Khomeini, occurred in the late 1970s. It is a generation that appears to want reform, better lives for themselves, freedom, better relations with the West, and better relations with the United States of America.

Remarkably, in the midst of the very authoritarian government that came into power in the late 1970s and has been there since, the Iranians have continued to have elections.

Here is the power of the people at work again. Last Friday, apparently, more than four out of five eligible voters came out to vote in Iran. I say, parenthetically, what an embarrassment it should be to us to recall that in 1998, the last time we had a congressional election—our own, if you will, parliamentary election—36 percent of the

eligible voters came out to vote; only one-third, as compared to more than four-fifths in Iran. They are apparently expressing very broad support for the forces of reform.

Does that diminish the concern we have about what Iran is doing? Not immediately, unfortunately. Because the power is still exercised by a small group of leaders at the top. Not by the reform-oriented, moderate President Khatami, but by the religious leaders at the top who still exercise and control the agencies of foreign policy, defense policy, and intelligence policy, who still have the power to override and veto any of the acts, even of this new reform Parliament.

The focus of our concern about Iran is that it has been our most implacable foe in the recent past and that it has been the single most intransigent supporter of terrorism against this Nation and our allies, a reality that remains unchanged.

The thought that weapons of mass destruction, carried by ballistic missiles, would be in the possession of this nation, effectively still controlled by this small group of enemies of the United States, should fill us with the most profound fear and anxiety.

It is from that fear and anxiety that this bill emerges. It is not the first time we have expressed our concerns about these developments in Iran. In previous enactments we have given the Administration the tools to try to address this problem, specifically in the Arms Export Control Act and in the Iran-Iraq Sanctions Act. But we were not satisfied with those measures and the way they were being used, so we passed the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act in 1997, a measure similar to this legislation we are considering today.

Unfortunately, the President chose to veto that legislation. That is why H.R. 1883 was introduced and why it passed the House overwhelmingly, 419-0, with every Member of both parties who voted supporting it.

Since 1997, our concern about the problem has not diminished. It is widely and reliably reported—this is why we are back with this legislation—that entities and people in Russia continue to provide both technology and assistance to Iran to build these dangerous weapons. Iran has made worrying progress on its missile program, as the majority leader indicated and as the intelligence reports, classified as they are, which are available to our colleagues, clearly state.

I cite also an unclassified source. According to the Congressional Research Service, with help from Russians and others, notably North Koreans and Chinese, Iran has produced a Shahab 3 ballistic missile with a range of 800 miles and tested it; on July 22, 1998, to be exact. Although the first test was apparently unsuccessful, the Congressional Research Service reports that the Shahab 3 is now thought to be operational and in production. There also

have been credible reports that Iran is in the process of developing yet another, more advanced missile, the Shahab 4, which would have a range of up to 2,000 miles, more than double the range of the Shahab 3. We have some basis for believing the Iranians are now working on intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If combined with weapons of mass destruction, these existing Iranian missiles can threaten American forces and our allies and friends in the Middle East and, soon after that, as indicated, our forces and allies throughout Europe and, of course, eventually, the American homeland itself. This is a frightening prospect, given Iran's large chemical weapons program and aggressive attempt to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. The American Government has made it clear that Iran is attempting—in this case largely with China's help—to reach self-sufficiency in the manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons, though Iran continues to deny that charge. Concerns have also been expressed by authorities in our country that Iran is seeking to become a nuclear arms state by attempting to buy material for such weapons or by using nonmilitary nuclear assistance to build up its knowledge about nuclear weapons.

These programs in Iran can profoundly change the balance of power in the region and strike a very serious blow to our efforts to contain Iran until it becomes a responsible member of the community of nations, until the forces of change which are blowing so hopefully through Iran, even as we speak today, reach fruition and a change of policy.

I am sure most everyone in this Chamber will look forward to a day when sanctions of this kind will not be necessary because a new government, representing what seems to be the clear will of the Iranian people, would be in power in Tehran; a government with which the United States of America and our allies could have constructive and peaceful relations. But until that time, the kinds of weapons capabilities that are being developed allow Iran to threaten, for instance, friendly Arab States, making it harder for them to cooperate with the United States. These weapons capabilities would raise the risks to U.S. military forces in the region and could threaten the free flow of oil out of this critical region which could, of course, create crises in the United States, in Europe, Asia, and in any other place in the world that depends on fuel from the Middle East to power their economies.

It is self-evident and axiomatic that we have to do whatever we can to try to deter this dangerous capability, to delay it, to retard it as best we can, given the Iranian Government that now exists. Part of that is making clear, as I believe this legislation does, to our friends in Russia in no uncertain terms that we are serious about this. The time for hit and miss, slower, bob-

and-weave progress toward shutting off Russian assistance to Iran for the development of these dangerous programs is over.

In addition to other sanctions, we have focused in this bill on holding up extraordinary, as we call it, American funding for the international space station to the Russian space agency, unless Russia takes sufficient action to halt any part it is playing in proliferation to Iran. This is our attempt to demonstrate the seriousness of our concern about this matter, even to the extent of stopping the funding of a program that is not only important to us—that is, space cooperation—but important to the Russians.

While we cannot expect to prevent all technology transfers to rogue states, we do have the ability to check the flow of some of it by adopting the kinds of sanctions in this legislation that are aimed at persons engaged in such activity. We are able and therefore must act to take measures against those governments that condone such activity, whether or not they are organizing and abetting the transfer, or merely looking the other way when their citizens engage in these activities.

Senator LOTT quoted CIA Director George Tenet. Director Tenet has made quite clear that despite the noticeable shifts within Iran, it remains "the most active state sponsor of terrorism." Iran's support for dangerous terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, through training, money, and weapons, has just not ended. There are people in our country, people whom I respect, who continue to sustain the belief, based on evidence they have gathered, that Iran was involved in the 1996 attack on American service personnel at Khobar in Saudi Arabia, though no definitive conclusion has been reached on that matter.

We have been engaged in a dialog across a wide spectrum with our friends and allies in trying to address the issue of proliferation to Iran. The prospect of a nuclear-capable, militarily powerful Iran armed with ballistic missiles is clearly a threat to our national interests and to those of our allies; therefore, we must act to stop it. The sanctions we are proposing will further stop the diffusion of this technology and lead to a more stable Middle East.

I echo the words of the majority leader: The passage of this measure may actually encourage the forces of reform in Iran which are now so boldly and inspiringly expressing themselves. It certainly does seem that those forces of reform want to have better relations with the West, with the United States. Part of what we are saying to them is, this matters to us. You must stop your support of terrorism. Stop your development of these weapons of mass destruction, and we can develop a much better relationship.

The bill itself is simple and direct. It requires the President to submit reports to Congress on foreign entities where there is credible information that these entities have transferred certain goods, services, or technologies to Iran. That part of the bill would apply to any entities anywhere in the world, not just the Russians. It authorizes the President to impose measures against these entities, but does not mandate him to do so. It allows him to consider exculpatory material, material that argues against the guilt of the entities.

And with an amendment that will be adopted, submitted by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, those entities will be given an opportunity to respond to those allegations before any sanctions are considered.

Finally, the bill prohibits these extraordinary American payments to the Russian space agency until certain conditions enumerated in the bill are met. The purpose is to say to the Russians specifically that we keep seeing compelling evidence that entities in Russia are supporting the development of these dangerous programs within Iran.

As much as we want to continue to work with Russia on joint efforts in space, we will not do so if they are contributing to this grave threat to our security.

Finally, I thank Senator LOTT, Senator BIDEN, Senator HELMS, and others on both sides who have worked together to bring this bill to the floor, where I have reason to believe it will achieve strong support. I was pleased to hear representatives of the Administration indicate to some of us a short while ago that, though they may not specifically support the bill, they would not recommend that, in its current form, the President veto it. I think we are on the way to making a unified statement, which is a constructive one, and which takes a small but significant step toward protecting us, our children, and grandchildren from the threat of weapons of mass destruction carried by ballistic missiles.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Connecticut leaves the floor, I wish to thank him and acknowledge all the work he has done over the past year or more on this issue. He has, in a sense, exercised some forbearance in the past when he thought it might have been more appropriate to make a stronger move, but because of circumstances within Russia and our bilateral relations and the hope—not expectation—that there may be a way to get this done, he has cooperated. I think everybody should understand the reason this issue has stayed so much on the forefront is because of his vigilance and his effort. I thank him for that. I thank him as well, along with other colleagues, for

entertaining some of the changes that Senator LEVIN proposed. I think this is a much better bill. I agree with him; I think enough time has passed to demonstrate that this may be the only course left open, and hopefully it will work.

In a strange sense, the Senator and I have had occasion separately and individually, as the Presiding Officer has, to meet with members of the Russian Duma, members of the Russian Government, and members of the leadership of the various Arab states. I find it counterintuitive that they don't understand, quite frankly, that what is happening in Iran and their quest for this missile technology is literally a greater threat to them than it is to us. It is no greater threat to anyone than Israel; nonetheless, it is an incredibly significant threat to our friends in Europe, as well as our Arab friends. What is going on in North Korea is a threat to China and Russia in the long term, not only Japan and South Korea. What is going on in Iraq is a greater threat to our French friends—who seem to support Iraq against their own interests—than it is to us.

I am wondering when reason will take hold. I am a little bit dismayed, and more than a little bit miffed, by the ability of our friends, as well as those who are not viewed as our close friends, to dismiss reality. What do they think? If Russia is worried about the radicalization of the Moslem populations within the former Soviet Union, the Trans-Caucasus, and other places, why in the devil do they not understand that what is going on in Iraq, as well as in Iran—if it does not take a drastic change in course—is inimical to their interests? Ironically, the second largest former Communist state—the former Soviet Union—seems to be the ultimate capitalist in this regard; but they can't add very well. This is, I think, more about money than anything else. Hopefully, as I will lay out in my statement—and I don't want to delay the Senator any longer—they will see the virtues of looking to the West and not to Iran and Iraq for the source of their economic survival. At any rate, I thank the Senator very much for his leadership.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Delaware for his kind words and the spirit of cooperation in which we have worked on this and on so many other matters over the years. I could not agree with him more on what he said. There is an irony here. It is as if folks in places such as Russia are still doing what we sometimes criticize people in our country for doing—going by a cold-war mentality. But it is a cold-war mentality heavily not only affected by communism, but what the Senator has said, capitalism. So they are selling for short-term gains that, before very long, will endanger them more than us. This is our attempt to say: We are in this together. We are threatened by what you are doing, but watch out,

friends, you are going to be threatened soon yourselves.

I thank the Senator for his characteristically straight talk—although he is not on the Straight Talk Express. He is a straight talker in the Senate Chamber. I thank him for his support.

Mr. BIDEN. I wish the driver of that express a lot of luck.

Maybe what Mr. Putin, who is the Acting President and likely soon to be elected President, it appears—maybe we should send my mom over to see him. My mom had an expression, from the time we were kids, when you would do something against your own interest out of anger, or out of pique, or misunderstanding. My mother would say, "Don't bite your nose off to spite your face." Well, we have a whole lot of Russians seeming to bite their noses off to spite their faces. I find it absolutely astounding what they appear to continue to do.

The bill before us is called the Iran Nonproliferation Act. That is the context in which we should talk about this, and I think we should understand this. The purpose of this bill is not to punish, but rather to restrain. The goal that we pursue is not to invoke sanctions, but rather to make this a safer world for all of us, including the Russians. The means to that end is to make this a world with fewer weapons of mass destruction and with fewer delivery systems able to deliver weapons of mass destruction, notably long-range ballistic missiles.

Long-range ballistic missiles are a curious invention. They are awesome, frankly, but they don't amount to much as a military weapon unless they are armed with a powerful warhead. Now, the sort of long-range missile that Third World countries might build—and that the countries I have mentioned are attempting to build, or have built—those missiles cannot carry big enough warheads to do much damage with a conventional high explosive, a plain old bomb; they are too heavy. The missile is not big enough, powerful enough, does not have enough throw weight to carry conventional weapons. So the irony is that a country which develops or buys long-range ballistic missiles is all too likely, therefore, to seek weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear warheads that are lighter and have much more—no pun intended—bang for the buck than a conventional weapon, or even potentially a lighter payload, with chemical weapons or biological weapons on top of these missiles. The irony is that as they develop a long-range ballistic missile capacity, they are led inextricably—if they are going to be of any "value" militarily—they move toward weapons of mass destruction with which to arm the missiles.

North Korea has been trying to build a nuclear weapon. Iraq has built chemical and biological weapons and is seeking a nuclear capability. They were close to building a nuclear weapon a decade ago. Similarly, Iran has a

covert nuclear weapons program. Even the Government of Russia admits that. Iran has also developed and used chemical weapons. Now, again, that is chemical weapons that, based on the missile technology they may have acquired, even if they have a range of 2,000 miles, as my friend from Connecticut indicated, doesn't get them to Washington, DC. It doesn't get them to any U.S. territory. But it does get them to a lot of areas of the world where our friends—in this case, the Russians—can be affected.

We have to stop this as best we can. The world must move toward fewer weapons of mass destruction, not more of them. We have to reduce the number of long-range ballistic missiles in the world, not increase them. Unfortunately, some foreign persons—and I say "persons" because that is the legal word in this legislation for officials or entities; by "entities" we mean the Russian agency comparable to our space agency, NASA, or the agency in Russia comparable to our Defense Department, or institutes, or companies. In Russia, institutes or companies cannot be separated very clearly from the Government.

Unfortunately, some of these foreign "persons"—in Russia, China, and North Korea—are deaf to the world's call for nonproliferation and apparently tone deaf to their own interests. The countries or entities are so desperate for cash or so angry at the West that they will risk Armageddon by helping Iran build long-range ballistic missiles or even nuclear weapons.

As ironic as this sounds, this legislation is designed in part to save them from their own destructive impulses. The United States has imposed sanctions at times on entities from all three of these supplier countries. Again, by the "supplier" countries I mean North Korea, China, and Russia. The United States has imposed sanctions on entities from these countries and is continuing negotiations with all of these countries to secure an end to their assistance to Iran. While we may hope for success in the months or years to come, however, there has been little success so far.

Today the Senate will vote to make the President list the offending "persons;" to increase his powers to impose sanctions against them; and to limit United States support for Russian work on the international space station if any entities under the Russian Aviation and Space Agency continue to assist Iran, which we have reason to believe they have.

It is important to understand that H.R. 1883, which we will shortly pass, is not an anti-Russian bill. Rather, it is simply and overwhelmingly a nonproliferation bill. Both I and the Senate sponsors of this bill would like nothing better than to have this bill result in no sanctions whatever against Russia.

While we try to crack down on entities that assist Iran's long-range bal-

listic missile programs, we also support nonproliferation of assistance to Russia. We continue to help Russia reduce its unneeded strategic weapons through the Nunn-Lugar program, protect its sensitive nuclear materials, help it find new careers for excess weapon scientists, and improve its export control laws. Those are the laws that are on the books, and should be enforced, which would prevent any agency or company within Russia from transferring usable information to aid and abet Iran in their long-range missile programs.

We are helping Russia in other ways, as well, so this should not be taken in isolation. This is part of a continuum of efforts on our part to deal with the interests of our country as well as Russia. The United States Government, with the support of many in this body, also continues to work with Russia on many other vital issues. We seek continued strategic arms reductions, through the so-called START process. We support the sharing of missile warning data. We are working to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the ABM Treaty, with an amendment that allows for—again, in Russia's interests—a limited ballistic missile defense. Again, we pointed out that North Korea and Iran present a greater danger to them than they do to the United States.

The United States and other Western countries also offer the investment on which Russia's economic development depends. United States companies even buy ballistic missile engines from Russia's top design bureaus. Our American companies are purchasing directly from Russian design entities. We are buying engines that they are producing, from which they are making substantial money. Iran cannot begin to match the power of the United States to sustain and transform Russian industry. In other words, they will make a heck of a lot more money doing the right thing, dealing with the United States and with the Western Europeans and Japan, than they will ever make from selling technology to Iran. I urge Russian leaders to think about that.

I wonder, with all the chaos that is in place in Russia, whether anybody at the top has ever really focused on this. In pure unadulterated dollars and cents, what is in Russia's economic interest is to sell to the West rather than to sell to Iran. If the choice is starkly made, which we are about to do, I hope they will focus more logically on their alternatives.

This bill and the Senate are not anti-Russian, but we are manifestly anti-proliferation. We will not tolerate vicious and venal persons plunging the world into a new cold war, let alone a hot one in which weapons of mass destruction would be a freely traded currency of death. If Russia or China or North Korea should choose the path of proliferation—and they have to some degree already done that—we will show

that there are better paths to power and prestige than proliferating ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction to Third World countries with unstable regimes. There is still time to stamp out proliferation and to put the world on a more peaceful path, but we must not and we will not collaborate in sowing the seeds of global destruction through proliferation.

It is unfortunate that the Senate action occurs only weeks before next month's Presidential elections in Russia. The need to pass this legislation is not our fault, that is Russia's fault. Some in that country between now and those elections may try to use our action to stir up a nationalistic reaction for their own political purposes in the upcoming Russian election. That would be both unwise and ill founded. It is also unfortunate that the House authors of this bill insisted upon triggering Presidential reporting and possible sanctions based upon a very low standard of evidence. In practice, however, no President will impose sanctions unless he is convinced that wrongdoing has occurred, notwithstanding the fact that the House standard of evidence is too low a threshold.

Finally, I regret that this bill does not permit the President to authorize extraordinary payments for work on the international space station, if those payments should be needed, to protect sensitive intelligence information. Neither does it permit payments to a sanctioned entity if such payments are needed to prevent significant dangers to the crew of the space station. I do not think either of those are wise restrictions, and I hope these concerns can be addressed in conference between the House and Senate.

The important fact is, however, that the Senate action today is a measure not of anti-Russian sentiment, nor of any impulse to bully. Rather, it reflects the depth of our concern and also our frustration over the increasing risk that Russian and other entities will recklessly open Pandora's box, against their own interest as well as ours.

I earnestly hope that in the coming weeks, our President and the newly elected President of Russia can put us back on the track of peaceful cooperation to make this a safer and more prosperous world. That is a real prospect for both countries, if Russia would only accept that its profit and its destiny lies in the West, not in the East.

Perhaps passage of this bill will help to bring about such a reevaluation. If so, then prospects for the new century on which we have just embarked would truly be improved. If not, it puts us on a perilous slope to more proliferation and colder, not warmer, relations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 1999.

As chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I am in a privileged position to have access to the volumes of intelligence information gathered at great expense and

even risk of life by our intelligence community.

Sadly, this intelligence leads me to the conclusion that our efforts thus far to stem proliferation have failed. As the Director of Central Intelligence told me in an open Hearing before the Senate Intelligence Committee just this month:

Mr. Chairman, on proliferation, the picture that I drew last year has become even more stark and worrisome. Transfers of enabling technologies to countries of proliferation concern have not abated.

Particularly in the case of Iran, the intelligence indicates that the proliferation of missile technologies as well as the technologies and expertise to enable their development of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, continues unabated.

Our nonproliferation efforts haven't failed because we haven't tried other things. They have failed because the tools we have used thus far have not been up to the task.

The task is indeed formidable.

Iran desperately wants these weapons. We wish they didn't. We wish the problem would go away on its own. But the evidence indicates that it won't. In the unclassified version of a report submitted to me on January 21st pursuant to a mandate in the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1997—a report available to all Members—the Director of Central Intelligence stated:

Iran remains one of the most active countries seeking to acquire WMD [weapons of mass destruction] . . . from abroad. In doing so, Tehran is attempting to develop an indigenous capability to produce various types of weapons—nuclear, chemical, and biological—and their delivery systems.

With regard to missile proliferation, in his testimony to me this month, the DCI reported that:

Most analysts believe that Iran, following the North Korean pattern, could test an ICBM capable of delivering a light payload to the United States in the next few years.

And, he added, Iran could become not just a recipient, but a proliferator:

While Russia, China, and North Korea continue to be the main suppliers of ballistic missiles and related technology, long-standing recipients—such as Iran—might become suppliers in their own right as they develop domestic production capabilities.

Iran is not just seeking missiles, but also biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. Iran is seeking dual-use technologies to further the biological warfare program it began during the Iran-Iraq war. Iran also wants to maintain a prohibited chemical weapons capability. According to the January DCI report I just mentioned, Iran, despite its commitment to give up chemical weapons under the Chemical Weapons Convention, “has manufactured and stockpiled chemical weapons, including blister, blood, and choking agents and the bombs and artillery shells for delivering them.” They have continued to “seek production technology, expertise, and chemicals that could be used as precursor agents in its chemical warfare program from entities in Rus-

sia and China.” Finally, Iran wants a nuclear weapons capability. According to the DCI: “Iran sought nuclear-related equipment, material and technical expertise from a variety of sources, especially in Russia, during the first half of 1999.”

Importantly, Iran is seeking an indigenous capability. Their pursuit of WMD and delivery systems has led to a maturing indigenous capability. This means that the window in which we can stop significant proliferation to Iran is closing rapidly. This means that the time to intervene is now.

Some have suggested that the recent elections in Iran should lead us to pause our consideration of this bill. I disagree. First, to the degree that the newly elected Iranian legislators seek to constrain efforts to develop and deploy weapons of mass destruction, I believe that this legislation will strengthen such an effort. It demonstrates the seriousness with which the United States Congress views proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Second, existing evidence indicates that we cannot count on the elections to bring an end to Iran's national policy of developing weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. It is important to underscore that former President Rafsanjani, considered a moderate in Iranian political circles, was the very leader who initiated Iran's pursuit of those weapons. Indeed it was Rafsanjani who said that “Chemical and biological weapons are poor man's atomic bombs . . .” After he became Iran's President, he is quoted as saying: “We should fully equip ourselves in the defensive and offensive use of chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons.” We cannot expect that Iran will therefore give up its pursuit of these weapons on their own. This bill will provide additional incentive for them to do so, and we will watch carefully for evidence of such a decision, but at this point, absent strong policy on our part, we must conclude that the policy of acquiring these weapons and their means of delivery will continue.

The task of stemming proliferation to Iran is made more difficult because individuals and the nations from which they proliferate have their own strong motives for aiding Iran. For some individuals, the motive is money. But why can't we simply rely on the governments in which they operate to stop them? In some cases, governments are too weak to intervene. In others, the government looks the other way or even promotes proliferation to Iran because their leaders welcome the challenge an Iran with missiles and weapons of mass destruction poses to the United States.

We need the tools to offset the benefits of aiding Iran. We must ensure that there are financial and other costs associated with supplying the assistance Iran still needs in its drive for weapons of mass destruction and missiles.

H.R. 1883 gives the United States tools to attack proliferation on the supply side.

The first tool is the light of exposure to scrutiny. H.R. 1883 requires the President to submit annual reports identifying every person that, on or after January 1, 1999, transfers to Iran goods, services or technology on existing control lists or items with the potential to make a material contribution to Iran's development of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons or ballistic or cruise missile systems. As a result, the Congress, the American people, and the community of nations will know who is supporting Iran's efforts to threaten peace and stability. We will shine a light on those lining their bank accounts by selling the tools of hideous death and unimaginable destruction to Iran. The threat of public exposure should serve as a significant deterrent to those who contemplate proliferation to Iran.

The second tool offered by H.R. 1883 is the authorization for the President to deny perpetrators of proliferation access to some U.S. trade. I highlight the word “authorization.” The sanctions provided by H.R. 1883 are not mandatory and exceptions are granted.

These tools, properly employed, will help stem the tide of proliferation to Iran. Are there costs? Yes. Some U.S. businesses may be called upon by the President to refrain from commerce with individuals that are shown to be materially aiding Iran's weapons of mass destruction and missile programs. But such a potential cost seems reasonable to me in light of the potentially far greater cost if we fail to act—the lives of American men, women, and children.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1883 in a bipartisan way, as our House colleagues did when they voted to pass H.R. 1883 by a vote of 419-zero.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, there are few in this body who have worked harder on this issue than my friend from Connecticut, and it has been a real pleasure to work with him on this legislation and on this issue.

The Iran Nonproliferation Act is an important piece of legislation which seeks to halt the flow of ballistic missile technology and other weapons of mass destruction from Russia to Iran. I strongly support Senate passage of this legislation.

Indeed, even as much of the U.S. focus in the past year—and rightly so, in my mind—has been on the peace process and Israel's relations with Syria and the Palestinians, there may be no greater long term threat to Israel's security and Middle East peace than an Iran actively seeking ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons.

That is why I believe that preventing the transfer of illegal nuclear and missile technology from Russia to Iran must be at the top of the U.S. policy agenda.

As my colleagues are aware, there have been numerous reports over the

past several years of Russian missile technology reaching Iran, sometimes with a semi-official wink from government authorities in Moscow, sometimes by rogue operators.

Either way, the Russian government must put a stop to these transfers.

As much as we want good relations with Russia, cooperation in this area is crucial. In some ways, I believe it is a litmus test of what sort of player Russia wants to be in the post-Cold War international system.

Although Russia has denied that any illegal transfers have taken place, it has taken some tangible steps in response to American concerns—such as the cancellation of a 1997 contract between a Russian missile factory (NPO Trud) and Iran in which rocket engine components were to have been shipped under the guise of gas pipeline compressors.

Unfortunately, despite such progress as cooperation with the NPO Trud contract, since issuing an Executive Order in 1998, the United States has been forced to sanction ten Russian entities for continuing to transfer technology for the development of advanced ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction, and the Central Intelligence Agency reports that Russian entities continue to provide Iran with assistance. Indeed, there are reportedly over 10,000 Russians in Iran helping Iran with these programs.

For its part, and despite some positive signs of moderation in Iran's politics—the recent elections notwithstanding—Iran has not yet moderated any of its policies with regard to the support of international terrorism or the pursuit of advanced ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

Iran has flight-tested the Shihab-3, a missile that can hit Israel and U.S. forces in the Middle East, and is continuing to work on other advanced missile designs, including those capable of delivering nuclear warheads.

Because of Russia's mixed record—and Iran's outright dangerous record—I believe that although we should try to build on Russia's record of cooperation, we must also be prepared to take tough action when the situation warrants. In other words, we must be prepared to work with Russia on this issue and offer them a carrot, but, if our interests and those of our friends and allies are threatened, we must also be prepared to use a stick.

To that end, last year I offered an amendment on the Department of Defense authorization bill, passed by the Senate, which stated that it is the sense of Congress that the U.S. should increase the quota on commercial space launch services provided by Russia if the Russian government demonstrates a sustained commitment to prevent the transfer from Russia to Iran, or other countries, of nuclear and missile technology.

I continue to believe that pending Russian cooperation this quota can be raised to 20 and, if Russia continues to

cooperate, incrementally raised again in the coming years. Each launch provides Russia with approximately \$100 million in hard currency. A \$100 million carrot is a good incentive to cooperate.

The bill we consider before us today recognizes that in addition to such carrots, we must also be prepared to take tough action when necessary. The Iran Nonproliferation Act has two parts.

First, it requires the President to report credible information about any foreign entity providing dangerous technologies to Iran and authorize the President to sanction these entities in accordance with the President's own Executive Order.

Second, it requires that the President must certify that the Russian government opposes the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to Iran and is taking steps to oppose such proliferation before the Russian Space Agency is provided with any additional U.S. taxpayer money beyond what has contracted for the International Space Station. These are funds which the U.S. is providing to Russia so that Russia can meet its own obligations to the International Space Station. If Russia and the Russian Space Agency cooperates with the U.S. on proliferation, then cooperation between Russia and Iran on the proliferation of advanced ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction must stop. If Russia and the Russian Space Agency cooperates with the U.S. on proliferation, then I believe we can work in partnership with them to increase commercial space launch and to provide funding for the International Space Station.

But there are few things more dangerous or destabilizing to U.S. interests and peace and security in the Middle East than a nuclear armed Iran which continues to support international terrorism. And if Russia does not recognize this and is not willing to work with the United States to build a more stable and more secure Middle East, then we must not shy away from taking the tough action necessary to get results.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the past three years the Clinton administration has fought tooth-and-nail against the legislation now before the Senate. The White House repeatedly claimed, in its attempted defense, that the Lott-Lieberman initiative would undermine U.S. nonproliferation efforts, repeatedly asserting that they had Russia's behavior in check, and that progress was being made.

Well, Mr. President, we now confront an Iran that has been armed to the gills with technology for ballistic missiles and nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. According to the National Intelligence Officer for Strategic and Nuclear Programs, (who testified before the Foreign Relations Committee this past September), Iran is in a position to test, within the latter half of this decade, an ICBM that "could deliver a several-hundred kilogram pay-

load to many parts of the United States . . . using Russian technology and assistance."

Moreover, according to the Director of Central Intelligence, Iran "probably has achieved 'emergency operational capability'" with its medium range Shahab-3 missile. In other words, under President Clinton's watch, Iran has acquired from Russia and China the ability to strike Israel and Turkey with ballistic missiles carrying chemical or biological warheads. And the mullahs are working overtime to develop the Shahab-4 and Shahab-5 in order to menace U.S. citizens at home.

In conclude now, in the absence of fierce opposition to this bill from the White House this time around, that reality has finally sunk in at the National Security Council. The Clinton administration's nonproliferation policy has been an abject failure. Bill Clinton and AL GORE will leave office having subordinated nonproliferation concerns to business interests, the wishes to foreign campaign donors, and their "touchy-feely" personal politicking in Russia, China and elsewhere.

The result has been an all-out fire-sale of deadly technologies by Russia, China, and others. Delegations from Iran, Syria, Iraq, North Korea, Libya, Sudan, Egypt, India, and Pakistan are virtually tripping over one another on their way in and out of various Russian and Chinese firms.

The Clinton-Gore Administration will leave office:

1. having allowed Russia and China to sell dangerous commodities around the globe with no fear of sanctions or consequences;
2. having presided over the development of a North Korean ICBM capable of dropping biological weapons on U.S. soil (according to the intelligence community, a Taepo Dong-2 ICBM could be tested any day now);
3. having presided over the arming of Iran, Syria, and others with nuclear, chemical, and biological missiles;
4. having squandered its inheritance regarding Iraq by interfering with, and ultimately abandoning, UNSCOM;
5. having prompted India and Pakistan into an all-out nuclear arms race by trying to "strong-arm" the two countries into the Test Ban Treaty (which merely prompted the nations to test);
6. having lost all hope of getting the START II Treaty ratified, which would have banned MIRVed ICBMs in Russia;
7. having imperiled the IAEA by tying the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to the poorly-conceived, poorly-drafted CTBT, which the Senate rightly rejected;
8. having destroyed the Missile Technology Control Regime by allowing Russia (a missile proliferator) to come in as a member; and
9. having wasted half a decade of precious time in deploying a national missile defense to protect the United States from the consequences of their failed nonproliferation policy.

We must all remember that the Clinton-Gore administration voted the DoD authorization bill in 1995 because it required deployment of a national missile defense by 2001, with additional protection by 2003. Because of the President's reckless disregard for the nation's security, the U.S. will not "break ground" on a missile defense site in Alaska until this summer, at the earliest.

At the same time, this administration taught Russia and China how to evade U.S. sanctions laws while simultaneously putting the U.S. sanctions determination process into a deep freeze. Not a single MTCR sanction has been imposed for Russia's arming of Iran or China's assistance to Pakistan. The enormity of this blatant disregard for the law is stunning, Mr. President.

What is worse, by promoting U.S. commercial interests at the expense of national security, the Clinton-Gore administration has become part of the problem.

China's nuclear proliferation has been swept under the rug by Mr. Clinton in order to clear the way for the nuclear lobby to sell reactors to the PRC. We must recall that, in 1998, President Clinton made a legally binding certification which no other President could, in good faith, bring himself to make. But the Clinton-Gore administration was happy to oblige industry and the Communist Chinese.

In 1996 the Clinton administration pulled controls on commercial satellites because millionaire campaign donors wanted it. Unsupervised, unscrupulous U.S. companies engaged in the transfer of very sensitive ballistic missile information to the PRC, including information relating to the MIRVing of ICBMs. The Congress tried to shore up this fiasco by recontrolling satellites, but the Commerce Department is at it again, having recently declared—despite the law—that it wants reduced controls on extremely sensitive items such as radiation hardened chips and kick motors.

From 1993 until 1999, willful disregard for security at the White House and the Department of Energy permitted continued acquisition of the nation's most sensitive nuclear warhead designs by China. This was exacerbated by the foolhardy declassification of thousands of documents by Hazel O'Leary, which undoubtedly has contributed to nuclear weapons capabilities around the globe. Even now, the Clinton-Gore administration is contemplating sharing nuclear weapons secrets with Russia in an effort to bribe them into submission on the ABM Treaty.

Lately, the Department of Defense—once the bulwark against the foolhardy weakening of export controls—has been working "hand-in-glove" with the defense industry and the Gore campaign. The Pentagon is now looking for ways to undermine the Arms Export Control Act. Again, this is happening because industry lobbying groups want these changes. There is an effort underway to

avoid congressional notification of arms sales and to create license-free zones. The result, if unchecked, will be unfettered and unregulated trade in weaponry, which cannot be seen as a positive development under any circumstance.

Finally, the administration has decided to support passively an Export Administration Act which would effectively undermine all existing U.S. export controls and which would undercut what is left of the nonproliferation policy which this administration inherited eight years ago. Enormous sums of money are being spent all over Washington by various industry groups because they know how loose export controls will be under this bill.

Ronald Reagan's nonproliferation policy is in shambles, Mr. President. At best, this administration has been inept in managing such important issues. At worst, the administration has co-opted and corrupted nonproliferation policy on the basis of fund-raising schemes being run out of the Oval Office. The damage to U.S. nonproliferation policy is so severe and far-reaching, and the global results to date have been so catastrophic, that the next administration is going to spend the first four years just picking up the pieces.

Mr. President, history will do worse than recording this administration as having fiddled while Rome burned. It will record these people as having set many of the fires themselves.

I support the Iran Nonproliferation Act. Its reporting requirements will shed light on the fact that numerous Russian entities have sold their souls to the Mullahs in Tehran by offering that bunch of terrorists everything they want for their ballistic and cruise missile programs, including nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare technology. It will also prove that this administration has accomplished nothing in the past several years of "talking."

That said, however much it might help, this bill will not solve the problem. It is much too late to prevent Iran from capitalizing upon the capabilities it has acquired.

While it is not too late to defend ourselves, or to assist Israel, Turkey, and others in defending themselves, it will fall to the next administration to reconstruct a comprehensive nonproliferation policy and reverse the fearful effects of the past eight years.

Thank you, Mr. President; I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile delivery systems continues to be one of the most significant threats to America's national security. States like North Korea and Iran are actively pursuing ambitious programs and the technology needed to threaten the United States. Unclassified reports from our intelligence agencies indicate that these efforts have intensified.

Iranian ballistic missile progress is largely the result of substantial assist-

ance from North Korea, China, and especially, Russia. There is no doubt that foreign technology and assistance are essential to Iran's ballistic missile and weapons of mass destruction programs. The U.S. intelligence community's most recent unclassified Semiannual Report to Congress on Proliferation states, "Iran remains one of the most active countries seeking to acquire WMD [weapons of mass destruction] and ACW [advanced conventional weapons] technology from abroad."

The type of foreign assistance that is the subject of this legislation serves to increase the sophistication and rate of development of Iran's ballistic missiles. We must do more than we are doing now to impede its progress and, at the same time, prepare defenses against the use of such weapons.

The rapid development of the Shahab-3 demonstrates how foreign assistance accelerated Iran's ballistic missile programs. The Shahab-3 is based on the North Korean Nodong ballistic missile. But instead of simply purchasing the missile as Pakistan did, Iran chose to modify the design of the missile with Russian and Chinese assistance and produce the missile on its own. In February 1997, George Tenet, then Acting Director of the CIA, testified that with North Korean assistance, Iran could develop the Shahab-3 medium-range ballistic missile, "in less than ten years." Less than a year later, in January 1998, Director Tenet testified, "Iran's success in gaining technology and material from Russian companies, combined with recent indigenous Iranian advances, means that [Iran] could have a medium-range ballistic missile much sooner than I assessed last year." Six months later, in July 1998, Iran flight-tested the Shahab-3. An unclassified Intelligence Community report released in January of this year assessed that Iran has achieved an "emergency operational capability" with the Shahab-3.

Proliferation to Iran continues. According to the U.S. intelligence community's most recent unclassified Semiannual Report on Proliferation, summarizing proliferation that occurred in the first half of 1999,

Russian entities during the first six months of 1999 have provided substantial missile-related technology, training, and expertise to Iran that almost certainly will continue to accelerate Iranian efforts to build new indigenous ballistic missiles.

* * * * *

During the reporting period, firms in China provided missile-related items, raw materials, and/or assistance to several countries of proliferation concern—such as Iran.

* * * * *

Throughout the first half of 1999, North Korea continued to export ballistic missiles-related equipment and missile components, materials and technical expertise to countries in the Middle East . . .

This report to Congress also states, ". . . economic conditions in Russia continued to deteriorate, putting more pressure on Russian entities to circumvent export controls. Despite some

examples of restraint, Russian businesses continue to be major suppliers of WMD equipment, materials, and technology to Iran."

Because Russian government officials continue to show an unwillingness or inability to stop this dangerous assistance to Iran, the legislation we are considering should be passed to authorize and direct more effective sanctions.

North Korea's continuing relationship with Iran is also of great concern. Iran has already received sufficient technology from North Korea to build a copycat three-stage Taepo Dong-1 ballistic missile on its own. Moreover, senior Intelligence Community officials have testified that they expect North Korea to continue to sell ballistic missiles to Iran. Therefore, we must expect Iran to acquire the technology for the longer-range Taepo Dong-2 ballistic missile when North Korea begins its export. It is too optimistic, given the North Korea-Iran ballistic missile relationship, to expect Iran's capabilities to lag North Korea's for very long.

There are several significant consequences of the continued proliferation of ballistic missile technology to Iran. I'll mention two.

First, this assistance will allow Iran to develop more advanced ballistic missiles faster, cheaper, and easier than it otherwise would have on its own. Iran's defense minister has announced that it is working on the more advanced Shahab-4 and Shahab-5 missiles, and the Iranians even claim that they are going to launch a satellite into orbit by the second half of 2001. According to press reports, Iran's Shahab-4 and Shahab-5 ballistic missiles will use Russian engine technology, leading to an Iranian ICBM based in large part on Russian technology. Diminishing this proliferation is essential to slowing Iran's long-range ballistic missile program.

Second, Iran is bound to become a supplier of ballistic missile technology and expertise as its own program proceeds. CIA Director Tenet recently made this point, testifying that, "Iran's existence as a secondary supplier of this technology to other countries is the trend that worries me the most." We are already seeing indications that Iran is no longer merely a recipient of ballistic missile technology. According to unclassified intelligence community reports, Iran is assisting Libya's ballistic missile programs. Press reports also indicate Iran is helping Syria and others develop or acquire ballistic missiles.

The legislation before the Senate will improve our efforts to restrain the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile technology to Iran. I urge its approval.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I had a number of concerns with this bill, as it was approved by the House. I am pleased that we have been able to reach agreement on an amendment that ad-

resses many of these concerns. The managers' amendment would make it clear that the application of sanctions under section 3 of the bill is discretionary, not mandatory. It would also urge the executive branch to provide notice to persons who may be subject to sanctions under this provision, giving them an opportunity to provide explanatory or exculpatory information before such sanctions are provided.

I had planned on offering several amendments to this bill when it came to the floor, but because of the adoption of this amendment, I shall not do so. I would also like to clarify a few points with the chief Senate sponsors of the bill.

First, the bill requires reporting of foreign persons when there is "credible information" indicating that the person transferred specified goods, services, or technologies to Iran. I understand that it is the intent of the sponsors that the President judge the credibility of information on the basis of all information available to him, including both information that supports and information that undermines the conclusion that a covered transfer may have taken places. In other words, "credible information" is information that would lead a reasonable person to conclude—after consideration of all the available evidence—that there is a substantial possibility that a covered transfer took place. Is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. I agree. That understanding is consistent with the intent of the House, which defined "credible information" as such in its report.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I agree.

Mr. LEVIN. The second point that I would like to address is the use of the word "timely" in the managers' amendment. It is my understanding that the intent is that, whenever appropriate, the President provide notice to foreign persons, or to the government with primarily jurisdiction over such persons, in a manner that provides them a reasonable opportunity to provide explanatory or exculpatory information before sanctions are imposed. Do the lead sponsors agree with this view?

Mr. LOTT. I agree.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I agree.

Mr. LEVIN. Finally, I would like to address section 6 of the bill, which requires a determination by the President that, among other things, the Government of Russia has demonstrated a sustained commitment to seek out and prevent the transfer to Iran of goods, services and technology that "could" make a material contribution to the development of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons, or of ballistic or cruise missile systems. It is my understanding that the use of the word "could" in this provision is not intended to go beyond other nonproliferation requirements or require the President to consider remote or absurdly hypothetical circumstances. Is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. That is correct. The use of the term "could" is meant to convey

an expectation that commodities should be controlled and monitored because of their potential for contributing to nuclear, chemical, or biological warfare programs, or to ballistic or cruise missile development. That is to say, this section covers commodities which should be controlled because of their physical or technological properties. This standard is consistent with current United States export control practice and with various statutory nonproliferation reporting requirements.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I agree.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Iran Nonproliferation Act. For the past few years, I have been concerned about Iran's efforts to acquire the technology for ballistic missiles and nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons from Russia and China.

When reports began to surface in 1997 about Russian missile assistance to Iran, I met twice with Russia's Ambassador to the U.S. and the administration's special envoy on this issue to express my concern about this dangerous trade and to urge the Russian government and the Clinton Administration to take steps to stop it.

I also gathered together a group of 99 Members of the House and Senate, who wrote to the President to urge him to invoke sanctions to halt this trade. The President refused.

Along with a bipartisan group of House and Senate Members, I went to the White House to meet with Vice President GORE to urge the administration to take concrete actions to end Russian transfers to Iran. Again the administration refused, citing the need to let diplomacy work.

That summer, I successfully offered an amendment that was adopted by unanimous consent to the fiscal year 1998 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill barring U.S. aid to Russia if missile assistance to Iran continued. In conference, the amendment was changed to give the President the ability to waive this prohibition on aid to Russia, which he subsequently did.

In November 1997, the Senate unanimously passed a concurrent resolution that I sponsored, expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should sanction the Russian organizations involved in selling missile technology to Iran. The House also passed this resolution overwhelmingly by a vote of 414 to 8. Again the President refused to impose sanctions.

The Congress tried again to spur the administration to action 6 months later when we passed the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act mandating sanctions on any organization involved in assisting Iran's missile or weapons of mass destruction programs. This bill passed the Senate by a vote of 90 to 4. Yet, when it reached the President's desk, he vetoed it.

Instead of voting to override this veto, the Congress acceded to the President's request for more time to

let diplomacy work. The verdict is in on that decision. Transfers of nuclear, biological, chemical, and ballistic missile technology to Iran persist demonstrating the Congress erred in deciding not to override the veto. While the administration has imposed so-called administrative sanctions against a handful of Russian entities, it cooperated with the Russian government to identify the target organizations such that the sanctions would have no meaningful effect, completely undermining the value of the action.

While I will not go into the same detail here, let me simply say the administration has a similar record on Chinese proliferation to Iran, where it has failed to enforce U.S. laws calling for sanctions, again noting the need to let diplomacy work.

Since the administration would not take steps to halt proliferation to Iran, I offered an amendment to a supplemental appropriations bill that the President signed into law in May 1998. The amendment appropriated \$179 million to accelerate the development of U.S. theater missile defenses, including \$45 million for Israel to begin purchasing equipment for a third battery of its Arrow missile defense system in order to counter the increased Iranian missile threat.

As these examples show, the Clinton Administration is simply not willing to take the tough actions necessary to prevent proliferation. As a result, intelligence assessments indicate the problem is growing worse all the time. In an unclassified report to Congress last month, CIA Director George Tenet stated:

Iran remains one of the most active countries seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional weapons technology from abroad. . . . For the first half of 1999, entities in Russia and China continued to supply a considerable amount and a wide variety of ballistic missile-related goods and technology to Iran. . . . Iran already is producing Scud short-range ballistic missiles and has built and publicly displayed prototypes for the [1,300 kilometer-range] Shahab-3 medium-range ballistic missile, which had its initial flight test in July 1998 and probably achieved "emergency operational capability"—i.e., Tehran could deploy a limited number of the Shahab-3 prototype missiles in an operational mode during a perceived crisis situation. In addition, Iran's Defense Minister last year publicly acknowledged the development of the [2,000 kilometer range] Shahab-4 . . . [and] publicly mentioned plans for a "Shahab-5."

In the report, Director Tenet went on to note that Iran continues to seek biological warfare technology from Russia and Europe and despite being a party to the Chemical Weapons Convention has "already has manufactured and stockpiled chemical weapons . . . and the bombs and artillery shells for delivering them." He also said that "Tehran continues to seek production technology, expertise, and chemicals that could be used as precursor agents in its chemical warfare program from entities in Russia and China."

Finally, the report indicated that despite promising never to acquire nu-

clear weapons, when it ratified the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), Iran has a nuclear weapons program, stating:

Iran is attempting to establish a complete nuclear fuel cycle for its civilian energy program. In that guise, it seeks to obtain whole facilities . . . that in fact could be used in any number of ways in support of efforts to produce fissile material needed for a nuclear weapon. Despite international efforts to curtail the flow of critical technologies and equipment, Tehran continues to seek fissile material and technology for weapons development and has set up an elaborate system of military and civilian organization to support its effort.

In fact, according to the Washington Post, the CIA recently concluded that it could no longer rule out the possibility that Iran is already capable of producing a nuclear weapon. This is terribly troubling in light of the progress Iran has made in its missile program. Earlier this month, Director Tenet testified to the Intelligence Committee that:

Most [intelligence] analysts believe that Iran, following the North Korean pattern, could test an ICBM capable of delivering a light payload to the United States in the next few years. . . . As alarming as the long-range missile threat is, it should not overshadow the immediacy and seriousness of the threat that U.S. forces, interests, and allies already face overseas from short and medium range missiles. The proliferation of medium-range ballistic missiles [to nations like Iran] is significantly altering strategic balances in the Middle East and Asia.

Finally, Director Tenet outlined a new type of proliferation threat from Iran in his testimony, warning that:

. . . long-standing recipients—such as Iran—might become suppliers in their own right as they develop domestic production capabilities. . . . Iran in the next few years may be able to supply not only complete Scuds, but also Shahab-3s and related technology, and perhaps more advanced technologies if Tehran continues to receive assistance from Russia, China, and North Korea.

It is clear that meaningful measures, and not simply another round of feckless diplomacy or a flawed international treaty such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty CTBT, is needed to combat this growing threat. Last Fall, the Administration accused the Congress of undermining U.S. nonproliferation efforts in rejecting the CTBT. But that treaty was unverifiable, would have undermined America's nuclear deterrent, and would have done nothing meaningful to combat proliferation.

As I mentioned earlier, Iran along with 191 other nations has ratified the NPT, and thereby promised never to acquire nuclear weapons. It is violating this treaty. It is also violating the Chemical Weapons Convention and is acquiring missile technology. All of these actions should trigger U.S. sanctions, but the Clinton Administration has refused to take action.

If arms control treaties like the NPT and other nonproliferation efforts are to be useful, they must be enforced. I urge the administration to finally get

serious about this matter and for my colleagues to vote for the Iran Nonproliferation Act. Iran's possession of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and the missiles used to deliver them poses a clear and present danger to the United States and our forces and friends in the region. It is long past time that we address this threat.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. 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. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE REGULATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to read portions of a proposed regulation found on page 173 of the January 3, 2000, issue of the Federal Register:

"[I]t is important that individuals alter their daily behaviors," "and for governmental entities to seek programmatic incentives, public education, regulatory changes, or other approaches."

"Daily behaviors" are further defined as "Individual decisions about energy consumption for heating, travel, and other purposes;" and "individual maintenance of residences or gardens."

Those passages come directly from a "4(d)" Endangered Species Act regulation for the Pacific Northwest proposed by the National Marine Fisheries Service. The rule states flatly these are examples of activities that could kill salmon or steelhead through water, air, and ocean pollution, and that NMFS "might or might not" seek to regulate them as such under the rule.

Taken literally, if these rules are enacted as written, National Marine Fisheries Service could regulate how often individuals drive their cars, where and how property owners could plant or fertilize their lawns, gardens, or farm crops. They could dictate the content of county zoning, public works, building, and road ordinances, and possibly even suggest limits on the setting of thermostats in homes or public school classrooms, or the operation of public transit buses—all to protect salmon.

Washington citizens, and those in other Northwest States, would be asked to make a host of changes in their daily lives, but unfortunately, could be assured of nothing except for the certainty that a greater portion of their tax dollars would fund the salaries of even more Federal bureaucrats to draft more rules and regulations of this nature. This year, the National Marine Fisheries Service is asking

Congress to fund 41 new employees just to implement its West Coast salmon recovery plan.

Those proposals would represent a striking power grab by unelected bureaucrats if they were absolutely necessary to save whole species of salmon. But they are not. As I said in a letter to President Clinton 2 weeks ago, the Federal Government should be seeking to encourage and promote incentives for States, tribes, and local entities and private groups to come up with creative solutions to save salmon, not make it more difficult for them.

And that is exactly what these rules do. The rules go far beyond telling hundreds of farmers in the Methow Valley that they cannot exercise their water rights to irrigate their crops until they have National Marine Fisheries Service-approved fish screens installed at their own expense, as the agency told my constituents in north central Washington last year.

They would go beyond holding up the construction of bridges in Columbia County or cities' efforts to install stop lights, as the National Marine Fisheries Service's salmon regulatory process has already done.

In short, these rules, if enacted as proposed, would be likely to slow down local salmon recovery efforts, rather than "increasing people's flexibility in complying with the Endangered Species Act," as the National Marine Fisheries Service publicly claimed in mid-December. More Federal bureaucracy simply will not help local communities and private groups protect salmon and steelhead.

I also notice that the National Marine Fisheries Service has proposed a narrow set of exemptions within the rules, which could make the enforcement of the rule arbitrary and unfair against those who don't meet their stated criteria. The Oregon Department of Transportation, for example, would be in compliance with the rule in carrying out its road maintenance activities on roads abutting streams, because that agency agreed to implement special National Marine Fisheries Service-approved training for its road maintenance crews. No such exemption exists in the rule for private land owners anywhere or the Washington Department of Transportation to carry on the same activities.

The people of Washington State realized the importance of not allowing endangered salmon and steelhead runs to go extinct long before any Federal agency told them they should modify their own "daily behavior" as part of the effort. The only "daily behavior" that local salmon enhancement groups are concerned with in Washington right now is to restore salmon and steelhead runs right in the streams and rivers near where they live and work. And they are doing it.

Look, for example, at the successful efforts of the variety of agricultural, business, and tribal groups who formed the Skagit Watershed Council to

produce an on-the-ground science-based strategy for prioritizing local habitat recovery projects. They came together, often disagreeing on other issues, but to work together on the most productive salmon recovery efforts—without the Federal Government telling them to do so.

Then there are the successful efforts of Long Live the Kings on the Wishkah River on Grays Harbor County, where low-tech, inexpensive habitat restoration methods helped double the returns of natural spawning salmon there in 1 year.

A captive brook stock facility was built with \$1 million in private funds on Lilliwaup Creek on Hood Canal, and already the State of Washington has looked to that success in restoring the very most threatened local wild salmon runs. I can cite several more examples, but suffice it to say that local efforts are underway, and we should congratulate their efforts to proactively and successfully preserve salmon.

Proposing regulations of this sort, at the very least, would be putting the "cart before the horse." The National Marine Fisheries Service must come forward with concrete goals of how many fish they intend to recover throughout the Northwest in areas they call "evolutionary significant units." This is something that Congress asked the National Marine Fisheries Service to do in an appropriations conference report last year. The National Marine Fisheries Service was directed to determine and set numerical goals for Puget Sound areas by July 1 of this year, and, by then, to set a schedule for establishing numerical goals for all other areas in Washington State.

Why is this important? Well, very simply put: How can you mandate means, mandate lifestyle changes, before you know what you are trying to accomplish? In my view, having these numerical goals is critical to guiding the agency in any effort it makes to enforce 4(d) rules to protect threatened species.

Unfortunately, not only has the National Marine Fisheries Service failed to provide the required numerical goals for salmon species, it has yet to deliver the actual funding to the State. Last year, Congress approved \$18 million to be provided directly by the National Marine Fisheries Service to the Washington State Salmon Recovery Board, so that the board could distribute funds for State and local salmon recovery projects, as well as fund implementation of the Washington Forest and Fish Agreement, which was authorized by the State legislature. I am disturbed to learn that the National Marine Fisheries Service has not yet secured arrangements to distribute these much-needed funds to the State of Washington. As a result, the National Marine Fisheries Service is holding up State and local efforts to comply with the Endangered Species Act.

Even without funding, several counties and salmon enhancement groups

throughout Washington have been working on their own plans to comply with ESA requirements. Many smaller counties, however, simply do not have the resources to meet the National Marine Fisheries Service process under the rules. They are nevertheless expected to scramble to come up with their own ordinances that will be ultimately reviewed and approved by the National Marine Fisheries Service to ensure that they are "adequate to help conserve anadromous salmonids."

Aside from my concerns with the way these rules are written, I am not at all pleased that the National Marine Fisheries Service has decided to refuse even a modest extension of the public comment period, and has stated publicly that it wants to enact this rule by July.

Keep in mind, these lengthy, 20 plus page rules were only printed for the first time in the Federal Register about 5 weeks ago. After tonight, the public hearings process will already have been slammed shut.

That is why when I learned that the regional director of the National Marine Fisheries Service had scheduled all five of Washington's public hearings on these lengthy and complex rules within just a 7-day period, I asked for more opportunities for citizens to be heard. Most of the five hearings were so full of interested citizens that not everyone could find a chair or be given adequate time to have a face to face question and answer period with the very bureaucrats who want to have the authority proposed in these rules.

While the National Marine Fisheries Service recently agreed to two additional hearings scheduled on the same day and time, they flatly refused to extend the comment process, stating that "a longer extension to the public comment period would not be likely to provide any new information, and would delay implementation of the rules, which the National Marine Fisheries Service feels are necessary for salmon conservation." It is disturbing that while they are often criticized for being too slow to process permit requests, when it comes to listening to people on highly controversial proposals, they can't move fast enough to enact them into law.

The National Marine Fisheries Service owes the citizens of Washington and the Pacific Northwest a more responsible handling of their duties to enforce the Endangered Species Act. Section 2(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act requires the National Marine Fisheries Service to cooperate with State and local agencies to protect endangered species. I believe the National Marine Fisheries Service cannot fairly force rules and local and State agencies without first establishing the goals and objectives requested by Congress last year. I renew the request made by the appropriations conference for the National Marine Fisheries Service to provide the numerical goals and objectives for Puget Sound salmon, to provide a

framework for similar numerical goals and objectives for the rest of Washington and the Pacific Northwest, and to establish performance standards for salmon recovery projects. And they should do so before they enact these rules.

I conclude my comments by noting that any proposal which would regulate "daily behavior" certainly requires closer scrutiny than 30 days of public hearings and 30 more days of written comments. I commend those Washington citizens who are now working hard on local-based solutions to protect salmon, and offer them my full and continued support for the successful course they are taking to rebuild and restore salmon. I am concerned that the Federal Government, with rules drafted in this manner, would not help these on-the-ground local efforts. I will continue to call on Federal agencies not to dictate how best to accomplish ESA compliance. I request that the National Marine Fisheries Service address the valid concerns I and others raise regarding these proposals and to do so before they begin implementing these sweeping regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may state his inquiry.

Mr. BURNS. Are we in morning business or are we on a specific subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is considering H.R. 1883.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for the next 15 minutes.

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

FUEL COSTS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, there are a lot of truckers in town, protesting what they say is an unwarranted increase in fuel costs that is putting them out of business.

It really doesn't surprise me. It seems every year we come to the floor of the Senate to criticize the administration's failure to implement a domestic energy policy that would support a sustainable oil and gas industry. We argue for tax relief, common sense royalty collection, access to oil and gas reserves on Federal lands. We do this because there are a lot of us who watch figures, and every day we can see that we are growing more dependent on foreign sources of oil and gas. Oil traditionally coming from the Middle East and gas coming from Canada in ever increasing volumes despite large, untapped reserves in America. I have been joined by numerous Senators from around the Nation in bringing those concerns to the floor. We have proposed numerous pieces of legislation to combat the problem, yet we have not been successful in getting many of them enacted into law.

As a result, we are faced with what is happening today: Oil prices are now

around \$30 a barrel, with few domestic producers reaping any benefits, and with most of our oil coming from offshore. There are few domestic producers enjoying the rise in oil prices because the Administration's energy and environmental policies have just about run them all out of business. That is sad. I speak not only for the oil and gas industry, the trucking industry and the transportation industry, but also for all consumers. A case in point is that we are already witnessing a surcharge being put on airline tickets; the same thing will happen soon with rail transportation as well.

When I take a look at my home State of Montana, fuel costs are at least 50 percent higher than they were just a year ago. We have cause for frustration. Montanans are at the end of the line. I don't care if you are receiving goods or shipping product, it hurts us. This is especially true for our number one industry, agriculture. We end up selling wholesale, buying retail, and paying the freight both ways. One has to remember that these costs have to be absorbed by somebody. This somebody is generally the person least able to afford it. Now we have to ask ourselves a question. Are we doing anything about fixing the root of the problem? What are we doing to fix the root problem we have in energy development?

Today's rally of long-haul truckers underscores the reality that all consumers and all producers are being faced with fuel increases resulting from a failed domestic energy policy. Prices are simply raising out of sight. We have 26,000 people in Montana who are employed by the trucking industry. They are being impacted by these increases. Farmers are coming upon the planting season. They are facing higher fuel costs which add to their uncontrollable costs of production. Costs of producing in the agricultural industry cannot be passed on; they never have been in the past. It is a buyers' market and you sell for what they offer. End of story. Just because our fuels costs go up, does not mean we get to charge more per bushel. We also aren't faced with the luxury of turning a tractor off and waiting for fuel prices to go down. Mother Nature dictates when you plant, when you till, and when you harvest. She doesn't care if diesel is 50 cents a gallon, \$1 a gallon, or \$1.80 a gallon. When the time comes, you go.

We have seen some improvement in the livestock industry, but we have not seen any kind of improvement in the grain industry. There again, with grain, we get hit harder by energy costs than anywhere else.

So far, the administration's only action has been to send the Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, to ask OPEC to release more oil and reduce prices. That tells me we are not in a very strong bargaining position. That is upsetting when we could have taken steps to avoid our current plight. The problem of inaction by the administration

carries over into other areas of energy. One example is the production of clean coal. We have a lot of coal that is clean coal and considered "compliant coal" by the Clean Air Act. It has low SO₂ levels, and low emissions. But so far, the Department of the Interior has blocked any sale of that coal, which lies right at the top of the earth. The only thing that has to be done is to take the overburden off, mine the coal and reclaim the area. The result of this inaction has been—and it will show up later on in America's power bills—that soon we will face a shortage of clean coal and stringent emissions controls, and all at once our electric bills will increase because we haven't done a very good job in managing our clean coal resources.

Secretary Richardson has testified before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee that clean coal will be an integral portion of our Nation's energy portfolio for the next 30 years. But after they say that, they have done nothing or they are unwilling to ensure that the political actions of the Department of the Interior do not endanger the supply of clean coal.

It doesn't make a lot of sense. How about hydroelectric production of electricity? Secretary Babbitt wants to be known as the first Secretary to tear down large dams that are placed along some of our major waterways, and he offers no response when asked how we are going to replace the power produced by those dams. In light of the recent action on the nuclear waste bill, the administration has also opposed any cohesive policy for nuclear energy management, instead desiring to sit back and posture on the debate.

Again, we see evidence of a failed energy policy. Today we see the truckers coming to town, and that is just the tip of the iceberg. The Department of the Interior has thwarted any attempts to reinvigorate the domestic gas industry. They have closed vast areas of our Outer Continental Shelf to gas. They will release a statement saying they fully support the natural gas industry, yet fail to deliver on any of the policies to help it along.

The same has been done throughout the Rocky Mountains. We have reserves of natural gas across Montana that could be used to fuel this nation. There is a large supply, yet we cannot tap it because of the Department of the Interior and this administration's policy seal it away development.

I want to bring up one more fuel related problem we are faced with in Montana. In my hometown of Billings, MT, we have three refineries. They produce gas, diesel, and other refined petroleum products, not only for domestic use in Montana but also for the entire region, including eastern Washington. We have to reroute a pipeline that lets those products flow to the Spokane area, and it has to cross about 60 miles of Forest Service managed public lands. This reroute has been vigorously opposed by this administration.

What happened? The Yellowstone Pipeline Company went to the Forest Service and said: Give us an estimate for the reroute proposal. We have to do an environmental impact statement. We want to do it right. This was back in 1997. What will it cost they asked. Less than a million dollars was the response from the Forest Service. Good they responded, let's go ahead with the EIS process and find a viable route. Three years later, the Yellowstone Pipeline Company has paid \$5 million to resite those 60 miles of pipeline, and just a week and a half ago the Yellowstone Pipeline was forced to pull the plug on the project because the Forest Service refused to acknowledge that their preferred alternative was too expensive to build. A pipeline, the cheapest way to move fuel and distribute energy across this country, now is in jeopardy, if not dead.

The result will be that these 60 miles absent of pipeline will be crossed in another way. We are going to rail it or truck it. We will probably have an accident, even the Forest Service's EIS documents acknowledge this. A spill will probably result—we have already had one at Alberton. We might also truck it. However, with energy costs as high as they are today, that will increase the cost to consumers. It also, in that 60 miles, exposes traffic to large semis on a two-lane road. Lives will be at stake. The Forest Service has also acknowledged that, but continues to forge along proposing an unbuildable route. The hazards to the public, and the costs to the consumer, increase. That is just an example of what this administration has failed to do to ensure that we have energy prices that are affordable and energy is accessible to all Americans.

So we feel for those truckers out there. We know what it is like to go down that road and try to deliver the goods to America in an efficient and safe way, and to get the products to market in a competitive manner so they fall within the consumers' reach of affording them.

Two years ago, we were buying gasoline for around 85, 90 cents a gallon. It didn't take us long to get spoiled, did it? But now we find that through that we usually have to pay the piper one time or another. It is us, the consumers, that will pick up the bill of a failed energy policy. The administration will be gone, but we will be left holding the tab. It is our economy that will slow, and it is our families that will have to do with less. We see it happening today in our oil and gas production. Let's not see it happen in our electricity production. This economy we have been enjoying all these years could go away in a flash—just a flash. It takes a while for an administration's action to lead to a tangible impact, we are beginning the impact of this administration's failed energy policy today.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What is the status of the legislation at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are considering H.R. 1883 under a time limit.

Mr. DOMENICI. Under that time limit, can the Senator from New Mexico speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If he yields himself time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 7 minutes.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the legislation before us. This legislation is only one of many important steps required to counter the greatest threat to U.S. security in this era—the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I am not being an alarmist. I am being a realist. The proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological technologies and the means to deliver them present a growing threat to U.S. security. This is a threat which we have only begun to address in the changed security environment of the 21st century.

Mr. President, I would like to mention three important aspects of the problem as stated by George Tenet, the Director of Central Intelligence, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence early in February.

First, Russia and China no longer represent the only missile threat to the United States. The missile threat to U.S. interests and forces from other nations is here and now.

Second, South Asian nations are establishing doctrine and tactics for the use of their missiles and weapons of mass destruction. The nuclear rivalry between India and Pakistan steadily intensifies. The potential for miscalculation, misperception and escalation of the conflict in Kashmir is high.

Third, the countries we previously considered technology importers are now assuming roles as "secondary suppliers." This compounds the proliferation problem and confounds our ability to control or defend against it.

As outlined in the most recent Intelligence Community assessment of Ballistic Missile Threats, by the year 2015 the U.S. will not only face the ongoing challenges of large-scale missile threats from China and Russia. U.S. cities will also confront a real threat

from other actors—North Korea, probably Iran, and possibly Iraq.

One must mention that Intelligence Community's estimate excludes the possibility of social or political changes in those countries that would change the calculus. Also, the missile arsenals of these nations would be much smaller, limited to smaller payloads, and less reliable than Chinese or Russian capabilities.

At the same time, these remain a lethal and less predictable threat. Acute accuracy is not required for missiles tipped with nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads. And the U.S. cannot bank on rational actions from dictators like Saddam Hussein or Kim Chong-il.

At the same time that the threat increases, global changes make non-proliferation efforts even more difficult. Three specific aspects in the current international security environment will impede U.S. efforts to control or minimize this threat.

First, Russia—hard currency starved and heavily indebted—is a willing merchant—most notably of conventional defense items, but the U.S. Russian sales are not limited to this. This legislation attempts to address this aspect through creating incentives for the Russian government and others to implement and enforce stricter export controls on private actors or institutes in their dealings with Iran.

Second, North Korea and their No-Dong missile sales are altering strategic balances in the Middle East and Asia. While the administration's new strategy for engagement with North Korea may retard developments that require testing, such as reliability of long-range missiles, many suspect that the North Korean missile program continues and that its role as a supplier of medium-range missile technology has not been addressed.

Third, technology advances and rapid international economic integration alter and confuse the means by which the United States can control military advances of other nations. The list of potentially threatening dual-use technologies continues to grow. This is especially true of information technologies—command, control, communication, and information technologies, C-31, now comprise about 75 percent of a modern military's capability. But potential dual use is also true of nuclear, chemical, biological, and missile technologies.

The proliferation threat will remain our Nation's No. 1 security challenge in the 21st century. At the same time, the United States will be most vulnerable to this threat. As George Tenet, our head of the CIA, also noted, U.S. hegemony has become a lightning rod for the disaffected.

As Americans enjoy unprecedented prosperity, many in the world remain disaffected. These disaffected represent a group who resent our power and our prosperity. Our success fuels the intensity of their claims and their feelings.

The same forces aligned against our nonproliferation objectives apply to terrorist organizations as well, whether state sponsored or not. A disaffected Iran, despite some moderating trends, remains an active state supporter of terrorism.

Terrorist groups will continue to increase their destructive or their potential for disruption through rapidly evolving and spreading technologies. Again, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents offer cheap means to achieve highly lethal terror. Acquisition of information technology may not only greatly improve a terrorist group's means for organization and coordination and attack, these technologies offer increasing potential for massive, possibly crippling, disruption of U.S. information infrastructure.

This legislation is a small step, but a good one, in addressing the problem of supplying WMD technologies to Iran. But we have much more work to do. We must prevent, when prevention is possible, such as providing safeguards for nuclear materials in Russia and controlling access to technology and know-how as best we can and in as many cases as we can.

We must also find the most effective means to defend against such threats, such as training and equipping policemen and firemen to respond to these attacks and pursuing the best technological solutions to defend against them.

I believe the United States is not pursuing with sufficient vigor the means of greatest potential against missile threats. For example, directed energy technologies represent the next revolutionary step in military technologies. Laser technologies in particular dramatically alter U.S. potential to counter a missile attack. Missile defense at the speed of light will improve effectiveness and efficiency, substantially reducing the cost-per-kill ratios.

Despite this understanding, the budget of the President cut the airborne laser program \$92 million. In addition, the defense budget reduced science and technology spending, according to our first estimates, by more than \$1 billion. It is not easy to understand. The administration proposes sacrificing the potential of real defense against proliferation threats, although it seems very clearly to be a shortsighted approach.

I have been working as hard as I can, and in some instances at the forefront, on some prevention efforts, especially with respect to proliferation threats from Russia. I hope this year for stepped up measures of prevention, especially regarding the threat of nuclear proliferation in the form of the brain drain from Russia. At the same time, where I can, I will put on a full court press to improve the science and technology budget for the Pentagon, especially as it pertains to the most promising means of missile defense and directed energy.

I hope my colleagues will join in ensuring that every means of proliferation prevention is pursued. I also invite my colleagues to join in increasing the means of our military laboratories to provide for our national defense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of H.R. 1883 occur at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 24.

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

Mr. GRAMS. In light of this agreement, there will be no rollcall votes today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes out of order.

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR TED KENNEDY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, The Apocrypha, or the Hidden Books, is a term used to describe the books found in the Alexandrine Greek Scripture (The Septuagint), but absent from the Orthodox Hebrew Scripture. In the second book of Esdras is found the following Admonishment: "Now therefore keep thy sorrow to thyself, and bear with a good courage that which hath befallen thee."

There is one Member of this body who seems to have lived his life by that particular piece of ancient wisdom. That Member to whom I refer is the senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

The saga of the Kennedy family is well known by nearly everyone. It is a story replete with triumphs and unfathomable tragedies. Many times, I have marveled, at the resilience displayed by TED KENNEDY and by his family. Somehow they always manage to regroup, to prevail, to go on, even in the face of devastation.

I believe they find their strength in the love of each other, and in their unstinting devotion to public service.

Senator TED KENNEDY is absolutely committed to public service.

He has served and served wisely and well in the United States for 38 years. First elected to the Senate in 1962, TED KENNEDY is now the third most senior Member of this body.

A child of privilege, educated at Harvard and the University of Virginia Law School, TED KENNEDY could have taken the easier path in life. But instead TED KENNEDY came to the Senate to work. And the causes he has championed and put his broad shoulder to the wheel to support, are for the most part, the causes that benefit the little people—the poor, the downtrodden, the children in our society.

Senator KENNEDY has been an unstinting warrior in the effort to ensure quality health care to the citizens of the Nation. Two recent achieve-

ments in this area are the Health Insurance and Accountability Act of 1996, which makes it easier for those who change or lose their jobs to keep their health insurance, and the children's Health Insurance Act of 1997, which makes their health insurance far more widely available to children through age 18 in all 50 states.

Senator KENNEDY has for years, also been a dynamic leader on a wide range of other issues of central importance to the people of this Nation, including education, raising the minimum wage, defending the rights of workers and their families, strengthening civil rights laws, assisting individuals with disabilities, fighting for cleaner water and cleaner air, and protecting Social Security and Medicare for senior citizens.

I have not always agreed with his solutions to our Nation's problems, but I have always respected his capacity for hard work, his devotion to the causes he champions, and his energetic ability to get things done.

And although we have disagreed in the past, one time or another over the years, Senator KENNEDY and I have come to be friends for a long time. We share many things in common, although two more different individuals in background could hardly be imagined. We share a love of history, of poetry, of the rough-and-tumble and the humor of politics, and we share a love and understanding of this Senate and the singularly important role it was intended to play in this Republic.

Rarely have I been more touched than when TED personally delivered 80 long-stemmed roses to my office in remembrance of my 80th birthday, 2 years ago. It was a memorable moment for me.

Through all the triumphs and tragedies, through all the hard work, the disappointments, and the hard knocks that always accompany a long political career, Senator KENNEDY has retained a young man's zeal for life, for service, for laughter, and for achievement. I believe that his shadow will loom large when the history of this body is written in future years. Already, the sum total of his legislative achievements is enormous, and he is still as active, as energetic and as committed as ever. Fortunately, for this body and for the Nation, we can expect many, many more years of loyal and distinguished service from the senior Senator from the Bay State.

So today on the birthday of my friend, TED KENNEDY, I rise to salute his courage, his work, his resiliency, and his extraordinary friendship and kindness to me.

And I offer to him this day one of those famous, certainly very lyrical of Irish blessings:

May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind be always at your back,
May the sun shine warm upon your face,
May the rain fall softly upon your fertile fields.

And, until we meet again,

May God hold you in the palm of His hand.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Iran Nonproliferation Act. I note, as many do, the encouraging election results that happened this past week within Iran. I say encouraging because perhaps that country is moving towards a more open policy, a better policy of engagement with the rest of the world and the United States.

I want to point out some facts and some reasons that this act should be passed. Iran remains a danger to the United States and to our friends in the Middle East, particularly to Israel. It is a fact.

Iran continues as the largest state supporter of international terrorism, the bankroller of munitions supplied to Hezbollah in Lebanon and to Islamic Jihad and Hamas. It is still opposed to the Israeli peace process and to peace under any circumstances with Israel.

Those are all the facts, and they remain the facts, in spite of the fact that a so-called moderate President Khatami has been in power in Iran for 2½ years. I know some would say he does not have full control, and he doesn't, nor will he after these elections. This will remain the factual situation even after this election.

I don't think the United States should act on hope but on fact. The recent Hezbollah attacks on Israeli soldiers could not have happened without Iranian approval. Those attacks, made possible by the continued funneling of

arms from Iran to Hezbollah, were undertaken primarily to derail the peace process. After all, Israel has already committed itself to withdraw from Lebanon by July.

Even more worrisome is Iran's effort to acquire weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to be able to deliver them. The administration has already sanctioned 10 Russian entities for providing dangerous technologies to Iran but readily admits that the flow continues. Thousands of Russian scientists and technicians are at work in Iran helping these efforts. This remains the fact today.

Iran has already flight-tested a missile capable of reaching Israel and is working on longer range missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads. Fact.

Under the guise of peaceful nuclear energy development, Iran is spending billions to develop a nuclear infrastructure. Iran, a country rich in both oil and natural gas, needs to develop nuclear energy about as much as Alaska needs artificial snowmaking machines.

The picture gets worse. CIA Director Tenet, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee earlier this month, forecast the possibility that Iran might become a supplier in its own right of missile technology as it develops its own indigenous production capability. Fact.

Those are the facts. Iran is getting this dangerous technology from North Korea and China, but its primary source remains Russia. Russian entities have assisted Iran in the development of a missile capable of hitting Israel. They are also the main technology sources for a longer range missile, the Kosar, that could hit the heart of Europe with nuclear warheads. Fact.

The Russian Government has also signed peaceful nuclear cooperation agreements with Iran to build nuclear power reactors. Iran is reportedly using this legal cooperation to make clandestine efforts to procure nuclear material and to develop the ability to produce weapons-grade nuclear material on its own.

The administration sought to get the Russian Government to stop this flow, and the Russians have taken some steps. They have passed legislation to create an export control regime, for example, but they have done little to enforce it. Not one Russian has been convicted of passing dangerous technology to Iran. Not a single Russian has been convicted under this law.

That is why we must keep the heat on. This legislation requires the President to report to Congress, in a classified form if he deems it necessary, credible information on any entity anywhere in the world that is providing Iran with dangerous technology. It then authorizes him to sanction those entities. If he chose not to, he would then report to Congress on his rationale for not sanctioning. So, in the first instance, this legislation captures China, North Korea, and any oth-

ers who are providing Iran the wherewithal to obtain weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them.

It goes a step further. Over the past few years, the Russians have been unable to meet their limited financial obligations to the creation of the international space station, so we have been helping them out, paying part of their funding in addition to our own, considerably larger, space station obligations. As it happens, the recipient of this money, the Russian Space Agency, their NASA, is also the Russian governmental entity with jurisdiction over any entity in Russia dealing with missile technology.

Therefore, this legislation requires the President to certify three things before we can continue to pay the Russian share of the space station: That it is Russian policy to stop proliferation to Iran, that they are taking the steps necessary to prevent the proliferation, and that no entity under the jurisdiction of the Russian space station is cooperating with the Iranian missile program.

If we are going to pay Russian obligations, then we have the right to suggest they must do everything they can to stop the proliferation to Iran—something that threatens not only America and our friends but, ultimately, Russia as well. It cannot be in Russia's interests to have a nuclear-armed Iran sitting on its borders.

Some may say, with the recent elections in Iran in which the moderates appear to have done very well, indeed this is not the time to push this legislation. Unfortunately, as I pointed out earlier, even under the reportedly moderate President Khatami over the last 2½ years, Iranian support for terrorism and its weapons technology acquisition have not diminished. Those facts remain.

Hard-liners remain in charge of Iranian security and foreign policy; they will after this election, as well. It may be that at some point in the future Iranian moderates may seek a different course. They have not to date. But for now, they have neither the ability nor necessarily the interest. They appear much more interested in reforming Iranian domestic policy than in all of these problems they are creating internationally. That means we cannot let down our guard. We must do everything we can to stop the flow of technology, to raise the cost of developing weapons of mass destruction, and to delay the time at which Iran could have such a capability.

This is the purpose of this legislation and why I strongly urge its adoption. While the timing of this legislation may not seem the best, perhaps it is the absolute right time. We need to make clear to the Iranian people, particularly their leadership on foreign policy and these terrorist items, that this is unacceptable behavior for them and for the rest of the world to have to tolerate. The development of these

weapons, the sponsorship of terrorism, the development of the missile capacity that could so threaten its neighbors and much of Europe is not responsible behavior. This is something we cannot tolerate, and we are sending that clear message at this time.

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

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

THE PRICE OF ENERGY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to share with my colleagues the plight of our independent truckers who are here in Washington, many of them, expressing their frustration as a consequence of the high increase in the cost of diesel oil. These are individuals who own their own trucks, for the most part, and supply this country with untold tons of food and various other supplies, virtually everything we need.

This is a mobile society and we are dependent on energy to move us. The price of that energy has increased dramatically.

I have yet to hear from the administration expressing any of their concerns, as a consequence of this demonstration by the independent truckers who are trying to bring a focus to what kinds of relief the administration is proposing because every indication is we are going to see higher oil prices, higher energy prices. There are some reasons for this. One of them is we have an increased dependence on imports of oil. We are currently 55-percent dependent on import oil. Most of these imports are coming from the Mideast.

In the world of the oil market, the United States is certainly a giant consumer but, a bit player. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries really calls the tune, and the U.S. generally has to pay the piper. That organization is known by all of us as OPEC. There are 11 countries that make up OPEC, and they produce more than 40 percent of the world's oil and possess three-fourths of the world's proven reserves. The United States, as I indicated, imports 55 percent of the oil we use, or about 10.5 million barrels out of the 19.3 million barrels of oil consumed in the Nation in each and every day.

The point I want to make is this is not just a one-time incident. If you go back to 1973, some of you will remember the lines around the block at the gas station. At that time, we had an Arab oil embargo. However, at that time, we were 36-percent dependent on imported oil, and we created the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We said we would never expose ourselves to near 50-percent dependence on foreign oil. Today, we are 55-percent dependent, as

I have indicated, and growing. It is our own Government's policies, or lack of policies, both local and national, that have handicapped our domestic industry. The result is consumers from New York to Oregon are paying the price. The truckers who are in Washington today, are paying the price, but not without some loud howls, seeking some Government relief. Several of these self-imposed handicaps are correctable if we would only wake up to a few realities.

On the production side, we have banned oil exploration off a good portion of our coastline, including California and Florida, because a majority of these States oppose it. They have every right to oppose it, and we should honor it. However, we refuse to consider exploration in many areas where clearly it is supported, such as in some areas of Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and my State of Alaska.

We should, in these areas where the public supports exploration, get an aggressive leasing plan and proceed to open up these areas, using the advanced technology we have and getting on with the task of lessening our dependence on imported oil.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in my State of Alaska has often been mentioned as a potential for major oil discovery. From the standpoint of my State of Alaska, we have supplied this country with nearly 20 percent of the total crude oil produced in the last 27 years. We have done it through a pipeline and a development process that has been safe. The tragic accident of the Exxon Valdez was a tanker accident that had nothing to do with the production or transportation of oil by pipeline.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge consists of 19 million acres. The assumption is that the entire 19 million acres is going to be open for exploration. That is not correct. Congress has set aside 8 million acres of that tract in wilderness in perpetuity that can never be disturbed. Another 9.5 million acres have been set aside in a wildlife refuge. No development is allowed or is going to be allowed. The remainder of that 19 million acres is 1.5 million acres which geologists have identified as holding as much as 16 billion barrels of oil which would or could replace Saudi oil coming into the United States for the next 30 years. It is not a drop in the bucket by any means.

Where is this administration going with regard to lessening our dependence on imported oil? It wants to raise taxes on the oil companies, saying the royalty valuation in the past has been unfair. Is that an incentive for exploration? I think not.

The President's current proposal in his budget calls for more than \$400 million in new taxes on the oil industry. Who is going to pay those taxes? It is going to be the American consumer.

The consequences are evident. Since the Clinton administration assumed of-

fice, U.S. crude oil production has fallen by 17 percent, and during that period U.S. consumption of oil has gone up 14 percent. Why? Some people drive bigger cars than they used to. Some people like air-conditioning. Some people get on that jet airplane.

What has happened to the industry? Our drilling rigs have gone from 532 active rigs operating in 1990 to 133 rigs operating in 2000.

What is our policy? Our policy is to become more dependent on imports.

On the downstream side, domestic policy really is not any better. Some of my New York colleagues have concerned themselves about the high price of heating oil. I am sympathetic with those who are dependent on that energy source, but while I sympathize on the one hand, I also point out that a good portion of this is self-inflicted. Prices are high because stocks are low.

The State of New York itself reports that the petroleum bulk storage capacity has declined over the past 5 years by more than 15 percent, and the heating oil storage capacity has declined nearly 20 percent, largely due to environmental regulations. Those regulations may be well-founded, but the fact is they do not have either the storage for crude nor the storage they once had for heating oil. Of course, it has been a cold winter. When the heating oil supply is tight, many of my colleagues search for an excuse, while the answer is right in their backyard.

Moving over to suggested relief that has been proposed by opening up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is our petroleum reserve in case of a national emergency, there is a suggestion that if we were to release that, somehow this would address the concerns we have over the high price of heating oil. Let me walk you through that scenario.

First of all, the SPR is for supply disruption emergencies. It is a crude oil supply in salt caverns in Louisiana. As a consequence, it has a limited capacity to get out that crude. It is not heating oil. It is crude. So it has to be moved from SPR to refineries, be refined, and then go into the market.

The difficulty with this is the refineries have crude supplies. So if you bring in SPR crude, you are going to have to offset that with the crude they have at the refinery already. The difficulty is in the mix of what the refineries make. As a consequence of low stocks going into this winter, based on the assumption this would not be a cold winter, those inventories were low. Coupled with the reduction in the storage supply for the fuel oil—and then later we did have a colder winter; we all saw the Coast Guard breaking ice in the Hudson River—as a consequence of that, we could not meet the demand for heating oil, and the price went up to nearly \$2 a gallon. That was indeed unfortunate.

Relief. The refiners continued to produce more heating oil. The weather

began to cooperate, and reports suggested that Europe sent over refined product.

The point I want to make is, SPR is not the answer because the simple reality is, you do not displace one type of crude oil with another. That does not relieve the problem. It is the mix within the refineries.

Now we have an administration that is petitioning them to still produce large volumes of heating oil even though there are indications the inventories are now adequate. The real threat is that they should be producing gasoline soon for the summer market. We could see a shortage of gasoline this summer and perhaps retail price increases in the neighborhood of nearly \$2 a gallon.

We did a little comparison on the west coast, which is the area where I am from. We did a comparison for retail prices in three Western States and Alaska. We found California's regular gasoline was \$1.38 per gallon; for Oregon's regular gasoline, it was \$1.42 per gallon; for Washington's regular gasoline, it was \$1.35 per gallon; and for my State of Alaska, it was \$1.35 per gallon.

But when we talk about self-inflicted problems, we need to look at the taxes imposed on each gallon of gas within the four States.

California's tax burden is about 46.4 cents on the gallon; for Oregon, it is 45.4 cents per gallon; for Washington State, it is about the same. The taxes include Federal, State, and local taxes in the three States. California includes a sales tax, as well, and has the added burden of 5 to 8 cents a gallon its residents must pay for reformulated gasoline.

Oregon is a little different. It adds to its cost by banning self-service as an option at the pumps. In other words, you do not fill up your car in Oregon. Somebody does it for you. You pay for it. The estimated additional cost is about 15 cents a gallon.

But in Alaska, my State, the combined taxes are only 26 cents. Without taxes, my State of Alaska actually pays the highest price for gasoline of the four States; yet we produce it all—or a good portion of it.

Gasoline prices. If you take off gas taxes, take off the cost of additives, take off the cost in relation to whether or not somebody fills your tank, then you begin to be able to identify what the true costs are to the consumer for a gallon of gasoline.

My State of Alaska supplies 46 percent of the current stock to the west coast. But barrels of oil from Alaska are beginning to decline. We are producing little more than a million barrels a day. Virtually all of that is shipped to Washington and California; significant portions go from Washington to Oregon.

California's Senators object to any development in the Arctic. But without new development, the production will continue to decline, and it will be necessary for the west coast and their west

coast constituents to purchase more oil from even more expensive sources, such as the Mideast. How are they going to get the oil in? In foreign tankers owned by foreign companies that clearly have more of an environmental exposure than our own domestic fleet.

Common sense tells us we should stop handicapping our industry. We should do this by encouraging exploration, development of our reserves, and not increasing taxes on this industry.

Oil development in my State can be done right. It is environmentally sound. It keeps land disturbance to a minimum.

To give you some idea, out of the 19 million acres of ANWR that we talked about, of the million and a half acres that Congress has the authority to open up—and I add, this body voted to open it up; and the President vetoed it a number of years ago—the footprint is estimated to be no larger than the footprint of the Dulles International Airport, assuming the rest of Virginia were wilderness. That is to give you some idea of the magnitude of what the footprint is. It is relatively small.

Again, I remind you that the estimates are that the ANWR area could produce more than 16 billion barrels of oil, which would equate to about what we bring in from Saudi Arabia over a 30-year period. Yet this administration would rather bolster the oil output of Saddam Hussein by lifting oil production limits in Iraq, which is what they have done. Should we really be placing our energy security on OPEC decisions?

The administration pursues policies that discourage investment within our borders, driving investment overseas, and our jobs overseas. If we are going to participate in this energy race, we are going to need to get in the game. If we choose to continue to drive oil production offshore, then we will have no room—or little room—to complain about the high price of that decision, or the insecurity of our future oil supplies.

There is no question in my mind that our national energy security is very much at risk. We still do not seem to get it. We do not understand the vulnerability of increasing our dependence on imports.

If we look over our shoulders at world crude markets, since 1997, we have gone from a low of \$10 a barrel to \$30 a barrel. To some extent, we have explained that this was due to the slowdown of the Asian economy, mild winters, and increased Saudi and Venezuela production. Then we have also seen OPEC kind of get its act together with self-discipline. It cut production 6 percent. They decided they would rather sell less oil but sell it higher than sell more oil and sell it lower.

Then we saw the Asian economy rebound. Winters in the U.S. got colder even with global warming. The thought from OPEC was: Wait a minute. We are going to hold off for a little while. We saw the low stocks as a result of this.

Of course, we have discussed the heating oil situation and SPR and OPEC and ANWR. But when we get back to what the administration is doing about it, we are still stuck with the reality that they are throwing more taxes at us—\$400 million. They are not encouraging the industry to go out and drill, as evidenced by the reduction in drilling rigs.

Some of them say: We will simply go out and hook up to natural gas. The National Petroleum Council report indicated that is not going to be a viable alternative. They said that we consume about 20 trillion cubic feet of gas today. We will be consuming about 31 trillion cubic feet in the next 10 years. We do not have the infrastructure in to meet that demand. It is going to have to be an expenditure of about \$1.5 trillion. Gas will not be cheap.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Babbitt, won't make public lands available to produce natural gas. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission puts up environmental roadblocks to building new gas pipelines to the Northeast. Where is the power going to come from?

Some would say hydroelectric. We have already seen the proposal by the Secretary of the Interior. He wants to tear down four dams in the Pacific Northwest. Now a FERC Commissioner, Commissioner Hoecker, claims that FERC has the authority to tear these dams down.

Moving over to coal, the administration is proposing to take a number of plants down through EPA decisions. Those were plants that were grandfathered in under the Clean Air Act, with the assumption that they would operate for a period of time. As the power industry has attempted to maintain those plants, they have been subjected to criminal prosecution by the EPA for extending the life of the plants. I am not debating the issue of, if you stay within your permit by continuing to maintain your plant at a level that you have to, whether you are extending the life of that plant or not. But that is the dilemma for the coal industry.

We have already debated for days the reality and role of the nuclear industry, the fact that it contributes 20 percent of the power in this country. The administration does not want to address a solution on its watch. It would just as soon let the industry choke on its own waste. While we had 64 votes the other day, we were still a few short of a veto override, and the President threatened to veto the legislation that would address, temporarily, relief so our nuclear industry could continue to produce power.

With the attitude of the administration, it is evident that in the area of nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, there are simply no alternatives being proposed. I suggest to the Senate that is an irresponsible attitude. It seems all this administration wants to do is to hang on until it is over—and I can't wait—in

the hope that there won't be some kind of calamity that will disrupt their departure. I suggest there is going to be a calamity. It relates to what is happening in Washington today with the truckers. This is proof the folks out there are fed up. They are looking to Government for a response. They are fed up with the administration's attitude which suggests we should go over to OPEC and beg that they increase production, that we become more dependent on imported oil. The realities of that are totally unacceptable to this Senator.

It is going to get more serious. OPEC would like to see oil at somewhere between \$20 and \$25; that is good for OPEC. I suppose now that it is \$30, it might be good for the United States.

OPEC is having a meeting in March, but some economists suggest it is too late. We are going to be increasingly exposed to increased gasoline prices this summer. Some suggest we are going to be subjected to \$40 oil, if Saddam Hussein chooses to cut off his supply in protest of United Nations sanctions. Here we are in the United States, dependent on what Saddam Hussein might do to his oil production that could affect our price of energy. Incredible, Mr. President, incredible, but nevertheless true.

As I have indicated, the past year alone, oil has tripled in cost to \$30 from less than \$11; heating oil, nearly \$2 a gallon; our airline tickets, \$20 surcharge. One of these days when you go to fill up that sports utility vehicle, it is going to cost you \$60 to fill your gas tank.

People in this technological age wonder what the role of oil is. Is oil energy king? Well, let's look at inflation. We hear Chairman Greenspan worry about inflation, about oil prices increasing. The Secretary of Energy, in the meantime, tours six oil-producing nations. He says he can't ignore the potential for oil to have an impact on inflation. He says what OPEC does matters, and it sure does. I think we are at a point of reckoning where oil has reemerged as a political and economic threat to our economy.

Now, here we are, looking at dependence on Mideast oil-producing countries, and we are asking them to change their cash-flow to accommodate us and increase production. I wonder if they will be inclined to do that.

If we look at some of the realities associated with inflation, I think we have to look over our shoulder and recognize what happened in the past. Many people don't remember the gas lines in 1973. December of 1980, inflation in this country was 11 percent; the prime rate was 20.5 percent. People started to wake up. Are they waking up now? The signs are there. Is OPEC willing to sacrifice windfall oil profits to help keep economic growth on track in the United States, Europe, and Asia at their own expense? I happen to believe that charity begins at home. We have become dependent on OPEC. Can we be

dependent on them increasing the supply of oil?

A source of information from the International Energy Agency says that OPEC will have to increase by 10 percent just to keep up with world demands. If they don't want to keep up with world demands, the price goes up, doesn't it? That will increase production somewhere between 4.5 and 12 percent, or between 1.2 and 3.1 million barrels per day.

A lot of people don't realize how long it takes for a barrel of oil from the Mideast to reach their gas station. It is roughly 6 weeks. If we go into this summer with the current forecast we are getting, we will see gasoline at \$2 a gallon. We depend on oil to keep us warm, for travel, for our homes, sport utility vehicles, on and on, and we are concerned about prosperity. We are concerned about inflation.

There was an article by Daniel Yergin with the Cambridge Energy Research Association, an expert on oil. He indicated there are three things that can get people concerned about inflation and spook the stock market. When I highlight them, you will agree they are here.

It is the price and availability of labor. It is the cost of money or interest rates that are on the rise. And it is the increased price of oil.

We are starting to move. Mark my words, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development has estimated that every \$10 rise in the price of oil lifts inflation by $\frac{1}{2}$ percentage point and reduces economic growth by $\frac{1}{4}$ percent. If that isn't what is happening right now, I will trade places with the President of this body. Oil prices have accounted for the doubling of inflation, to 2 percent from 1.1 percent in the last year.

I quote Chairman Greenspan:

I've been through too many oil shocks to not take them seriously. If price changes, it impacts the economy.

These are a few of the highlights of where the United States is, why the truckers are circulating in Washington, DC.

What is this administration doing about it? They are kowtowing to the Arab world. They are wringing their hands. They have no positive suggestions. Least of all, they have not made one single statement to encourage domestic exploration and production in this country. One wonders what you learn by history; some people say "not much." If you look over your shoulder at where we were in the early 1970s with the Arab oil embargo, where we are today—and, of course, in the interim we fought a war over oil in Iraq and Kuwait. Today, we are right back there, only we are more dependent on the Mideast. If we don't take the steps now to reduce that dependence, this is going to happen again.

Keep in mind that, for the time being, it isn't over. We are just starting into this crisis. This administration must be held accountable for the

lack of an energy policy in this country. There is no energy policy on nuclear power, no energy policy on coal, no energy policy on gas, no energy policy on oil. It kind of drifts out there. And they are well-meaning, but some extreme environmental groups basically propel the direction of this administration. It is no direction at all because there is no energy policy.

So as we look at the increased price of energy, we look at the frustration of the truckers in Washington, DC, and we look at what the administration is doing to address it, we have to come to the conclusion that the administration's efforts—if you can identify them at all—are limited to pleading with the Mideast oil barons to simply produce more oil. That is inadequate. They are simply exporting jobs and dollars. We are going to have to turn this around in the Congress of the United States. The administration won't stand up and recognize the reality that charity begins at home. We have the resources in this country, we have the technology, we have the capital, and we can relieve our dependence on imports if given the support of the Clinton administration.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, February 18, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,739,814,030,329.64 (Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-nine billion, eight hundred fourteen million, thirty thousand, three hundred twenty-nine dollars and sixty-four cents).

One year ago, February 18, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,613,958,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred thirteen billion, nine hundred fifty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, February 18, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$494,617,000,000 (Four hundred ninety-four billion, six hundred seventeen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,245,197,030,329.64 (Five trillion, two hundred forty-five billion, one hundred ninety-seven million, thirty thousand, three hundred twenty-nine dollars and sixty-four cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists, upon its amendments to the bill (S. 761) to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints for consideration of the Senate bill and the House amendments, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BILEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, as the managers of the conference on the part of the house.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to repeal the reduction of the refundable tax credits.

H.R. 2086. An act to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2366. An act to provide small businesses certain protection from litigation expenses and to limit the product liability of non-manufacturer product sellers.

H.R. 3201. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home in the District of Columbia as a National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3557. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

H.R. 3642. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation and support National Donor Day.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Speaker has appointed the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were received and read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2086. An act to authorize funding for networking and information technology re-

search and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3201. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home in the District of Columbia as a National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3557. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The following concurrent resolutions were received and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation and supporting National Donor Day; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 6. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to repeal the reduction of the refundable tax credits.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 16, 2000, he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 632. An act to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-7536. A communication from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the "Sequestration Preview Report for Fiscal Year 2001"; to the Committees on the Budget, and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7537. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, a report relative to certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to French Guiana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7538. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal Costs" (Rev. Rul. 2000-7), received February 9, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7539. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to additions to and deletions from the Procurement List, received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7540. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia: Oxygenated Gasoline Program" (FRL # 6534-7), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7541. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Miscellaneous Revisions to the Forsyth County Local Implementation Plan" (FRL # 6520-4), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7542. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emamectin Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction" (FRL # 6489-4), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7543. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL # 6490-5), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7544. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Field Study; Definition" (Docket # 98-043-2), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7545. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cable Attribution Rules" (CS Docs. 98-82, 96-85, FCC 99-288), received February 9, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7546. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7547. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pilot Pre-Filing Agreement Program" (Notice 2000-9; I.R.B.—, dated February 28, 2000), received February 11, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7548. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Rehabilitation Short-Term Training (Client Assistance Program)" (CFDA Number 84.246K), received February 11, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7549. A communication from the Chairman, Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7550. A communication from the Director, Holocaust Memorial Museum transmitting, pursuant to law, the request for reauthorization of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-7551. A communication from the Special Assistant to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Creation of Low Power Radio Service" (MM Docket No. 99-25, FCC 00-19), received February 11, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7552. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (30); Amdt. No. 1973 (2-9/2-10)" (RIN2120-AA65) (2000-0009), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7553. A communication from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials Transportation: Registration and Fee Assessment Program" (RIN2137-AD17), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7554. A communication from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Hazardous Substances-Revisions" (RIN2137-AD39), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7555. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois" (FRL # 6536-1), received February 11, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7556. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri" (FRL # 6528-7), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7557. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL # 6534-2), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7558. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and

Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rhode Island: Determination of Adequacy for the State's Municipal Solid Waste Permit Program" (FRL # 6535-8), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7559. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "Additional Guidance on PM2.5 Cassette Handling and Transportation"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7560. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the denial of safeguards information for the period October 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7561. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7562. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the allotment of emergency funds to all states under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7563. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "29 CFR Part 44-Process for Electing State Agency Employment Statistics Representatives for Consultations with Department of Labor" (RIN1290-AA19), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7564. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Rule for Reporting by Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Entities that Offer or Provide Coverage for Medical Care to the Employees of Two or More Employers (29 CFR Part 2520)" (RIN1210-AA54), received February 15, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7565. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Rule for the Assessment of Civil Penalties under Section 502(c)(2) of ERISA (29 CFR Part 2560)" (RIN1210-AA54), received February 15, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7566. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Rule Governing Procedures for Administrative Hearings Regarding the Assessment of Civil Penalties under Section 502(c)(2) of ERISA (29 CFR Part 2570)" (RIN1210-AA54), received February 15, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7567. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to two possible new decorations for individuals who are killed or injured in the line of duty while serving under competent authority with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7568. A communication from the Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Eco-

nomics, Department of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Stakeholder Input Requirements for Recipients of Agricultural Research, Education, and Extension Formula" (RIN0524-AA23), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7569. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1999 Crop and Market Loss Assistance" (RIN0560-AG13), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7570. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Analysis, Department of Veterans Affairs transmitting, the fiscal year 1999 annual report of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-7571. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Service Life Insurance" (RIN2900-AJ78), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-7572. A communication from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Highway Trust Fund quarterly report that appears in the December 1999 issue of the "Treasury Bulletin"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7573. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ahadpour v. Commissioner", received February 9, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7574. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determination; 65 FR 6028; 02/08/2000", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7575. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations; 65 FR 6025; 02/08/2000", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7576. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations; 65 FR 6018; 02/08/2000", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7577. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations; 65 FR 6014; 02/08/2000", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7578. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations; 65 FR 6022; 02/08/2000" (Docket No. FEMA-7316), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7579. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determination; 65 FR 6031; 02/08/2000", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7580. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to additions to and deletions from the Procurement List, received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7581. A communication from the Acting Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7582. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on programs for the utilization and donation of Federal property; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7583. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-243, "Motor Vehicle Parking Regulation Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7584. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-244, "Office of Cable Television and Telecommunications Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7585. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-246, "Federal Law Enforcement Officer Cooperation Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7586. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-248, "Sex Offender Registration Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7587. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-249, "Lateral Appointment of Law Enforcement Officers Clarifying Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7588. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-251, "Mandatory Autopsy for Deceased Wards of the District of Columbia and Mandatory Unusual Incident Report Temporary Act of 1999 to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7589. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-255, "Al Arrighi Way Designation Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7590. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-257, "Dennis Dolinger Memorial Park Designation Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7591. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska", received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7592. A communication from the Vice President, Government Affairs, National

Railroad Passenger Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, the Amtrak annual report for 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7593. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to the Port-au-Prince International Airport, Haiti; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7595. A communication from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Bunk Beds" (RIN3041-AB75), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7596. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class D Airspace; Jackson, WY; Docket No. 99-ANM-11 {2-14-2-14}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0032), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7597. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Lexington, KY; Docket No. 99-ASO-25 {2-8-2-14}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0035), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7598. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; London, KY; Docket No. 99-ASO-23 {2-8-2-14}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0034), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7599. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class D and Class E Airspace; Tupelo, MS; Docket No. 99-ASO-3 {2-9-2-14}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0036), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7600. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Puerto Rico, PR; Correction; Docket No. 99-ASO-17 {2-8-2-10}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0031), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7601. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class C Airspace Area; VT; Docket No. 99-AWA-12 {2-10-2-14}" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0033), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7602. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (111); Amdt. No. 19742 {2-9-2-10}" (RIN2120-AA65) (2000-0008), received February 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7603. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric

Company CF6-80C2 Series Turbofan Engines; Docket No. 98-ANE-79" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0079), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7604. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200 Series Airplanes Modified in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate ST00969AT; Docket No. 99-NM-226" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0080), received February 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-406. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine relative to the Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States has a history that reveals the proud tradition and heritage of the American people; and

Whereas, battlefield sites where significant military engagements happened are some of the nation's most important historical sites; and

Whereas, Gettysburg was the site of one of the largest battles in the history of the United States and that battle is considered a turning point for the country in the Civil War; and

Whereas, President Lincoln, in giving his now famous Gettysburg Address dedicating the national cemetery that is located in Gettysburg, acknowledged that he could not adequately dedicate or consecrate the cemetery because "the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract"; and

Whereas, Gettysburg National Military Park, created shortly after the battle and funded largely by private donations and various states that belonged to the Union forces, covers thousands of acres and contains hundreds of monuments commemorating the battle; and

Whereas, the National Park Service lacks sufficient funds to adequately maintain and care for the grounds and monuments and is accepting donations to help preserve the park's monuments; and

Whereas, the commitment to preserve and maintain the monuments and grounds of Gettysburg National Military Park is a measure of how we value this nation and its people: Now therefore, be it

Resolved: That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the United States Congress appropriate funds to adequately maintain and preserve the grounds and monuments of Gettysburg National Military Park; and be it further

Resolved: That suitable copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-407. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the shortage

and cost of home heating oil in the Northeast; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the recent severe weather in the Northeast part of the country has caused a large increase in the use of home heating oil; and

Whereas, such increase has created a burden on the homeowners, tenants and business people who rely on such oil by adversely affecting their budgets; and

Whereas, such increased costs have been exacerbated by the large increase in the cost of such oil; and

Whereas, such increases have raised the specter of petroleum companies acting in combination to increase profits, fix prices and create artificial shortages; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby urges the Congress of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth to conduct an investigation and study of the current shortage of home heating oil in the Northeast part of the country and its attendant cost to determine whether such shortage and cost are real and the result of ordinary market forces or whether they are the result of price fixing and artificial manipulation; and urges the Congress to request the Justice Department of the United States to participate in such investigation and study; and also urges the Governor of the Commonwealth to direct the Department of Energy Resources to participate in such investigation and study in order to develop policies to prevent such shortages and cost increases in the future in the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event that such investigation and study shows that such increase in cost is due to a legitimate shortage of oil in the marketplace, thereafter the Congress shall take action to release into the marketplace an amount of oil from the national reserves that is sufficient to ameliorate the current cost; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the Governor of the Commonwealth, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

POM-408. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the shortage and cost of home heating oil in the Northeast; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the recent severe weather in the Northeast part of the country has caused a large increase in the use of home heating oil; and

Whereas, such increase has created a burden on the homeowners, tenants and business people who rely on such oil by adversely affecting their budgets; and

Whereas, such increased costs have been exacerbated by the large increase in the cost of such oil; and

Whereas, such increases have raised the specter of petroleum companies acting in combination to increase profits, fix prices and create artificial shortages; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court hereby urges the Congress of the United States to commence an investigation and study of the current shortage of home heating oil in the Northeast part of the country and its attendant cost to determine whether such shortage and cost are real and the result of ordinary market forces or whether they are the result of price fixing

and artificial manipulation; and also urges the Congress to request the Justice Department of the United States to participate in such investigation and study; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event that such investigation and study shows that such increase in cost is due to a legitimate shortage of oil in the marketplace, thereafter the Congress shall take action to release into the marketplace an amount of oil from the national reserves that is sufficient to ameliorate the current cost; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2074. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the social security earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2075. A bill to expand Federal employee commuting options and to reduce the traffic congestion resulting from current Federal employee commuting patterns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 2076. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. 2077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nonitemizers a deduction for a portion of their charitable contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2078. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his outstanding athletic accomplishments and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2079. A bill to facilitate the timely resolution of back-logged civil rights discrimination cases of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2080. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that food that contains a genetically engineered material, or that is produced with a genetically engineered material, must be labeled accordingly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2081. A bill entitled "Religious Liberty Protection Act of 2000"; read the first time.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 2082. A bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a uniform dollar limitation for all types of transportation fringe benefits excludable from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 2084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for contributions of food inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. BREAU):

S. 2085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility for full social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2086. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility for full social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2074. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the social security earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST ELIMINATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today in favor of repealing the Social Security earnings test, the onerous tax burden the United States government places on seniors who wish to continue working. In order to ease this unfair burden, I am hereby introducing the Social Security Earnings Test Elimination Act of 2000.

The earnings test limits the amount a person older than 65 and younger than 70 can earn without having his or her Social Security benefits reduced. Currently, benefits are reduced by \$1 for each \$3 of earnings over \$17,000. This test provides a disincentive for seniors to work by reducing seniors' Social Security benefits according to the amount of income they earn.

It is time to repeal that limit. Right now, Social Security is scheduled to go bankrupt in 2034. One of the reasons for the looming bankruptcy of Social Security is the declining ratio of workers

to beneficiaries, which worsens as our elderly population continues to grow much faster than the number of workers entering the workforce. In 1960 the ratio was 5:1, today it is a little more than 3:1, and in thirty years it is expected to be only 2:1. This decreasing number of workers paying for retirees benefits is making it increasingly difficult to make the Social Security books balance.

Instead of helping to fix this problem, the earnings test exacerbates this situation. By providing a disincentive to work, the earnings test keeps seniors at home instead of at work and paying the payroll taxes that keep the Social Security system solvent.

The earnings test is based on a misconception of the U.S. economy. The Social Security Earnings Test is a relic of the Great Depression, designed to move older people out of the workforce and create employment for younger individuals. The idea behind the earnings test is that if seniors were penalized for working, they would stay home and open up employment opportunities for younger workers. Not only was this view wrong in earlier times, but it is counterproductive in today's economy. Today, we do not have a labor surplus, but a labor shortage. Unemployment is at a long-time low of 4.0%, one-and-a-half points lower than the so-called "full employment" mark of 5.5%.

Low unemployment is a great development, but it contributes to a labor shortage that will worsen when the "baby boom" generation ages. Employers will have to develop new sources of labor to fill this shortage, and seniors represent the most experienced, most skilled workers. Many senior citizens can make a significant contribution, and often their knowledge and experience complements or exceeds that of younger employees. 35 million Americans are over the age of 65, and together they have over a billion years of cumulative work experience. It is both counterproductive and harmful to our growing economy to keep willing, diligent workers out of the American economy.

In addition to the negative consequences for the economy as a whole, the Social Security Earnings Test is also bad for seniors. The earnings test punishes Americans between the ages of 65 and 70 for their attempts to remain productive after retirement. This is particularly problematic for low income seniors, many who exist on fixed incomes, and are burdened with a 33.3 percent tax on their earned income. When combined with federal, state and other Social Security taxes, taxes on the elderly can total nearly 55 or 65 percent. An individual who is struggling to make ends meet should not be faced with an effective marginal tax rate which exceeds 55 percent.

While the earnings test harms lower-income people, it only affects seniors who must work and depend on their earned income for survival. Wealthy seniors are not affected by the earnings

limit. Their supplemental, "unearned" sources of income are safe and not subject to the earnings threshold. At the same time, many of the older Americans penalized by the Earnings Test need to work in order to cover their basic expenses: health care, housing and food. Many seniors do not have significant savings or a private pension. For this reason, low-income workers are particularly hard-hit by the Earnings Test.

In addition to all of the policy reasons for elimination of the Earnings Test, the most important reason to eliminate the Test is that it is fundamentally unfair. The earnings test discriminates against seniors. Nobody, regardless of creed, color, gender, or age should be penalized for working or discouraged from engaging in work.

Furthermore, the Earnings Test takes money from seniors that is rightfully theirs. The Social Security benefits which working seniors are losing due to the Earnings Test penalty are benefits they have rightfully earned by contributing to the system throughout their working years before retiring. These are benefits which they should not be losing because they are trying to survive by supplementing their Social Security income.

Mr. President, it is time to eliminate this counterproductive and unfair penalty. With the Social Security and Medicare Trusts Funds facing long-term insolvency, it is now more important than ever to encourage work. More people working means more people paying into the Social Security Trust Fund and Medicare. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this unfair burden placed on elderly Americans.

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

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

S. 2074

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 "Social Security Earnings Test Elimination Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF EARNINGS TEST FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "the age of seventy" and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))";

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (2) of subsection (d), by striking "the age of seventy" each place it appears and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))";

(3) in subsection (f)(1)(B), by striking "was age seventy or over" and inserting "was at or above retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))";

(4) in subsection (f)(3)—

(A) by striking "33½ percent" and all that follows through "any other individual," and inserting "50 percent of such individual's earnings for such year in excess of the product of the exempt amount as determined under paragraph (8)."; and

(B) by striking "age 70" and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))";

(5) in subsection (h)(1)(A), by striking "age 70" each place it appears and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))"; and

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "Age Seventy" and inserting "Retirement Age"; and

(B) by striking "seventy years of age" and inserting "having attained retirement age (as defined in section 216(1))".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS ELIMINATING THE SPECIAL EXEMPT AMOUNT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.—

(1) UNIFORM EXEMPT AMOUNT.—Section 203(f)(8)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403(f)(8)(A)) is amended by striking "the new exempt amounts (separately stated for individuals described in subparagraph (D) and for other individuals) which are to be applicable" and inserting "a new exempt amount which shall be applicable".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 203(f)(8)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403(f)(8)(B)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "Except" and all that follows through "whichever" and inserting "The exempt amount which is applicable for each month of a particular taxable year shall be whichever";

(B) in clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "corresponding" each place it appears; and

(C) in the last sentence, by striking "an exempt amount" and inserting "the exempt amount".

(3) REPEAL OF BASIS FOR COMPUTATION OF SPECIAL EXEMPT AMOUNT.—Section 203(f)(8)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. (f)(8)(D)) is repealed.

(c) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF REDUNDANT REFERENCES TO RETIREMENT AGE.—Section 203 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), in the last sentence, by striking "nor shall any deduction" and all that follows and inserting "nor shall any deduction be made under this subsection from any widow's or widower's insurance benefit if the widow, surviving divorced wife, widower, or surviving divorced husband involved became entitled to such benefit prior to attaining age 60."; and

(B) in subsection (f)(1), by striking clause (D) and inserting the following: "(D) for which such individual is entitled to widow's or widower's insurance benefits if such individual became so entitled prior to attaining age 60.".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONS FOR DETERMINING AMOUNT OF INCREASE ON ACCOUNT OF DELAYED RETIREMENT.—Section 202(w)(2)(B)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(w)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(A) by striking "either"; and

(B) by striking "or suffered deductions under section 203(b) or 203(c) in amounts equal to the amount of such benefit".

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO EARNINGS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING SUBSTANTIAL GAINFUL ACTIVITY OF BLIND INDIVIDUALS.—The second sentence of section 223(d)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423(d)(4)(A)) is amended by striking "if section 102 of the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1996 had not been enacted" and inserting the following: "if the amendments to section 203 made by section 102 of the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1996 and by the Social Security Earnings Test Elimination Act of 2000 had not been enacted".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments and repeals made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 2000.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the legislation of my colleague Senator JOHN ASHCROFT to repeal the Social Security earnings limit. Under current law, workers aged 65-69, can earn only up to \$17,000 without losing out on their Social Security benefits. This "earnings limit" penalizes hard-working seniors by docking them \$1 for every \$3 of earnings over the limit. In fact, an older worker's entire Social Security benefit could be eliminated by the earnings limit if he or she earns more than \$45,944. A few years ago, I worked successfully to increase the limit to \$30,000 by 2002. But we can do better. Penalizing older workers sends the wrong message to those who choose to stay in the workforce beyond normal retirement age. And in today's tight labor market, we need to do a better job about recruiting and retaining good employees. In fact, in my state of Iowa, the jobless rate for December was 2.2 percent. That rate is even below the national jobless rate of 4.1 percent. We cannot afford to discourage older Americans who want to work from remaining in the labor market.

I am a strong supporter of efforts under way this year to repeal the earnings limit. Eliminating the penalty would help 800,000 older workers who now lose part or all of their benefits simply because they have the will and ability to stay on the job after 65. From my home State alone, many Iowans have contacted me in frustration over the earnings limit.

For the first time in years, I am confident we can get the job done once and for all. The proposal has overwhelming bipartisan support from Congress and the White House. We could see swift action on this commonsense proposal.

While fixing this inequity in the retirement system will give fair treatment to those ages 65-69 who have paid into the program during their entire working years, it will not address Social Security's long-term demographic challenges. When the baby boom generation comes on board, the revenue and benefit structure will not be able to sustain the obligations under current law. That is why I have worked with six of my Senate colleagues, Senators JUDD GREGG, BOB KERREY, JOHN BREAUX, FRED THOMPSON, CRAIG THOMAS, and CHUCK ROBB, to craft bipartisan Senate reform legislation. Our bill, the "Bipartisan Social Security Reform Act" S. 1383 is the only reform legislation which has been put forth in the Senate which would make the Social Security trust fund permanently solvent. I will continue to press ahead and work to build a consensus among our colleagues to save Social Security and achieve long-term solvency for generations to come.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 2076. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

• Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to rise alongside my distinguished colleagues Senators MOYNIHAN, SPECTER, SANTORUM, BAYH, BROWNBACK, DURBIN, LANDRIEU, and STEVENS, to honor the enormous contributions made by John Cardinal O'Connor to religion, humanity, international relations, and service to America, by bestowing upon him the Congressional Gold Medal.

I believe this simple gesture would be our opportunity, as members of Congress, as representatives of this nation, to thank his Eminence for the care, compassion, and spiritual guidance that he has provided to millions of people throughout his lifetime. The work he has done from the treasured St. Patrick's Cathedral has reinforced the traditional teaching and practices of the Roman Catholic church, and helped bring to life the spirit and mission of the Vatican.

Since being ordained 54 years ago, John Cardinal O'Connor has dedicated his life to the noblest of deeds, that of service. He has been an advocate of the poor, the sick, the elderly, and America's young children. He has heeded his country's call to service, serving first as a military chaplain, and rising, with distinction, to become Navy Chief Chaplain. He has served as an international ambassador, traveling the world over, Israel, Jordan, Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Russia, as a messenger of peace, humanity, and freedom. Wherever war, oppression, and poverty have threatened to weaken the human spirit, he has been there—a tireless servant of the Roman Catholic church and as an American citizen.

With the recent celebration of his 80th birthday, and the prospects of his retirement growing, it is truly the proper time for America to pay tribute to John Cardinal O'Connor. Last week, the members of the House overwhelmingly supported similar legislation, introduced by Congressman FOSSELLA, by a 413 to 1 vote. It is my hope that this legislation will receive similar support here in the Senate, and that all of our colleagues will join us in this effort. •

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. 2077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow non-itemizers a deduction for a portion of their charitable contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

THE CHARITABLE GIVING TAX RELIEF ACT

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act along with my

colleague Senator COVERDELL. This legislation will allow non-itemizers to deduct 50 percent of their charitable giving, after they exceed a cumulative total of \$500 in annual donations.

As we approach another tax deadline, more than 84 million Americans cannot deduct any of their charitable contributions because they do not itemize their tax returns. In contrast, there are 34 million Americans who itemize and receive this benefit. In Pennsylvania, there are nearly 4 million taxpayers who do not itemize deductions while slightly more than 1.5 million taxpayers do itemize.

While Americans are already giving generously to charities making a significant positive impact in our communities, this legislation provides an incentive for additional giving and allows non-itemizers who typically have middle to lower middle incomes to also benefit from additional tax relief. In fact, non-itemizers earning less than \$30,000 give the highest percentage of their household income to charity. It is estimated that restoring this tax relief provision which existed in the 1980's would encourage more than \$3 billion of additional charitable giving a year. According to Price Waterhouse, the Charitable Giving Relief Act would result in \$725 million in additional charitable giving in Pennsylvania alone over a five year period.

Representative PHILIP CRANE of Illinois has previously introduced identical bipartisan legislation, H.R. 1310, with 122 cosponsors in the House of Representatives. The legislation is also supported by a long list of nonprofit groups and the Independent Sector, a coalition of more than 700 nonprofits, foundations, and other charitable groups.

President Clinton in his FY2001 budget has included a provision which would allow non-itemizers to deduct 50 percent of their charitable contributions in excess of \$1,000 for single filers and \$2,000 for joint filers. The President's proposal would eventually lower the threshold to \$500 in 2006 in a manner consistent with the Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act.

One important dimension of my involvement in promoting charitable efforts helping to revitalize our communities, empower individuals and families, and enhance educational opportunities is encouraging charitable giving. This legislation is a great opportunity to lower the tax burden on the many Americans who have not received any tax relief for their charitable contributions since 1986.

As Senate Co-Chair of the Congressional Empowerment Caucus with Senator LIEBERMAN and in my efforts with the Renewal Alliance, I am committed to helping further unleash the potential of charitable organizations and harness the generosity of Americans to improve the quality of life of all Americans. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the President to provide additional tax relief and incentives for charitable giving this year.

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

The text of the bill follows:

S. 2077

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 "Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act".

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR PORTION OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO BE ALLOWED TO INDIVIDUALS WHO DO NOT ITEMIZE DEDUCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsection:

"(m) DEDUCTION FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT ITEMIZING DEDUCTIONS.—In the case of an individual who does not itemize his deductions for the taxable year, there shall be taken into account as a direct charitable deduction under section 63 an amount equal to 50 percent of the excess of the amount allowable under subsection (a) for the taxable year over \$500."

(b) DIRECT CHARITABLE DEDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 63 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) the direct charitable deduction."

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 63 of such Code is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) DIRECT CHARITABLE DEDUCTION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'direct charitable deduction' means that portion of the amount allowable under section 170(a) which is taken as a direct charitable deduction for the taxable year under section 170(m)."

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 63 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) the direct charitable deduction."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2079. A bill to facilitate the timely resolution of back-logged civil rights discrimination cases of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE USDA CIVIL RIGHTS RESOLUTION ACT OF 2000

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President. I am pleased today to introduce a bill that is designed to clean up a terrible mess at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, dealing with civil rights.

Last year, a finding was made that the USDA had, for decades, been guilty of violating many of America's producer's civil rights. When these producers tried to take advantage of the programs offered by the USDA they were treated differently than their friends and neighbors.

Many cases have been pending for too long. At least one has been on the list for up to ten years. Due to USDA's in-

action, Congress waived the statute of limitations on certain USDA discrimination cases, giving farmers until October 21, 2000, to file or re-file cases that allegedly occurred between 1981 through 1997. In addition to the cases that have been pending, that added another major backlog.

While we realize there is a massive backlog of cases to be dealt with, we feel Congress has made a good-faith effort to assist the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) in every way possible. We have written countless letters and met with Rosalind Gray, the Director of the OCR to discuss this issue. In addition, in 1998 the Senate included money in the agricultural appropriations bill, to deal with this back-log of cases.

However, despite numerous phone calls and letters, no progress has been made in resolving these cases. I have invited Department officials to come to Montana and speak with the civil rights complainants so that we may solve these cases more quickly. So far, I have not seen enough action and not nearly enough closure.

The horror stories about the treatment civil rights complainants have received from the USDA are numerous and unbelievable. These complaints are simply being ignored. The inadequacy of this process is adding insult to injury. These people are being put on hold while the USDA plods through their cases. Many have been forced to the brink. They don't even know if they can still make agriculture their livelihood should USDA finally decide in their favor. Operating costs alone are placing many producers at a disadvantage. Add to that, the costs associated with filing a complaint and you can see why many feel completely helpless, and hopeless.

I have constituents calling my staff at home because they are on their last leg. The OCR has continually ignored requests for information from my staff, or delayed sending pertinent information to these people. Those affected by these decisions cannot afford to waste more precious time listening to the USDA's excuses while they try to find a way to buy next month's food. Allowing these cases to go on for years and years is a travesty. How can these people get on with their life? The USDA has taken away their livelihood. Without equal treatment from the USDA they can't run their operations. Without a working farm, they have lost everything they had.

Secretary Glickman has stated publicly and repeatedly that the civil rights issue within the Department of Agriculture is an extremely high priority on his agenda. It should be. But still, I have seen very little action.

These constituents cannot get on with their lives until the USDA does take action. My bill will give the OCR 270 days to resolve the complaint after it has been investigated. If, after 270 days the complaint is not resolved, the complainant may petition the Civil Rights Division of the Department of

Justice (DOJ). The DOJ shall then conduct a review and make a recommendation to the OCR within 30 days.

This law will also broaden the statute of limitations. As I said earlier, legislation passed by Congress waived the statute of limitations on certain USDA discrimination cases, giving farmers until October 21, 2000, to file or re-file cases that allegedly occurred between 1981 through 1997. However, I want to make sure that civil rights cases do not fall through the cracks of that waiver. If an act occurred prior to February 22, 1998, for example, that person could not file for discrimination. This legislation will cover that gap.

These cases must be resolved soon. These producers have suffered too much already. They cannot afford to wait any longer. We look forward to working with members of other states affected by this abuse of the civil rights program to resolve these complaints as quickly as possible.●

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2080. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that food that contains a genetically engineered material, or that is produced with a genetically engineered material, must be labeled accordingly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act. This legislation requires that all foods containing or produced with genetically engineered material bear a neutral label stating that: "this product contains a genetically engineered material or was produced with a genetically engineered material."

The bill adds this labeling requirement to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act which contain the general standards for labeling foods.

Recent polls have demonstrated that Americans want to know if they are eating genetically engineered food. A January 1999 Time magazine poll revealed that 81% of respondents wanted genetically engineered food to be labeled. A January 2000 MSNBC poll showed identical results.

This pressure has already led some companies not to use genetically engineered materials in their foods. Gerber and Heinz have said they will no longer use genetically engineered material in their baby food. Whole Foods and Wild Oats Supermarkets also have said they will use no genetically engineered material in their own products.

Great Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Spain, Austria, Italy, Portugal, Greece, New Zealand, and Japan already require genetically engineered food to be labeled.

If the U.S. wants to sell its genetically engineered food to these countries, it will have to label the food for foreign consumers. It is only fair that American consumers be given similar information.

Why do I feel it's important for consumers to know that their food is genetically engineered?

First, we don't know whether genetically engineered food is harmful or whether it is safe. However, scientists have raised concerns about genetically engineered food. These concerns include the risks of increased exposure to allergens, decreased nutritional value, increased toxicity and increased antibiotic resistance.

In addition, scientists have raised concerns about the ecological risks associated with genetically engineered food. Some of those risks include the destruction of species, cross pollination that breeds new weeds that are resistant to herbicides, and increases in pesticide use over the long-term.

Earlier this year, for example, researchers at Cornell University reported that Monarch butterflies were either killed or developed abnormally when eating milkweed dusted with the pollen of Bt-corn, a genetically engineered food.

Second, the Food and Drug Administration does not require pre-market health and safety testing of genetically engineered foods. Therefore, it is only fair that consumers know they are eating products that have not been tested.

Third, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture do not require substantive environmental review of genetically engineered materials under their jurisdiction.

My Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act not only mandates labels, but does something even more important: it authorizes \$5 million in grants to conduct studies into the health and environmental risks raised by genetically engineered food.

Specifically, it directs the Secretary of HHS to make grants to individuals, organizations and institutions to study risks like increased toxicity, increased allergenicity, negative effects on soil ecology and on the environment in general.

What is the extent of genetically engineered crops today?

Last year, 98.6 million acres in the U.S. were planted with genetically engineered crops. More than one-third of the U.S. soybean crop and one-quarter of corn were genetically engineered. This represents a 23-fold increase in genetically engineered crop production from just four years ago.

And waiting to come into the marketplace are more than 60 different genetically engineered crops—from apples and strawberries to potatoes and tomatoes.

Providing consumers with information about the foods they eat is hardly new.

For example, I was proud to be the author of the law to provide for the

“dolphin safe” label on tuna. The label indicated that the tuna was harvested by methods that don't harm dolphins.

I was also proud to lead the fight in the Senate to make sure that chicken frozen as solid as a bowling ball could not be labeled fresh. At the time, USDA's position was that frozen chicken could be labeled “fresh.”

In 1996, I succeeded in amending the Safe Drinking Water Act to require that drinking water providers give their consumers annual reports concerning the quality of their water.

Others in Congress led the fight to tell consumers whether their products contain artificial colors or sweeteners, preservatives, additives, and whether they are from concentrate. I supported those labels as well.

Food manufacturers also label their products with information that is of little value to consumers. Certain brands of pretzels, for example, bear a label which states that the manufacturer is a “Member of the Snack Food Association: An International Trade Association.”

I don't think this is information consumers are clamoring for, yet the manufacturer is willing to go through the trouble of putting it on the bag.

My legislation builds on the existing food labeling system, and would be simple to implement. It would require that all foods containing or made with genetically engineered foods be labeled with this information: “this product contains a genetically engineered material or was produced with a genetically engineered material.”

For example, corn flakes made with genetically engineered corn would be a “product that contains” genetically engineered material. To take another example, milk from a cow treated with genetically engineered bovine growth hormone would be a product “produced with” genetically engineered material.

Specifically, my bill requires that food that contains or was produced with genetically engineered material be labeled at each stage of the food production process—from seed company to farmer to manufacturer to retailer. The labeling requirement in my bill, however, does not apply to drugs or to food sold in restaurants, bakeries, and other similar establishments.

Genetically engineered material is defined under the bill as material that “has been altered at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes.” Food developed through traditional processes such as crossbreeding is not considered to be genetically engineered, and the legislation's labeling requirement would not apply to foods produced in that way.

Under the bill, persons need not label food if they obtain a written guaranty from the party from whom they received the food that the food does not contain and was not produced with genetically engineered material. Persons who obtain a valid guaranty are not subject to penalties under the bill if

they are later found to have failed to label food that contains genetically engineered material.

For example, a farmer who plants genetically engineered corn must label that corn. Each person who then buys and then sells that corn, or food derived from it, will also be required to label it as genetically engineered.

Conversely, farmers who obtain a guaranty that the corn they are planting is not genetically engineered may issue a guaranty to purchasers that their corn is not genetically engineered. The purchaser then would not have to label that corn or product made with that corn.

If the corn or food is later found to have contained or been produced with genetically engineered material but was not labeled accordingly, the purchaser would not be subject to penalties under the bill.

This guaranty system is used today to enforce provisions of existing law concerning the distribution of adulterated or mislabeled foods. The system is much less expensive than a system which would require food to be tested at every phase of the food production process.

Failure to label food that contains or was produced with genetically engineered material carries a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 amount for each violation.

Importantly, the bill provides that if a party fraudulently warrants that a product is not genetically engineered, no party further down the chain of custody may be held liable for mislabeling. This provision is particularly meant to protect small farmers from the possibility that their suppliers would by contract provide that any liability for mislabeling be borne by the farmer regardless of the suppliers' own actions.

The bill also provides another protection for farmers. Under the bill, a farmer who plants a non-genetically engineered crop, but whose crop came to contain genetically engineered material from natural causes such as wind carrying pollen from a genetically engineered plant is not subject to penalties under the bill. This is the case so long as the farmer did not intend or did not negligently permit this to occur.

And, finally, the bill directs the Secretary of HHS to make grants to study the possible health and environmental risks associated with genetically engineered foods. The bill authorizes \$5 million for this purpose.

In closing, Mr. President, during the recent negotiations on the Biosafety Protocol, it was the United States' negotiating position that international shipments of seeds, grains and plants that may contain genetically engineered material be labeled accordingly.

If the United States took the position that it is appropriate to provide this information to its trading partners, shouldn't we make similar information available to American consumers?

I am hopeful that my House and Senate colleagues can act quickly to ensure the passage of my legislation to give American families the right-to-know whether their food contains or was produced with genetically engineered material.

I ask that the text of my legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the legislation follows:

S. 2080

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 "Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1999, 98,600,000 acres in the United States were planted with genetically engineered crops, and more than 1/3 of the soybean crop, and 1/4 of the corn crop, in the United States was genetically engineered.

(2) The process of genetically engineering foods results in the material change of such foods.

(3) The health and environmental effects of genetically engineered foods are not yet known.

(4) Individuals in the United States have the right to know whether food contains or has been produced with genetically engineered material.

(5) Federal law gives individuals in the United States the right to know whether food contains artificial colors and flavors, chemical preservatives, and artificial sweeteners by requiring the labeling of such food.

(6) Requirements that genetically engineered food be labeled as genetically engineered would increase consumer knowledge about, and consumer control over consumption of, genetically engineered food.

(7) Genetically engineered material can be detected in food at levels as low as 0.1 percent by reasonably available technology.

SEC. 3. LABELING REGARDING GENETICALLY ENGINEERED MATERIAL; AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(t)(1) If it contains a genetically engineered material, or was produced with a genetically engineered material, unless it bears a label (or labeling, in the case of a raw agricultural commodity) that provides notices in accordance with each of the following requirements:

"(A) The label or labeling bears the following notice: 'GENETICALLY ENGINEERED'.

"(B) The label or labeling bears the following notice: 'THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS A GENETICALLY ENGINEERED MATERIAL, OR WAS PRODUCED WITH A GENETICALLY ENGINEERED MATERIAL'.

"(C) The notice required in clause (A) immediately precedes the notice required in clause (B) and the type for the notice required in clause (A) is not less than twice the size of the type for the notice required in clause (B).

"(D) The notice required in clause (B) is the same size as would be required if the notice provided nutrition information that is required in paragraph (q)(1).

"(E) The notices required in clauses (A) and (B) are clearly legible and conspicuous.

"(2) This paragraph does not apply to food that—

"(A) is served in restaurants or other similar eating establishments, such as cafeterias and carryouts;

"(B) is a medical food as defined in section 5(b) of the Orphan Drug Act; or

"(C) was grown on a tree that was planted before the date of enactment of the Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act, in a case in which the producer of the food does not know if the food contains a genetically engineered material, or was produced with a genetically engineered material.

"(3) In this paragraph:

"(A) The term 'genetically engineered material' means material derived from any part of a genetically engineered organism, without regard to whether the altered molecular or cellular characteristics of the organism are detectable in the material.

"(B) The term 'genetically engineered organism' means—

"(i) an organism that has been altered at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes (including recombinant DNA and RNA techniques, cell fusion, microencapsulation, macroencapsulation, gene deletion and doubling, introduction of a foreign gene, and a process that changes the positions of genes), other than a means consisting exclusively of breeding, conjugation, fermentation, hybridization, in vitro fertilization, or tissue culture; and

"(ii) an organism made through sexual or asexual reproduction, or both, involving an organism described in subclause (i), if possessing any of the altered molecular or cellular characteristics of the organism so described.

"(C) The term 'produced with a genetically engineered material', used with respect to a food, means a food if—

"(i) the organism from which the food is derived has been injected or otherwise treated with a genetically engineered material (except that the use of manure as a fertilizer for raw agricultural commodities may not be construed to be production with a genetically engineered material);

"(ii) the animal from which the food is derived has been fed genetically engineered material; or

"(iii) the food contains an ingredient that is a food to which subclause (i) or (ii) applies."

(b) GUARANTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(d)" and inserting "(d)(1)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(2)(A) No person shall be subject to the penalties of subsection (a)(1) or (h) for a violation of section 301(a), 301(b), or 301(c) involving food that is misbranded within the meaning of section 403(t) if such person (referred to in this paragraph as the 'recipient') establishes a guaranty or undertaking that—

"(i) is signed by, and contains the name and address of, a person residing in the United States from whom the recipient received in good faith the food (including the receipt of seeds to grow raw agricultural commodities); and

"(ii) contains a statement to the effect that the food does not contain a genetically engineered material or was not produced with a genetically engineered material.

"(B) In the case of a recipient who, with respect to a food, establishes a guaranty or undertaking in accordance with subparagraph (A), the exclusion under such subparagraph from being subject to penalties applies to the recipient without regard to the manner in which the recipient uses the food, including whether the recipient is—

"(1) processing the food;

"(ii) using the food as an ingredient in a food product;

"(iii) repacking the food; or

"(iv) growing, raising, or otherwise producing the food.

"(C) No person may avoid responsibility or liability for a violation of section 301(a), 301(b), or 301(c) involving food that is misbranded within the meaning of section 403(t) by entering into a contract or other agreement that specifies that another person shall bear such responsibility or liability, except that a recipient may require a guaranty or undertaking as described in this subsection.

"(D) In this paragraph, the terms 'genetically engineered material' and 'produced with a genetically engineered material' have the meanings given the terms in section 403(t)."

(2) FALSE GUARANTY.—Section 301(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(h)) is amended by inserting "or 303(d)(2)" before "which guaranty or undertaking is false" the first place it appears.

(c) UNINTENDED CONTAMINATION.—Section 303(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by subsection (b)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(3)(A) No person shall be subject to the penalties of subsection (a)(1) or (h) for a violation of section 301(a), 301(b), or 301(c) involving food that is misbranded within the meaning of section 403(t) if—

"(i) such person is an agricultural producer and the violation occurs because food that is grown, raised, or otherwise produced by such producer, which food does not contain a genetically engineered material and was not produced with a genetically engineered material, is contaminated with a food that contains a genetically engineered material or was produced with a genetically engineered material (including contamination by mingling the 2 foods); and

"(ii) such contamination is not intended by the agricultural producer.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to an agricultural producer to the extent that the contamination occurs as a result of the negligence of the producer."

(d) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333) is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

"(h)(1) With respect to a violation of section 301(a), 301(b), or 301(c) involving food that is misbranded within the meaning of section 403(t), any person engaging in such a violation shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 for each such violation.

"(2) Paragraphs (3) through (5) of subsection (g) apply with respect to a civil penalty assessed under paragraph (1) to the same extent and in the same manner as such paragraphs (3) through (5) apply with respect to a civil penalty assessed under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (g)."

SEC. 4. GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD.

Chapter IX of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 908. GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to appropriate individuals, organizations, and institutions to conduct research into the public health and environmental risks associated with genetically engineered materials, food that contains a genetically engineered material, and food that is produced with a genetically engineered material, including risks related to—

"(1) increased allergenicity;

"(2) increased toxicity;

"(3) cross-pollination between genetically engineered materials and materials that are not genetically engineered materials; and

“(4) interference with the soil ecosystem and other impacts on the ecosystem.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 to carry out the objectives of this section.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this subsection shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—The terms ‘genetically engineered material’ and ‘produced with a genetically engineered material’ have the meanings given the terms in section 403(t)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.”.

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 1(n) of Public Law 90-201 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) if—

“(A) it contains a genetically engineered material, or was produced with a genetically engineered material; and

“(B)(i) it does not bear a label or labeling, as appropriate, that provides the notices required under the terms and conditions of section 403(t) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(t)); or

“(ii) it is the subject of a false guaranty or undertaking,

subject to the terms and conditions of section 303(d) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 333(d)) and subject to the penalties described in section 303(h) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 333(h)) and remedies available under this Act.”.

(b) Section 4(h) of Public Law 85-172 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) if—

“(A) it contains a genetically engineered material, or was produced with a genetically engineered material; and

“(B)(i) it does not bear a label or labeling, as appropriate, that provides the notices required under the terms and conditions of section 403(t) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(t)); or

“(ii) it is the subject of a false guaranty or undertaking,

subject to the terms and conditions of section 303(d) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 333(d)) and subject to the penalties described in section 303(h) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 333(h)) and remedies available under this Act.”.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 2082. A bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PRESIDENTIAL SITES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor not only the birthday of our great nation's first president, George Washington, but all presidents who followed in his foot steps. I am introducing the Presidential Sites Improvement Act of 2000, which would create a new and innovative partnership with public and private entities to

preserve and maintain Presidential birthplaces, homes, memorials, and tombs. Our Presidents have contributed so much to our country, and we have much to learn from them. It is fitting that we recognize their contributions as leaders of our country.

Mr. President, there are numerous sites across the nation that pay tribute to our nation's chief executives, but the majority of these sites are not owned by the National Park Service. This means that these sites generally do not receive federal support. These sites must rely on donations, state and local assistance, and private endowments to pay for staff, maintenance, and restoration projects. Some of these sites have large endowments for operation expenses. Unfortunately, many other sites have a very difficult time making ends meet. In fact, many of these sites delay necessary capital improvement projects because site managers simply don't have the resources to pay for them. Over time, maintenance neglect will cause these historic sites to slowly fall apart.

I have visited many of the Presidential historic sites throughout my home state of Ohio, a state that has been the home of eight presidents. It is disturbing to see at the Ulysses S. Grant birthplace the discoloration throughout the house and falling plaster because of water damage. At the home of President Warren Harding, the famous front porch where then candidate Harding gave his campaign speeches actually began to pull away from the house. Fortunately, we were able to obtain the funding to prevent these two historic treasures from deteriorating further. However, by providing some federal assistance for maintenance projects today, we can help prevent larger maintenance problems tomorrow.

Mr. President, these Presidential sites are far too important to let them slowly decay. My legislation would authorize grants, administered by the National Park Service, for maintenance and improvement projects on presidential sites that are not federally owned or managed. A portion of the funds would be set aside for sites that are in need of emergency assistance. To administer this new program, this legislation would establish a five member committee, including the Director of the National Park Service, a member of the Trust for Historic Preservation, and a state historic preservation officer. This committee would make grant recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior. Each grant would require that half of the funds come from non-federal sources. Up to \$5 million would be made available annually.

With this legislation, we can do more than just set one day aside to honor our country's dedicated leaders. We can make a lasting commitment to preserve their memory and contributions for generations to come. Our children and grandchildren should have the opportunity to understand the richness of

our country's history. If we do not make efforts to maintain these Presidential sites, we will lose these treasures forever. The funds given to these sites would be a great tribute to our nation's past and a lasting asset to our nation's future.

Our Presidents have shaped this country, so it is fitting that we recognize their contributions as leaders. I invite my colleagues to join me, along with my colleagues from Virginia, Senators WARNER and ROBB, in cosponsoring this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2082

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 “Presidential Sites Improvement Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) there are many sites honoring Presidents located throughout the United States, including Presidential birthplaces, homes, museums, burial sites, and tombs;

(2) most of the sites are owned, operated, and maintained by non-Federal entities such as State and local agencies, family foundations, colleges and universities, libraries, historical societies, historic preservation organizations, and other nonprofit organizations;

(3) Presidential sites are often expensive to maintain;

(4) many Presidential sites are in need of capital, technological, and interpretive display improvements for which funding is insufficient or unavailable; and

(5) to promote understanding of the history of the United States by recognizing and preserving historic sites linked to Presidents of the United States, the Federal Government should provide grants for the maintenance and improvement of Presidential sites.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) GRANT COMMISSION.—The term “Grant Commission” means the Presidential Site Grant Commission established by section 4(d).

(2) PRESIDENTIAL SITE.—The term “Presidential site” means a Presidentially-related site of national significance that is—

(A) managed, maintained, and operated for and is accessible to, the public; and

(B) owned or operated by—

(i) a State; or

(ii) a private institution, organization, or person.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. GRANTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for major maintenance and improvement projects at Presidential sites to owners or operators of Presidential sites in accordance with this section.

(b) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant awarded under this section may be used for—

(A) repairs or capital improvements at a Presidential site (including new construction for necessary modernization) such as—

(i) installation or repair of heating or air conditioning systems, security systems, or electric service; or

(ii) modifications at a Presidential site to achieve compliance with requirements under titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.); and

(B) interpretive improvements to enhance public understanding and enjoyment of a Presidential site.

(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to award grants under this Act—

(i) 15 percent shall be used for emergency projects, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) 65 percent shall be used for grants for Presidential sites with—

(I) a 3-year average annual operating budget of less than \$700,000 (not including the amount of any grant received under this section); and

(II) an endowment in an amount that is less than 3 times the annual operating budget of the site; and

(iii) 20 percent shall be used for grants for Presidential sites with—

(I) an annual operating budget of \$700,000 or more (not including the amount of any grant received under this section); and

(II) an endowment in an amount that is equal to or more than 3 times the annual operating budget of the site.

(B) UNEXPENDED FUNDS.—If any funds allocated for a category of projects described in subparagraph (A) are unexpended, the Secretary may use the funds to award grants for another category of projects described in that subparagraph.

(c) APPLICATION AND AWARD PROCEDURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary, an owner or operator of a Presidential site may submit to the Secretary an application for a grant under this section.

(2) INVOLVEMENT OF GRANT COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall forward each application received under paragraph (1) to the Grant Commission.

(B) CONSIDERATION BY GRANT COMMISSION.—Not later than 60 days after receiving an application from the Secretary under subparagraph (A), the Grant Commission shall return the application to the Secretary a recommendation of whether the proposed project should be awarded a Presidential site grant.

(C) RECOMMENDATION OF GRANT COMMISSION.—In making a decision to award a Presidential site grant under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration any recommendation of the Grant Commission.

(3) AWARD.—Not later than 180 days after receiving an application for a Presidential site grant under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) award a Presidential site grant to the applicant; or

(B) notify the applicant, in writing, of the decision of the Secretary not to award a Presidential site grant.

(4) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project at a Presidential site for which a grant is awarded under this section shall not exceed 50 percent.

(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project at a Presidential site for which a grant is awarded under this section may be provided in cash or in kind.

(d) PRESIDENTIAL SITE GRANT COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Presidential Site Grant Commission.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Grant Commission shall be composed of—

(A) the Director of the National Park Service; and

(B) 4 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(i) A State historic preservation officer.

(ii) A representative of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

(iii) A representative of a site described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii).

(iv) A representative of a site described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iii).

(3) TERM.—A member of the Grant Commission shall serve a term of 2 years.

(4) DUTIES.—The Grant Commission shall—

(A) review applications for Presidential site grants received under subsection (c); and

(B) recommend to the Secretary projects for which Presidential site grants should be awarded.

(5) INELIGIBILITY OF SITES DURING TERM OF REPRESENTATIVE.—A site described in clause (iii) or (iv) of paragraph (2)(B) shall be ineligible for a grant under this Act during the 2-year period in which a representative of the site serves on the Grant Commission.

(6) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACIA.—The Grant Commission shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues Senators DEWINE and WARNER to introduce a bill aimed at preserving an important part of our national heritage. The Presidential Sites Improvement Act will help preserve and protect some of our nation's greatest historical treasures, homes and other places close to the lives of U.S. Presidents. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Virginia is the birthplace and home of some of our most illustrious presidents. We have honored those Presidents by preserving their homes, and we honor our history by maintaining those homes and using them to educate and remind ourselves of what has gone before. Mount Vernon, Monticello, and Montpelier are famous for providing historic perspective on what the nation was like during the years when their owners served our country.

Not all Presidential homes are as grand as Mount Vernon, nor were all Presidents as well remembered and honored as George Washington. But each President has an important place in American history, and their homes and other sites related to their lives, remain an important part of our nation's story.

Many of these sites are owned by private citizens, small community organizations, universities, and historical societies. These organizations don't always have the funds available to keep the sites in good repair, provide fire protection, handicap access, and develop interpretive displays that teach our nation's history. The Presidential Sites Improvement Act is aimed primarily at those sites. We want to lend a hand to those local organizations and individuals who work to preserve the story of individual Presidents in order to preserve the story of America's growth, and America's greatness.

Mr. President, I also want to thank each of these organizations for preserving our country's history, and for providing our generation and future generations with information on the backgrounds and influences that tie each President to his time in history, and his place in the national mosaic of our great democracy.

I am pleased to be an original sponsor of this bill, and I hope the Senate will join us in supporting this legislation, and moving it to quick passage.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a uniform dollar limitation for all types of transportation fringe benefits excludable from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMUTER BENEFITS EQUITY ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, today with Senator MOYNIHAN I introduce legislation that will continue our fight on urban sprawl by encouraging the use of public transportation. The Commuter Benefits Equity Act of 2000 increases the tax exemption for transit and van passes to the same level as parking. Currently, we allow employers to provide up to \$175 a month in tax-free parking benefits, but only \$65 a month for transit. This makes no sense when our goal is to reduce the amount of traffic on our highways.

The Commuter Benefits Equity Act of 2000 raises the limit on transit and van passes up to the current limit for parking passes, \$175 a month. Both of these benefits will then be adjusted for inflation annually. To ensure that federal employees can also take advantage of this benefit, the bill also eliminates an outdated provision that currently precludes an employee from cashing out his employer-provided parking pass and using an employer-provided transit pass instead. It is important that federal employees have the same access to public transportation benefits as do private sector employees.

While this is but one step towards dealing with traffic congestion and the more comprehensive problem of sprawl, it is an important one. I will continue to push for sensible legislation, like this bill, that continues to improve our quality of life.●

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the Commuter Benefits Equity Act of 2000, which Senator ROBB introduced today. I am proud to join Senators SCHUMER, LAUTENBERG, LIEBERMAN, DODD, CHAFEE, MIKULSKI, WARNER, KERRY, and SARBANES as a cosponsor of this legislation, which will provide substantial tax savings to American workers and move commuters out of their cars, off our congested highways, and onto mass transportation systems.

The Commuter Benefits Equity Act of 2000 represents the latest in a decade-long series of Federal surface transportation policy reforms that began with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). Instead of building highways irrespective of need or economic justification, we have, since ISTEA, turned our focus to improving the mobility of Americans while reversing some of the environmental degradation caused by highway congestion. We have made great progress and built formidable constituencies for balanced transportation investments, but arguments over Federal transportation priorities extend back to Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. In short, we must remain vigilant.

Under current law, employers may permit employees to set aside up to \$65 of their monthly pre-tax salary to pay for commuting costs. This benefit, known as the transit/vanpool "qualified transportation fringe," excludes up to \$780 of a worker's annual salary from Federal income taxes and reduces employer payroll taxes while encouraging mass transit usage. If employers prefer, they may choose to offer the benefit in addition to an employee's salary. Under this system, workers receive a Federal tax-free benefit of up to \$780 per year, which employers may provide at a far lower cost than a commensurate salary increase.

These are sensible measures that promote environmentally sound commuting practices, and reward working Americans. However, a similar benefit exists for employer-provided parking spaces with a monthly cap of \$175 per month. For many commuters whose companies offer both the transit/vanpool and parking benefits, driving to work can be significantly cheaper. With this bill, my colleagues and I are stating that the Federal government should, at minimum, treat transit commuters and those who drive to work equally. Our proposal is to raise the cap on the transit/vanpool benefit to \$175.

A second feature of the bill expands the availability of the transit/vanpool benefit to many Federal employees who are precluded from using it because of Federal employee compensation law. Specifically, under current law Federal employees may not "cash-out" their parking space benefit in exchange for either taxable income or the tax-free transit and vanpool benefit. This section of the bill permits Federal employees to enjoy the same benefits as their private sector counterparts.

I believe that this bill is long overdue. Federal tax policy should not encourage people to drive to work, and Federal employees should not be prohibited from enjoying the same tax benefits as other working Americans. In passing this bill, we can institute a measure of fairness into both Federal tax policy and Federal employee compensation. In addition, we can reduce automobile congestion and air pollution from our highways. ●

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 2084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for contributions of food inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE HUNGER RELIEF TAX INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act. The United States is experiencing one of the greatest economic expansions in our nation's history. Our country is in the enviable position of experiencing both strong growth and record low unemployment and inflation.

Unfortunately, some families have not shared in this rising economic tide. Last year, America's Second Harvest food banks, our nation's largest hunger relief network, provided food assistance to 26 million needy people.

Food banks and other charities are finding it increasingly difficult to meet all of the demand for food assistance. Nearly 1 million needy and hungry people were turned away from food banks last year for a lack of food, according to Second Harvest. Statistics by the United States Department of Agriculture show that up to 96 billion pounds of food goes to waste each year in the United States. If a small percentage of that food could be captured and directed to food banks, significantly more food would be available to those in need.

In the past, food banks have gained donations from the inefficiencies of manufacturing. Producing blemished product or manufacturing too much merchandise has provided charities with a steady flow of donations. However, technology has made businesses and manufacturers significantly more efficient. Although beneficial to the company's bottom-line, donations have lessened as a result. Furthermore, the advent of a second market, including dollar and value stores, has created additional demand for these over-produced or cosmetically flawed products, placing another strain on this source of food donations.

As Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I realize the important assistance provided through federal nutrition programs. During the debate on welfare reform, I fought for our nation's school lunch program, opposing the block granting of such funds in order to ensure that low income children received at least one nutritious meal a day. I also fought successfully to maintain food stamps as an entitlement to ensure access to nutritious food for the nation's poor. In 1997, Congressman Lee Hamilton and I sponsored and passed legislation that gave charities that serve the poor preferential access to surplus federal property. The Hunger Relief Tax Incentive bill I am introducing today will complement these efforts and spur private donations of food products to food banks and soup kitchens around the country.

Under current tax law, when a corporation donates food to a food bank, it is eligible to receive a "special rule" tax deduction. Congress created the "special rule" deduction in the Tax Reform Act of 1976 to provide a special incentive for the donation of food to charities that serve the poor. The "special rule" deduction allows a company to deduct the cost (or basis) of the donated product and up to ½ the mark-up of the product's fair market value. This deduction is capped to not exceed twice the cost basis.

Unfortunately, when the "special rule" deduction is applied to most donations, companies have found that they do not even recoup their actual production costs. Moreover, current tax law limits the "special rule" deduction to corporations, thus disallowing farmers, ranchers, small businesses and restaurant owners from receiving the same tax benefits afforded to corporate donors.

The Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act will encourage additional food donations with three changes to our current law. First, this bill will extend these favorable tax incentives now afforded only to corporate donors of food to all business taxpayers. That means farmers, ranchers, small business and restaurant owners will benefit through tax incentives for their donations of food to hungry people in their own community.

Second, this legislation will enlarge the tax deduction for donated food to the fair market value of the product, not to exceed twice the product's cost (basis). Although most companies will continue to recoup less than the entire cost of production, the enhanced deduction from the donation and the resulting heightened good-will makes donating food a more economically sound proposition.

Lastly, this bill will codify the Tax Court ruling in "Lucky Stores, Inc. v. IRS". In that case, the Court upheld the right of the taxpayer to determine the fair market value of donated food, rather than the IRS. I agree that taxpayers are in the best position to determine the appropriate fair market value of these products.

Mr. President, the Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act will help in our battle to feed needy Americans and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. BREAU):

S. 2085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility for full Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

THE RETIRED AMERICANS RIGHT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT I

S. 2086. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility

for full Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

THE RETIRED AMERICANS RIGHT OF
EMPLOYMENT ACT II

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues, Senators GREGG and BREAUX, to introduce two pieces of bipartisan legislation intended to encourage older Americans to remain in the workforce. Today more individuals wish to work and are capable of working beyond retirement age. Yet our laws discourage such behavior. Our policies should provide productive older Americans with incentives for staying in the workforce, paying taxes, and strengthening our economy and Social Security System.

The American economy, its workforce, and ensuing retirement patterns have all changed dramatically since Congress passed the Social Security Act over sixty years ago. In 1935, when the Social Security retirement age was set at age 65, most workers were employed in physically demanding jobs in either the manufacturing or agricultural sectors. The physical strain of work and the resulting health problems made it difficult for individuals to continue to labor past the age of 65. Furthermore, most individuals were not expected to live much beyond the age of retirement. The life expectancy of individuals born in 1935 was only 61 years.

Today's economy and workforce differs greatly from the industrial one that Social Security was designed to augment. The current American employment base is mostly service and technology driven. These sectors do not take as much of a physical toll on workers. Compared with the 1950's that witnessed 20 percent of the workforce in physically taxing jobs, today those figures are closer to 7 percent.

The health and life expectancy of older Americans also has improved dramatically since Social Security was enacted. In the past decade, the rate of disability among older Americans has been falling nearly three times as fast as the previous eight decades. Older Americans are living longer and healthier as a result of improvements in medicine and treatment. According to Frank Williams, a professor of medicine at the University of Rochester, the approaching trend for older Americans will be to experience a longer "health span" during their retirement years and a brief acute illness before death, rather than years of costly, chronic disability. Other studies have supported these findings. This suggests that older Americans have the physical abilities to continue to work beyond retirement age if they so choose.

Unfortunately, laws remain on the books that are designed to penalize older Americans for staying in the workforce past retirement age. We cannot afford to discourage older Americans from working. As our economy grows and the baby-boomers approach retirement, productive workers will be scarce. Tapping into the pool of experi-

enced older Americans will be important to continue to improve our economy and standard of living.

The two bills I am introducing today each make four changes to our laws in an effort to encourage older Americans to remain in the workforce. The most significant disincentive for working past retirement age is the Social Security earnings test and both bills I have introduced would eliminate it. In 2000, the earnings test provides that recipients under age 65 may earn up to \$10,080 a year in wages or self-employment income without having their Social Security benefits affected. Those aged 65-69 can earn up to \$17,000 a year. For earnings above these amounts, recipients under age 65 lose \$1 of benefits for each \$2 of earnings, and those aged 65-69 lose \$1 in benefits for each \$3 of earnings.

The earnings test was established during a time when our nation pushed older employees out of the workforce in order to make room for a younger generation. Our economy is in need of all productive workers, including the growing pool of experienced older Americans. The antiquated Social Security earnings test remains an onerous work disincentive for older Americans and it should be eliminated. The elimination of the earnings test was one of the recommendations contained in the final report of the 21st Century National Commission on Retirement Policy.

The second provision contained in both pieces of legislation would change the Social Security benefit formula to include all earnings years in the calculation of an individual's benefit, including those that occur after retirement. Under current law, the Social Security Administration determines an individual's retirement benefit by using the average of the top 35 earnings years prior to an individual's eligibility age. For most people, retirement eligibility occurs at age 62. This means that for most Americans, those earnings that occur after age 62 are not accounted for in an individual's benefit calculation. This anomaly in the law provides a disincentive to work past retirement age. Our two bills would address this by including all earnings years in the benefit formula. Retirees will be rewarded through a higher benefit for continuing to work and pay taxes.

The third provision would make adjustments to the benefit formula for those who retire early and those who delay retirement. The 21st Century National Commission on Retirement Policy recommends adjustments to the early retirement benefit level and the delayed retirement credit to reflect more accurately the value of extra taxes paid if retirement is delayed. Actuarial studies have found that the Social Security benefit formula is currently weighted to favor those individuals who retire early and against those who delay retirement. These bills adjust the benefit calculation to ensure

that there is not a bias in the benefit formula that discourages working.

Where the two bills differ is in the fourth section, which uses the tax code to induce individuals to work past the retirement age. The RARE Act I would cut individuals' portion of the FICA tax by 10 percent once they reach full retirement age as an incentive for them to stay in the workforce. Retirees would see their FICA tax cut from 7.65 percent to 6.885 percent. Under current law, the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) is currently funded with a 6.2 percent tax on employee wages up to \$76,200 with a matching contribution by the employer. The Hospital Insurance (HI) or Medicare portion is funded through a 1.45 percent tax on all wages with a similar employer match. Because FICA taxes are levied on the first dollar of wages earned, this tax reduction will benefit all income levels of retirees, including those who choose to work part-time after retirement.

The second bill, the RARE Act II, takes a bolder tax cutting approach. It would provide individuals who have reached the full retirement age with a tax credit equal to the lesser of 10 percent of the amount of income tax owed or the earned income of an individual. This provision would effectively reward older Americans who continue to earn and to pay taxes past the age of retirement.

Mr. President, the Retired Americans Right of Employment Acts are thoughtful pieces of legislation aimed at keeping productive workers engaged in our economy and I urge my colleagues to support these bipartisan efforts.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 38

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 38, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase out the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period.

S. 39

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 39, a bill to provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above the call of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 71

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service-connection for certain veterans with Hepatitis C, and for other purposes.

S. 119

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to establish a Northern Border States-Canada Trade Council, and for other purposes.

S. 158

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 158, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the manufacture, importation, and sale of ammunition capable of piercing police body armor.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to change the determination of the 50,000-barrel refinery limitation on oil depletion deduction from a daily basis to an annual average daily basis.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for a waiver of or reduction in the matching funds requirement in the case of fiscal hardship.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to provide for full parity with respect to health insurance coverage for certain severe biologically-based mental illnesses and to prohibit limits on the number of mental illness-related hospital days and outpatient visits that are covered for all mental illnesses.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from California

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to streamline, modernize, and enhance the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to plant protection and quarantine, and for other purposes.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the "Made in the USA" label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1314, a bill to establish a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement in deterring, investigating, and prosecuting computer crimes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation, relief, and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and for other purposes.

S. 1384

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1384, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national folic acid education program to prevent birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate May as "National Military Appreciation Month."

S. 1480

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to assure access of medicare beneficiaries to prescription drug coverage through the SPICE drug benefit program.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to provide for excellence in economic education, and for other purposes.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to establish the Immigration Affairs Agency within the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 1642

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to amend part F of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and refocus civic education, and for other purposes.

S. 1729

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1729, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails, and for other purposes.

S. 1886

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1886, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to permit the Governor of a State to waive the oxygen content requirement for reformulated gasoline, to encourage development of voluntary standards to prevent and control releases of methyl tertiary butyl ether from underground storage tanks, and for other purposes.

S. 1902

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1902, a bill to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons and records of the Japanese Imperial Army in a manner that does not impair any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 1924

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1924, a bill to ensure personal privacy with respect to financial information, to provide customers notice and choice about how their financial institutions share or sell their personally identifiable sensitive financial information, to provide for strong enforcement of these rights, and to protect States' rights.

S. 1941

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts

(Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1941, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide assistance to fire departments and fire prevention organizations for the purpose of protecting the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards.

S. 1946

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1946, a bill to amend the National Environmental Education Act to redesignate that Act as the "John H. Chafee Environmental Education Act," to establish the John H. Chafee Memorial Fellowship Program, to extend the programs under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1962

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1962, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

S. 1983

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1983, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to increase the amount of funds available for certain agricultural trade programs.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1988, a bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1993

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1993, a bill to reform Government information security by strengthening information security practices throughout the Federal Government.

S. 2001

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to protect the Social Security and Medicare surpluses by requiring a sequester to eliminate any deficit.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 2005

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from

North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2005, a bill to repeal the modification of the installment method.

S. 2012

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2012, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to elementary and secondary school teachers who provide classroom materials.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991.

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2021, *supra*.

S. 2023

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2023, a bill to provide for the establishment of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) that will allow individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, to access education, to own their own homes and businesses, and ultimately to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 2029

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2029, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes.

S. 2030

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2030, a bill to authorize microfinance and food assistance for communities affected by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and for other purposes.

S. 2047

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2047, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to create a Heating Oil Reserve to be available for use when fuel oil prices in the United States rise sharply because of anticompetitive activity, during a fuel oil shortage, or during periods of extreme winter weather.

S. 2056

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2056, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to ensure an adequate level of commodity purchases under the school lunch program.

S. 2062

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2062, a bill to amend chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for organ and tissue donation awareness through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2068, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations.

S. CON. RES. 69

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 69, a concurrent resolution requesting that the United States Postal Service issue a commemorative postal stamp honoring the 200th anniversary of the naval shipyard system.

S. CON. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 81, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire.

S.J. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 26, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the courtmartial conviction of the late Rear Admiral Charles Butler McVay, III, and calling upon the President to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the final crew of the U.S.S. Indianapolis.

S.J. RES. 39

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 39, a joint resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 87, a resolution commemorating the 60th Anniversary of the International Visitors Program.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 128, a resolution designating March 2000, as "Arts Education Month."

S. RES. 247

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 247, a resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the men and women who have lost their lives while serving as law enforcement officers.

S. RES. 248

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 248, a resolution to designate the week of May 7, 2000, as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week."

S. RES. 251

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 251, a resolution designating March 25, 2000, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 2000

LOTT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2820

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1883) to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike "1999" and insert "2000".

On page 5, beginning on line 7, strike "No. 12938" and all that follows through the period and insert "No. 12938."

On page 5, beginning on line 9, strike "The United States" and all that follows through "shall terminate" and insert "Prohibition on United States Government sales to that foreign person of any item on the United States Munitions List as in effect on August 8, 1995, and termination of".

On page 5, beginning on line 16, strike "The President shall deny licenses and suspend" and insert "Denial of licenses and suspension of".

On page 8 between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(b) OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Congress urges the President—

(1) in every appropriate case, to contact in a timely fashion each foreign person identified in each report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, in order to afford such person, or governments, the opportunity to provide explanatory, exculpatory, or other additional information with respect to the transfer that caused such person to be identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a); and

(2) to exercise the authority in subsection (a) in all cases where information obtained from a foreign person identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or from the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, establishes that the exercise of such authority is warranted.

On page 8, line 24, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 9, line 11, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 9, beginning on line 12, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 10, beginning on line 11, strike "through the implementation of concrete steps".

On page 10, beginning on line 16, strike "including through the imposition of meaningful penalties on persons who make such transfers".

On page 10, line 19, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 10, line 21, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 11, line 25, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 12, line 2, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 6, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 8, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 13, line 10, insert after "Service Module" the following: "and for the purchase (at a total cost not to exceed \$14,000,000) of the pressure dome for the Interim Control Module and the Androgynous Peripheral Docking Adapter and related hardware for the United States propulsion module."

On page 13, line 15, insert "credible" before "information".

On page 17, beginning on line 15, strike "RUSSIAN SPACE AGENCY" and insert "RUSSIAN AVIATION AND SPACE AGENCY".

On page 17, beginning on line 17, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 18, beginning on line 1, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 6, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 10, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

On page 18, beginning on line 13, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 15, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

On page 18, line 16, strike "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on February 23, 2000, in SD-106 at 9 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the EPA's water quality regulations of August 23, 1999.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will conduct an oversight hearing on the President's budget request for Indian programs for fiscal year 2001 beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 23, 2000. The hearing will be held in the committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

Those wishing additional information may contact committee staff at 202/224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on February 24, 2000, in SR-328A at 10 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss risk management crop/insurance and possibly other issues before the Agriculture Committee.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a full committee hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Thursday, February 24, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine energy supply and demand issues relating to crude oil, heating oil, and transportation fuels in light of the rise in price of these fuels.

Those who wish to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Presentation of oral testimony is by committee invitation only.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold two days of hearing entitled "Day Trading: Everyone Gambles But The House." This subcommittee hearing will focus on the practices and operations of the securities day trading industry.

The hearings will take place on Thursday, February 24, 2000, and Friday, February 25, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. each day in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the President's proposed fiscal year 2001 budget for the Bureau of Reclamation (Department of the Interior); and the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration (Department of Energy). The hearing will be held on Tuesday, March 7, 2000, beginning at 2:30., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those who wish to submit written statements, should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on Medical Errors: Administrative Response and Other Perspectives during the session of the Senate on Tuesday February 22, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 22, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to hold two hearings.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, February 22, 2000, at 3:00 p.m., in SD226.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 22, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 22 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct an oversight hearing.

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

CAUCUS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control and the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 22, 2000 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony regarding U.S. Assistance Options for the Andes.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that Jill Hickson, who is a fellow in our office, be allowed to be on the floor during the duration of this debate.

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

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Mike Daly, a fellow in the office of Senator ABRAHAM, be granted the privilege of the floor for the period of the consideration of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO "PEANUTS" CREATOR CHARLES M. SCHULZ

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a man who spent the

first 36 years of his life as a Minnesotan, an artist who through his work—and his work ethic—illustrated the values cherished by the people of my state, and the dreams, ambitions, and even aggravations of nearly everybody else.

Today, I pay tribute to Charles M. Schulz.

The "Peanuts" comic strip that ran in newspapers worldwide on February 13 was meant as a good-bye from the cartoonist to his creation and a thank-you to its legions of fans. Instead, it turned out to be a fitting farewell to the cartoonist himself when Charles Schulz passed away the day before its publication.

Mr. President, I regret that I never had the privilege of meeting Charles Schulz, but I felt like I knew him anyway. That is a sentiment the artist understood. "If you want to know me, ready my comic strip," he would say to inquiring journalists. So, the journalists did, along with much of the rest of the planet.

At its peak popularity, "Peanuts" was published in more than 2,600 newspapers in 20 languages in 75 countries, and had 350 million daily readers.

The artist's observations on life from a child's point of view were internationally acclaimed. Charles Schulz twice won comic art's highest honor. He was named International Cartoonist of the Year. Adaptations of his work garnered Emmy and Tonay Awards, even the prestigious Peabody Award.

Today, Charlie Brown and his companions can be found everywhere * * * populating Camp Snoopy at the Mall of America, starring in books, TV shows, movies, and on the Broadway stage, and gracing everything from pencils and backpacks to sheets, shoelaces, and greeting cards.

All this from a private man who was most content in letting his art speak for itself.

Charles Schulz was quite simply the best, most honored, and most beloved cartoonist of the entire 20th century. Success, however, never diminished the enthusiasm he brought to his work or his passion for doing it right; up until the day he retired, he insisted on drawing, lettering, and coloring every frame of every cartoon panel himself.

"Why do musicians compose symphonies and poets write poems?" he once asked. "The do it because life wouldn't have any meaning for them if they did not. That is why I draw cartoons."

What most "Peanuts" fans—at least those outside of Minnesota—probably do not know is how Charles Schulz came to be a cartoonist. Well, that story begins in the Twin Cities.

Charles Monroe Schulz was born in Minneapolis on November 26, 1922, although he spent the majority of his youth across the river in St. Paul. An only child, he grew up in an apartment on the corner of Selby and Snelling Avenues, above the Family Barbershop owned and operated by his father.

Charles Schulz went by the nickname "Sparky," a tribute from his comic-loving father to another popular comic strip character of the day. The young boy's interest in cartooning first took hold about the time Charles was six, and was spurred after his graduation from St. Paul Central High by a correspondence course ad that read "Do you like to draw?" His parents paid the \$170 tuition in installments, although they may have questioned their investment when the class on drawing children netted Charles a grade of just C-plus.

After serving as an army tailgunner in Europe, Charles Schulz returned to Minnesota and earned his first paycheck as a cartoonist by working on a Catholic magazine feature. He also taught art, and sold 15 cartoons to the Saturday Evening Post. He created his first feature for the St. Paul Pioneer Press in 1947. "L'il Folks" was brought in 1950 by United Feature Syndicate, christened with a new name, and Charlie Brown and "Peanuts" debuted on October 2 in seven newspapers. Two days later, Snoopy was introduced to the world.

A phenomenon was born.

More than a few books, college theses, and critical essays have tried to dissect the popularity of "Peanuts." Maybe Charles Schultz himself had the best answer when in a 1994 speech he said, "There is still a market for things that are clean and decent."

I have always thought that the "Peanuts" gang endured because the characters were so strongly developed and so genuine that we saw something we could identify with in each of them.

Snoopy was the dreamer, persistently straddling his doghouse in pursuit of the Red Baron.

Lucy, dispensing nickel douses of pop psychology, took great pride in her crabbiness.

Woodstock was the accident prone one.

Peppermint Patty struggled in the classroom, but never struggled on the baseball field.

Linus made it all right for us to need a security blanket from time to time.

Sally, the loveable younger sister, wanted to believe in Santa Claus and the Great Pumpkin.

Schroeder was the unapologetic artist who loved his music.

Pig Pen* * * well, I think we all know a Pig Pen.

And Charlie Brown, "the little round-headed kid," was Everyman. We relate to him because at some point in our lives, we all pined for a little red-haired girl * * * were menaced by a kite-Eating Tree * * * and faced down a football we were certain would be snatched away at the last moment. Charlie Brown's perpetually upbeat search for happiness was our search, too.

"As a youngster, I didn't realize how many Charlie Browns there were in the world," Charles Schulz said. "I thought I was the only one. Now I realize that

Charlie Brown's goofs are familiar to everybody, children and adults alike." No wonder he considered Charlie Brown his alter ego. "There is a lot of myself in his character, too," he said.

In his art, Charles Schulz could be tender, insightful, sometimes sarcastic, heartbreaking, hilarious, and occasionally sentimental. Always, his work was centered in a deep spirituality. Though it occasionally drove his fans mad, there was a practical reason why his comics were frequently tinged with pathos. In his 1980 book, "Charlie Brown, Snoopy and Me," the artist wrote, "You can't create humor out of happiness. I'm astonished at the number of people who write to me saying, 'Why can't you create happy stories for us? Why does Charlie Brown always have to lose? Why can't you let him kick the football?' Well, there is nothing funny about the person who gets to kick the football."

Mr. President, I am proud to co-sponsor legislation offered by my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, to award Charles Schulz the Congressional Gold Medal. I am pleased our colleagues in the House have already adopted this resolution. While I wish we had accorded the cartoonist this great honor in his lifetime, I know that Charles Schulz did not need the endorsement of this Congress to be fulfilled in his work, for how can a congressional honor compare with the love shown to him by his millions of faithful fans?

Minnesotans have always considered Charles Schulz one of us, even though he eventually moved to Santa Rosa, California, where he made his home with his wife Jeannie. He was blessed with five children, two stepchildren, and several grandchildren, and our prayers are with them all.

Mr. President, Charles Schulz fretted that his work as a cartoonist would never be considered great art and would certainly not stand the test of time.

With all due respect to the cartoonist I honor today, my two-word response to that is "Good grief!" Charlie Brown will undoubtedly live on long after the rest of us are forgotten. And that, I would argue, is exactly the way things are supposed to be.●

A HEROIC GIFT OF LIFE

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to inform my colleagues of a recent act of great charity by one of my constituents, Ms. Debbie Laakso of Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

In an astonishing act of kindness, the single mother of four donated a kidney to her friend and former boss, Verle Jucht. The odd twist is that Debbie and Verle met at John Morrell and Company where Verle was Debbie's supervisor. Though they separated as colleagues in 1993, they surprisingly remained friends for the last six years. When Verle's kidney began to fail last year, Debbie gave him hers. Knowing

her jovial nature, Verle and his wife, Colleen, thought their old friend was kidding when she first offered to donate.

Luckily, Debbie and Verle were a match, and after surgery last November, both are doing well. This story, Mr. President, is a great testament to the truly good and giving nature of people. I rise today to thank Debbie Laakso for her good nature and good humor and to congratulate her and Verle Jucht on their bravery and courage. Debbie serves as a model of goodness and friendship for all Americans, and their story is an account for all of the importance of the "Gift of Life."●

RELEASE OF SONG YONGYI

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the safe return of Song Yongyi to his home and family in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Mr. Song, Librarian at Dickinson College, was recently freed from a Chinese detention center after a detainment of 172 days.

Mr. Song was born on December 15, 1949 in Shanghai where he attended elementary and middle school. During the Chinese Cultural Revolution, his education was interrupted and Mr. Song became a dockworker. In 1971 he was detained and labeled a "counter-revolutionary" for organizing a book club with four other young people interested in discussing political ideas. Mr. Song spent five years in detention under harsh conditions, where he was severely beaten, resulting in permanent damage to his health. After the Cultural Revolution, he was completely exonerated of all criminal charges.

In 1977 Mr. Song was part of an elite group of students who entered university as a result of a competitive, nationwide examination. He graduated from Shanghai Normal University in 1981. He taught Chinese literature for Shanghai educational television until 1987, at which time he became a full-time literary critic and widely recognized researcher. Mr. Song moved to the United States in 1989 and enrolled in graduate school at the University of Colorado, where his wife Helen (Xiaohua) and daughter Michelle (Xiaoxiao) joined him in 1990. After obtaining a second masters degree in library information science from Indiana University, the Song family moved to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where Song Yongyi is employed as Librarian at Dickinson College.

Mr. Song's deep interest in the 1966-1976 Cultural Revolution and growing prominence as an expert in the field led him to make research trips to China in the summers of 1998 and 1999. As part of his research, Mr. Song collected documents concerning the Cultural Revolution, which are widely available in markets and curio shops. It was during this most recent visit to China that state security officials detained Mr. and Mrs. Song in Beijing on August 7. For about one month, Yongyi and

Helen were held in a detention center in Beijing and interrogated. They were not allowed to see each other or communicate with the outside world. Later they were moved to a facility where conditions were less harsh and were finally permitted to speak with each other. Helen was released from custody on November 16 and allowed to return home to Carlisle, but Yongyi remained in detention. On December 24, Song Yongyi was arrested and charged with the "purchase and illegal provision of intelligence to foreign people."

Mr. Song's arrest generated an outpouring of support from scholars in the United States and abroad, as well as from politicians. As of result of the vigorous campaign to secure Mr. Song's release, the Chinese government announced their decision to free Song Yongyi.

On behalf of the many Pennsylvanians who diligently kept the Song family in their thoughts and prayers, I would like to extend my heartfelt congratulations and warmest wishes on the safe return of Song Yongyi.●

HATS OFF TO THE ALL-STAR RESEARCH TEAM AT NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, well over a decade ago, plant pathologists at North Dakota State University's Agricultural Experiment Station observed signs of a plant disease called Fusarium Head Blight—more commonly known as scab—in a few of the region's wheat fields. Upon this discovery, the researchers swung into action, not knowing they were about to do battle with an insidious plant disease which would eventually devastate wheat fields across the Northern Plains during the 1990s. Since 1993, scab has been an ever present scourge. Losses to the region's farmers from this cereal crop disease have been estimated to be as high as \$2.6 billion during the last decade, the most costly plant disease outbreak ever in the United States.

Earlier this month, though, some good news was delivered on this front by those researchers who have battled this disease for so long. The North Dakota State University Agricultural Experiment Station announced the release of a new scab resistant spring wheat variety named Alsen. The new variety is named after the town of Alsen, located on route 66 in Northeastern North Dakota, an area which was particularly hard hit by this disease.

The researchers say that while this variety is not immune to scab, it can fight off the disease. This is excellent progress and welcome news. And, while this is the first spring wheat variety to exhibit scab resistance, it certainly won't be the last.

My hat is off to these researchers from North Dakota State University! There are many long, tedious, and unglamorous hours involved in cross-breeding wheat plants. The farmers of

the region will be served well by this research, and it is proper and fitting that we recognize the dedicated efforts of those who have contributed their life's work to combat this disease which threatens the livelihood of our producers.

On behalf of all who are involved with, or impacted by, the agricultural economy of the Northern Plains—which includes just about everyone living in the region—I am proud to be able to take this opportunity to say thank you for a job well done to the researchers and support staff of the North Dakota State University Agricultural Experiment Station.●

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA BUSCH

● Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an American who has given graciously and unselfishly to her country. For over 36 years, Barbara Busch served this nation with great distinction in her many different capacities at the U.S. Peace Corps: from a staff assistant when she first began in 1964, to Executive Officer of the Recruitment and Communications Division, to Chief of Operations of Volunteer Recruitment and Selection, to Acting Director of the Peace Corps. It is truly a story of hard work and dedication.

Barbara retired from public service just under one month ago. Mr. President, I wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate her for a remarkable career and wish her well as she moves on to the next stage of her life. She leaves the Peace Corps with a better understanding of its importance and its role in the world than anyone that comes to mind. She will be greatly missed.

When I had the privilege to serve as Peace Corps Director, Barbara was working in the Office of Planning, Budget, and Finance. She was a diligent worker, excellent manager, and had a wonderful rapport with Peace Corps volunteers and returned volunteers alike. She was one of the few, courageous supporters of World Wise Schools, an innovative global education program that provides students in the United States with a view of life in countries around the globe. Since its inception in 1989, more than a million students in all 50 states have "put a face on a place" through World Wise Schools.

Back in 1964, when Barbara began her service, the Peace Corps was operating in 48 countries. Today, after her 36 years, the Peace Corps has 7,000 volunteers in 78 countries around the globe. It is because of dedicated public servants like Barbara that the Peace Corps continues to build on its distinguished record of service and continues to provide unique leadership around the world. There is no doubt that Barbara embodies the very spirit of the Peace Corps: a strong work ethic, generosity of spirit, and a commitment to service—the finest characteristics of the American people.

The Peace Corps continues to be the most successful program of its kind precisely because of its commitment to serving others. It is this legacy of service and commitment to others that Barbara leaves behind and for which she will be remembered.●

THE HONORABLE IKRAM U. KHAN, M.D.

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my good friend, the Honorable Ikram U. Khan, M.D.

I have had the honor of knowing Ikram for several years and I am fortunate we have developed a good friendship. Because of that friendship, I am doubly pleased that Ikram has been appointed by President Clinton to the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

This is an extremely prestigious appointment, one that Ikram richly deserves. During his twenty-one years of private practice, he has served not only his patients and the institution of medicine, but also his community and state. He has been honored by his hometown of Las Vegas and various local organizations for his community service and achievements. He has been nominated to serve on Nevada's State Board of Medical Examiners and on the state Legislature's Health Care Cost Containment committee. On the national scene, Congresswoman Barbara Vucanovich, in 1993, asked Ikram to advise her on health care delivery issues specific to Medicare, and President Clinton, in 1995, recognized Ikram for his health care reform efforts. He is a very fine man, and his years of dedication to military medicine and to the health industry in general ensures he will perform a great service in this position.

Mr. President, I would like to again congratulate my friend, Dr. Ikram Khan, on his appointment to the Board of Regents and wish him the best on his new challenges managing the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. I trust the University and Secretary Cohen will find him a valuable asset and a skilled adviser.●

NATIONAL HEART FAILURE AWARENESS WEEK

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, on February 10th, I phoned in a request to become a cosponsor of S. Res. 256, a resolution designating the week of February 14 through 18, 2000, as "National Heart Failure Awareness Week". Unfortunately, my name was inadvertently not included in the list of cosponsors at that time. Hence, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD reflect my support and cosponsorship of the resolution.

Mr. President, I cosponsored this important resolution because it will help to promote research related to all aspects of heart failure and enhance the quality and duration of life for those

with heart failure. With that in mind, I was pleased that S. Res. 256 passed the Senate by unanimous consent.●

TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and to salute our Nation's Veterans. The Department of Veterans Affairs has designated the week of February 13–19 as "National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week." I take this opportunity to pay special tribute to those veterans who are currently hospitalized, especially those hospitalized in the Battle Creek, MI, VA Medical Center.

These brave people served their country in time of need. Many of them were wounded. Many of them knew others who never came home from battle. It is only right, then, that our nation help them in time of physical need.

The Battle Creek VA Medical Center provides an excellent example of how our nation can repay some of the debt it owes our brave veterans. This facility has provided quality care for up to 325 residents at a time for over 75 years. It is an important part of our system of 172 VA Medical Centers across the United States, and an important part of the Battle Creek community.

I know that a festive schedule of special events has been planned for the week long salute. Our veterans, and particularly those who are currently hospitalized, certainly deserve every tribute we can give to them. And the same goes for the dedicated men and women who care for them.

The American people will be forever indebted to our veterans and their families. Without their sacrifice, dedication, and unwavering commitment to our nation and its ideals, America would not be the beacon of freedom it is today. I ask that you and my colleagues join me in saluting the veterans at the Battle Creek VA Medical Center and each and every individual who has served with distinction in the U.S. Armed Forces. Let us say to them: We salute you and we thank you.●

HONORING MARY FORD, MAYOR OF NORTHAMPTON

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the public service of Mary Ford, who recently stepped down as the Mayor of Northampton, Massachusetts. Throughout her 8 years in office, Mayor Ford has elevated the City to one of the jewels of New England, and I join all of her friends, family, and constituents in honoring her today.

As Mayor of Northampton, Ms. Ford oversaw the improvement of the school system, conducted comprehensive infrastructure improvements, modernized city services, and restored fiscal discipline. Perhaps the largest measure of her contributions to the city rests in the fact that, in the course of man-

aging an annual budget of \$55 million dollars, she erased a \$3.2 million deficit. This financial turn-around allowed the city to entertain larger goals; the renovation and expansion of Northampton High School, the establishment of an innovative trust to preserve Section 8 assistance, and establishing Northampton as an attractive place to start new businesses.

Her leadership on the budget, which includes the general fund, schools, and enterprise funds, has been complemented by computerizing all the city office's and raising hiring standards. She set the policy priorities for all the city's administrative departments, including; housing, health and safety inspection services, planning, culture and arts, finance, as well as economic and community development. Mayor Ford orchestrated all of these elements into a cohesive, focused set of services that was delivered in an effective and efficient manner, thus improving the lives of all residents.

Due to Mary Ford's leadership, The City of Northampton is now one of the state's thriving, growing cities.

The list of her accomplishments on behalf of the city's revitalization is varied and extensive; she improved the city's emergency response capabilities by allotting \$5.5 million for a state-of-the-art firehouse, renovated one third of the city's roads, and conducted comprehensive traffic re-designing for increased safety. Her accomplishments in education include securing an investment of \$25 million for the modernization of Northampton's high school, a \$12 million middle school expansion program, and work with the entire system's faculty and staff in implementing staff recommendations, reforming curriculum, and increasing parental involvement.

She has also shared her expertise in municipal and governmental affairs with state and national organizations. From 1995–99, she was a member of the Human Development Committee in the National League of Cities, a founding member of the Regional Education Business Alliance, Chair of the Task Force on the Future of State and Local Revenue Sharing for the Massachusetts Municipal Association, and President of the Women Elected Municipal Officials organization in 1998.

Mr. President, I am proud to regard Mary Ford as a friend, colleague and partner in maintaining Massachusetts's economic prosperity and growth. She has performed an enormous task for the City and its residents, and I join with all of Northampton in thanking her for her exemplary public service and leadership.●

HONORING THE 110TH FIGHTER WING OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the proud achievements of the 110th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard. This group was re-

cently awarded the prestigious United States Air Force Outstanding Unit Award for meritorious service, an award given to only three Air National Guard fighter wings. I would like to take this opportunity to share the history of success of this unit.

The 110th Fighter Wing has served America courageously around the world. Recently, the unit conducted flight operations from Aviano Air Base, Italy, in support of Operation Joint Guard over Bosnia-Herzegovina. During this period, the unit received a grade of "Outstanding"—an honor reserved for only the elite forces in the U.S. Armed Services—for an Operational Readiness Inspection. This distinction was the first ever given to a Michigan-based unit.

Mr. President, I would also like to recognize the service of Col. Ken Heaton, USAF, the unit's commander. Under Colonel Heaton's command, the 110th Fighter Wing has continued its history of excellence with these most recent awards. In the unit's 52-year history, it has been awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award four times.

I am proud to have the opportunity to share the accomplishments of the 110th Fighter Wing on the floor of the U.S. Senate. On behalf of the State of Michigan, I congratulate Colonel Heaton and his unit on their achievements, and I look forward to hearing of this unit's laurels for years to come.●

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few minutes discussing the Agricultural Cooperation Agreement that was signed by the United States and China in December in Seattle. Although the negotiations for this agreement were held at the same time as the bilateral WTO accession negotiations between our two countries, this agriculture agreement is a stand-alone arrangement. According to its own terms, it formally entered into effect when U.S. Trade Representative Barshefsky and Chinese Trade Minister Shi signed it.

This agreement deals with three categories of agriculture products—Pacific Northwest wheat, meat, and citrus. The agreement requires that sound science be used when evaluating agricultural imports into China. Specifically, the agreement ends the decade-long prohibition that China had against importing Pacific Northwest wheat. It provides for US government certification of meat packing facilities. And it eliminates unreasonable technical barriers to the export of citrus products from the United States to China.

On February 11, 52 other Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, joined me in sending a letter to Chinese President Jiang Zemin, insisting that China needs to implement the Agricultural Cooperation Agreement immediately. We explained to President

Jiang that now is the time to buy our agricultural products. Words are fine. Agreements are fine. But what matters is the result—concrete commercial purchases. I would like to put a copy of that letter, along with a list of the 53 Senators who signed it, into the RECORD.

I am very pleased to announce that a high level Chinese agriculture delegation, including government officials, along with representatives from COFCO, the China National Cereals, Oils, and Feedstuffs Import and Export Corporation, will visit my state of Montana on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. This is a critical next step in securing the implementation of the agriculture agreement.

I will join with Montana agriculture, Montana business, and Montana economic development officials in Great Falls this week to meet this important delegation, to provide them with information about the opportunities Montana presents, and to offer them high quality and competitive agricultural products and value-added food products.

I have been working for over twenty years to expand trade and open markets overseas for Montana and American agricultural commodities, value-added agricultural products, manufactured goods, and services. Increasing exports brings benefits to our farmers, our workers, and our communities, including, of course, in the state of Montana.

China represents a market of almost unlimited potential. I have worked hard for the last ten years to expand trading relations between the United States and China. This year, I am leading the fight to grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status, PNTR. The full implementation of this agricultural agreement is a vital part of this effort to bring China into the WTO and to ensure that American and Montana will take advantage of the unique opportunities in China.

I look forward to the signing of purchase agreements with China in the near future for Pacific Northwest wheat. Montana and China can help each other grow. That is what international trade is all about.

February 11, 2000.

President JIANG ZEMIN,
People's Republic of China,
Beijing, China.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge full implementation of the bilateral Agricultural Cooperation Agreement that Ambassador Barshefsky and Trade Minister Shi signed in April. Both sides agreed that when they initiated the Chinese version in Seattle last December that implementation would begin immediately.

We appreciate that your citrus technical team has completed its visit to the United States. We understand that actions will now be taken to make those changes necessary for American citrus products to be sold to China.

We want to stress, however, how important it is that actual sales of wheat, meat, and citrus take place as soon as possible. This would demonstrate to everyone watching our

bilateral relationship that this agreement is working. It would also provide a solid contribution to the efforts to ensure the passage of Permanent Normal Trading Relations ("PNTR") for China.

Mr. President, we are entering a new stage in the relationship between our two countries. The sale of product through the Agricultural Agreement will help immeasurably.

Yours Truly,

Max Baucus, Bob Graham, Kent Conrad, Tim Johnson, Patty Murray, Slade Gorton, Pat Roberts, Larry E. Craig, Blanche L. Lincoln, Dick Durbin, Michael B. Enzi, Tom Daschle, Trent Lott, Spencer Abraham, George V. Voinovich, Sam Brownback, Craig Thomas, Connie Mack.

Daniel Inouye, Mike Crapo, Gordon Smith, Jay Rockefeller, Joe Biden, Harry Reid, Richard Bryan, Rod Grams, Chuck Hagel, Wayne Allard, Tom Harkin, John Edwards, Rick Santorum, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Evan Bayh, Chuck Robb, Jeff Bingaman, John Ashcroft, Bob Kerrey.

Conrad Burns, Jim Bunning, Byron L. Dorgan, Kit Bond, Chuck Grassley, Phil Gramm, Lincoln Chafee, Barbara Boxer, Charles Schumer, Ron Wyden, Paul D. Coverdell, Herb Kohl, Dianne Feinstein, Daniel K. Akaka, Orrin Hatch, Kay Bailey Hutchison.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THUNDER CLOUD CONSTRUCTION

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to publicly congratulate two of my constituents, Mr. Leonard Lone Hill and Mr. Warren Giago, both of Porcupine, SD. I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that Mr. Lone Hill and Mr. Giago, partners in Thunder Cloud Construction, a Porcupine-based construction company, have been honored by the Small Business Administration as winners of the 1999 Minority Small Business People of the Year for South Dakota. As my colleagues may know, Porcupine is located in Shannon County on the Pine Ridge Reservation. Highlighted by the President during his New Markets Initiative tour, Shannon County is the poorest county in the country.

Thunder Cloud Construction is working to reverse the trend of Native American poverty on the Reservation by not only hiring minority workers, but by providing on-the-job training for new, unskilled employees. The activities of the company and its two owners, result not only in participation in the development of community infrastructure and resources but also a substantial contribution to economic growth and development of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Among its achievements, Thunder Cloud has recently completed a shelter for homeless children, the Casey Family Building. Following last years devastating tornadoes, the company won a substantial contract to build foundations and basements for twenty-two units of replacement housing.

Mr. President, Leonard Lone Hill and Warren Giago of Thunder Cloud Construction richly deserve this honor. After five years in business, they have

twenty-two employees on the payroll and annual sales of \$277,500. Their work has vastly improved the economic landscape of Porcupine and the Pine Ridge Reservation, and is a great model for other aspiring businessmen to follow. They have overcome many obstacles and I look forward to all of their future successes.●

IN RECOGNITION OF MOST REVEREND MOSES B. ANDERSON, S.S.E. AUXILIARY BISHOP OF DETROIT

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable person from my home state of Michigan, Most Reverend Moses B. Anderson, S.S.E. Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit. On February 17, 2000, Bishop Anderson was honored with the Mother Theresa Duchemin Maxis Award in recognition for his many years of dedication and service within the Archdiocese of Detroit.

Serving as Michigan's first African American Catholic Bishop, Moses Anderson has ministered to the needs not only of the Catholic Community, but to the Community of Humankind, since his ordination in 1958. For the last 40 years, he has served the Catholic Church with integrity and dedication. In addition, he is the recipient of multiple honorary degrees, an enstooled Chief in Ghana, West Africa, and an internationally revered minister and scholar. Currently serving as pastor at the Church of the Precious Blood in Detroit, his homilies have the distinction of being based in songs portraying the loving relationship between God and humankind. For this reason, Anderson is known as a man of songs as well as an accomplished and beloved clergyman.

Bishop Anderson's departure from his vicariate duties makes way for new beginnings in his life. I am confident that his future endeavors will be as successful and fulfilling as the previous ones. For certain, he will remain active in his many church and community activities, but will have more time to dedicate to his favorite hobbies—music, organic gardening, cooking, and being the "good shepherd" he is known to be. I am pleased to join his colleagues and friends in offering my thanks for all he has accomplished in making his community a better place.

Mr. President, Bishop Moses B. Anderson can take pride in his long career of service and dedication to the Catholic Church. I know my colleagues join me in saluting Bishop Anderson's commitment to his community and religion, and in wishing him well in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE HAUSCHILD

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the passing of a dear friend and counselor, Mr. Wayne "Haus" Hauschild of Brookings, South Dakota.

Because of our state's immigrant past, many of my constituents are not originally from South Dakota. Wayne Hauschild is a good example. Born and raised in Davenport, Iowa, it wasn't until 1954 that, after graduating from Saint Ambrose College and serving in the U.S. Navy, he settled in Brookings. For his remaining forty-six years, Wayne Hauschild served the community of Brookings in many capacities. For a remarkable thirty-nine years, he taught high school U.S. history and government. In addition to his teaching duties, he coached high school basketball, football, golf, tennis, and the Brookings Cubs and American Legion baseball teams.

His government service began as a representative to the South Dakota State Legislature where he served five terms from 1971 to 1980. Though he retired from teaching in 1993, he remained a faithful servant of the public, serving as Brookings mayor from 1993 to 1999, presiding over Brookings changed to the city manager form of municipal government.

Whenever someone mentions Wayne Hauschild, I think of dedication. As a State Legislator and as Brookings mayor, he was dedicated to improving the lives of his neighbors and his fellow South Dakotans. As a teacher of thirty-nine years, he was dedicated to educating young people, and ensuring they

remember the importance of civic participation and the lessons of history when that fundamental right is deprived. As a coach, he was dedicated to instilling the values of sportsmanship, fairplay, and hardwork. As all these things, he was always a father and a husband, dedicated to his family. I will truly miss him, because, to me, he was always a dedicated friend.

Mr. President, this is a sad time where we are forced to bid farewell to a man who was a fixture of the Brookings community for the last forty-six years. However, this is also a time when we can remember a dedicated man who led a truly extraordinary life, no matter the measure.●

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jim Morhard:									
Argentina	Peso		758.00						758.00
Chile	Dollar		810.00						810.00
Brazil	Real		1,594.57						1,594.57
Kevin Linsky:									
Argentina	Peso		758.00						758.00
Uruguay	Peso		200.00						200.00
Brazil	Real		1,429.00						1,429.00
Total			5,549.57						5,549.57

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Jan. 15, 2000.

AMENDMENT TO 3RD QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jim Morhard:									
France	Franc	8,993.92	1,472.00					8,993.92	1,472.00
Clayton Heil:									
France	Franc	8,993.92	1,472.00					8,993.92	1,472.00
Senator Daniel K. Inouye:									
Israel	Dollar		803.00						803.00
Senator Tom Harkin:									
Guam	Dollar				5,389.04				5,389.04
Indonesia	Rupiah	5,698,500	786.00			5,350,500	738.58	11,049.00	1,524.58
China	Yuan	2,505.81	303.00					2,505.81	303.00
Japan	Yen	34,739	311.00	21,350.00	197.87			56,089.00	508.87
Rosemary Gutierrez Bailey:									
United States	Dollars				5,791.08				5,791.08
Indonesia	Rupiah	5,698,500	786.00			5,350,500	738.58	11,049.00	1,524.58
China	Yuan	2,505.81	303.00					2,505.81	303.00
Japan	Yen	34,739	311.00	21,350	197.87			56,089.00	508.07
Galen Fountain:									
United States	Dollar		4,420.40						4,420.40
Italy	Lire	11,880.00	1,980.00					11,880.00	1,980.00
Kosovo	Dollar		119.00						119.00
Total			13,066.40		11,575.86		1,477.16		26,119.42

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Oct. 10, 1999.

AMENDMENT TO 1ST QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
Cambodia	Dollar								
Indonesia	Dollar								
Australia	Dollar		2,500.00						2,500.00

AMENDMENT TO 1ST QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1999—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
New Zealand	Dollar								
Robin Cleveland:									
Cambodia	Dollar								
Indonesia	Dollar								
Australia	Dollar		2,500.00						2,500.00
New Zealand	Dollar								
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Cuba	Dollar		686.00						686.00
Tim Rieser:									
Cuba	Dollar		686.00						686.00
Steve Cortese:									
South Africa	Dollar		758.00						758.00
South Africa	Dollar		830.00						830.00
Uganda	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Kenya	Dollar		1,170.00						1,170.00
United States	Dollar				6,932.06				6,932.06
M. Sidney Ashworth:									
South Africa	Dollar		758.00						758.00
South Africa	Dollar		830.00						830.00
Uganda	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Kenya	Dollar		1,170.00						1,170.00
United States	Dollar				6,932.06				6,932.06
Jennifer Chartrand:									
South Africa	Dollar		758.00						758.00
South Africa	Dollar		830.00						830.00
Uganda	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Kenya	Dollar		1,170.00						1,170.00
United States	Dollar				6,932.06				6,932.06
Kevin Linsky:									
Australia	Dollar		1,178.95						1,178.95
Thailand	Baht		960.00						960.00
Total			17,009.95		20,796.18				37,806.13

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Mar. 31, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Charles S. Abell:									
United States	Dollar				3,928.45				3,928.45
Italy	Dollar		750.36						750.36
Germany	Dollar		365.89				142.28		508.17
Gerald J. Leeling:									
United States	Dollar				3,928.45				3,928.45
Italy	Dollar		650.41						650.41
Germany	Dollar		363.51		55.66		9.00		428.17
George W. Lauffer:									
Germany	Dollar		414.57						414.57
United Kingdom	Dollar		40.35						40.35
United States	Dollar				5,494.88				5,494.88
United States	Dollar						36.00		36.00
Lawrence J. Lanzillotta:									
Germany	Dollar		414.57						414.57
United Kingdom	Dollar		40.35						40.35
United States	Dollar				5,495.41				5,495.41
United States	Dollar						60.00		60.00
Tomie L. Brownlee:									
France	Dollar		358.00						358.00
Germany	Dollar		262.00						262.00
Italy	Dollar		229.00						229.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		374.00						374.00
United States	Dollar				7,134.67				7,134.67
William C. Greenwalt:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		495.17		107.90				603.07
France	Dollar		482.49						482.49
Germany	Dollar		253.75						253.75
Italy	Dollar		247.64						247.64
United States	Dollar				7,134.67				7,134.67
Eric H. Thoemmes:									
France	Dollar		1,215.20						1,215.20
Germany	Dollar		607.60						607.60
Italy	Dollar		303.80						303.80
United Kingdom	Dollar		1,215.20						1,215.20
Belgium	Dollar		608.20						608.20
United States	Dollar				7,861.13				7,861.13
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Bosnia	Dollar		250.00						250.00
Germany	Dollar		500.00						500.00
Ivory Coast	Dollar		250.00						250.00
United States	Dollar				9,070.25				9,070.25
Cord A. Sterling:									
Ivory Coast	Dollar		191.00						191.00
Luxembourg	Dollar		351.00						351.00
Germany	Dollar		407.00						407.00
France	Dollar		316.00						316.00
Bosnia	Dollar		201.00						201.00
Spain	Dollar		368.00						368.00
United States	Dollar				9,383.33				9,383.33
Thomas L. MacKenzie:									
Israel	Sheqel		993.00						993.00
Italy	Lira		741.50						741.50
Hungary	Forint		251.00						251.00
Germany	Mark		467.50						467.50

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				6,003.19				6,003.19
John R. Barnes:									
Israel	Sheqel		993.00						993.00
Italy	Lira		741.50						741.50
Hungary	Forint		251.00						251.00
Germany	Mark		467.50						467.50
United States	Dollar				6,003.19				6,003.19
Senator Jack Reed:									
United States	Dollar				8,482.89				8,482.89
Australia	Australian Dollar	419.65	269.66						269.66
Elizabeth King:									
Australia	Australian Dollar	315.40	202.67						202.67
United States	Dollar				8,360.89				8,360.89
Total			17,904.39		88,444.96				106,596.63

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Dec. 27, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sloan W. Rappoport:									
Brazil	Real	4,392.00	2,440.00			189.00	105.00	4,581.00	2,545.00
United States	Dollar				1,098.45				1,098.45
Total			2,440.00		1,098.45		105.00		3,643.45

JOHN McCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Jan. 7, 2000.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Garman:									
Germany	Deutsche Mark	1,414.26	729.00		5,456.01			1,414.26	6,185.01
Shirley Neff:									
Germany	Deutsche Mark	5,185.62	2,673.00		653.86			5,185.62	3,326.86
Total			3,402.00		6,109.87				9,511.87

FRANK MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Jan. 1, 2000.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Loesch:									
Israel	Dollar		1,356.00						1,356.00
Syria	Dollar		315.00						315.00
Dennis Ward:									
Israel	Dollar		1,356.00						1,356.00
Syria	Dollar		315.00						315.00
Robert Roach:									
Mexico	Dollar		640.02		705.05				1,345.07
Total			3,982.02		705.05				4,687.07

FRED THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Jan. 12, 2000.

AMENDMENT TO 3RD QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Esther Olavarria:									
United States	Dollar		3,550.00		3,172.81				6,722.81
Frank Chase Hutto III:									
United States	Dollar		5,500.00		3,687.12				9,187.12
Michael Ivahnenko:									
United States	Dollar		4,550.00		4,483.00				9,033.00

AMENDMENT TO 3RD QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			13,600.00		11,342.93				24,942.93

ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Dec. 29, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Arlen Specter: Panama	Dollar		224.00						224.00
David Urban: Panama	Dollar		224.00						224.00
James Twaddell: Panama	Dollar		224.00						224.00
Total			672.00						672.00

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Jan. 27, 2000.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JOINT ECONOMICS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kurt Schuler: United States	Dollar		210.00		482.45				692.45
Chris Frenze: United States	Dollar		1,368.00						1,368.00
Total			1,578.00		482.45				2,060.45

CONNIE MACK,
Chairman, Committee on Joint Economics, Jan. 18, 2000.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON Y2K FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 14 TO NOV. 9, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. Paul Nicholas: South Korea			1,300.00		3,300.00				4,600.00
John Stephenson: France			1,850.00		796.67		602.00		3,248.67
James Barker: France			2,376.00		796.67				3,172.67
Amber Sechrist: France			1,188.00		796.67				1,984.67
Total			6,714.00		5,690.01		602.00		13,006.01

ROBERT F. BENNETT,
Chairman, Committee on Y2K, Dec. 22, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Thad Cochran: Israel	Dollar		1,331.00						1,331.00
Syria	Dollar		289.00						289.00
Mitch Kugler: Israel	Dollar		1,356.00						1,356.00
Syria	Dollar		315.00						315.00
Dennis Ward: Switzerland	Swiss Franc		654.00		4,679.93				5,333.93
Senator Connie Mack: Haiti	Dollar		20.00		667.45				687.45
Gary Shiffman: Haiti	Dollar		219.00		667.45				886.45
Total			4,184.00		6,014.83				10,198.83

TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, Feb. 1, 2000.

AMENDMENT TO 3D QUARTER REPORT, CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), DELEGATION: NATIONAL SECURITY WORKING GROUP, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY MAJORITY LEADER, TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mitch Kugler: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Dennis McDowell: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Dennis Ward: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Delegation Expenses ¹							4,317.00		4,317.00
Total			3,450.00		15,957.06		4,317.00		23,724.06

¹ Funds appropriated for foreign travel under authority of S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977, for interpretation expenses for Staffdel Kugler while in Russia.

TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, Oct. 14, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY DEMOCRATIC LEADER, TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Franz Wuerfmannsdorbler: United States	Dollar				1,110.64				1,110.64
Germany	Deutsche Mark		1,215.00						1,215.00
Total			1,215.00		1,110.64				2,325.64

TOM DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, Feb. 1, 2000.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on the Executive Calendar: Executive Calendar No. 280.

I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nomination appear at this point in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nomination was considered and confirmed, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

David J. Hayes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

MEASURES PLACED ON
CALENDAR—S. 2081 AND H.R. 6

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2081, introduced earlier today by Senator HATCH, is at the desk, and I therefore ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2081) entitled "Religious Liberty Protection Act of 2000."

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 6 is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15 percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to repeal the reduction of the refundable tax credit.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 23, 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 23. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business until 11:30 a.m., with the first 45 minutes under the control of Senator DASCHLE, or his designee, and the next 45 minutes under the control of Senator THOMAS, or his designee.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will conduct a period for the transaction of morning business until 11:30 a.m. Following morning business, it is anticipated that the Senate could turn to any other Legislative or Executive Calendar items cleared for action, including the education savings account bill. Therefore, votes may be anticipated and Members are reminded that a vote will occur at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:06 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 23, 2000, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN EDWARD HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN.

HOWARD FRANKLIN JETER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

A. ELIZABETH JONES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY

AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

ROSE M. LIKINS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

LAURENCE E. POPE, OF MAINE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF KUWAIT.

THE JUDICIARY

JOHNNIE B. RAWLINSON, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE MELVIN T. BRUNETTI, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DONNIE R. MARSHALL, OF TEXAS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT, VICE THOMAS A. CONSTANTINE, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. LESTER L. LYLES, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

CATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL E. ZETTLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8034:

To be general

LT. GEN. JOHN W. HANDY, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. GOODMAN, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PHILLIP M. BALISLE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN T. BYRD, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM W. COBB, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER W. COLE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID R. ELLISON, 0000

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID T. HART, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH F. HEIMGARTNER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH G. HENRY, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) GERALD L. HOEWING, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL L. HOLMES, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM R. KLEMM, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL D. MALONE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) PETER W. MARZLUFF, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES D. MCARTHUR, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL J. MCCABE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID C. NICHOLS, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) PERRY M. RATLIFF, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) GARY ROUGHEAD, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH D. SLAGHT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) STANLEY R. SZEMBORSKI, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) HENRY G. ULRICH III, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) GEORGE E. VOELKER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT F. WILLARD, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DAVID J. HAYES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.