



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2000

No. 8

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 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:

Gracious God, thank You for the gift of prayer. You always are the Initiator. You call us to prayer because You want to communicate Your love, forgiveness, guidance, and power. It is awesome that You, Creator and Sustainer of the universe, know each of us and care about what concerns our Nation. Time with You changes things. It changes us, our attitudes, our circumstances, and the people of our lives.

Today, as we met for the National Prayer Breakfast, we prayed specifically for our President, Bill Clinton. Bless him in this last year of his Presidency. Grant him Your grace and peace, wisdom and guidance. Strengthen the lines of communication with the Senate so that consensus may be achieved on matters of crucial legislation.

We commit our day to continuous conversation with You so that all we say and do may be under Your control and for Your glory. You are our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JIM BUNNING, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The acting majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, many of us have just returned from the National Prayer Breakfast, and I certainly commend Senator MACK and others who were responsible for putting it together. It is one of the outstanding events of our year. And thanks, too, to the Chaplain for his work.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately proceed to the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Alan Greenspan. The leader would like to announce that this will be the only vote of the day.

Following the vote, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for general floor statements and bill introductions.

As previously announced, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow to accommodate the Democrat conference meeting. On Monday, it is expected the Senate will begin consideration of S. 1052, the Mariana Islands legislation. And on Tuesday the Senate should begin debate on the nuclear waste bill.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. REID. We appreciate the statement of the acting majority leader. Also, on behalf of Senator AKAKA, I express appreciation to the majority for allowing the Mariana Islands bill to go forward, as it was indicated it would be done before February 15. We are grateful for that.

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

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

NOMINATION OF ALAN GREENSPAN TO BE CHAIRMAN OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

• Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I strongly support Alan Greenspan's nomination to a fourth term as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. While Congress and the President continue to claim credit for our strong economy and projected budget surpluses, one person truly deserves the nation's gratitude for this unprecedented economic expansion—that is Alan Greenspan. His tenure has been a spectacular success.

Chairman Greenspan's decisions regarding monetary policy have helped lead us to low unemployment, low interest rates and the longest period of sustained economic growth in the nation's history. Given his remarkable record, it is easy to forget that circumstances have not always been this good for him. Chairman Greenspan has also been tested by periods of adversity during his tenure at the Federal Reserve. Immediately following the October 1987 crash on Wall Street, Chairman Greenspan worked with money center banks to ensure that the brokerage firms continued to have the liquidity necessary to calm both markets and investors. Even in times of adversity, his was a steady hand.

Last year, during debate on the financial modernization legislation, Chairman Greenspan served as a crucial advisor to the Members of the Conference Committee. He added indispensable expertise to enacting legislation

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S305

that will help maintain the competitiveness of our financial services industry in a global economy while ensuring the safety and soundness of our financial markets.

Unfortunately, I will not be present for the full Senate vote on the Chairman's nomination. I have the responsibility of leading a bipartisan congressional delegation to Wehrkunde, the annual world security conference in Munich, Germany and to Moscow, where we are to meet with acting Russian President Vladimir Putin.

I voted for Chairman Greenspan's nomination during the Banking Committee's markup and would vote for his renomination before the full Senate had I been present. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.●

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I strongly support Alan Greenspan's renomination to Chair the Federal Reserve Board for a fourth term.

The United States is currently enjoying the longest period of economic growth in our history, with price stability and record low unemployment. Welfare rolls have been dramatically reduced, and we have more Americans in homes of their own and invested in the burgeoning stock market than ever before.

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board for the past 12 years, Dr. Greenspan deserves no small amount of the credit for this unprecedented growth and prosperity. Chairman Greenspan has consistently steered American monetary policy on a prudent and responsible course. He has won the respect and confidence of policymakers, the financial services industry and the American people. Indeed, we have witnessed that Alan Greenspan's words alone have the potential to trigger fluctuations on the global markets. Commendably, Chairman Greenspan has also upheld a high standard of evenhanded, apolitical management of our nation's money supply. And last year, Chairman Greenspan played a critical leadership role in the passage of the Financial Services Modernization Law to expand the market powers and competitiveness of our financial institutions, while lowering fees and promoting financial product innovation to the benefit of all Americans.

And this strong economy has coincided with fiscal discipline on our part, rather than the deficit spending of the past. The Federal budget is balanced, and, this year, we will hopefully take continued steps to retire more of the \$5 trillion national debt. As Chairman Greenspan has advised, retiring the debt is one of the most important steps we can take to promote continued economic growth and plan for the future financial challenges of the aging of the baby boomer generation. There is room for tax cuts. There is room to increase spending on important domestic priorities, but debt reduction should remain a centerpiece of our economic agenda.

We can be confident that Alan Greenspan will continue providing vital lead-

ership of monetary policy toward our common goal of keeping the economy robust. Considering his past record and looking to the future, he deserves reappointment, and I urge my colleagues to support his renomination.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the confirmation of Alan Greenspan to a fourth term as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. President, our economy has just completed its 107th month of expansion—a record period of growth in peacetime or war in our Nation. Our economy is the marvel of the world, and for good reason. The unemployment rate is at a record low, and the Gross Domestic Product grew at a rate of almost 6 percent in the second half of 1999.

Despite this low unemployment and high growth, factors that can typically bring about strong inflation, inflation has been kept in check. Part of the reason for this is due to increases in productivity, which resulted in large part from the pro-growth economic policies of the 1980s as well as stunning technological advances.

These technological advances are revolutionizing the way America does business and are changing the face of our economy. Some are calling it a "new economy," because it seems to defy some of the conventional forces that shaped the economy in the past. Some are going so far as to suggest that the economic cycle may be dead and that we do not need to worry as much about these old forces.

Now that the economy has surpassed all previous records of growth, there are signs that it is perhaps overheating. Yesterday, the Federal Open Market Committee and the Federal Reserve, under the leadership of Chairman Greenspan, raised the federal funds and the discount rates as a further measure to counter this possible overheating. Some are criticizing these moves, saying they are unnecessary and that the "new economy" does not need the same kind of restraint as did the old.

But, Mr. President, I would certainly be cautious about second-guessing the wisdom of Alan Greenspan. Over the past 13 years, Alan Greenspan has been the voice of steady reason and common sense for our monetary policy. His policies have shown prescience, and his stewardship has been confident and strong. Chairman Greenspan has been the voice of common sense that the financial markets listen to and respect. I believe we are indeed fortunate to have had the services of Chairman Greenspan over the past 13 years, and I commend the President for reappointing him to this key post. I am greatly pleased and relieved that he is willing to serve another term. We need his experience. We need his wisdom. And we need his continuing steady hand at the helm of our monetary policy.

Whether or not we truly have a new economy that will continue to defy tra-

ditional forces, I don't know. But I am very pleased that Alan Greenspan is here to guide us and I enthusiastically support his confirmation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will vote to confirm the nomination of Alan Greenspan to another term as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. While I continue to have some concerns about some of the day-to-day management of the Federal Reserve System, he has helped sustain a period of economic growth that few would have predicted a few years ago.

Mr. President, when I first ran for the U.S. Senate in 1992, my highest priority was reducing the Federal budget deficit. In 1992, that deficit stood at \$340 billion. This past fiscal year, we balanced the budget. That is an enormous achievement, and it was due to the tough fiscal policies of Congress, particularly the 1993 deficit reduction package, and Chairman Greenspan's stewardship at the Federal Reserve. Both were integral to our economy's growth and to the resulting improvement in our budget picture, and I credit Chairman Greenspan for his part in that effort.

I do want to make clear that I have some continuing concerns regarding the Federal Reserve, concerns that stem in part from a 1996 General Accounting Office report which reviewed the Federal Reserve System. Noting that there were no strong external forces to minimize Federal Reserve costs, the report identified weaknesses in existing oversight and budgetary processes which resulted in a number of troubling issues. The GAO found a \$4 billion cash reserve known as a Surplus Account that the Federal Reserve exempted from its policy of returning all its net profits to the Treasury. The report found evidence from its policy of returning all its net profits to the Treasury. The report found evidence of inefficiencies and excessive spending, and specifically identified the construction of a Federal Reserve Bank as well as overly generous travel, salaries, and employee benefits.

The report noted at least one major instance, the construction of the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank, in which the Federal Reserve missed an opportunity to save money, including the purchase of unnecessary land at the cost of \$7 million.

The GAO also reported that some employees had home security systems installed by the Federal Reserve, costing from \$2,500 to \$8,000, while others had home-to-work transportation using Federal Reserve vehicles. And the GAO found Federal Reserve travel expenses had risen by nearly 67 percent between 1988 and 1994, from \$28.5 million in 1988 to \$47 million in 1994, compared to only 26 percent for the Federal government.

Mr. President, it should be noted that the Federal Reserve did respond to the GAO findings by establishing annual audits of their Reserve banks, and I credit that action.

Those annual audits have since been codified, along with annual audits of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve System by a provision added to the financial modernization bill, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. That audit provision was added to the financial modernization bill by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN). They have been vigilant on this matter, and in fact they were the original requesters of the 1996 GAO report.

The Reid-Dorgan audit requirements are an important step, and I am greatly encouraged by it, but we should go further. I feel strongly that we should ask the GAO to update its 1996 report on the Federal Reserve, and hope Chairman Greenspan will join in such a request.

We cannot have a complete understanding of current management practices at the Fed until we hear from the GAO again on this matter, however, I am willing to give Chairman Greenspan the benefit of the doubt. The audit requirements added to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act do represent an improvement, and I was encouraged by the modest step taken by the Fed in response to the 1996 GAO report.

Mr. President, I opposed this nomination four years ago, and I very much look forward to a needed update of the GAO audit of the Federal Reserve. However, given his remarkable record in helping to sustain the economic growth of the past several years and in the improvement in our budget picture, I will vote to confirm Chairman Greenspan.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a couple of days ago marked the longest economic expansion in U.S. history: 107 months. Alan Greenspan deserves credit for coordinating closely with the administration foster that growth.

Mr. Greenspan has been described as a master of the art of monetary policy. He has certainly learned and grown in office. His renomination deserves our full support.

President Clinton renominated Chairman Greenspan for two reasons: Our unprecedented record of economic success; and his ability to coordinate Fed monetary policy with our fiscal policy.

Those two reasons are, in fact, inseparable. It is the marriage of fiscal and monetary policy that created and has sustained current economic expansion. This successful working partnership has worked despite his being a lifelong Republican—though we would gladly welcome him as a Democrat.

The best illustration of Mr. Greenspan's ability to coordinate closely with administration is the 1993 economic plan. Mr. Greenspan signaled that if the new President attacked the deficit aggressively, it would produce lower interest rates. The President followed that advice. A Democratic Congress passed that plan.

As a result, we have gone from the biggest budget deficits in U.S. history

to the biggest surplus. Largely as a result of the 1993 economic plan, we now have the lowest interest rates since WWII. We have created more than 20 million new jobs. Unemployment is at the lowest level in 30 years. The poverty rate is the lowest in two decades. Homeownership is at an all-time high. Real wages have grown faster and longer than at any time in more than two decades.

What is most remarkable is that we have achieved all of this while keeping inflation under control: 2.7% inflation last year. It used to be an article of faith among many conservative economists that you had to have at least 6% unemployment or you would trigger inflation. Chairman Greenspan had the courage to challenge that orthodoxy and prove it wrong. The result is millions of people are working today who would not have had jobs under the old rules.

He has done so without sacrificing his commitment to taming inflation and has succeeded in maintaining record low inflation.

We should confirm Chairman Greenspan for a fourth term as Fed Chairman. We should also continue to uphold our end of the partnership. We have confidence Chairman Greenspan will continue to exercise strong monetary leadership. We should commit ourselves to continuing to exercise strong fiscal discipline.

People sometimes find Chairman Greenspan's messages a little difficult to decipher. They tend to look for shades of meaning in his statements. But on the question of our national debt, he has been absolutely clear and unequivocal. He has said over and over: We must pay down the debt. Huge new tax cuts or excessive Government spending could destroy our prosperity. He could not be clearer on that point.

We need to listen to Chairman Greenspan. Many inside this Congress—and outside—are now seizing on new surplus estimates from the Congressional Budget Office to justify massive new tax breaks. Their plans stand in direct contradiction to Chairman Greenspan's advice to us. Their plans represent a total abdication of the fiscal discipline that has helped get us to this point.

Our best first use of the surplus is not to pay for an election-year tax cut. It is to pay down the debt. That will enable us to protect this economic recovery today and protect Social Security and Medicare tomorrow.

We support tax cuts to help working families with real, pressing needs like child care and college tuition. We support tax cuts to help working families care for sick and aging relatives. We support eliminating the marriage penalty tax.

The American people have made it clear that these are the kinds of tax cuts we should aim for: tax cuts that expand our prosperity, not undermine it; that help all Americans, not just a privileged few. We should listen to them. But we also share Mr. Green-

span's view that the best tax cut for America's families and businesses is to pay down the debt. This year because of the progress we have made since 1993 in eliminating the deficit and reducing the debt, the average American family will save: \$2,000 on its mortgage; \$200 on its car loan; and \$200 more on student loans.

Shortly after it was clear the Asian "flu"—the Asian monetary crisis—had been successfully contained, *Time* magazine ran a cover story. The picture on the cover showed Alan Greenspan and, standing behind him, Bob Rubin and Larry Summers. The headline read: "The Committee that Saved the World: The inside story of how the Three Marketeers * * * prevented a global economic meltdown."

That is strong praise and it is deserved. Chairman Greenspan, working with this Administration, has earned our vote of confidence. I am proud to cast my vote in support of his renomination.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that this nomination is before us, and I am hopeful that we will see an overwhelming vote in favor of Alan Greenspan this morning. We have made remarkable progress in this economy and in our country, in large measure because of the marriage between fiscal and monetary policy.

That monetary policy was created because of the leadership of Chairman Greenspan. He has been a leader not only in creating monetary policy but in setting the tone for this country as we make some difficult choices in our fiscal policy.

He has said to all of us we need to be very prudent in making decisions about how we spend our surplus, about how we manage our budget, about the commitments we make to tax cuts we cannot afford, about the importance of paying off the debt and bringing long-lasting fiscal responsibility by eliminating the public debt.

That kind of advice is advice we all ought to take. It is the kind of advice that has given us the longest economic expansion in history. It is an expansion that ought to be continued for years and years to come. It will if we follow the advice of Alan Greenspan. It will if we keep this marriage of fiscal and monetary policy. It will if we pay off the debt and do what we should to ensure the fiscal prudence we have demonstrated in our budgets over the last couple of years.

I very enthusiastically endorse this nomination and hope that on a bipartisan basis we can provide the kind of vote of confidence this Chairman deserves.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of

Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System? The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bayh	Gorton	Moynihan
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Robb
Breaux	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NAYS—4

Dorgan	Reid
Harkin	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Kyl	Stevens
Burns	McCain	
Hagel	Reed	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be notified of the confirmation.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted

to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of myself, and that I be permitted to control up to 30 minutes.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

THE ALAN GREENSPAN CONFIRMATION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to Alan Greenspan. I think the Senate has done exactly what it should have done, which is overwhelmingly approve the nomination of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He has been in that position for 13 years and has guided our country on a very even keel while going through an economy that could have been volatile but because of his leadership has not been. I look forward to continuing this long string of prosperity in the economy we have been able to have under the leadership of Chairman Greenspan.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today, for the next 30 minutes, we are going to talk about a subject that I think perhaps is the highest priority we have in Congress, and that is to correct a terrible inequity in the tax laws of our country—a penalty that we exact on married couples.

You may ask, penalty on married couples? Are you serious? Well, the fact is, yes, I am serious. The Tax Code, over the years, has not kept up with what has happened in our country demographically, which is that over 64 percent of the married couples in this country today have two incomes; both spouses work outside the home, in addition to working inside the home. The Tax Code has not caught up to treating them fairly when they get married. In fact, what has happened is that we have not increased the standard deduction to be double for a two-income-earning couple; nor have we expanded the tax brackets for a two-income-earning couple. So if you take the example of a schoolteacher and a sheriff's deputy or a policeman, one of whom makes \$27,000 a year, the other of whom makes \$31,000 a year, they will pay an extra \$717 in taxes just because they got married.

Now, generally, this is a young couple who is getting married, who need the extra money now more than ever. It is a couple who want to buy their first home, want to have their first child, want to buy the extra car they will need to fulfill their responsibilities. But, in fact, we take money away from their ability to fulfill their hopes and dreams.

Americans should not have to choose between love and money and, most certainly, the Government should not encourage this. We need to have policies that encourage marriage, encourage families.

I read an interesting article recently pointing out that marriage is one of the key factors in determining poverty. One in three poor families is headed by an unmarried parent. In contrast, 1 in 20 married couples are considered to be in poverty. So being married is one of the factors in people being able to lift themselves out of poverty. So, of course, knowing this, we should be even more attuned to this inequity.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that 21 million married couples are paying this penalty; that is, 42 million Americans are paying a higher tax because they are married. This tax hits hardest those couples with two incomes. Two-thirds of those married couples, that have two incomes, will pay a tax penalty simply for being married. These couples are paying an average of \$1,400 more; that is \$29 billion in taxes being sent to Washington—money which our Treasury should not be receiving—\$29 billion in money just because people are married and not single.

Why are many people working? In many instances, it is because of the incredibly high tax burden. We have the highest tax burden since World War II on families in this country. Nearly 40 percent of the income families earn goes straight to the tax collector. How can we solve this problem? We can start by increasing the standard deduction for married couples from \$7,200 to \$8,600. This would make it exactly double what is available to single taxpayers.

Senator ASHCROFT, Senator BROWNBACK, and myself have introduced legislation to do exactly this. That should be our very first step. In fact, that is exactly what the Congress passed last year and sent to the President, but he vetoed it. It was part of a balanced tax package that would have put \$790 billion back in the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. But the President chose to veto that legislation.

This same legislation was introduced this week by Congressman ARCHER, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on the House side. His legislation would increase the standard deduction in 2001 for married couples to twice the rate applicable to singles.

The second thing we can do is to widen the tax bracket for married couples so that it is twice the size of the corresponding bracket for singles.

Let me give you an example.

A married couple is taxed at the 15-percent rate up to \$43,350 in income. But if two single people make the same salary, they could be taxed at 15 percent on income up to \$50,700. That means \$7,350 is taxed just because people are married.

We need to change this policy. Senator ASHCROFT, Senator BROWNBACK, and myself have introduced a bill that would adjust every bracket so that married couples would not pay a penalty. They would not go into higher tax brackets just because they are married.

If one person makes \$20,000 a year, and another makes \$55,000 a year, they should pay taxes on what they earned, not putting it together and penalizing them by making the entire \$20,000 that is earned by one spouse to be taxed at the higher 28-percent bracket of the other spouse.

This week, Congressman ARCHER introduced legislation that would widen the 15-percent bracket. This is clearly the right direction. But I also want to make sure we don't forget those people in the 28-percent bracket. They get hit hard by the marriage penalty as well. The people who move up to the 28-percent bracket when they are earning the 15-percent bracket salaries should not pay that penalty. That is what we are trying to correct.

Senator ASHCROFT, Senator BROWNBACK, and I have introduced this legislation for 3 straight years. We have tried to get the President to sign tax relief for our married taxpayers.

Yesterday, the House Ways and Means Committee reported legislation out, and it will be considered on the House floor next week. This is a great step forward. It is a step in the right direction. I commend Chairman ARCHER for acting so quickly.

I hope we can pass a balanced tax bill this year. I hope we can make the linchpin of that bill the marriage tax penalty relief.

But that is not the only tax relief that our people in this country deserve, and the working families deserve. They also deserve tax credits for education expenses, and tax credits for caring for elderly parents, which is becoming a bigger problem—a bigger issue—as our population is aging.

We want to make sure small businesses and farmers and ranches don't have to be broken up because of the inheritance tax.

We want to try to make sure we have capital gains tax reductions so that people will be encouraged to invest in our country to help spur our economy forward.

We have a lot of wage earners who will be coming into our economic system. We want to make sure we can absorb them. The way we can do this is by creating new jobs. The way you create new jobs is to invest in capital.

I want a balanced, good tax cut bill. I want to say very clearly that we are not talking about taking the entire surplus and giving it back to the taxpayers of our country. We have bifurcated our surplus. We have said that trillion dollar plus in surplus funds that belongs to Social Security is going to stay in Social Security, so that will always be there. It will be part of a trust fund, and Social Security will be safe forever.

What we are talking about is an income tax withholding surplus. This is the surplus that people have sent to Washington in income taxes—not Social Security taxes. We are talking about taking approximately one-third of the income tax withholding surplus

and giving it back to the people who sent it to Washington because it is very clear that if we don't give it back to the people who sent too much, it will sit here and it will eventually go away. There is nothing like the creativity of the Federal Government when it comes to spending more money.

Mr. President, we want to give people the bonus they have sent to the Federal Government back. We want them to make the decisions for their children about how they are going to spend the money they earned that belongs to them. That is the bonus they deserve.

We are going to make marriage tax penalty relief the linchpin of our balanced tax cut plan, and we are going to put in capital gains tax relief and inheritance tax relief and relief for people who are sending their children to college, or perhaps to a private school that has a huge tuition fee. That is very difficult for the family to absorb.

Sometimes when I talk to my friends and people who I meet in airports and in cities I visit, the second spouse is working for education expenses for their children, or for the expense of caring for an elderly parent. We want to help them.

I think we can get a balanced tax cut for the working people of this country that will give them the relief they deserve because they sent more money to Washington than we need for the services we must cover.

I am very proud that I have two cosponsors who have worked so diligently with me to try to keep this issue in the forefront of issues the Senate will address. Senator ASHCROFT from Missouri and Senator BROWNBACK from Kansas have been cosponsors of my legislation every time we have tried to push it through. Last year, we won. But the President said no. We are coming back until we win this for the married couples of this country so they get the money they earned in their pocketbooks to decide what is best for their families—not somebody in Washington, DC, they have never met making that decision for them.

I am proud Senator BROWNBACK is here to talk about how this affects families in Kansas, his home State. And later I am hoping Senator ASHCROFT will be able to also come and talk about the legislation we have tried so hard to push through, and which I hope this year will be the one that we see the victory for the hard-working people of our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleague from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, in this effort yet again. We are going to keep pushing this ball up the hill until we get it over. I think this is the year we will get that done—to finally do away with this marriage penalty that impacts nearly 21 million

American families in a very adverse and a terrible way—and an awful signal it sends to the married couples: Well, if you are going to get married, that is fine, but we are going to tax you for it.

I think if there is one thing we ought to try to figure out, it is how not to tax the institution of marriage, which is in so much trouble. And there is so much pressure in this country already. The last thing it needs is more pressure by the taxation system, the Tax Code.

This is the year for us to be able to get this done.

I hope at the end of the day we can put together the marriage penalty and the estate tax, which is another family tax—particularly in my State with family farmers and small businesses—and pass a family tax cut bill of those two items, send it through, pass it by the House, and put it on the President's desk and ask him: Mr. President, please sign this on behalf of the working families of this country to be able to maintain these businesses, farms, and these marriages—that all of us ought to be strongly supporting and working with.

It is interesting that the marriage penalty currently affects almost 50 percent of America's families. Fifty percent of America's families are impacted negatively by the marriage penalty today. On average—this is an old figure. People have heard this one but it is true, and it is so stark—they pay an additional \$1,400 in taxes. You have 50 percent of married couples in America impacted by this tax and on average paying \$1,400 a year more for the pleasure and the privilege in America to be married. It is a terrible signal and bad policy. This is the year to do away with it.

It is critically important that during this second session of the 106th Congress we take the steps finally to eliminate the marriage penalty and alleviate its impact on our working families in this country.

I applaud the work of Chairman ARCHER over in the House in advance of his proposal to double the standard deduction and widen the 15-percent bracket and to adjust the earned-income tax credit in order to alleviate the impact of the marriage penalty for America's working families. His proposal is an important first step in our effort to rid our Tax Code of this onerous penalty to our families.

The Congressional Budget Office has announced that the expected on-budget surplus—I want to make this clear; it is the on-budget surplus; it is not Social Security—for this fiscal year is \$233 billion. Clearly, we have the funds available on budget to do this tax cut and to start it this year. We need to begin by making an investment in America's families. Using the on-budget surplus to rid the Tax Code of this unfair tax is one way to make such an investment. We clearly have the funds to do this for both the marriage penalty and the estate tax, starting this year and phasing that out over a period of 5 years.

The Government should not use the coercive power of the Tax Code to erode the foundation of our society—working families. We should quit incentivizing that erosion resulting from this taxation. Normally in the Tax Code we try to encourage work; we try to encourage families; we try to encourage good things. Yet these are two areas where we are discouraging two of our greatest things. One is the creation of families—good, strong, healthy families that are absolutely critical for vibrant societies. The second is working families, so they do not have what they labor for stolen from them by the taxation system upon death, so they can pass it on to their heirs, so they can hold the farm together.

Some years ago I was an extension specialist for Kansas State University, and I worked with farm couples who were facing two facts of life at that point in time. One I was hoping we could get rid of. One was that they were all going to die. The second was they were very fearful they would have to break the farm up, rather than being able to pass it on to a son or daughter to farm as an intact unit; they were going to have to break it up to pay a portion of the estate taxes.

These were good, hard-working people who worked all of their lives. Because they were frugal and saved and poured the money back into the farm, bought farmland, bought equipment, didn't go out and live luxuriously and take lots of vacations—they stayed there and worked and saved, all of which are laudable things for which we should be applauding them—here were people I was working with, couple after couple, saying: We just really want to have our son be able to farm, or our daughter and son-in-law be able to farm, but if we break this farm up they are not going to be able to have an economical-size unit. They are going to have to work in town and subsidize the farm because farming is a very capital intensive operation; it takes a lot of capital and there is very little return on the investment. We are afraid we will have to break the farm up to pay the estate taxes, so our son or daughter will not be able to farm.

They worked hard and saved and we are going to tax them so they have to break up the farm.

I worked with a whole bunch of other family farmers who said they would organize around this estate tax. They would go and work setting up a trust, a limited partnership, starting a gifting program here. So we have organized five different units to be able to break the assets up so they could get it to the next generation with a minimal amount of tax.

That is a very uneconomical thing to do. Lawyers make money; accountants make money doing that. For farming, it is a bad thing to do because you are breaking your economical unit up into five and trying to figure it out, focusing so much on avoiding taxes rather than the profitability of the farm. It is

ridiculous but it is the policy of the United States.

We now have people basically paying as much to get around paying estate taxes as they pay in estate taxes. But that is only the apparent, on-the-surface costs. It says nothing about the economic cost—what happens to that farm and small business by focusing so much time on tax reduction rather than how do I run this business. How do I try to remain profitable when we have wheat prices the way they are today? Instead, I am focusing on how do I hold my capital together.

It is a very counterproductive tax. We have the opportunity, the resources, the wherewithal, and the will this year to do two things: eliminate the marriage penalty and eliminate the estate tax. We should put them together as a family tax cut package and get it done. It sends good signals to our families; they need a good signal. Marriage in America has enough difficulty without the penalty from the Federal Government.

I wish to give you a statistic from Rutgers University, a study they did about marriage being in the state of decline it is today. From 1960 to 1996, the annual number of marriages per 1,000 adult women declined by almost 43 percent, a precipitous falloff in the number of people getting married in a period of about 36 years. At the same time that fewer adults are getting married, far more young adults are cohabiting. In fact, between 1960 and 1998, virtually the same period, the number of unwed cohabiting couples increased by 1,000 percent. We gave them a tax subsidy for doing that. We taxed the married people. Is that the proper signal for Government to send?

When marriage as an institution breaks down, children suffer. The past few decades have seen a huge increase in out-of-wedlock births—we are at nearly 30 percent of our population born to single mothers—and divorce, the combination of which has substantially undermined the well-being of children in virtually all areas of life: physical and psychological health, socialization, academic achievement, and even in the likelihood of suffering physical abuse.

That is not to say some single parents do not struggle heroically to raise children. They do, and many get it done. It is simply to say it is far more difficult, and the numbers are bearing that out for us as a society that this is a very difficult thing to do, and has an enormous social cost in the aggregate associated with it.

Study after study has shown that children do best when they grow up in a stable home, raised by two parents who are committed to each other through marriage. It should not take studies to tell us that. That is basic common sense and the experience we have. Newlyweds face enough challenges without paying punitive damages in the form of a marriage tax. Think of that. It really is basically pu-

nitive damages. If you get married, we are going to sock you with punitive damages in the amount of \$1,400 a year. The last thing the Federal Government should do is penalize the institution that is the foundation of a civil society. We must eliminate the marriage penalty.

The surging surplus is a result of nonpayroll tax receipts. In other words, the surplus is really a tax overpayment to the Government—personal income and capital gains taxes. We must give the American people the growth rebate they deserve and return this overpayment in the form of the marriage penalty elimination and the estate tax elimination. We can. We should start now. I believe we must do it for a healthy society, for a healthy married society, for a healthy family society, for a healthy economical society, for small businesses and family farms. To rid the American people of the marriage tax penalty and the estate tax is something we can and we should do this year.

I am delighted Senator HUTCHISON from Texas continues this fight; that Senator ASHCROFT from Missouri has been one of the leaders in this fight. You can start to taste victory. It is going to be a tough fight. Clearly, there is not an excuse not to do it this year. We are starting early. We have the resources. The American people want us to do this. We need to send this signal to a society which is asking us: Where are the values in society? Where is the morality?

We need to rebuild the civil society. These are enormously positive messages and notes we can send by doing this.

With that, I call on my colleagues, all, to vote for these proposals. Do it together in a family tax cut and eliminate these two taxes.

I yield the floor to my good friend and colleague from the State of Missouri. He has been a leader for many years on rebuilding civil society. Here is one more area and effort he is leading, in working for the elimination of this marriage penalty.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to commend the House for beginning to move through its process, specifically the House Ways and Means Committee, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act of the year 2000.

I am delighted that my colleagues in the Senate, including Senator BROWNBACK of Kansas and Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, have been so aggressive in talking about what this tax means to America.

Almost all of us realize that if you tax something, you get less of it, and if you give something a subsidy, you get more of it. It occurs to me that we do not need less marriage, less family, and fewer intact households in America. We need strong, durable, lasting families

that reflect the kind of commitments for which marriage really stands.

It is possible for people to be committed to each other without the formal institution of marriage, but the data indicates that possibility does not find its way into reality very often. Marriage is not something that is against the interests of America. Marriage is something that is advancing the interests of America because it is in our homes and in our durable, lasting, persistent relationships, loving relationships, that we teach the fundamental values so important to this culture—values of responsibility, values of work and, yes, values of caring. We learn that we have responsibility and duty to each other. If someone in our family is in trouble, our first turn is not outside the family to get help; we first turn toward each other to help. One of the greatest values any culture can have is learning how to care one for another, and it happens in our families.

I plan to talk for a few minutes today about a real problem we have in this country, and that is that our Tax Code is at war with some of the fundamental values and attributes and characteristics in our culture. I think it is wrong for our Government to be attacking the very institution in society which provides the best support for what we otherwise achieve governmentally. Someone far more wise than I said it first when they said the family is the best department of social services, the family is the best department of education, the family is the best department of health and welfare. One would think if the family were doing this job and doing it well and relieving Government of its backstopping responsibility in these places, we would want to encourage the family; we would want to support it; we would want to sustain it; we would want to provide incentives for it rather than a penalty.

That is the thing that confounds us—that we are providing a penalty. Some great industrialist once said: Your system is perfectly designed to give you what you are getting, basically saying if you are not getting what you want, you should change your system.

Senator BROWNBACK eloquently cited the data. We are not getting what we want. We are getting fewer marriages instead of more marriages. We are getting less durability in these relationships instead of more. Look at the reason for the family breakdowns we have, and almost every sociological study says at the heart of it is the financial stress in the family.

What is Government doing in regard to marriage and stress that financially threatens and sometimes disrupts those marriages? It is adding to the stress instead of relieving the stress. Forty-two percent of all married couples suffer a marriage penalty, meaning the Government taxes them more for being married than they would be paying if they were not married.

We have already heard the data, and I do not think it is important to have

the data, but it is there: About \$1,400 per couple per year on average for the 21 million couples who suffer this \$29 billion a year disadvantage imposed by Government against the very institution that should carry us into this next century.

When the House Ways and Means Committee marked up the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act, they were simply saying it is time for us to start peace negotiations; stop the war between Government and families; let's start having incentives for helping families. At least let us have a neutral environment so we do not have a situation where families are discriminated against by the Tax Code of the United States.

In my home State of Missouri, there are 1 million potential marriage tax victims because of family standing. According to the Treasury Department, 42 percent—over 4 out of every 10 married couples—pay a penalty for being married. I find that to be a tragedy.

According to the Tax Foundation, an American family spends more of its family budget on taxes than on health care, food, clothing, and shelter combined. When you say this is the kind of tax bite the American family is paying—it pays more for Government than health care, food, clothing, and shelter combined—Government is taking a big bite. It is taking a big bite from every citizen. Then add to that a Government penalty, a financial stigma imposed, saying we are going to tax you more because you are married than you would pay otherwise. This is wrong. It is simply that we have found a way, unfortunately, to get additional resources for Government at the expense of resources to the family.

In some measure, this really calls upon us to ask ourselves where our faith is for the future of America. What do we believe will sustain America in the future? Is it going to be big Government or will it be strong families? Will it be a culture that teaches responsibility, duty, compassion, and caring, one for another, or will it be a massive Government? If we really believe families are irrelevant, we should take more and more of their money and pour it into the bureaucracy. But I do not believe bureaucracies are the hope of America or of the world tomorrow.

Responsible citizenship, the kinds of values that are engendered in families, these are the elements of America's future. These are the bright lights that allow us to believe the best is yet to come, and we should stop eroding the funding for families by giving it all to Government.

If our faith is in families, we should help families. How do we help families? The first thing we do is let them keep some of the money they earn. Penalizing families is the wrong way to go about that. Unfortunately, Treasury Secretary Larry Summers announced on Tuesday that he will advise the President to oppose the House bill, less

than 1 week after the President announced his support for marriage penalty tax relief.

The marriage penalty may actually contribute to one of society's most serious and enduring problems. There are now twice as many single-parent households in America as there were when this penalty was first enacted. I cannot say it is a cause, but it is hard to believe it is not a contributor. In our Government policies, we should not be intensifying the problems; we should be eliminating the problems and mitigate the damages they cause.

Our Government should uphold the basic values that give strength and vitality to our communities and to our culture. Sound families do that, and the science which supports that proposition is sound and complete and uncontradicted. Marriage and family are a cornerstone of who we are and what we stand for as a civilization, but the heavy hand of Government which imposes a penalty against marriage distorts the system and lacks the fairness we want in the tax system, and, frankly, it undermines our potential for the kind of future that good families, allowed to reserve some of their resources for their own use and development, could provide.

It is with that in mind that I commend the House for its action, and I look forward to the day when we in the Senate can do what we almost got done last year. We did it in the Senate. We had a major tax relief for the American family through the abolition or mitigation of the marriage penalty tax, sponsored by Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, Senator BROWNBACK of Kansas, and I was privileged to be a cosponsor. It went to the President and was vetoed in the overall tax package.

This concept the President has endorsed, which I think America understands, to bring parity to families so they are not discriminated against, because they are a part of the enduring, lasting, persistent, valuable relationship of marriage, is a concept whose time has come.

I am grateful for the action taken by the House and look forward to the opportunity of implementing, otherwise enhancing, that relief for American families in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Kansas for joining me today to talk about this very important issue.

The House is getting ready to take action. We have spoken once on this issue. We have taken the lead to give relief to the hard-working taxpayers of our country. We do not think people should have to choose between having the money they earn to spend for their families or sending it to Washington, when it is already in excess because we have income tax withholding surpluses.

I appreciate the leadership of Senators ASHCROFT and BROWNBACK on this

issue. We will not give up. We will not walk away from this issue. Before we leave the Senate, the married people of this country will be treated equally by the IRS Code across the board. It is our responsibility, and we will not walk away from it.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HARKIN. I understand, Mr. President, we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, are there time limits on how long we may talk in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Ten minutes.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Minnesota has arrived on the floor. I want to take this time today to talk a little bit about—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Could I ask my colleague to yield for one second?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator.

I have a group of students outside. I would like to follow the Senator. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow Senator HARKIN in morning business.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. We are each allowed 10 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have never heard Senator HARKIN speak for only 10 minutes. I ask Senator HARKIN, can you make your statement in 10 minutes?

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I said, I have never heard you be able to make an argument in 10 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I may ask unanimous consent to extend my morning business remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM SAFETY NET PROPOSAL

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to talk on the issue of agriculture and rural America, and the administration's proposal announced by Secretary Glickman yesterday for improving the farm safety net.

At the outset, I am pleased that the administration has recognized that the

Freedom to Farm bill has failed. The proposal the administration came up with is an impetus for change, and I think it will do a good deal to remedy the shortcomings of the Freedom to Farm bill.

I think the administration proposals of yesterday are a good step forward. I will go through a number of those. However, I want to forewarn my colleagues, while I think there is a lot in the administration's proposal that is good and positive and moves us ahead, I believe there are some shortcomings in it also.

First, on the conservation end, I believe the administration's proposal is a good step forward. It has some very positive features. The administration is proposing, for example, that we extend the conservation reserve program by 3.6 million acres up to 40 million acres. I believe that is a good proposal. That will do a lot to help conserve land and water and take some land out of production. It will help our wildlife. I think this is a good step.

There is a proposal for \$600 million for the conservation security program. This is a program that is designed after a bill I authored to set up a conservation security program whereby farmers and ranchers could, on a voluntary basis, carry out certain conservation measures on their land, and then they would receive payments for doing so. This program would be administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Again, this is fully voluntary, but it is another means whereby farmers could, by engaging in certain conservation practices, shore up their income.

The wetland reserve program has a cap right now of 975,000 acres. The administration would enroll an additional 210,000 acres in 2001 and another 250,000 acres in each subsequent year—again, a very positive step forward, to enroll land in the wetland reserve program.

There are several other conservation proposals: new funding for the farmland protection program, the wildlife habitat incentives program, and the environmental quality incentives program. All of these are extremely good measures that will both help conservation but also improve farm income.

The risk management provisions are positive. The administration is proposing about \$640 million for a premium discount program for farmers and ranchers who take buy-up levels of crop insurance. That would help them reduce the cost and get better coverage. The administration also is proposing \$100 million annually to develop a policy that covers multiyear losses. In places such as North Dakota, South Dakota, some parts of Minnesota, and others, we have had areas where they have had 3, 4, 5 years of drought, floods, crop disease or other damaging conditions. We need a risk management program that covers those multiyear losses. I am glad to see the administration taking a step to address this problem in the budget.

The administration is also proposing to establish a pilot program for insuring livestock. Currently there is no such insurance program. I hear a lot from livestock producers in Iowa that there should be some form of a risk management program, an insurance program for livestock production. Half of all our farm receipts come from livestock or livestock products. The administration is proposing a pilot program of \$100 million annually to provide livestock producers with some form of price protection. I believe that is another good provision in the administration's proposal.

There is another area I am very pleased to see the administration addressing. That is using \$130 million in the next couple of years to establish new cooperative development programs to provide equity capital for new livestock and other processing cooperatives. This proposal would address concerns about market concentration by encouraging new entrants into the livestock processing market. It would also provide an additional source of income for farmers through the ownership of value-added processing. This is key. We have to help farmers to form more cooperatives, both for the marketing of their grains and livestock and also to develop value-added processing plants and enterprises that would help farmers obtain more of the value added to the livestock and crops they produce. Again, this is a good proposal.

The administration is proposing to develop a new bioenergy program to encourage greater use of farm products for production of biofuels. Again, by supporting ethanol and other bioenergy feedstocks, we can use some of our land, perhaps even some of our conservation land, to produce energy sources such as switch grass, which can then be used to generate energy. We have a project ongoing in Iowa right now that will do that so we can use land set aside in the conservation reserve program. We can grow products such as switch grass. We can cut that switch grass and burn it for energy. So we get conservation, plus the farmer will get some additional income, plus it will cut down on our need for imported energy into this country. I am delighted the administration is moving ahead on that.

Lastly, the area I am concerned about with the administration's proposal is sort of the heart and soul of it, which is farm income support. Again, the administration recognizes that we need some kind of countercyclical type of support. That is true. That is what we need. That is what Freedom to Farm does not provide. It does not provide an adequate safety net. It does not provide for countercyclical help. Nevertheless, the administration proposal misses the mark. They are proposing that under this program they are going to have supplemental government payments, in addition to the AMTA payments under Freedom to Farm, to eligible producers if projected gross income for the crop falls below 92 percent

of the preceding 5-year average. Gross income would include gross market revenues for the crop plus government payments, including AMTA payments, marketing loans, and loan deficiency payments.

That is where I have a problem with the administration's proposal. First of all, they are going to use a 5-year average. That is fine. But what are they using? They are using gross income over 5 years. They are throwing into the gross income all of the government payments, loan deficiency payments, marketing loan gains, everything. Farm income should not be looked upon as government payments. Farm income ought to come from the marketplace. That is where the farmer ought to get a better share of the marketing dollar. If you are going to use gross income for 5 years, what about the farmer's costs? Seed goes up in price; fertilizers go up; fuel costs are sky-rocketing; machinery and equipment continue to go up. And, thanks to the Federal Reserve System, interest rates are going up. So if you are just going to take gross income over the last 5 years and not take into account the cost to the farmer, you are already downgrading the net income farmers get.

A farmer can tell you—I don't care how much gross income they get—they have to know what their bottom line is. You might say a farmer has a gross income of \$100,000. That sounds great. But you add up all the costs of feed, seed, fertilizer, machinery, fuel, equipment, interest rates and the like; if his costs are \$92,000, the farmer has made \$8,000. That is what we are seeing happening out there. To use gross income over 5 years, I think, is inadequate, ineffective, illogical, and not in the best interest of trying to get net income up to farmers.

That is what I am interested in—net income. I don't care about gross income. I want to know what the net income of farmers is. What are they going to have left afterward to put away for a rainy day, to help their bottom line, to help put their kids through school, to keep a roof overhead, to help buy some better machinery in the future, to help provide for their retirement, to pay off their land costs? This is what we ought to be thinking about.

I am disappointed that the administration would use gross income over 5 years and average it out that way. Again, that is better than the Freedom to Farm bill, which is fixed and declining payments based upon acreages and yields from 20 years ago. That is totally illogical. So is this better than Freedom to Farm? Yes, a little bit, but it still shortchanges farmers. Quite frankly, I think we are going to have to modify that. I am disappointed, I must say, in the administration for using gross income figures over 5 years. That is not the right way to base the income support.

Again, they have tried to target the payments to family-size farms. I am all

for that principle, and, quite frankly, the way they have figured it, most of the income support would go to the bulk of the farmers who need the help. I won't get into the mechanics of that, but it basically looks that way at this point. The idea of sending the bulk of the support to family farms who need the help is good, but they are basing it over income of 5 years—gross income—and farmers would be getting short-changed.

Secondly, the administration, in establishing and sort of outlining and coming up with this program, said in their release:

Rising crop surpluses, continued low prices and declining incomes will contribute to increasing farm financial stress in 2000, indicating a need for further Federal assistance. However, added assistance should not be made in the form of emergency legislation with the bulk of the payments in the form of Agricultural Market Transition Act payments. That approach, taken the past two years, is not in the best interests of farmers and taxpayers, as the assistance is ad hoc and ineffectively targeted.

Well, that is partially true—certainly about the AMTA payments. Listen to this again:

Rising crop surpluses, continued low prices, and declining incomes will contribute to increasing farm financial stress in 2000, indicating a need for further Federal assistance.

There is nothing in their program—the administration's proposal—that will tend to reduce crop surpluses. A little bit of the land taken out for the CRP, or WRP, that is fine. That is mostly marginal land anyway. But there is nothing in here that will tend to get our surpluses down and thus, increase the market price, or the price farmers get when they sell their crops. That is the problem.

It seems to me that the administration has sort of bought into the idea that we are going to plant fence row to fence row, we are going to continue to produce everything we can produce—the sky is the limit—and we are going to come in with some kind of targeted Federal assistance. On the one hand, I believe we do need some Federal assistance. On the other hand, we need to get out of the mindset we are in; we need to have a different mindset, one which says we can shape programs that will help get the surpluses down and thus increase the price at the farm gate.

I would hope that we can put some money into a shorter-term reserve program, something that would be 2 years, or maybe a 3-year program, to facilitate taking some land out of production and putting it into conservation use for a while. I am talking about land we will not get into the 10-year CRP. Farmers will not tie up relatively productive land by agreeing to take it out for 10 years. You can't pay them enough to do it. But I believe they will take some land out in this period of very low commodity prices for maybe 2 years. That should help alleviate the surpluses and improve market prices. I would think we would have a target of

saying we want to enroll a certain number of acres in a short-term program, which would tend to get some of our surpluses down. So I hope we can come up with the funding to attract land into a shorter-term reserve or paid set-aside program.

Lastly, there is nothing in the administration's proposal that will provide farmers the assistance they need to store grain so they can market their grain in a more orderly fashion. The Farmer Owned Reserve was taken away by the Freedom to Farm bill. It was one of the best programs we ever had. Right now, farmers harvest grain and they can put it under loan for a time, but there are no storage payments. And then they have to sell their crops even if the price is very low. Well, we need a program for on-farm storage, where they can store it at the farm or in an elevator, but the payments ought to go to the farmers.

There is nothing in the administration's proposal that would do that. Now, there is a provision—and I haven't looked at it that closely—which says:

Using existing authorities to implement a new on-farm storage loan program to facilitate farmers' marketing opportunities.

Well, I don't know exactly what that is, a loan program. I am talking about storage payments to farmers, which we had before, and not some kind of a loan program just for the facilities. So I think while there are some good things in their proposal in terms of the conservation programs that are in there, the new amount of money for cooperatives, to encourage cooperatives for marketing—I ask unanimous consent for another 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HARKIN. There is a good proposal in there on the bioenergy. But when you get to the heart of it, and what we are going to do to get away from this mindset of the Government supplying the income to the farmers—that is the heart of what the problem is—and get to the mindset of how do we get the prices up at the farm gate, this is where the administration's proposal falls short. I am hopeful as we move ahead we can convince the administration to get off of that mindset, to provide for perhaps some increased loan rates for farmers, to provide for storage payments to farmers, and to provide for a shorter-term paid set-aside program. Again, as the administration said in their proposal:

Rising crop surpluses, continued low prices, and declining incomes will contribute to increasing farm financial stress in 2000, indicating a need for further Federal assistance.

We have to get off of that mindset. We have rising surpluses. Well, let's get them down and provide for the kind of programs that will get the surpluses down. Continued low prices—get those low prices back up at the farm gate—that is the mindset we have to get on, and I hope we can take the good things

in the proposal, but get to the heart and soul of it, which is getting farm income up—not from Government payments, but from the prices farmers receive for their products. That is what we have to do.

I see my friend from Minnesota is here to speak on this. Again, we have talked about this, and we share the same strong feelings that this is not adequate, this needs some additional work in the Congress. I hope we can get the administration to help us on that. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Iowa—and I see the Senator from Oregon—I want to come out on the floor next week with some other Senators from farm country, and I think we should talk more about it. As I understand the Senator from Iowa—and he can correct me if I am wrong—it is that we don't want to wait until 2002 for a new farm bill. We want to reopen this farm bill and give our farmers some leverage so they can get a decent price.

What we are doing is essentially saying to these grain companies and to these packers: Go ahead. You can get by with not having to worry about paying producers as little as possible because you have all the power of the marketplace. Then they will have enough money to support their families. Then we come in and provide them with some money so they can support their families. We are basically subsidizing these big grain companies and these packers. We are not getting to the root of the problem. If it is a farmer-owned reserve we are talking about, CRP, mid-size and family farmers, that is what people want. Zeroing in on mid-size farmers is what people want. They want to be able to make a decent price.

Isn't that really what the Senator from Iowa was saying?

This will be on my time.

Mr. HARKIN. It is exactly what we are talking about. I point out that in the administration's proposal for their farm support this year, they will use a 5-year average of gross income—gross income. Look, what about the increased price of fuel, machinery, fertilizer, seed, and, thanks to the Federal Reserve System, increased interest rates? I said before and I say to my friend again that the farmer has a \$100,000 gross income averaged over 5 years. But if his costs are \$92,000, what does that mean? It doesn't mean anything.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from Iowa the other thing which worries me is we had an estimate the other day by the USDA that net farm income was going to go down 17 percent this year. As I look at their figure for some sort of income support, it isn't going to be enough to provide even a safety net. But the point is it doesn't deal with the root causes.

Let's have some fight. Let's say this farm bill is a miserable failure. Let's have some antitrust action. Let's have a level playing field. Let's give our

farmers some leverage so they can get a decent price in the marketplace.

I think there are a number of us who are going to come out on the floor with just those proposals.

Am I correct?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator is absolutely correct. I look forward to working with him and others to set forth proposals that will move us in the right direction.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will make one final point, I say to the Senator from Oregon. It looks to me as if—I think it is going to happen—the religious community, the AFL-CIO, the farm organizations, and the environmental organizations are all beginning to organize for March 20-21. Basically, rural America is coming here to raise the roof. I think it will be healthy for all of us.

I think the pressure should be put on dealing with the price crisis and dealing with other issues that are important to rural America, which for too long have been out of sight and out of mind. I think we have to get off the dime. We have to make a difference.

Mr. President, I want to reinforce what my colleague from Iowa said. I think what the President and the administration suggested for family farmers is too timid. Where is the fight? I appreciate getting some help to people—sort of safety-net help. Getting some income to our family farmers is not going to be enough. It doesn't deal with the root of the problem. We don't want to wait until 2002 to write a farm bill. It is a failed farm bill. It is a failed farm policy. We are grinding family farmers up into pieces. We are driving people off the land. It is an economic convulsion, and it calls for bold action.

I don't know where the fight is. To tell you the truth, I don't see the fight. I say to the Senator from Iowa that we have different positions in the Presidential race. This has nothing to do with who we are supporting.

But where is the fight? Where is the boldness? Where is the leadership? We need people—starting with the President—to come out and say this "freedom to fail" bill has not worked. There is tremendous economic pain. Time is not on our side. There is an economic convulsion out there. Family farmers in rural communities want a decent price. We want farmers to get a fair shake in the market. We want antitrust action. We want a fair trade policy. We want stable agriculture. We want a different farm policy. In all due respect, this proposal will only help people somewhat. Thank you. But we have to do a lot more.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. HARKIN. We have to get away from thinking that agriculture is some sort of a minor entity out there, some kind of a sidebar issue. Agriculture is still, if I am not mistaken, something like 20 percent of our gross national product. I think we are up from 20 per-

cent, if I am not mistaken. People still have to eat. Food is one thing we can't do without. Yet we sort of treat agriculture as sort of—well, it is sort of a sidebar, sort of a side item. We have to think of agriculture as a central, integral part of our entire economic structure in America.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

SECURITY FOR CAPITOL HILL

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to repeat what I said yesterday. I am going to come out on the floor every day and spend a few minutes on this question.

Many of us attended the services for Officer Chestnut and Agent Gibson, the two officers who were slain. I believe we all made a commitment to making sure that we were going to have security for our police officers, much less for the general public.

Starting back in October, I realized we have a single-person post. We have posts—I say to my colleague from Oregon, who has always cared about these questions—where you have one officer with lots of people streaming in. This is unconscionable. It puts these officers at great risk. It puts all of us at great risk. You could have one deranged person who could show up at any of these stations with other people coming in, and God knows what would happen.

After these two police officers were slain, we passed a supplemental appropriations bill that was a little over \$1 million. It was to go for weapons, investigations, security, and if we needed more overtime so we could staff these stations through overtime. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate has made it crystal clear we have to change this situation. I have talked to him. I told him I was going to speak on the floor. He said: Please do so.

I am not going to point my finger and say this particular person or that particular person is at fault. I am just going to say this: We should be able to do better for these Capitol Hill police officers. They do well for us.

We made a commitment that we would not put them in a situation where we did not have real security. We are doing that.

We still have single-person posts. I raised this question back in October before we adjourned. I was told there would be changes. But we still have not put the resources into this. I say to my colleagues if this is an issue of spending and we need to spend more money and we need to have more police officers, then let's do it. If this is some sort of an internal issue where we somehow need to figure out how to use overtime pay to staff up, then let's do it.

I don't know what the policy answer is. I will leave that up to other people. I am not going to be the one to micro-manage. But I will say this as a Senator: Every day I am going to come out on the floor, and every day I am going

to say we lost two police officers; that we made a commitment in their memory to make sure we would have security; we made a commitment to make sure that we would not have single-person posts. That was a promise we made. We have still not lived up to that promise. We should do better. We should do better for the Capitol Hill police. We should do better for the general public. The sooner we do, the better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to tell the Senator from Minnesota how much I appreciate him speaking up for the Capitol Hill police officers. When we think about the many people in this country who are decent and caring, right up at the top of the list are those folks who serve this country as Capitol Hill police officers. I commend the Senator for his persistence in being willing to speak up for those folks day after day. I will find time to come out and join him.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, I have made it clear my top priority for this session of Congress is to make sure that we finally add prescription drug coverage for senior citizens to the Medicare program.

Towards that end, I have teamed up for more than a year with Senator Olympia SNOWE of Maine with a proposal we believe can win bipartisan support in this Congress and effectively respond to the enormous need that all of us are seeing as we go home to our communities and visit with older people. The Snowe-Wyden prescription drug legislation is bipartisan. It is marketplace oriented—we use competitive forces as a tool to hold down the prescription drug bills for senior citizens. All of us in the Senate can identify with the approach we are using because the Snowe-Wyden legislation is modeled after the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan which all of us in the Congress are fortunate to enjoy.

As part of our campaign to get this bipartisan legislation enacted, I have made a commitment to come to this floor again and again and urge senior citizens, as this poster says, to send in copies of their prescription drug bills. We would like seniors to send in copies of their bills to each of us in the Senate, Washington, DC, 20510.

As part of the effort to win passage of this legislation or a similar approach to it, I am going to come to the floor of the Senate again and again and again and read from some of the letters I am receiving from older people.

For example, recently I had a chance to hear from an elderly woman who lives in Yoncalla, in southern Oregon.

It is a small town. Her closest pharmacy is about 30 miles away. She has diabetes; she has osteoporosis. Her Social Security check, the entire source of her income, is \$567 a month. She is taking eight different medications for her health problems. Her monthly drug costs come to about \$400 a month. That leaves this elderly woman in southern Oregon with less than \$200 a month to live on after she is done paying her prescription drug bill. Think about that, think about what it is like for an older person in this country having just a couple hundred dollars a month to pay for food and heat or other medical expenses.

She told us she has had to basically cut back on buying her drugs on a monthly basis because she knows, unless she juggles all her bills, she is not going to be able to come close to meeting all of her obligations. She has \$567 a month, lives in a small town, Yoncalla, Oregon. The pharmacy is a pretty good distance away; she has diabetes; she has osteoporosis, and when she is done paying her prescription drug bill, she has only about \$200 a month left to live on. That is a disgrace. That is wrong in a country as rich and good and powerful as ours.

Under the Snowe-Wyden bipartisan prescription drug legislation, with a modest copayment that woman would be able to get health insurance to cover her prescription drug bill. Our legislation would pick up essentially completely the prescription drug portion of her health insurance premium.

The reality is, a person such as that older woman in Yoncalla is hit by a double whammy. Medicare does not cover prescription drugs and hasn't since the program began in 1965; and, second, she is in effect subsidizing big buyers, health maintenance organizations, big health plans that go out and negotiate discounts. It is no wonder that very often we see older people in our communities in this situation. This story is representative. I am getting accounts similar to this continuously. In every community in this country there are similar people who are walking an economic tightrope, seniors who, every month, balance their food bill against their fuel costs, and fuel costs against medical expenses. If they have any unexpected expenses at all that month, they fall off the economic tightrope and go further and further into the hole.

Another older couple I heard from recently, this time from my hometown in Portland, told me they spend \$5,264 a year on medications. This older couple gets Social Security benefits. The husband has a veteran's pension. Between the various sources of income they have, they receive just under \$12,000 a year. They have to spend over \$5,000 of it on prescription medicines. I am not going to go into all the details of this, but they sent me an itemized bill of four pages that outlines the prescriptions they are paying for on a regular basis. Mr. President, \$5,000 a year of

their \$12,000 income goes to pay for these medicines.

I think we can come up with a bipartisan approach to deal with this issue, one that is marketplace oriented. We have a good model in the Federal Employees Health Plan. Senator SNOWE and I are very proud that when we brought the funding plan for our legislation to the floor of the Senate as part of the budget last session we got 54 votes. A majority of the Senate is now on record in support of ensuring we fund prescription drug coverage for older people.

I was very pleased with how the President handled the prescription drug issue at the State of the Union Address. He made it clear he was not interested in scapegoating anybody or saying Republicans were at fault or somebody else was at fault for not getting this enacted. He made it clear he wanted to work with the U.S. Congress. He said the need is urgent. He left open the opportunity to work with Republicans and Democrats on the particulars. Senator SNOWE and I believe our approach is one that makes sense. We are proud of the fact we got the majority of the Senate on record voting for a funding approach for it.

But our colleagues have lots of other good ideas. We recognize that. Our bill is called SPICE, the Seniors Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity Act. Other colleagues have other ideas as well. I hope seniors across the country will consider this poster I have up here that says, "Send In Your Prescription Drug Bill," to each of us in the Senate, Washington, DC, 20510.

I am going to keep coming to the floor of the Senate, reading from these letters, reading from these accounts. Today you heard about an older person in Yoncalla, an older woman in southern Oregon literally with less than a couple hundred dollars a month left to live on when she is done paying for her prescription drug bill, and an elderly couple in Portland who worked hard all their lives, always played by the rules, who are spending more than half their income on prescription drugs.

I will wrap up with this point. We as a nation are just starting to have the debate about whether we can afford to cover prescription drugs. My view is we cannot afford not to cover prescription drugs. If that older woman in Yoncalla cannot get help with her prescriptions when she has diabetes and osteoporosis and she is taking eight medications, if that couple in Portland cannot afford their medications, all of the gerontological research proves what is going to happen. Those folks are going to get sicker. They are going to land in the hospital where they need much more expensive care under what is called Part A of the Medicare program.

I see my friend from Minnesota. He and I have worked often on these issues. The Presiding Officer of the Senate handled the Social Security issues in the House. We know what needs to be done. We know it needs to

be done in a bipartisan way. We can only get important issues addressed in Washington, DC, if we work in a bipartisan way. That is what I have teamed up with Senator SNOWE for more than a year to do.

I hope, as I bring additional cases to the floor of the Senate and talk about the extraordinary suffering we are seeing among our seniors, that we can come together on a bipartisan basis to deal with this issue. I have spoken with Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT about it. I know Senator SNOWE is doing so as well. This is an issue to which every single Member of the Senate can point as an achievement if we come together and address it in a bipartisan way.

Towards that end, I intend to keep coming to this floor and describing these cases. I have believed since the days I was codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers that this was an important issue to address. It becomes even more important by the day as these new drugs are key to keeping seniors well and keeping them from landing in the hospital and incurring greater expenses.

I hope seniors will take heed of this poster and send copies of their prescription drug bills to their Senators in Washington, DC, 20510.

I will keep coming to the floor of this body again and again urging bipartisan support on this issue. It is my top priority for this session, and it ought to be a top priority for every Senator.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to have this issue addressed in this session of Congress and give our older people meaningful relief from their prescription drugs bills.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

DAIRY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to address concerns about the direction our country is taking in agriculture policy for our Nation. It has been very frustrating to me that our Federal dairy policy has been driven by what I can only describe as urban myths about the supposed benefits of dairy compacts in our country. These myths, just like stories on the street, have been repeated so many times in Congress that they are assumed to be true, despite their total lack of a factual basis.

I would today like to discuss the myth that dairy compacts are necessary to provide an adequate supply of fresh, locally produced milk to consumers. As I have said before, I believe this assertion is a deliberate attempt to mislead consumers into believing that if we do not have compacts, there may not be milk in the dairy case the next time they go to the grocery store. Perhaps the statement is not a total deception because it says that the dairy compact is designed to guarantee fresh, locally produced milk. But as we

enter the 21st century, we as consumers know that a product in the grocery store does not have to be produced locally to be "fresh." If it is produced locally, all the better, but we regularly go to the grocery store and buy fresh, perishable food that comes from all over the United States, including fruits, vegetables, meats, poultry, and any of a number of other foods. Similarly, fresh milk and dairy products can now be safely and rapidly shipped all over the country in refrigerated trucks—there is no need to restrict interstate trade in our country to guarantee fresh milk to our consumers.

One of the reasons that America thrives economically is because we allow individuals to produce what they are most skilled at producing. And this principle extends to geographic regions of the country. As an example, Americans buy most of their citrus products from Florida and California, cotton and rice from the South, and potatoes from the West. Economists call this "comparative advantage"—regions produce and sell whatever they are most efficient at producing, and everyone benefits because trade and efficiency is maximized. Lower price; better products to the consumer. It all seems very simple, but it is not allowed to work that way in our dairy industry.

The upper Midwest, due in part to its climate, low feed prices, and an abundant water supply happens to have a comparative advantage in milk and dairy products. However, unlike the rest of the country, it is not permitted to freely sell the product that it so efficiently produces. Instead, Congress has chosen to protect entire regions of the milk industry against competition from the upper Midwest through dairy compacts and/or outdated milk marketing orders.

Basically, in dairy, the Government is picking winners and losers, not who can produce the best, not who can be competitive, what area of the country it is. But under a Government program, the Government is saying who is a winner and who is a loser when it comes to the dairy industry.

Dairy compacts require that processors pay a minimum price for the milk they sell for fluid consumption. Compact proponents will claim that producers outside the compact region are not prevented from selling into the region, but for all practical purposes, this is exactly what it does. If you have a floor price, it eliminates the ability of lower cost producers to sell in that region. There is no incentive for processors to buy from producers outside the region because the price they pay is already set. So they are not able to buy at the lower price or more competitive supply, but because of the compact setting the price, that is where they buy it.

It is interesting that the argument that compacts are necessary to guarantee a supply of fresh milk to a region was also made to justify the unreasonable high support prices in the 1980s

that resulted as you will remember, in massive government purchases of surplus dairy products. The Federal Government spent \$2.6 billion on surplus purchases in 1983 alone, more than 12 percent of U.S. milk production. Congress consequently had to begin a dairy termination program which paid dairy farmers not to produce milk for 5 years.

Congress today is perpetuating the same myths as in past years, with the same predictable results of producer surpluses and higher milk prices to consumers. Upper Midwest producers could sell cheaper milk to consumers almost nationwide, but instead, not only can they not compete for markets outside the region, but their prices in cheese markets are depressed by the oversupply of production in the compact region that flood into the Midwest.

Finally, it appears that not only are dairy compacts not necessary to guarantee a fresh supply of milk to consumers, but they seem to only offer Government protection to dairy farmers within the compact area and guarantee decreased consumption by families due to the high milk prices. If something costs more, you sell less of it, and milk is no different. For example, in 1998, each consumer drank an average of 23.8 gallons of fluid milk products. That is compared to 56.1 gallons of soft drinks, 15 gallons of fruit juices, and 14 gallons of bottled water. Moreover, beverage milk consumption declined from 28.6 gallons in 1975 to 23.9 gallons in 1997. This is not a trend we can ignore. If we went to encourage milk consumption, we cannot do so by artificially raising the price and keeping less expensive, domestically produced milk out of the market.

As we begin the second session of the 106th Congress, I ask my colleagues to be truthful in the dairy debate and not perpetuate the falsehood that compacts are necessary to ensure a fresh supply of milk to consumers. There are, unfortunately, other dairy myths to be exposed, so you can look forward to me returning to the Senate floor to make sure Congress and the American people learn the truth about our Federal dairy policy.

We need some fairness in our dairy policy.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

LONGEST ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have now reached a milestone in our economic history with the report the other day that our economic expansion is now the Nation's longest. We have now enjoyed economic expansion of 107 months. That is the longest economic expansion in our Nation's history. I thought it might be useful to reflect on some of the policies that have contributed to that success.

First and foremost is the fiscal policy of the Nation. The policies that determine our economic success are the fiscal policy of the United States and the monetary policy of the United States.

The fiscal policy of America is controlled by the President, working with the Congress of the United States. That is the spending policy and the tax policy of America.

The monetary policy is controlled by the Federal Reserve Board. Of course, we had a vote this morning on the question of the continued leadership of Chairman Greenspan over the monetary policy of our country.

With respect to the fiscal policy of the country, I thought it would be useful to compare and contrast the records of our last three Presidents.

Under President Reagan, starting in 1981, we saw a dramatic increase in Federal budget deficits. In fact, they nearly tripled from \$79 billion a year, when he came into office, to over \$200 billion a year. Then we saw some improvement in the final 2 years of his administration.

Then, with President Bush, we saw a dramatic increase in our Federal budget deficits, going from \$153 billion in his first year to \$290 billion in his final year in office. At that point, we were advised that we could expect red ink for as far into the future as anybody could project. In fact, they were expecting, at that point, this year we would have budget deficits of over \$600 billion if there was failure to act.

Thank goodness we did not fail to act because in 1993 President Clinton came into office, put forward an ambitious 5-year plan to reduce the budget deficit, and we were able to pass that plan. We were able to pass that plan; and for the next 5 years, under that 5-year plan, each and every year the budget deficit came down, and came down sharply, to \$22 billion at the end of that 5-year plan.

At that point, we passed, on a bipartisan basis—unlike in 1993, where nobody on the other side of the aisle in either Chamber supported the 5-year plan put forward by President Clinton—but in 1997, we joined hands, on a bipartisan basis, to finish the job.

Indeed, we did finish the job, so that in 1998 and 1999 we saw unified budget surpluses. In fact, in 1999, we had a surplus of \$124 billion, on a unified basis—that means counting all of the accounts of the Federal Government. And even better news; we were able to balance that year without counting Social Security.

This year, the year we are currently in, we anticipate a \$176 billion unified budget surplus, again, without counting Social Security.

Those are very dramatic improvements that we have had in the fiscal policy of the United States.

I will go to this chart first because it shows the changes that were made in the two key elements in determining whether or not you have a budget deficit. The blue line is the outlays of the

Federal Government; that is, the spending. The red line is the revenues. You can see, we had a big gap between the two for many years. That is why we had a budget deficit. We were spending more than we were taking in.

In 1997, when we passed that 5-year plan to close the gap, you can see from the chart we reduced expenditures and we raised revenue. That combination has eliminated the budget deficit. That is why we are in surplus today.

Let's go back to the chart that shows, on the spending side of the ledger, how things changed.

We are now at the lowest level of Federal spending in 25 years as measured against our gross domestic product, as measured against our national income, which is the fairest way to measure these things so you see changes over time, so that you are able to put in context the time value of money.

What you see is, we are now spending 18.7 percent of our national income on the Federal Government. That is, again, the lowest level since 1974, 25 years ago. If we stay on this course, you can see we will continue to see declines down to about 17 percent of our national income going to the Federal Government. That is a dramatic improvement over where we were back in 1992, when we were spending over 22 percent of our national income on the Federal Government.

Some have said: We have the highest taxes in our history.

Let me go back to the chart that shows revenue and spending. This, again, is measured against our gross domestic product, our national income.

The red line is the revenue line. It is true that the revenue line has gone up, just as the spending line has come down. That is how we balance the budget. We cut spending and we raised revenue so we could eliminate the deficit.

One of the key reasons we have more revenue is because the economy is doing well. It has been revived because we got our fiscal house in order in this country. Some say that translates into the highest taxes individuals have paid. That is not the case.

The fact is, the tax burden is declining for a family of four. This is not the Senator from North Dakota's analysis. This is the respected accounting firm of Deloitte & Touche, that compares the tax burden for a family earning \$35,000 a year in 1979 to 1999. This chart shows their overall tax burden. This includes payroll taxes, income taxes. It shows that their tax burden has declined. The same is true of a family income of \$85,000 a year. Their taxes have not gone up. Their taxes have gone down. Their taxes have been reduced.

Overall, revenue has increased because the economy is strengthened. Goodness knows, anybody who looks around at America's economy understands we are in the best shape we have been in in anybody's memory.

How do we keep this successful economy going? I think it is useful to re-

flect on how very important the successful economic policy we have been pursuing has been. It has produced the lowest unemployment rate in 41 years. This chart shows the dramatic improvement in the unemployment rate in this country. We have also experienced the lowest inflation rate in 33 years.

You remember we used to talk about the misery index. We used to combine the unemployment rate and the inflation rate and look at the so-called misery index. The misery index would be as favorable as it has been in almost anybody's lifetime because we have seen unemployment and the inflation rate come down dramatically.

The fact is, this economic policy has been working—a policy of balancing the budget and getting our fiscal house in order.

Now the question is, What do we do going forward? We have these projections that say we are going to be experiencing substantial surpluses in the future.

Chairman Greenspan, who we voted for overwhelmingly on the floor of the Senate, has given his recommendation. As recently as January 27, he told Congress: "Pay down the debt first." That is what he is urging. He is saying: Continue the policy that we have pursued to eliminate deficits, reduce debt because that lifts an enormous burden off of the American economy. We reduce the interest costs; we reduce the competition for funds; we reduce the Government's call on money that is available in this economy; and there is more money available for the private sector at lower interest rates. That means higher rates of investment. That means stronger economic growth. We ought to pay attention to what Chairman Greenspan is telling us: "Pay down the debt first."

I wish to talk a little about these projections of surpluses we have heard about. When the Congressional Budget Office released their projections, they put out three different calculations of what the surpluses might be over the next 10 years.

The first one was based on an assumption that we have a so-called capped baseline; that is, we go back to the 1997 agreement. That would mean very sharp cuts in spending this year over the spending we had last year. In fact, this baseline assumes that we would cut spending this year by \$66 billion over last year's spending.

Now, that is not going to happen. We have had a Republican-controlled Congress the last 2 years. They have not been reducing spending from the previous year. They have been increasing the spending, even though the caps existed. In fact, we shattered the caps last year. So it is an unrealistic expectation to suggest that all of a sudden we are going to start following them this year. In fact, that would require a \$66 billion cut in spending to get the projection of a non-Social Security surplus over the next 10 years of \$1.9 trillion.

The second estimate put out by CBO was, if we froze all domestic spending for the next 10 years, that would give us a non-Social Security surplus of \$1.8 trillion. Again, how realistic is that? Are we really going to freeze for the next 10 years all the spending on education? Are we going to freeze for the next 10 years all the spending on defense? Are we going to freeze for the next 10 years all the spending on law enforcement? Are we going to freeze for the next 10 years all the spending on parks in this country, roads, and highways? That is not a realistic projection. That is not an honest projection.

The third estimate put out by the Congressional Budget Office is if we adjusted for inflation each of the years going forward for the next 10 years. That resulted in a non-Social Security budget surplus of \$838 billion. In order to evaluate how reasonable that forecast is, I think you have to look at what has happened the last 2 years. This Republican-controlled Congress has been increasing spending by higher than the rate of inflation, which would reduce this number even further. That means instead of a \$1.9 trillion Social Security surplus that has been bandied about in the press, or a \$1.8 trillion surplus over the next 10 years that has been discussed in some circles, we are much more likely to face a surplus over the next 10 years in the non-Social Security accounts of about \$800 billion. That is reality, that is facing the most likely prospect, instead of the kind of dreamworld anticipations we have had in the first two scenarios.

In the proposal of Governor Bush and the Republican side over the next 10 years, he is proposing a tax cut of \$1.3 trillion, when we only likely will have a non-Social Security surplus of \$800 billion. That means Governor Bush would have to take \$500 billion out of Social Security to pay for his tax cut scheme, a tax cut scheme that gives 60 percent of the benefit to the wealthiest 10 percent in this country. That is a dangerous plan for this Nation's economy.

Instead of further reducing the debt with this non-Social Security surplus, he would devote every penny of it to a tax cut disproportionately going to the wealthiest 10 percent in this country. That is a dangerous plan.

It is especially dangerous in light of what Chairman Greenspan has told us, which is that the highest priority ought to be to pay down the debt—not to have a massive tax cut scheme, not to have a massive new spending scheme, but to have our first priority being to pay down the debt. Goodness knows, our generation ran up this debt. We have a responsibility to pay it down. Not only do we have a moral obligation, but it is the best economic policy for this country. It will take pressure off interest rates. It will mean greater economic growth. It will mean we are preparing for the baby boom generation, which all of us know is coming.

I am a baby boomer; many of us are. We know there is a huge bulge in the population. When these baby boomers start to retire, they are going to put enormous pressure on Social Security spending, on Medicare spending, and we ought to get ready for that day. We ought to be responsible. The responsible thing to do is not to engage in some big new spending scheme, not to engage in some massive tax cut scheme, but to have a balanced approach, one that puts the priority on paying down this debt, one that puts a priority on strengthening Social Security, extending the solvency of Medicare, and also addressing certain high-priority domestic needs such as education and defense, which I think many of us in this Chamber believe needs to be strengthened.

I come from agriculture country. I come from a farm State. Agriculture needs attention. That is a domestic priority for many of us.

Finally, yes, we can have tax reduction as well, but we certainly shouldn't put that as the highest priority. We certainly should not take all of the non-Social Security surplus and devote it to that purpose. We absolutely must not take money out of Social Security to provide a tax cut. That is irresponsible. That is dangerous. That threatens our economic security and our economic expansion.

Over 5 years, the Bush tax cut plan is even more dramatic in terms of its effect on Social Security. I talked about a non-Social Security surplus over 10 years of just over \$800 billion. Over 5 years, it is about \$150 billion. Yet the Bush tax cut plan over 5 years approaches \$500 billion. Let me say that again. Over the next 5 years, the most realistic projection of surpluses is just under \$150 billion. Yet the Bush tax cut plan over 5 years is over \$480 billion. Where is the difference coming from? It can only come from one place. That is the Social Security surplus. That is profoundly mistaken, profoundly wrong. That is exactly what we should not do in terms of the fiscal policy of this country. The last thing we should do is put this thing back in the old ditch of deficits and debt.

I end as I began. Chairman Greenspan has advised us that what we ought to do as the highest priority is pay down this debt—\$5.6 trillion of total debt, \$3.6 trillion of publicly held debt. Let us keep our eye on the ball. Let us put as our highest priority the paying down of this national debt. Our generation ran it up. We have an obligation to pay it down.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may require as in morning business and that, by unanimous consent, Senator FEINGOLD be recog-

nized to speak directly following the conclusion of my remarks.

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

HIV/AIDS IN AFRICA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, this afternoon Senators will come to the floor to speak about a problem we believe is a very serious one; that is, the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. I know the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, will speak, and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD will speak. I believe others will as well.

Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues here this afternoon to address what I consider to be one of the most pressing and important national security and international health issues that we will face in the coming decades: The HIV/AIDS pandemic, which is currently sweeping Africa.

I wish to begin by giving my colleagues a sense of the scope and scale of this problem.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely affected by AIDS than any other part of the world. Today, 23.3 million adults and children are infected with the HIV virus in Africa, which only has about 10 percent of the world's population, but nearly 70 percent of the worldwide total of infected people.

Worldwide, about 5.6 million new infections will occur this year, with an estimated 3.8 million in sub-Saharan Africa—3.8 million people will contract HIV. Every day, 11,000 additional people are infected—1 every 8 seconds.

All told, over 34 million people in Africa—the population of my State of California—have been infected with HIV since the epidemic began, and an estimated 13.7 million Africans have lost their lives to AIDS, including 2.2 million who died in 1998.

Each day, AIDS buries 5,500 men, women, and children. We saw a very compelling documentary made by the filmmaker Rory Kennedy, which showed the burials of some of these children as well as the enormous cultural problems that exist in Africa because of HIV/AIDS. By 2005, if policies do not change, the daily death toll will not be 5,500, it will be 13,000—double what it is now—with nearly 5 million AIDS deaths that year alone, according to the White House Office of AIDS Policy.

AIDS has surpassed malaria as the leading cause of death in Africa, and it kills many times more people on that continent than war.

The overall rate of infection among adults is about 8 percent, compared with a 1.1-percent infection rate worldwide. In some countries of southern Africa, 20 to 30 percent of the adults are infected.

AIDS has cut life expectancy by 4 years in Nigeria, 18 years in Kenya, and 26 years in Zimbabwe. As these numbers suggest, AIDS is devastating Africa.

AIDS is swelling infant and child mortality rates, reversing the declines that had been occurring in many countries during the 1970s and 1980s. Over 30 percent of all children born to HIV-infected mothers in sub-Saharan Africa will themselves become HIV infected. Let me say again, 30 percent of all of the children born to HIV-infected mothers will become HIV infected.

There are many explanations for why this epidemic is sweeping across sub-Saharan Africa. Certainly the region's poverty, which has deprived much of Africa from effective systems of health information, health education and health care, bears much of the blame. Cultural and behavioral patterns, which have led to sub-Saharan Africa becoming the only region in which women are infected with HIV at a higher rate than men, may also play a role.

HIV/AIDS is becoming a major woman's issue. AIDS has largely impacted the heterosexual community in Africa, and it has established itself in such a way that it sweeps across and wipes out entire villages.

Because of the region's poverty, all too often treatment of AIDS sufferers with medicines that can result in long-term survival has not been widely used in Africa.

But I strongly believe that if the international community is to be successful, we must make every effort to get appropriate medicine into the hands of those in need.

For too many years there were no effective drugs that could be used to combat HIV/AIDS, but now, thanks to recent medical research, we do have effective drugs. For example, some recent pilot projects have had success in reducing mother-to-child transmission by administering the anti-HIV drug AZT, or a less expensive medicine, Nevirapine, during birth and early childhood.

New studies indicate that Nevirapine can reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission by as much as 80 percent. NVP is given just once to the mother during labor, once to the child within 3 days of birth. Taking three or four pills can mean that a child is prevented from being born with HIV. In fact, for \$4 a tablet—a little more than the cost of a large latte at Starbucks, which is not a lot here, but a great deal in Africa—this drug regime has created an unprecedented opportunity for international cooperation in the fight against AIDS. I, frankly, believe it is the single most cost-effective thing that can be done. Currently, however, less than 1 percent of HIV-infected pregnant women have access to interventions to reduce mother-to-child transmission.

Administered in a treatment regimen known as HAART—highly active antiretroviral therapy—antiretroviral drugs can allow people living with AIDS to live a largely normal life and use of the drugs can lead to long-term survival rather than early death. Such treatment is proven highly effective in

developed countries, including our very own.

My understanding is that most antiretrovirals are relatively inexpensive to produce. AIDS Treatment News recently reported:

AZT in bulk can be purchased for 42 cents for 300 milligrams from the worldwide suppliers; this price reflects profits not only to the manufacturer, but also to the middleman bulk buyer. The same drug retails at my local pharmacy for \$5.82 per pill. This ridiculous price bears no relation to the cost of production.

Unfortunately—and inexplicably, in my view—access for poor Africans to costly combinations of AIDS medications, or antiretrovirals, is perhaps the most contentious issue surrounding the response to the African epidemic.

As the U.S. Development Program head, Mark Brown, said at the U.N. Security Council meeting on AIDS in Africa last month:

We cannot lapse into a two-tier treatment regime: drugs for the rich, no hope for the poor. While the emphasis must be on prevention, we cannot ignore treatment, despite its costs.

I agree with that. Although it is true that the cost of combination therapy is beyond the means of most people living with HIV/AIDS and governments in sub-Saharan Africa—combination therapy in South Africa, incidentally, was estimated at \$334 a month, or \$4,000 per individual per year, and UNAIDS reports that Brazil treated 75,000 people with antiretrovirals in 1999 at a cost of \$300 million—or, again, \$4,000 a person.

I believe we have a strong moral obligation to try to save lives when the medications for doing so exist. There are several things the United States can do to increase access to lifesaving drugs.

First, the U.S. should work with others in the international community to provide support to make these drugs affordable and to strengthen African health care systems so that drug therapies can be effectively administered. The plan for combating HIV/AIDS in Africa recently put forward by the President and Vice President goes a long way towards seeing that the U.S. meets its commitment to this goal.

Second, it should be possible for African governments and donor agencies to achieve reductions in the cost of antiretrovirals through negotiated agreements with drug manufacturers. The British pharmaceutical firm Glaxo Wellcome, a major producer of antiretrovirals, has already stated that it is committed to "differential pricing," which would lower the cost of AIDS drugs in Africa.

Third, I strongly believe that the United States must work to advocate "parallel imports" of drugs and "compulsory licensing" by African governments to lower the price of patented medications so that HIV/AIDS drugs are more affordable, and more people in Africa will be able to have access to them.

Through parallel importing, patented pharmaceuticals could be purchased

from the cheapest source, rather than from the manufacturer. Under "compulsory licensing" an African government could order a local firm to produce a drug and pay a negotiated royalty to the patent holder.

Both parallel imports and compulsory licensing are permitted under the World Trade Organization agreement for countries facing health emergencies. There can be little doubt that Africa is facing a health emergency of monumental proportions.

That is why I, along with my colleague from Wisconsin, introduced an Amendment to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act last year to allow the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa to pursue "compulsory licensing".

Without "compulsory licensing", which would allow access to cheaper generic drugs, more people in Sub-Saharan Africa will suffer and die.

For those of my colleagues who may be concerned that this Amendment may undermine wider Intellectual Property Rights, this Amendment acknowledges that the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS) is the presumptive legal standard for intellectual property rights (IPR).

The WTO, however, allows countries flexibility in addressing public health concerns, and the compulsory licensing process under this Amendment is consistent with the WTO's approach to balancing the protection of intellectual property with a moral obligation to meet public health emergencies such as the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa.

In other words, this Amendment does not create new policy or a new approach on IPR issues under TRIPS, nor does it require IPR rights to be rolled back or weakened. All it asks is that in approaching HIV/AIDS in Africa, U.S. policy on compulsory licensing remains consistent with what is accepted under international trade law.

By doing so, this Amendment will allow the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa to continue to determine the availability of HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals in their countries, and provide their people with affordable HIV/AIDS drugs.

These drugs exist. We need to get them to where this epidemic is reaching monumental proportions.

I was pleased to work with the Managers of this bill when the African Growth and Opportunity Act was on the floor of the Senate last November, to modify my Amendment to meet some of their concerns, and to have their support in seeing it included in the final Senate-passed version of this bill.

Unfortunately, several pharmaceutical manufacturers are strongly opposed to this measure, and, as I understand it, there are efforts to have this Amendment taken out of the final bill that will be reported out of Conference.

I believe that such efforts are reprehensible, and I am determined not to allow this to happen.

And if, behind closed doors, this amendment is indeed removed from this bill, I intend to do all I can to—I hope I will be joined by my colleagues—make sure that an African Growth and Opportunity bill without this provision does not pass this Congress.

What good is an African trade bill if Africa is going to get wiped out from AIDS?

It is clearly in the interest of the United States to prevent the further spread of HIV/AIDS in Africa, and I believe that the “compulsory licensing” amendment was a necessary addition to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act if we are to continue to assist the countries of this region in halting the number of premature deaths from AIDS. Antiretroviral drugs can do much to improve quality and length of life. The United States has the power to make these life-saving drugs more affordable and accessible to Africans. We cannot turn our backs on Africa. Our assistance is truly a matter of life and death.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, be recognized after my remarks.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

Let me first thank my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, for her comments and leadership on this issue, and in particular the work we started together last fall and her determination with regard to the amendment that we are quite determined to make sure stays in the African Growth and Opportunity Bill.

I also especially thank Senator DURBIN, who came back from Africa in December with a tremendous passion on this issue, for using his enormous leadership skills to bring us together on a bipartisan basis to try to help fight this problem. I am grateful for his leadership and for his having the idea that we should come together in the Chamber to make some comments.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa, I have always felt very strongly about the issue of AIDS in Africa. I have raised it in the context of the African debate. I have had success in some areas but not in others. I had a chance to raise it in December in personal meetings in their own countries with 10 different African Presidents.

I applaud the United Nations Security Council's decision to address the crisis last month. I want to especially mention our Ambassador to the U.N., Richard Holbrooke, whose idea it was to have such a session, and I support the administration's call to increase the resources directed at the crisis. I am especially pleased to stand with my colleagues to raise the issue again today.

I have heard some of the statistics, but I think they bear repetition.

In 1998 alone, AIDS killed 2 million Africans. At least 12 million Africans have been killed by AIDS since the onset of the crisis. Africa accounts for over half of the world's cases of HIV. According to World Bank President James Wolfensohn, the disease has left 10 million African children in its wake.

In Botswana, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, 25 percent of the people between the ages of 15 and 19 are HIV positive.

By 2010, sub-Saharan Africa will have 71 million fewer people than it would have had if there has been no AIDS epidemic.

My recent trip to 10 African countries only renewed my resolve to address this matter with the urgency and seriousness it deserves.

In Namibia, HIV-positive citizens pulled up to a meeting in a van with curtained windows, and they hurried to the safety of the meeting room as soon as they arrived. They feared that their identity would be revealed, and that the stigma still attached to the disease would cause them to lose their jobs and perhaps even to be disowned by their families. It was shocking—in a country gripped by the epidemic, people are still afraid to acknowledge the crisis.

In Zambia I visited an orphanage of sorts, where 500 children, many of them orphaned when AIDS killed their parents, gathered by day. At night, there is only room for 50 of them—the rest must make their own arrangements, and many end up sleeping on the streets, sometimes prostituting themselves—thereby risking exposure to HIV in their struggle to survive.

In Zimbabwe, life expectancy has dropped from 65 to 39. Let me repeat that: life expectancy in Zimbabwe dropped from 65 to 39. Walking past the Parliament building one day, I asked how old one had to be to become a legislator there. The answer was 40. That exchange helped me to grasp how far-reaching the consequences of this disease really are—no society is structured in a way that prepares it to deal with an unchecked epidemic like AIDS.

In July 1999, the National Institutes of Health released a report on the effectiveness of a drug called nevirapine, the drug Senator FEINSTEIN mentioned, in preventing mother-to-child transmission of HIV. Studies indicate that this drug can reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission by as much as 80 percent.

As she said, NVP costs \$4 per tablet. This relatively simple and inexpensive drug regimen has created an unprecedented opportunity for international cooperation in the fight against the vertical transmission of HIV.

It should be recognized that Uganda is making real headway with regard to prevention. Since 1992, the Ugandan government's very frank and high-profile public education efforts have helped to reduce the incidence of HIV infection by more than 15 percent.

But despite these positive signs, there are many fronts on which there has been very little progress. Virtually no one has access to drugs to treat the disease. Prevention is unquestionably the most important element of the equation, but treatment cannot be ignored. Poverty should not be a death sentence—not when the infectious disease that is destroying African society can be treated.

Again, because Senator FEINSTEIN and I, and I know Senator DURBIN, are determined on this, we offered an amendment to the African Growth and Opportunity Act that was accepted into the Senate version of that legislation. It prohibits federal money from being used to lobby governments to change TRIPS-compliant laws allowing access to HIV/AIDS drugs. Basically, it just says that taxpayer money shouldn't be used to prevent countries from taking international legal measures in this AIDS emergency. I strongly urge the conferees to support that amendment.

The AIDS crisis in Africa is just what the TRIPS agreement was meant to address. This is a crisis, an emergency on an incomprehensibly vast scale. This is the rare and urgent situation that calls for something beyond a dogmatic approach to intellectual property rights.

If allowing for a TRIPS-compliant response seems expensive, think how expensive it will be, in the long run, not to do so. Even beyond the human tragedy, there are vast economic costs to this epidemic. AIDS affects the most productive segment of society. It is turning the future leaders of the region into a generation of orphans.

It is simply unconscionable for the U.S. government to fight the legal efforts of African states to save their people from this plague. I cannot imagine why any of my colleagues would support such action. Those dissatisfied with the TRIPS agreement should focus their efforts on changing it—not on twisting the arms of countries in crisis who comply with international law.

I thank my colleague from Illinois and I look forward to all the efforts we will take on together on this issue, and I look forward to working with Members of the other party on this as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senators FEINSTEIN and FEINGOLD, for joining me to speak about AIDS today. I might add there are others who were not able to be here because of scheduling problems.

I, too, have just returned from a trip to Africa. Let me say at the outset there are some who question the value of Congressional travel. I wish they would look at it from a different perspective. I think the Senators who spoke on the floor on this issue, Senator FEINGOLD included, have benefited greatly from traveling to Africa, not just because we have seen firsthand

this epidemic and its devastation, but frankly because it is energizing. Seeing people, real people and their travails, their hardships because of this epidemic, causes many of us to dedicate ourselves to do something.

In an epidemic of such Biblical proportions as the AIDS epidemic in Africa, many of us are humbled, as we should be. I came back and met up with Senator FEINGOLD, whom I know had a similar interest, and Senator FEINSTEIN, who helped introduce the amendment which was discussed earlier, and I spoke with Senator ORRIN HATCH, a Senator from Utah, who has a similar passion on this issue. I have spoken to Senator BILL FRIST, a Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on African Affairs. I sincerely believe on this issue, more than any other issue, we should put party labels aside. I think we are dealing with not merely another political issue, and certainly not any political agenda; when we speak of AIDS in Africa we are dealing with a Holocaust without a Hitler. We are dealing with the greatest moral challenge of our time. Those are large statements, I understand. But as you listen to the statistics that have been noted in earlier debate about the epidemic, I do not believe I am overstating it at all.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely affected by AIDS than any other part of the world. Approximately 23 million adults and children are infected with HIV in that part of the world. They have about 10 percent of the world's population, 70 percent of the world's HIV-infected people. Though an estimated 13.7 million Africans have already lost their lives to AIDS, including 2.2 million who died in 1998, we are going to see these numbers increase dramatically.

This was my first trip to Africa. I tried to make an earlier trip with a Congressional delegation 10 years ago, and I was denied a visa by the South African Government. Those were the days of apartheid, and as a Congressman I had voted consistently against apartheid. They obviously had read my voting record and said they wanted me to stay home; they did not want me to visit their country.

Things have changed. Apartheid is over. There is majority rule in South Africa. Under the inspired leadership of Nelson Mandela and now President Mbeki, this country has a great future. They offered a visa and an invitation to come visit, and I did. I visited Kenya and Uganda as well.

I started out this trip thinking I would focus on issues I am familiar with such as food aid. I have been involved in agriculture and food assistance for as long as I have been in the House of Representatives and the Senate. I think these programs are so essential, where America takes its bounty and shares it with people who are hungry, people who are starving, around the world.

I also wanted to focus on microcredit. Ten years ago in Bangladesh, I learned of the Grameen Bank and similar microcredits that were producing miraculous results. These are small loans, \$50, \$100, \$200, primarily to women to give them a chance to buy a cow or some chickens or some goats or some tools or to expand their stall at the marketplace. Mr. President, 98 percent of these microcredit loans are repaid. It is a wonderful program, and it elevates people to a much higher level in terms of their living standards.

So I went looking for food and microcredit programs, realizing I would be discussing the AIDS issue as part of it. I quickly came to the realization that AIDS is an issue which is overwhelming the continent of Africa. Every other issue takes second tier to the AIDS issue. That became the focal point of the trip.

The three countries we visited, South Africa, Kenya, and Uganda, represent such different attitudes and different approaches when it comes to the AIDS epidemic.

South Africa: I have a photo I took and have blown up. This is a rural health clinic in Ndwedwe, which is right outside of Durban, South Africa. This was a lovely young mother and her beautiful little boy who sat in the front row of this clinic which I visited.

Americans help this clinic stay open. Americans help this clinic have a nurse come in each day and have a doctor come in once a month. These villagers walk sometimes hours to bring their children and members of their families in for medical care.

This beautiful little boy, as you can see—maybe you cannot see on the television—has the traditional Zulu bracelet made out of hair. His mother has the scarring on the cheeks, which is part of the ceremony of the Zulu tribes. They invited me to this clinic to meet some of the people being served.

There was a lady sitting right behind this mother and child, and she came up to speak. When she stood up, you could tell she was nervous. She had on a T-shirt and, over that, a long-sleeved shirt. This was a few weeks ago, and it was very warm in South Africa at that time.

As she came forward, she was clearly nervous about speaking with us. She very calmly buttoned every button on her shirt all the way up to her neck. She stood in front of this assembled group, and she was very quiet. Then she said in Zulu: Unity, unity, unity, unity; in unity there is strength. Every time she said the word, the crowd answered her. Then she summoned her courage and told her story about how 2 years ago she was diagnosed with tuberculosis and has heart problems and may need surgery and how important this clinic is to her.

At the very end of her talk, she said: And I have AIDS, and I don't know what will happen to my children. And she started crying.

The man who was the master of ceremonies at this little gathering asked

her to sit down on a bench next to me as she was crying. I reached up and put my arm on her shoulder, and this audience, wide-eyed, gasped that I would touch her. A doctor who traveled with us stood up and said to the people assembled on this porch: Do you see this? Do you see this American politician? He is touching her. You will not get this AIDS epidemic if you just touch someone.

That reflects the level of ignorance, the level of denial in South Africa about an epidemic that has reached and touched 4 million people out of some 40 million. They do not understand the basics.

In 1998 on World AIDS Day, a South African woman stood up and said: I have AIDS. She returned to her village that evening and was beaten to death because they believed that was how you could end the scourge.

The Chicago Tribune did an amazing series about the AIDS epidemic, one that I took out of the paper recently. They talked about another town in South Africa, Esidubwini, and they told a story about a lady, Thandiwe Mwandla, who was diagnosed with AIDS, and after the diagnosis, no one would buy her sugarcane, her bananas, her peaches. They would not buy anything she touched. She said at one point that her neighbors walked a broad circle around her. She had the stigma of AIDS. She said: We get sick, and we get poor, and we die lying to ourselves.

The Tribune wrote in this story what I consider to be a very inspiring paragraph:

Staring into the abyss of an incomprehensibly brutal epidemic, it is plain how the 23 million people who live with HIV in Africa can drift easily into numbing fatalism, or a fierce, hardening shell of denial.

We saw that shell of denial in South Africa, a country which looks more like Europe than any other part of Africa, a country which accounts for 30 percent of the economy of sub-Saharan Africa, a country where many people are pinning their hopes that they see the rebirth of Africa in the 21st century. Yet, devastated by this disease, it has been unwilling to face it.

From there we went to Kenya. In Kenya, there is a different circumstance—some positive, some not so positive. First, this is a photo we took of this little fellow in a slum in Nairobi, Kenya. It is called Kibera. It is a squatters slum in the middle of the city. People from the rural countryside who cannot make a living pile into this slum. They squat, set up their huts, and try to create a life and existence.

I asked how many people live in this slum. They said: Somewhere between 500,000 and 800,000; we are not sure, it changes so quickly. There is virtually no sanitation, no water. It all has to be brought in. And there certainly is no health care.

Kenya is ravaged by AIDS as well. Sadly, for a long period of time they denied it. They did little about it. Just

recently there was an indication that they are going to start admitting it and dealing with it. This political denial is part of the problem, and we in the United States have to be part of the solution in convincing these governments in Africa that what is at stake is not just this little boy but the future of a continent.

From Kenya we went to Uganda, and thank God it was the last stop on the trip because what we saw in Uganda suggested to me that there is no reason to despair, we should keep our hope alive, there is a chance to deal with this epidemic.

The reason Uganda is so far ahead of many other Third World countries is an interesting story.

About 10 years ago, President Museveni of Uganda sent some of his Ugandan soldiers to Cuba to be trained to fight rebels in the countryside. After a few weeks, he received a message from the Cuban Government. They said: We are sending your soldiers home. Of course, his Government asked why. And they said: Because half your soldiers you sent to Cuba have HIV.

That was 10 years ago. It was stunning for them to realize that what they thought was an isolated disease now infected half of the military.

We met some of the soldiers—in fact, some were HIV positive—in each of these countries who have now come forward and dealt with this in a more open and forthright way.

When those soldiers came back from Cuba to Uganda, at about that same time, one of the more prominent figures in music in Uganda, a man by the name of Philly Lutaaya, announced publicly that he had AIDS. By going public and talking to the people of Uganda, he achieved, in many ways, what Magic Johnson achieved in the United States. He suddenly raised our eyes from our other life's undertakings to look straight into the eyes of someone whom we knew and admired and thought this would never happen to.

Uganda then set out on a program to reduce the incidence of HIV infection, and when they tested the pregnant women of that country, they found that 30 percent of them were HIV positive. They started pushing for abstinence, faithfulness, and condoms as an effort to reduce the incidence of HIV infection. Ten years later, they cut that down from 30 percent of pregnant women to 15 percent—a dramatic improvement. Yet, in this country of 17 million people, there are some 1.7 million AIDS orphans today.

If you travel around Uganda and see how they have dealt with this epidemic and the success they have achieved, you come to understand human nature and the strengths of people who are facing the worst possible outcome: an early death from an incurable disease.

We went to a clinic called The AIDS Support Organization, TASO. It started many years ago with a handful of people and has grown into tens of thousands of HIV-positive people who come

there when they have a problem, when they are fighting off an infection. They do not have the AZT cocktail. They can never dream of that. Countries which spend \$2, \$3 per capita annually on public health cannot even imagine spending \$1,000 to treat AIDS. It is beyond their comprehension.

How do they get by? With the basics: With some antibiotics to try to get through each infection. They talk about nutrition and improving their lifestyle, eliminating alcohol and all sorts of things to make them stronger so they can cope with these infections.

There is another element that is equally, if not more, important. At TASO, there is a choir, a group of about 30, who perform for those who visit. They are all men and women, mothers and fathers, who have AIDS themselves. They sing when you come by.

In Africa, it is not unusual that when you go to a group, they will sing, hello; when you leave, they sing, good-bye. When you are there, they sing about what they are thinking about. It is an African style that really grows on you.

But the TASO choir sang some songs they had written. Some of them are very basic—"When We Come Together We Feel Strong." This support group keeps the people going, day in and day out, to know that others suffer from this disease and that they can rely on one another for consoling and for strength. I am proud that the U.S. Government, through the US Agency for International Development, helps support this TASO clinic.

As I watched this choir and listened to them sing—and they were very good—I looked into their eyes and thought: There must be some anger or resentment about this.

There is almost a resignation to this disease, this HIV. One of the songs, which a young lady named Grace had written for the TASO choir is entitled "Why Me?" It just breaks your heart to hear them sing: "Why me? Why him? Why her? Why you? Why me?"

We went to another project, which I think is a good investment, a support group called NACWOLA, the National Community of Women Living with AIDS. It is a group that counsels women with AIDS and children. They have a little house in which they come together and meet on a regular basis. They talk to one another and try to help one another.

They have a special project. It is called the "Memory Book." Mothers sit down and try to write their life's story in this book, with family photos, and they talk about where they came from and who their parents were and experiences they have had. And they talk about their children because, you see, they want to leave these books for their kids, so that when they are gone—and they know that day is coming—their children will have this memory book to look at.

I sat on the porch there at the NACWOLA house in Kampala, Uganda,

as two of the mothers, Beatrice and Jackie, read to me from their books. I realized then that I was in a nation that had turned into a hospice. These people were not crying. They were not angry. They were doing all they could do. They were trying to get by every day and leave a legacy for the kids who were playing in the yard.

The kids gathered around us and started singing. When they started singing, they talked about their future. They know their parents have AIDS. They know their lives are uncertain. They said: We hope we don't end up with cruel stepparents. We hope we don't end up on the streets. As they were singing, I looked behind me, and there were the mothers holding the Memory Books.

That is the state of Africa today. Some people ask: Why should we care? It is half a world away. We will never see these people. Of course, a lot of things have devastated Africa through the generations. I think there is more to the story.

The AIDS epidemic, most people believe, started in Africa. It is questionable when it started, but most people think it started there. It is now a worldwide epidemic. It is naive to believe that you can contain this kind of health problem and believe that it is not going to travel beyond other countries' borders.

Equally important, I think we understand, as Americans, one of the things that makes us different from some other people in the world is that we do care and we do try to make a difference. I think we can make a significant difference when it comes to this AIDS epidemic in Africa.

Let me tell you some of the things we can do and some of the things we are doing.

Senator FEINGOLD talked about the medical research going on in Africa. It is not at the same level as medical research in the United States. You do not have drug companies that are inspired by huge profits and think if they can find the cure to AIDS they are going to make billions of dollars. That isn't going to happen. These folks are looking at medical research at a much different level.

At Mulago Hospital in Kampala, Uganda, they have a project underway where they are testing this drug, Nevirapine. Nevirapine has been mentioned on the floor a couple times. A dosage of this drug to a mother at the time she goes into labor, and then a dose to the baby, basically cuts in half the transmission of AIDS from mother to child. This is a simple drug, at \$4 a dose, which can make a big difference. It is not likely to be a big seller in the United States because no drug company will get rich at \$4 a dose. But it works. It appears to work very well.

Thank goodness the Centers for Disease Control—part of our Government—Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, and this hospital have come together. They are showing how it can make a difference.

They are looking for supplements to diet—for example, whether additional vitamin A can mean that a person with HIV can live longer and be healthier.

They are operating at a lower level because that is all they have to work with. It is a survivalist approach. But it is making life better and longer for a lot of people. It is working. We are helping it to work. I am glad the United States is part of that.

There is a woman who has become somewhat legendary. Anyone who has not seen this I hope will get a chance to see this Newsweek cover story: "10 Million Orphans." It talks about the AIDS epidemic in Africa. Her name is Bernadette Nakayima, and she lives near Kampala, Uganda. She had 11 children. Ten of her children died of AIDS. They are buried on a hillside by their home. The one surviving daughter lives nearby.

This 69-year-old grandmother, after her 10 children died, brought in the orphans to her home. She has 35 orphans in her home. How does she get by? Well, according to the Newsweek story, at one point she did not think she could. She gathered all the children in a room and said: Close the doors and lock them. We're just going to starve to death here. We can't make it. But luckily somebody knocked on the door and said: Come out. We're going to try to help you. People are trying to help.

As I speak here on the floor today, Sandra Thurman, who is the head of the effort to deal with AIDS, is in the gallery. I was in Africa with her. She has visited Bernadette many times. She draws the same inspiration, as everyone who goes there, to think of the strength of this woman who, in advancing years, is trying to raise 35 grandchildren, one of whom, incidentally, is HIV positive.

How is she getting by? It points to another thing at which we should look; that is the fact that she is part of something called FINCA. FINCA is a microcredit program in Africa. Microcredit, as I mentioned earlier, is a small loan, primarily to women where they can dramatically improve their lives by having a little additional income.

Women like Bernadette are able to bring in AIDS orphans and help them lead normal lives in a family setting rather than on the streets.

One of the meetings I had with a FINCA group was in Lugazi, Uganda. I will not soon forget where we had the meeting. Our meeting of 20 women, who were coming to report on their loans and to seek additional credit assistance, took place in a little hut that a few days before had been a chicken coop. The chickens, who had been moved out of that coop to the adjoining room, squawked during the whole meeting. But these ladies were not going to be deterred by a few angry roasters. They were there to get on with the business. The business was borrowing money to improve their lives.

I asked one of the ladies: What have these microcredit loans meant to you? She said, through an interpreter: Because of these loans, my knees have gone soft. I had no idea what she was talking about. She explained. She said: Before I had microcredit, before I had more income, I used to have to crawl on my knees to my husband to beg for money for food for the children and to send the kids to school. Now I have some money. I don't have to crawl. My knees are going soft.

That story was repeated over and over again by the 20 women gathered there. I said: How many of you who are borrowing this money, by these small loans that make such a difference, have brought in AIDS orphans to your home? Half of them raised their hand—two children here, and four here, and six here. They had the wherewithal to do it.

In countries where people survive on 30 cents a day, it does not take much to dramatically improve the quality of life and keep these children within the extended family. It can help. It can work.

The second thing that is helping is food assistance. We are directing food assistance in areas where we know that we have serious problems with AIDS orphans. We need to do more in this regard.

I use these examples so that people who might otherwise want to throw up their hands and say: Well, it is a problem we should worry about, but how can we possibly address it if there are so many people victimized by it? There are things we can do, small things for a great nation to do, that can make a great difference, small things that can save lives and give families a chance.

I am going to introduce legislation today which is entitled: "The AIDS Orphans Relief Act of 2000." It addresses microcredit to try to increase it as an effort to help AIDS orphans find homes and to increase food assistance for that same purpose.

This is not going to solve the problem, by a long shot. There is so much we need to do in the areas of research and prevention, creating an infrastructure for distributing the medicines that are available in Africa. I hope this will be one part of an agenda, that we can gather together and speak, as Senator FEINGOLD and Senator FEINSTEIN did, about the pharmaceutical side of it, address the larger issues that the World Bank might be able to help us with, through Senator JOHN KERRY's bill and Congressman JIM LEACH's bill, and invite all of the Members of the Senate to focus on this issue in a bipartisan fashion. I believe sincerely we can make a difference.

It has been said earlier that this devastating disease is lowering the life expectancy of people in Africa. You find, when you go to some countries, such as South Africa, that employers will hire two people for a skilled position because they know one is not going to survive. Those are the odds. That is

what they are up against. It calls on us to focus on what we can do to help.

A little while ago we had a meeting of Democratic Senators not far from the floor, and Sandy Thurman, our AIDS director, was there, as well as a young woman named Rory Kennedy. She is the daughter of Robert Kennedy. She has been recognized for her skill as a producer of documentary films. She presented for us a 12-minute documentary film on the AIDS epidemic in Africa. It is a film she put together when she visited with a group not that long ago. It really does put in human terms what I am trying to say in words.

You see the faces of those little children. You see the trips to the graveyard to bury babies who have died because of HIV. You go down the road, as you would in Kampala, Uganda, and you notice the stalls of produce. Then at the end, you see the huge sign that says "coffins."

When I spoke to the Ambassador, Martin Brennan, he told of going to a village outside of Kampala and seeing in the town square stacks and stacks of coffins. It, unfortunately, is a big growth industry in Africa. It calls on us to address this in so many different ways.

Let me tell you another way that may not seem obvious that is part of this as well. While we were traveling in Uganda, we went to an agricultural research station. This is a station which brought together some ag research which the United States has supported for years. Cassava is a basic root crop used as a staple for the diet of many people in central and eastern Africa. Not that long ago, there was this virus that affected this crop and dramatically reduced it. People were going hungry and starving to death. Because of this research at this station they have found ways to end this so-called mosaic virus. People are now seeing this cassava grow, and they are once again feeding their families.

It was a little thing, lost in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, which means that millions have a chance to live. Some people will question ag research from time to time, even mock it. Yet we see day to day in Africa and in the United States that it pays off. This is a part of the world that has been ravaged by civil war, ravaged by famines as bad as the potato famine, ravaged by epidemic, now as bad as the bubonic plague, all of these things are coming down on central Africa like four horsemen of the apocalypse. They are coping with it every single day.

We need to do all we can to make sure that our country, working with other countries, can try to stop this crisis from getting any worse. The lessons we will learn in Africa will help us save lives there. It will help us take the message to other parts of the world, such as India and other parts of Asia, that are threatened with this epidemic. But there is something else we will learn. We will learn from the courage and compassion of the people who

live in this area that there is strength in the darkest hour.

I came back from this trip determined to do something. I hope that with this meeting today of several Senators on the floor of the Senate we can start this dialog. I think we cannot only reach across the aisle to my friends on the Republican side and share our feelings, but reach out beyond this Chamber and beyond this Government. I think we can reach out to churches across America.

I have written a letter to the Catholic bishops in my home State of Illinois. There, as a little boy growing up, I used to give pennies and nickels every day to the missions. It was something they did automatically in Catholic schools when you were growing up. I didn't know where that money was going. I barely knew what the missions were. But when I went to Sunday Mass at the basilica in Nairobi, Kenya, and saw 2,000 people, standing room only, I found out where that money went. It converted a lot of people to Catholicism, as the Anglican Church converted a lot of people to their religion. Now we have a chance to say to some of these religions, such as Catholicism and others: We made an investment in Africa at a time when they needed our help, and now they need it again. Can we bring together the religions of the United States that have focused on Africa and try to cope with this crisis?

The head of the National AIDS Commission in Uganda is a retired Catholic bishop. I think that says a lot. It says that they are crossing religious boundaries in an attempt to deal with this epidemic and this crisis.

When it comes to the security side of this issue, I have spoken about the military in Uganda, and I am afraid it is the case in so many other countries. They, too, are infected, and that is a source of concern for all of us. If your military cannot respond to a crisis in the country, it fosters instability. It creates security problems which reach far beyond that country, that may even involve the United States, as in the past 10 years we have been to Africa on peacekeeping missions, some with tragic results.

So if we can work, and I hope we can, through our skills and our military to help them cope with this disease in the ranks of the militaries in Africa, it is good for them and their countries. It is good for our world. I will be working with my colleagues to see if we can achieve that.

Let me close by thanking the Chair for this opportunity to speak. I have gone beyond the usual allotment of time. I thank the Chair for his patience in that regard. I hope in this session of Congress we can come together as they do at TASO in Kampala, Uganda, and find the strength and support to care for people halfway around the world, people perhaps of different color from some of us, but people who are our brothers and sisters.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, HIV/AIDS in Africa has become a global emergency unlike anything that public health has seen in this century. According to Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa, "AIDS in Africa is a plague of biblical proportions. It is a holy war that we must win."

The number of HIV-infected individuals in Africa has now reached 22.5 million. As a nation, America is all too familiar with the devastation that AIDS causes. Nearly 10 years ago, Senator HATCH and I sponsored the Ryan White CARE act, the legislation that helped begin the long battle to deal with the AIDS epidemic in this country. The situation has steadily improved in the United States, because extensive efforts have been made and needed systems of care have been put in place. The CARE Act has helped us make great progress.

We began our fight against AIDS in the United States with the advantage of having the world's most advanced health care infrastructure, but the situation in the developing world is much different. Resources are scarce, infrastructure is limited, and the people of Africa face a situation that is not improving but is steadily growing worse.

Officials at UNICEF have described the situation that many nations in sub-Saharan Africa face as a "tripod of deprivation" that involves poverty, debt and AIDS. Any of these three crises would be severe on its own. Taken together they are devastating. The result for the African continent is enormous pain, suffering, and death. Decades of progress on economic growth, infant mortality, and life expectancy are all threatened. The AIDS virus is infecting every aspect of life for the people of Africa, from work and family to education and even national stability.

The effect on the African workforce is especially ominous. African nations have worked hard for the economic development that is emerging. But HIV is striking vast numbers of individuals during their most productive years, and all of this recent progress is being placed in jeopardy. AIDS directly undermines productivity by increasing absenteeism. It raises the cost of business through increased need for benefits. Costs of recruiting and training employees are rising, as current employees die or become disabled. Higher costs also threaten international investment in Africa, which is essential for future economic development.

Over 8 million children have already been orphaned by AIDS in Africa. In the next decade, that number will reach 40 million, a number equal to the total number of children in the United States who live east of the Mississippi River. Children are forced to leave their schools in order to care for dying parents and put food on the table for themselves and their family. Many of these children are already suffering emotionally from the loss of one or both of their parents, and now they are

losing the vital educational opportunities they need and deserve.

HIV infection rates are as high as 80 percent in some African military forces, and the disease is threatening the security and stability of these nations. Forces that have been weakened by disease are less capable of defending their nations, maintaining order, or protecting citizens. The concern is immediate. A 1998 UNAIDS study reported that in both Zimbabwe and Cameroon, HIV infection rates were three to four times higher in the military than in the civilian population.

While new therapies have begun to offer hope in the fight against AIDS in the United States, the cost of these treatments has put them out of reach for developing countries, where the epidemic is raging out of control. During the past six years, there has been a 300 percent increase in annual cases of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. Yet until this year, U.S. funding for AIDS programs overseas had remained level-funded at \$125 million. When inflation is taken into account, level funding means a 25 percent decrease between 1993 and 1999.

Last year, many of us in Congress and the administration worked hard to obtain an additional \$100 million to fight the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. This funding was a vital first step towards turning the tide, but it is not nearly enough. This money will be used for prevention efforts, counseling and testing, direct medical services, and also to assist the millions of children orphaned by AIDS in the region. The additional \$100 million that President Clinton has included in his FY2001 budget will enable us to reach an even greater proportion of people infected with HIV in Africa.

Yesterday I cosponsored the bipartisan legislation introduced by Senator BARBARA BOXER and Senator GORDON SMITH that extends the U.S. commitment to sub-Saharan Africa through 2005. We know that increased U.S. aid for Africa is essential. In partnership with other donors, the U.S. invested \$46 million in HIV prevention and care in Uganda, and helped cut the HIV rates by more than half.

Prevention is effective, but it costs money. Treatment and care also cost money. Yet the nations of sub-Saharan Africa are among the poorest in the world, and they cannot and should not bear this burden alone. The U.S. is the leading donor of development assistance for HIV/AIDS prevention and control in the developing world, but our response to this crisis has so far been inadequate. The United States currently ranks ninth in terms of the percentage of GNP devoted to international AIDS programs. This is not the leadership that this country has shown in the past, when nations have been torn apart by tragedy.

I recently learned about a couple in Senegal who were both stricken by HIV. They have a small shop that sells newspapers, candy and other goods,

and are economically well-off in comparison to many of their fellow citizens. Their financial situation allowed them to afford some AIDS drugs, but the cost of basic treatment for one person takes thirty percent of their monthly income. They have been forced to choose which one of them will take these life-saving medications. That is a decision that no couple should have to make.

The rate at which AIDS has spread in developing countries should alarm all nations and peoples. The world is too small for us to think that a virus which has infected 34 million people and killed 14 million is under control and will not continue to infect our own country.

This global epidemic has already taken more lives than all but one of the major conflicts of this century. Only World War II surpasses AIDS in terms of human devastation in this century. We cannot stand by and let this level of suffering continue.

We can and must do more as a nation to fight this growing global epidemic. It is estimated that by the year 2005 more than 100 million people worldwide will have become infected with HIV—100 million people. The magnitude of the emergency is immense. What will we tell our children and our grandchildren about how we faced the largest human tragedy of our time? I hope that we can tell them that we reached across the aisle and then across the ocean to help those caught in this relentless epidemic. This is not about Democrats or Republicans.

This is about America, and what we stand for as a nation and as a world leader. I urge my colleagues to do all we can to save lives and ease this tragic suffering.

MICROSOFT AND THE AMICUS BRIEF

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this is an appropriate time to bring my colleagues up to speed on the continuing saga that is the Microsoft anti-trust trial. Since I last came to the floor to discuss this issue, the industry, of which Microsoft is a part, has once again changed dramatically. For instance, American Online recently triggered the largest corporate merger in history with the acquisition of Time-Warner. This media giant is now poised to compete vigorously in every aspect of the Internet, from the wires that connect you, to the content you watch. To meet this challenge, Microsoft and a legion of its competitors must be allowed to compete vigorously in the ever-changing landscape of the information technology industry.

My fellow Senators will soon receive a "dear colleague" letter endorsing an amicus brief filed on behalf of Microsoft by the Association for Competitive Technology (ACT). ACT is a nonprofit association representing more than 9,000 companies in the information technology industry. ACT's member-

ship is made up mostly of small and medium sized businesses but includes household names such as CompUSA, Excite at Home, Intel, Microsoft and Symantec. These members come from all walks of the industry, unified by the cause of protecting competition and innovation in the industry.

This brief was prepared by a bipartisan group of legal heavyweights including former White House Counsels Lloyd Cutler and C. Boyden Gray as well as former Attorneys General Griffin Bell and Nicholas Katzenbach. It eloquently reinforces many of the points that I have made on the Senate floor for over a year now. In the end, I think you will agree that this document reveals the glaring weaknesses in the DoJ's case against Microsoft.

The amicus brief reinforces the point that current antitrust laws expressly allow, and even encourage, the kind of competitive activity that the government seeks to stop; the kind of competition that continues to benefit not only consumers, but the hundreds of thousands of high-tech workers and entrepreneurs in the software and hardware industries as well. It also sounds the familiar refrain that the government needs to take a highly pragmatic and cautious approach to antitrust enforcement in this dynamic industry.

Unfortunately, Judge Jackson found last year that Microsoft's Windows holds a lawfully acquired monopoly of the market for "operating systems" for Intel-compatible personal computers. Although Microsoft may later challenge this finding, the brief assumes for purposes of argument that the finding is correct.

The plaintiffs (the federal government and several states) charge that Microsoft, in adding the Internet Explorer browser to Windows and marketing the package, violated antitrust laws. The amicus brief—and the Supreme Court cases on which it relies—demonstrates that the purpose of the antitrust laws is to protect consumers and competition—not competitors—and that Microsoft, far from violating the antitrust laws, competed vigorously to the immense benefit of consumers.

Vigorous competition, which antitrust laws are designed to protect, produces innovation, better products, more efficient distribution, and lower prices. All of these results of competition are to the benefit of consumers. The antitrust laws do not require competing firms to be nice to one another, or protect firms against their more powerful rivals. It is not wrong for any company to want to take business away from its rivals.

The antitrust laws encourage a firm that holds a lawfully acquired monopoly to compete hard to keep that monopoly. They also encourage such a firm to enter other fields where, by competing with better and cheaper products, it can benefit consumers.

Judge Jackson found that the widespread use of the Windows operating

system has made it a platform for a vast range of computer applications that consumers now enjoy.

Judge Jackson also found that when Microsoft added a superior Internet browser (Internet Explorer) and offered it to consumers at no extra charge, these actions gave consumers better access to the Internet and spurred its rival Netscape to improve the quality of its "Navigator" browser and to distribute it at no charge.

Microsoft did not drive Netscape's Navigator out of the browser market. On the contrary, even Judge Jackson found that Netscape's "installed base" has more than doubled since 1995 and will continue to grow in the future. Browser competition remains vigorous.

Microsoft did successfully break into the browser market and did obtain a share of that market for itself. The single most important reason, as even Judge Jackson found, is that Microsoft rival AOL itself chose and re-chose Internet Explorer over Navigator, even though AOL now owns Netscape. AOL made that choice because Microsoft offered a better product, better service, and better marketing support than did Netscape.

Microsoft's agreements with PC manufacturers and Internet access providers to distribute Internet Explorer were lawful agreements designed to help Microsoft break into a browser market in which Netscape was the overwhelmingly dominant firm. It was good for competition and consumers, for Microsoft to introduce competition into that market.

The plaintiff's theory is essentially that Microsoft, once it had a lawful monopoly in the operating systems market, should not have aggressively entered the browser market, because Netscape's dominance of that market might have led to more competition in operating systems. That theory is bad law. Again, the law protects consumers, not competitors. Consumers benefit when any firm, including one holding a lawful monopoly, competes aggressively to challenge another firm's incipient monopoly in a related field.

This competition helped usher in the most important change occurring on earth today. The power of information has been taken from a few large centralized institutions and put directly into the hands of people in every town and village across our globe via the Internet.

Not only is the number of users increasing exponentially, but the amount of information available to them is also growing at an unprecedented rate. The International Data Corporation estimated the number of web pages on the World Wide Web at 829 million at the end of 1998, and projects that the number will be 7.7 billion by 2002.

The explosive growth of the Internet will eventually have a fundamental impact on every aspect of American life, and will introduce a vastly different landscape in high-technology than exists today. Users will not necessarily

use stationary personal computers to access information, but instead rely on Web phones, palmtop computers and similar technology that is developing at an exponential rate. Microsoft must be allowed to compete in order to survive this transition.

Although Microsoft is a large and powerful company, it faces aggressive present and future competition in every field it enters, and if it wants to maintain its present position it must compete vigorously on every front, with innovations, improved quality and lower prices. That is exactly what anti-trust policy seeks to promote.

For a court to enter into this vitally important and rapidly changing field and seek to dictate what products shall be made and sold by which firms would be a tragic mistake. For example, if a few years ago a court had ordered Microsoft not to add Internet Explorer to Windows, there would today be fewer hardware manufacturers, fewer software developers, fewer applications, and a far less developed Internet, and the world would be a poorer place.

The best solution for both the administration and the courts is to retire from the field and to allow the most dynamic company in the history of technology to continue its growth in a competitive market, free from government interference.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, February 2, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,702,134,559,981.88 (Five trillion, seven hundred two billion, one hundred thirty-four million, five hundred fifty-nine thousand, nine hundred eighty-one dollars and eighty-eight cents).

One year ago, February 2, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,594,817,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-four billion, eight hundred seventeen million).

Five years ago, February 2, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,814,204,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fourteen billion, two hundred four million).

Ten years ago, February 2, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$2,987,306,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighty-seven billion, three hundred six million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost \$3 trillion—\$2,714,828,559,981.88 (Two trillion, seven hundred fourteen billion, eight hundred twenty-eight million, five hundred fifty-nine thousand, nine hundred eighty-one dollars and eighty-eight cents) during the past 10 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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 a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:52 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2005. An act to establish a statute of repose for durable goods used in a trade of business.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 2005. An act to establish a statute of repose for durable goods used in a trade of business; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-7299. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-317" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0517), received December 16, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7300. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-236 (1-6/1-10)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0015), received January 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7301. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-235 (12-29/1-3)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0545), received January 3, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7302. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes and Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-153 (11-22/11-29)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0477), received November 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7303. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-316 (11-19/11-22)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0457), received November 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7304. 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; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NM-318 (1-49/1-20)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0031), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7305. 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 Series Reciprocating Engines; Docket No. 95-ANE-39 (11-29/12-2)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0501), received December 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7306. 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 Aircraft Engines CF34 Series Turbofan Engines; Request for Comments; Docket No. 98-ANE-19 (11-19/11-29)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0481), received November 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7307. 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 GE90 Series Turbofan Engines; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-NE-62 (1-6/1-10)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0013), received January 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7308. 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 CF6-80E1A2 Series Turbofan Engines; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-E-52" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0487), received November 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7309. 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; Cessna Aircraft Company Model 182S Airplanes; Docket No. 98-CE-125" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0044), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7310. 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; Cessna Aircraft Company 300 and 400 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 97-CE-67" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0030), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7311. 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; Agusta S.p.a. Model AB412 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Docket No. 98-SW-69 (1-26/1-27)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0046), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7312. 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; Agusta S.p.a. Model A109A and A109A II Helicopters; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-SW-91 (1-5/1-6)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0006), received January 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7313. 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; Agusta S.p.a. Model AB412 Helicopters; Docket No. 99-SW-63 (12-20/12-20)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0522), received December 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7314. 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; Agusta S.p.a. Model 109A and 109A II Helicopters; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-SW-64 (12-20/12-23)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0531), received December 23, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7315. 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; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11 (CL600), CL-600-2A12 (CL601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL601-3A, 3R, and CL-604) Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-166 (12-28/12-30)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0541), received January 4, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7316. 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; Bombardier Model DHC-7 and -8 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-152 (11-22/12-2)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0503), received December 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7317. 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; Bombardier Model DHC-7-100 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-107 (1-27/1-27)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0042), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7318. 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; Lockheed Model 382 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-371 (12-3/12-6)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0504), received December 6, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7319. 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; Lockheed Model L1011 385 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-122 (11-30/12-2)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0496), received December 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7320. 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; Lockheed Model 1329-23 and 1329-25; Docket No. 99-NM-151 (11-22/11-22)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0473), received November 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7321. 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; Lockheed Model L-14 and L-18 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-142 (11-22/11-22)" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0472), received November 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7322. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations", received January 31, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7323. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "McLeod v. United States", received February 1, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7324. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Passive Foreign Investment Companies; Definition of Marketable Stock" (RIN1545-AW69) (TD8867), received February 1, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7325. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Export Certificates for Sugar-Containing Products Subject to Tariff-Rate Quota" (RIN1515-AC55), received February 1, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7326. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to progress in achieving the performance goals referenced in the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992, as amended; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7327. A communication from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, a report of the status of loans and guarantees issued under the Act as of September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7328. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Virginia Regulatory Program", received February 2, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7329. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-238, "Board of Trustees of the

University of the District of Columbia Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7330. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-237, "Disposal of District Owned Surplus Real Property Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7331. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-234, "Technical Amendments Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7332. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-236, "Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Management Control Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7333. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-235, "Housing Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7334. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-213, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 486, S.O. 99-67, Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7335. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-214, "Dedication of Land within Square 557 for Public Alley Purposes, S.O. 93-207, Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7336. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-215, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 105, S.O. 97-245, Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7337. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-218, "Management Supervisory Service Exclusion Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7338. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-217, "Performance Rating Levels Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7339. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-219, "School Proximity Traffic Calming Temporary Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7340. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-220, "Citizens with Mental Retardation Substituted Consent for Health Care Decisions Temporary Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7341. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-224, "Dedication and Designation of Harry Thomas Way, N.E. Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7342. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-216, "Executive Service Residency Requirement Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7343. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 13-233, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1942, S.O. 98-21, of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7344. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "Well Classification for Downhole Hydrocarbon/Water Separators; UIC Program Guidance #82"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7345. 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 State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators" (FRL #6532-2), received February 1, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7346. 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, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6530-6), received January 28, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7347. 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; Maryland, Post-1996 Rate of Progress Plan for Cecil County and Revisions to the 1990 Base Year Emissions Inventory" (FRL #6530-8), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7348. 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; Maryland; 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan for the Baltimore Ozone Nonattainment Area" (FRL #6531-1), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7349. 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, Kern County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6529-4), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7350. 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, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6528-5), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7351. 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 Plan; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Kern County, San Diego County, San Joaquin Valley Unified County Air Pollution Control Districts and South Coast Air Quality Management Districts" (FRL #6529-6), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7352. 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 "Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to Performance Testing Regulation" (FRL #6527-2), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7353. 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 #6529-1), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7354. 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; Georgia: Approval of Revisions to Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Portion" (FRL #6528-9), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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. BURNS:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a warm water fish hatchery at Fort Peck Lake, Montana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2028. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

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; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2030. A bill to authorize microfinance and food assistance for communities affected by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2031. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the

issuance of a certificate for subminimum wages for individuals with impaired vision or blindness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2032. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to address the issue of mother-to-child transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2033. A bill to provide for negotiations for the creation of a trust fund to be administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or the International Development Association to combat the AIDS epidemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2034. A bill to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a warm water fish hatchery at Fort Peck Lake, Montana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Fort Peck Fish Hatchery Authorization Act of 2000. As you may know, the Fort Peck project was built in the 1930s to dam the Upper Missouri River. The original authorization legislation for the Fort Peck project, and subsequent revisions and additions, left a great many promises unmet. A valley was flooded, but originally Montana was promised increased irrigation, low-cost power, and economic development. Since the original legislation, numerous laws have been enacted promising increased recreational activities on the lake, and also that the federal government would do more to support the fish and wildlife resources in the area.

In this day and age, economic development in rural areas is becoming more and more dependent upon recreation and strong fish and wildlife numbers. The Fort Peck area is faced with a number of realities. First, the area is in dire need of a fish hatchery. The only hatchery in the region to support warm water species is found in Miles City, Montana. It is struggling to meet the needs of the fisheries in the area, yet it continues to fall short. Additionally, an outbreak of disease or failure in the infrastructure at the Miles City hatchery would leave the entire region reeling with no secondary source to support the area's fisheries.

We are also faced with the reality that despite the promises given, the State of Montana has had to foot the bill for fish hatchery operations in the area. Since about 1950 the State has been funding these operations with little to no support from the Corps of Engineers. A citizens group spanning the State of Montana finally decided to make the federal government keep its promises.

Last year the citizens group organized, and state legislation subsequently passed to authorize the sale of a warm water fishing stamp to begin collecting funds for the eventual operation and maintenance of the hatchery. I helped the group work with the Corps of Engineers to ensure that \$125,000 in last year's budget was allocated to a feasibility study for the project, and Montanans kept their end of the bargain by finding another \$125,000 to match the Corps expenditure. Clearly, we are putting our money, along with our sweat, where our mouth is.

Recreation is part of the local economy. But the buzzword today is diversity. Diversify your economy. The Fort Peck area depends predominately on agriculture. More irrigated acres probably aren't going to help the area pull itself up by its boot straps. But a stronger recreational and tourism industry sure will help speed things up.

A lot of effort has already gone into this project. A state bill has been passed. The Corps has dedicated a project manager to the project. Citizens have raised money and jumped over more hurdles than I care to count. But the bottom line is that this is a great project with immense support. It is a good investment in the area, and it helps the federal government fulfill one thing that it ought to—its promises.

Mr. President, I want to acknowledge that this legislation is still a work in progress and many of the specifics will change as the Corps completes its feasibility study on the project. It may cost slightly more. It may cost less. The cost share requirement may need to be altered to make the project work, but I feel this legislation must be introduced now to expedite its consideration.●

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2028. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTERNET NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Internet Non-Discrimination Act. The central principle of this bill is that our tax policy should not discriminate against the most vibrant part of our nation's economy. The legislation would extend indefinitely the Internet Tax Freedom Act's three-year moratorium on discriminatory taxes against the Internet

and electronic commerce. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators ABRAHAM and LEAHY.

Three years ago, when Congressman CHRIS COX and I introduced the Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA), we said you can't squeeze the new economy into a set of rules written for smoke-stack industry. At that time, opponents predicted that retailers would vanish from Main Streets across America. Transcripts from hearings held on the legislation in the summer of 1997 are replete with opponents' predictions that a parade of horrors would be visited on every small merchant in every town in the United States. I am pleased to report that none of the horrors has come to pass.

In fact, this is what has happened in the 15 months since the Internet Tax Freedom Act was passed by the Senate 98-2 and became law.

States and localities have continued to collect sales and use taxes, and state budgets ended fiscal 1999 with a \$35 billion surplus. In California—one of the most wired states—1999 sales tax collections are up 20 percent over 1998.

Traditional bricks and mortar retailers had one of their best holiday seasons, recording a nearly 8% jump in sales over the previous year.

A recent survey of 1,500 Main Street businesses nationwide found that 74 percent have gone online since 1997.

E-commerce has become part of the retail landscape, but still accounts for only 3/100s of one percent of total retail sales.

States with the highest level of Internet use are also those with some of the largest gains in tax revenues.

It is clear to me that while state and local tax collectors sat wringing their hands, America's merchants were working on web pages. Main Street merchants seized the opportunity to expand their sales to new markets by going online. They also recognized the efficiencies of conducting their business-to-business transactions online. Rather than weaken Main Street merchants, the Internet has strengthened them. Rather than drain state and local tax coffers, the technological neutrality of the Internet Tax Freedom Act allowed online business to grow and state and local authorities to continue to collect lawful, nondiscriminatory taxes. The technological neutrality of the ITFA contributed to the rapid transformation of a bricks and mortar economy into a clicks and mortar economy.

I want the success of the bricks and clicks economy to continue, but consumers and businesses need some certainty. They need to know they won't have to start paying new taxes targeted specifically at e-commerce when the current moratorium expires in October 2001. That's why the ban on discriminatory taxes against the Internet and e-commerce should be made permanent.

The Internet Non-Discrimination Act we are introducing today will do just

that. It continues the policy of technological neutrality. It allows state and local tax authorities to continue to collect lawful, nondiscriminatory sales or use taxes on online sales. It will give the governors time to see if they can move forward with their technological fix for collecting remote sales and use tax—a voluntary plan which will require the cooperation of every business in this nation, from Bandon, Oregon to Bangor, Maine. And, finally, it extends permanently a policy that has worked well for the last 15 months and under which consumers, businesses and state and local tax collectors have lived—and thrived.

In about two months the Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce will issue its final report. After having talked yesterday with the Chairman of the Commission, Virginia Governor James Gilmore, I am hopeful that the Commission will endorse the approach we are taking in this bill.

If Congress does not act this year to extend the technologically neutral policy that is at the heart of the Internet Non-Discrimination Act, consumers and businesses will face thousands of tax authorities in this country jumping into their pockets when the current moratorium expires in October 2001. Consumers and businesses want certainty that they won't suddenly be facing an onslaught of new, confusing and discriminatory taxes.

A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives today by Congressman CHRIS COX, with whom I've worked on this issue for four years now. I am hopeful that this, our fourth bipartisan Internet effort, will be as successful as our previous three. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2028

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 "Internet Nondiscrimination Act".

SEC. 2. REPLACEMENT OF MORATORIUM WITH PERMANENT BAN ON NEW, MULTIPLE, AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON THE INTERNET.

Section 1101(a) of title XI of division C of Public Law 105-277 is amended by striking "during the period beginning on October 1, 1998, and ending 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting "on or after October 1, 1998."

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague, Senator WYDEN, in introducing legislation to extend indefinitely the current moratorium on new and discriminatory Internet taxes. Once again, Senator WYDEN has demonstrated his grasp of the crucial issues surrounding electronic commerce and has moved rapidly to assure that potential barriers to the new economy are eliminated before they do any harm. I am pleased to join him in his latest effort.

By now, it is obvious to everyone that e-commerce is the wave of the future. As a matter of fact, it's safe to say that the future is already here. During the week of December 6 alone, Americans bought \$1.22 billion of merchandise online. Sales for 1999 should reach \$64.8 billion. Beyond shopping, 5.3 million households had access to financial transactions like electronic banking and stock trading by the end of last year.

The rate of growth for Internet commerce has been exponential for the past several years. Unfortunately, it's also a tempting target for taxation by the Federal Government, States and localities. And that could slow the growth of e-commerce and of our entire economy.

We responded to this potential problem by passing Senator WYDEN's legislation in 1998, to place a three-year moratorium on new or discriminatory Internet taxes, fees or charges. That legislation also established a Commission to explore the issue of Internet taxation and to submit to Congress a list of recommendations on how the Federal Government should legislate in this area.

We are only halfway through the moratorium, but already it seems there are only two possible conclusions to the Commission. The first is that the wide differences of opinion within the Commission will make it impossible for the members to muster the majority of support necessary to submit a report. This is worrisome, Mr. President, because, unless action is taken by this Congress, the moratorium will expire and the door will be opened to new, discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

The other possibility, more recently offered, is that the Commission may actually recommend an extension of the current moratorium. Whatever the conclusion therefore, the role of Congress is clear; the Internet Tax Moratorium must be extended indefinitely. And because of the limited number of legislative days scheduled in this election year, the process of doing so should begin now.

As everyone knows, the current moratorium only precludes new and discriminatory taxes. It does not address the more difficult question of how to apply existing, State sales taxes to Internet transactions. The Supreme Court has spoken to this issue, ruling that States can indeed impose taxes on transactions much like Internet sales—namely catalog sales. However, States cannot force a business to collect sales taxes on purchases made to States where they have no physical presence or "nexus." This discrepancy in sales taxation between main street businesses and those that sell goods over the Internet will be difficult to address for the following reasons:

First, very soon every business will be an e-business in the sense that they will be using the Internet for sales, supplies, contracting and other purposes. We couldn't stop this process if

we wanted to, and we shouldn't want to. According to one recent survey, 74 percent of brick and mortar, main street businesses have added "click and mortar" Internet services to their business.

Second, the borderless nature of the Internet is going to make it difficult—if not impossible—to determine what constitutes "nexus." For example, what happens when someone in California uses America Online in Virginia to order fudge from the "shopmackinac" website in Michigan, and ships them to a friend in Rhode Island? Which State should claim "nexus?"

Perhaps a "destination-based" Internet sales tax regime would be more effective in terms of collecting State sales taxes. Whatever the eventual outcome, I believe that in light of the present uncertainty it would not be proper for Congress to intervene on this issue. The States must have every opportunity to debate and possibly even initiate a model for addressing the current impasse.

What is necessary is Congressional action to ensure that new, discriminatory taxes are not levied on the Internet by States or localities as a means of substituting perceived lost revenue. Many Governors—including Governor Engler of Michigan—support an extension of the current Internet tax moratorium.

Access fees and similar Internet taxes, whether imposed by the States, localities, or the Federal government, pose a grave threat to the continued evolution of the Internet. America is experiencing a record period of growth and prosperity. In my view, the continued expansion of the economy is due primarily to electronic commerce. The spirit of entrepreneurship which has energized our nation, the adoption of new business models to more fully explore marketing and sales possibilities and the dramatic increase in consumer and business services are all largely the product of our new e-economy. Why on earth would anyone, or any government, want to threaten this dynamic medium when it is still in its infancy by increasing the cost of doing business over the Internet? I certainly do not, and I will continue to work to ensure that neither the Federal government nor other units of government threaten electronic commerce.

If we are able to keep the government focused on removing impediments to electronic commerce rather than interfering in the development and implementation of new technologies then very soon the e-economy will simply be the economy, and our nation will be more prosperous as a result.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HOLINGS):

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; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE KNOW YOUR CALLER ACT OF 2000

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join today with my friend from Tennessee, Senator FRIST, to introduce the Know Your Caller Act of 2000—a bill that will make a real and immediate difference in the lives of all Americans.

Not a week goes by that I don't hear from Virginians about the intrusion of telemarketers into their homes. Although Congress passed the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, or TCPA, in 1991, the law is widely abused—telemarketers openly disregard the law, refusing to identify themselves when asked, and ignoring requests to be placed on "do not call lists."

In recent years, consumers have turned to caller ID services to help them screen out unwanted calls and report those who violate current law to the authorities. Unfortunately, most telemarketers actively block their number from being displayed on caller ID systems, making it difficult to determine the name and employer of the telemarketer. We already require telemarketers to identify themselves when they call, and we should apply this same requirement to their caller ID information.

The Know Your Caller Act of 2000 will prevent companies from blocking their identities on caller ID. Our legislation will require every phone solicitor to reveal the name of the telemarketer who is making the call, as well as a valid telephone number where that company can be reached for purposes of being placed on the do-not-call lists required under current law.

It's time that we gave consumers a way to fight back against these intrusions into their homes, and this bill is the perfect way to do so: by putting an end to caller ID blocks, we can empower the consumer to take action against violators of the TCPA and regain control of their telephones. I urge all of my colleagues to join Senator FRIST and me in supporting this important consumer protection bill.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2032. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to address the issue of mother-to-child transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MOTHER-TO-CHILD HIV PREVENTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce, along with my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, the Mother-to-child HIV Prevention Act, a bill that seeks to address mother-to-child transmission of HIV in developing regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

According to the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), nearly 4.5 million children below the age of 15 years have been infected with HIV since the AIDS epidemic began. More than 3 million have already died of AIDS. Children are becoming infected at the rate of nearly one child every minute, and the overwhelming majority of these children acquired the infection from their mothers.

In July 1999, the National Institutes of Health released a report on the effectiveness of a drug called nevirapine (NVP) in preventing mother-to-child transmission of HIV. NVP is given just once to the mother during labor and once to the baby within three days after birth. It costs \$4 per tablet. The discovery of this relatively simple and inexpensive drug regimen—along with others like it—has created an unprecedented opportunity for international cooperation in the fight against the vertical transmission of HIV.

USAID is currently engaged in four of the eleven vertical transmission pilot projects in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These studies will be completed within the year, at which point the intervention programs can undergo a significant increase in scale. But additional funding is needed.

The cost-effectiveness of these programs is clear. New antiretroviral drug strategies can be a force for social change, providing the opportunity and impetus needed to address long-standing problems in the health care system and the profound stigma associated with HIV-infection and the AIDS disease.

Naturally, primary prevention strategies should remain the top priority in the fight against AIDS, which is why I am requesting these funds in addition to our current efforts. This legislation would give the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) an additional \$25 million every year—for the next five years—to address the growing international dilemma of child victims of the AIDS epidemic.

Mr. President, this bill has the potential to improve the lives of hundreds of thousands of children whose lives are marred by this disease. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge its swift passage into law.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2034. A bill to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL
CONSERVATION AREA ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will help ensure that priceless public lands, including the Yellow Jacket Canyon in the Southwestern corner of my beautiful home state of Colorado, are preserved and managed in the most farsighted and balanced manner possible.

I have developed this legislation with the Department of the Interior and the

local government bodies. It successfully takes into account the concerns of all interested parties. The lands I hope we can protect were the home to a rich civilization before the existence of this hemisphere was known to the western world.

It is imperative we protect these lands now in a reasonable manner to recognize the historical, archeological and cultural value they hold. But, I do not believe we should lock these lands from the public. When public lands are suddenly grabbed away by executive decree it creates ill feelings and distrust.

The hardest hit are those people who live near the land, know it the best and whose livelihood is most connected to it. These are almost always hard working families. Elected local and state governments are also losers. Land grabs seriously erode the very tax base that enables towns, counties and states to provide the services the people need, including schools, law enforcement, and fire protection. Finally, participatory democracy, our nation's bedrock, also loses when an executive decree is used to end run the American people and those they have chosen to represent them in Congress.

Through close consultation with the acting BLM director, Tom Fry, I have drafted a bill which should take into consideration the views of interested parties. I will submit for the record at the conclusion of my statement a number of letters from local organizations and elected officials who support this effort to designate a National Conservation Area. It will allow many of the area's current uses to stay intact while preserving the ancient treasures found there.

I consider the declaration of national monuments by this administration by executive order another example of restricting the use of more public land without working with Congressional delegations, local officials, and other interested parties, as was the case with the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument designation in Utah.

My bill makes sure that the involved parties take part in land management decisions in Colorado. I am trying to ensure that all of the concerns of the people who live and work in the area are heard and addressed before any designation is made by the administration on these public lands.

My bill would require public hearings which would allow everyone involved from local ranchers, recreational users, and all local elected officials to be involved with preserving this area.

As I stated in a letter to Interior Secretary Babbitt on June 8, 1999, Coloradans do not want to see another Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument designation in Colorado. Secretary Babbitt in a letter to Mr. Ed Zink dated November 9, 1999, declared his intent to designating the Anasazi area a national monument by the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906. My bill proposes a compromise to preserve this

area with local input, and avoid the heavy handed action of a monument designation by the President.

My legislation will create a National Conservation Area which will allow the historic uses to take place while efforts are made to conserve the area. I am introducing this legislation to alert the president and the secretary that the citizens in Southwest Colorado desire protection of the area but oppose an executive action that bypasses Congress. This can be accomplished through the legislative process with a hearing scheduled on my bill early this year during the second half of the 106th Congress.

Some in the administration will say that they are currently trying to work with the local community since they held a series of six scheduled town meetings on the proposed withdrawal. From the input that I have received, no one seems sold on the idea at the local level that a monument designation is the only option available to protect the ancient treasures in Southwestern Colorado.

The Southwest Resource Advisory Council was formed to bring forth a wide variety of issues to take into consideration before the Secretary of the Interior moves forward with his intended move to remove the public from the area. The report addresses everything from recreation and tourism to oil and gas development in the area which is how these small communities survive economically. In our efforts to preserve the culture of the area, we cannot continue to lock up all of our public land which so many small towns in the West depend upon.

Our small communities in Southwestern Colorado know how to be good stewards of the land and my bill allows everyone from the local citizens, the Department of Interior, and Congress to work in a collective effort to save this area for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2034

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 "Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that certain areas located in Dolores and Montezuma Counties, Colorado—

(1) contain unique and valuable historical, cultural, scientific, archaeological, natural, and educational resources; and

(2) should be protected and enhanced for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish the Canyons of the Ancients, Colorado, as a National Conservation Area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONSERVATION AREA.**—The term "Conservation Area" means the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area established by section 4(a).

(2) **COUNCIL.**—The term "Council" means the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 5(a).

(3) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term "management plan" means the management plan developed for the Conservation Area under section 4(e).

(4) **MAP.**—The term "Map" means the map entitled "Canyon of the Ancients National Conservation Area Proposal" and dated January 6, 2000.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 4. CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado.

(b) **AREAS INCLUDED.**—The Conservation Area shall consist of approximately 164,000 acres of public land in Dolores and Montezuma Counties, Colorado, as generally depicted on the Map.

(c) **MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a map and legal description of the Conservation Area.

(2) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Copies of the map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(A) the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

(B) the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management in Colorado; and

(C) the offices of the county clerks of Montezuma and Dolores Counties, Colorado.

(d) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Conservation Area in a manner that—

(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the Conservation Area specified in section 2(a); and

(B) is in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) other applicable law, including this Act.

(2) **USES.**—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Conservation Area as the Secretary determines will further the purposes for which the Conservation Area is established.

(3) **VEHICULAR ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport in the Conservation Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for vehicular use under the management plan.

(B) **ACCESS TO LEASES.**—Nothing in this Act prohibits vehicular access to any oil, gas, or carbon dioxide lease by road or pipeline right-of-way.

(4) **WITHDRAWALS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights (including lease rights) and historic rights of access, and except as provided in subparagraph (B), all Federal land within the

Conservation Area and all land and interests in land acquired for the Conservation Area by the United States are withdrawn from—

(i) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) disposal under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(B) **OIL AND GAS LEASING.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this Act prohibits the leasing of oil, gas, or carbon dioxide (including resulting operations) within the Conservation Area under the mineral leasing laws.

(5) **HUNTING AND TRAPPING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this Act affects hunting and trapping within the Conservation Area conducted in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations) of—

(i) the United States; and

(ii) the State of Colorado.

(B) **HUNTING AND TRAPPING ZONES.**—The Secretary, after consultation with the Colorado Division of Wildlife, may promulgate regulations designating zones where and establishing periods when no hunting or trapping shall be permitted in the Conservation Area for reasons of—

(i) public safety;

(ii) administration; or

(iii) public use and enjoyment.

(6) **GRAZING.**—The Secretary shall issue and administer any grazing leases or permits in the Conservation Area in accordance with the same laws (including regulations) and executive orders followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing leases and permits on other land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the long-range protection and management of the Conservation Area.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The management plan shall—

(A) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Conservation Area in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) other applicable law, including this Act;

(B) incorporate, as appropriate, decisions contained in any other management or activity plan for the land within or adjacent to the Conservation Area;

(C) take into consideration any information developed in studies of the land within or adjacent to the Conservation Area; and

(D) give appropriate consideration to the historical involvement of the local community in the interpretation and protection of the resources of the Conservation Area.

(f) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be no protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Conservation Area.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONSERVATION AREA.**—The fact that an activity on land or a use of land in the Conservation Area is not permitted inside the Conservation Area shall not preclude the activity on land or use of land outside the boundary of the Conservation Area (or, in the Conservation Area, on land that is privately held), consistent with other applicable law.

(g) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire non-federally owned land in the Conservation Area only—

(A) from a willing seller; and

(B) through purchase, exchange, or donation.

(2) **MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARY.**—On acquisition of land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall modify the boundary of the Conservation Area to include the acquired land.

(3) **MANAGEMENT.**—Land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be managed as part of the Conservation Area in accordance with this Act.

(h) **INTERPRETIVE SITES.**—The Secretary may establish sites in the Conservation Area to interpret the historical, cultural, scientific, archaeological, natural, and educational resources of the Conservation Area.

(i) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act constitutes an express or implied reservation of any water right.

(j) **WILDERNESS ACTS.**—Nothing in this Act alters any provision of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) that applies to wilderness resources within the Conservation Area.

(k) **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDS.**—Nothing in this Act affects the management of land that is within the Conservation Area and under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish an advisory council to be known as the "Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Advisory Council".

(b) **DUTY.**—The Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Council shall be subject to—

(1) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(d) **MEMBERS.**—The Council shall consist of 15 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) A member of or nominated by the Dolores County Commission.

(2) A member of or nominated by the Montezuma County Commission.

(3) 13 members residing in, or within reasonable proximity to, southwestern Colorado with recognized backgrounds reflecting—

(A) the purposes for which the Conservation Area was established; and

(B) the interests of the stakeholders that are affected by the planning and management of the Conservation Area.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
STATE OF COLORADO, DENVER,
January 10, 2000.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing in support of your efforts to introduce National Conservation Area legislation to address the future of the BLM Anasazi ACEC in Southwest Colorado. Our support is predicated on legislation that addresses the concerns and recommendations outlined in the Working Group Report that was issued by the local ACEC Subcommittee and transmitted by the Southwestern RAC in August of 1999.

We are in agreement with the Montezuma County Commission that the Working Group Report provides the local consensus upon which to develop a legislative framework that addresses the protection of archaeological resources in a manner that protects critical multiple uses on BLM land, respects adjacent private property rights, and insures future opportunities for meaningful local involvement. The prospects for a constructive

and locally acceptable outcome through an open legislative process are far superior to a unilateral National Monument designation, which would be totally unacceptable to the local community.

We offer our assistance to you and the coalition that is emerging in support of a responsible and locally acceptable legislative resolution concerning the future of the ACEC in Southwest Colorado.

Sincerely,

MARK LARSON,
State Representative.
KAY ALEXANDER,
State Representative.
JIM DYER,
State Senator.

MONTEZUMA COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Cortez, CO, December 13, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing to ask for your leadership in the drafting of National Conservation Area Legislation for the BLM Anasazi ACEC, most of which lies in Western Montezuma County. We ask that the NCA legislation be drafted in keeping with the summary report drafted by the ACEC Working Group.

After carefully considering the public input reflected in the Working Group Report, we have spent several months exploring our options. We have concluded that NCA Legislation is the only way to avoid a unilateral National Monument designation which would be totally unacceptable.

We are prepared to work with you and the Department of Interior in any way necessary to support the development and adoption of NCA legislation that is in keeping with the goals and concerns outlined in the Working Group Report.

Sincerely yours,

G. EUGENE STORY.
GLENN E. WILSON, Jr.
J. KENT LINDSAY.

COLORADO FARM BUREAU,
Denver, CO, December 27, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: Colorado Farm Bureau, the state's largest farming and ranching organization, opposes the designation of the Anasazi Cultural Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) as a national monument. As an alternative, we encourage you to introduce legislation that would designate the Anasazi Area of Critical Environmental Concern as a National Conservation Area. After reviewing many options with our members, we feel that legislation to designate the area as a National Conservation Area would be in the best interests of farmers and ranchers in southwest Colorado.

Farm Bureau policy supports local communities, counties, landowners and cities must be allowed input into any designation of national monuments, national parks or conservation use areas as these designations change the current multiple use of public lands and adversely effect adjacent private property rights.

It is our understanding that a National Conservation Area designation would allow continued multiple use on these lands, a Farm Bureau priority. There would also be increased funding to the Bureau of Land Management to protect significant archaeological sites and develop a management plan. A designation would also allow for more local input and avoid a National Monument designation by the administration, which Farm Bureau is opposed to.

Colorado Farm Bureau would like to thank you for your continued support of multiple uses on public lands and offers any assistance in developing legislation. If you have any further questions, please contact Bob Frankmore, Director, National Affairs, (303) 749-7508.

Sincerely,

RAY CHRISTENSEN,
Executive Vice-President.

CLUB 20, "VOICE OF THE WESTERN
SLOPE, SINCE 1953,"

Grand Junction, CO, January 17, 2000.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: On behalf of the Board of Directors of CLUB 20, I would like to convey our support of legislation designating a National Conservation Area which will encompass the Anasazi ACEC. CLUB 20 has been following the efforts of Montezuma County and the BLM RAC group throughout their study process. Designation of the area to be protected needs to be done by legislation, not administrative directives!

CLUB 20 will make every effort to support you and our Montezuma County membership in attaining a legislative solution to the needs of the resource to be protected.

On February 8, 2000, our Natural Resources and Public Lands Committee will be meeting to review issues and recommend resolutions to our Board of Directors. If you feel it beneficial, I will recommend they take action on a definitive resolution that supports the National Conservation Area legislation.

Please keep us posted and let me know how we can help your effort. Thanks for your continued hard work on West Slope issues!

Sincerely,

STAN BROOME,
President.

COLORADO ENVIRONMENTAL COALI-
TION—SIERRA CLUB—THE WILDER-
NESS SOCIETY,

December 26, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing concerning the management of the Anasazi Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) in Southwest Colorado. As you know, Secretary Babbitt convened a working group of local interested parties to gather and compile public input on how the area should be managed so as to protect its plethora of archaeological sites and natural values. The ACEC contains not only the highest concentration of ancient Puebloan sites anywhere in the nation, but pristine wilderness values as well. We have long advocated for the designation of the Cross, Cahone, and Squaw/Papoose Wilderness Study Area (WSA) in the ACEC as wilderness, as the most effective way to protect these unique resources.

There are several options for protecting the area's resources that would provide real protection for sensitive sites, and maintain the region's traditional character. First, the Montezuma County Commission has proposed a draft budget for BLM management of the ACEC that significantly increases the funding for research, site preservation, NEPA analysis, and law enforcement. We think that this budget is a good starting point for discussions on how to adequately fund needed management by the BLM.

In addition, two protective designations for the area have been discussed: National Monument and National Conservation Area. We believe either of these could provide the needed management for the area if they provide strong protection for archaeological

sites from impacts of motorized recreation and oil and gas development. However, in deference to local concerns about increased impacts of tourism with a National Monument, our preference is for the delegation to work together on legislation establishing a National Conservation Area, including the designation of the above-mentioned WSA's as wilderness. We believe this represents the best middle ground mechanism for protecting the area's archaeological resources while also maintaining its rural character.

Wilderness designation for Cross, Cahone, and Squaw/Papoose Canyons would give the best protection to their archaeological sites, while allowing the continuance of traditional activities such as the grazing leases currently in effect. There would be little effect on oil and gas development in the area, since there has been no activity in the canyons, and any future development of existing leases could be accommodated with directional drilling from outside the wilderness boundaries.

Finally, we support Montezuma County's notion of funding part of BLM's management activities for the area through royalties from oil and gas production. Since oil and gas development represents some of the greatest impacts in the area, it stands to reason that some of the royalty funds should remain in the area and provide for its protection.

We urge you to consider these various approaches—increasing funding for management of the area, and designating a National Conservation Area, with wilderness status for the most pristine parts of the ACEC—as a workable solution that addresses local concerns as well as critical protection needs. We look forward to working with you on legislation to address all of these needs.

Sincerely,

JEFF WIDEN,
Colorado Environmental Coalition.
MARK PEARSON,
Sierra Club.
SUZANNE JONES,
The Wilderness Society.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President. This year will mark the 50th anniversary of America's effort in Korea to halt the spread of Communist aggression. Today, I am introducing a bill that is of great importance to me and the more than 1.5 million American men and women who so valiantly fought and supported the U.S. effort in Korea.

On June 25, 1950, the Communist North Korean military invaded South Korea, provoking a swift U.S. response. Two days later, President Truman ordered the intervention that eventually involved 22 nations. In the three years that the U.S. led this multinational force, more than 54,000 Americans gave their lives in the fight to preserve our freedom and democratic way of life. As many as 92,000 soldiers were wounded and more than 8,000 were left behind.

Despite this struggle and sacrifice, I can clearly remember as a young man,

returning home from my years in Korea, feeling as if no one knew that we had ever been gone. It was a harsh, painful conflict that America very quickly wanted to place well behind it. I knew then and understand now why Korea came to be known as "The Forgotten War."

If you visit the Korean War Memorial at the end of the Mall here in Washington, you will see the patrolling squad of 19 weary soldiers frozen in motion, their rustled ponchos and obstacles beneath them a testament to the harsh conditions and terrain that were endured each day of ground combat. On the adjacent granite wall, one will see the faint etchings of 2,400 unnamed faces of the men and women who contributed in the effort in so many different ways. Clearly displayed beyond these images is the message that so profoundly reminds us, "Freedom is Not Free."

Mr. President, the joint resolution that I introduce today marks the passage of these 50 years since the Korean War and recognizes its extraordinary significance in our history. Most importantly, it thanks and honors the brave men and women who fought so hard to defeat the spread of Communism and preserve our freedom and democracy. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to recognize our nation's Korean War veterans and mark this historic anniversary.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 39

Whereas on June 25, 1950, Communist North Korea invaded South Korea with approximately 135,000 troops, thereby initiating the Korean War;

Whereas on June 27, 1950, President Harry S. Truman ordered military intervention in Korea;

Whereas approximately 5,720,000 members of the Armed Forces served during the Korean War to defeat the spread of communism in Korea and throughout the world;

Whereas casualties of the United States during the Korean War included 54,260 dead (of whom 33,665 were battle deaths), 92,134 wounded, and 8,176 listed as missing in action or prisoners of war; and

Whereas service by members of the Armed Forces in the Korean War should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the 50th anniversary of the Korean War;

(2) expresses the gratitude of the people of the United States to the members of the Armed Forces who served in the Korean War;

(3) honors the memory of service members who paid the ultimate price for the cause of freedom, including those who remain unaccounted for; and

(4) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation—

(A) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the sacrifices of the members of the Armed Forces who served and fought in Korea to defeat the spread of communism; and

(B) calling upon the people of the United States to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty by providing that income tax rate bracket amounts, and the amount of the standard deduction, for joint returns shall be twice the amounts applicable to unmarried individuals.

S. 56

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 116

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to establish a training voucher system, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) 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. 463

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of renewal communities, to provide tax incentives relating to such communities, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to encourage the timely development of a more cost effective United States commercial space transportation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1128, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers, to provide for a carryover basis at death, and to establish a partial capital gains exclusion for inherited assets.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.

S. 1446

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to require that before issuing an order, the President shall cite the authority for the order, conduct a cost benefit analysis, provide for public comment, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) 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. 1941

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) 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. 1992

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. L. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to provide States with loans to enable State entities or local governments within the States to make interest payments on qualified school construction bonds issued by the State entities or local governments, and for other purposes.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. RES. 251

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) 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."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, February 10, 2000 at 10:00 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1797, a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land conveyance to the City of Craig, Alaska, and for other purposes; S. 1192, a bill to designate national forest land managed by the Forest Service in the Lake Tahoe Basin as the Lake Tahoe National Scenic Forest and Recreation Area, and to promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe Basin; S. 1664, a bill to clarify the legal effect on the United States of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve in the State of Utah; and S. 1665, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release reversionary interests held by the United State in certain parcels of land in Washington County, Utah, to facilitate an anticipated land exchange; H.R. 2863, a bill to clarify the legal effect on the United States of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve in the State of Utah; H.R. 2862, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release revisionary interests held by the United States in certain parcels of land in Washington County, Utah, to facilitate an anticipated land exchange; S. 1936, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other National Forest System land in the State of Oregon and use the proceeds derived from the sale or exchange for National Forest System purposes.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey (202) 224-2878.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, February 23, 2000 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to conduct oversight on the White River National Forest Plan.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey (202) 224-2878.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, March 2, 2000 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to conduct oversight on the United States Forest Service's proposed revisions to the regulations governing National Forest Planning.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey (202) 224-2878.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEETCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND
FORESTRY

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 3, 2000. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss rural satellite and cable systems loan guarantee proposal and the digital divide in rural America.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 3, 2000 at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed sessions, to receive testimony on current

and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 3, at 11 a.m. to receive testimony from Eric D. Eberhard, nominated by the President to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation; and W. Michael McCabe, nominated by the President to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 3, 2000 at 10 a.m. to consider the nominations to the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 3, 2000 at 2 p.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE
OVERSIGHT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Thursday, February 3, 2000, at 2 p.m., in SD226.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Natacha Blaine of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor during debate today.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow by the name of Charity Bracy be given floor privileges.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lori Way, a legislative fellow from the Department of Commerce, and Wayne Pieringer, a legislative fellow from the Air Force, be granted the privilege of the floor for the 106th Congress.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION
TECHNOLOGY THROUGH PART-
NERSHIP

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the federal investment in the area of education technology has been and continues to be critical in ensuring that schools in all of our states not only have technological capacity but are able to effectively integrate technology into the curriculum for the benefit of all children. The federal government has shown extraordinary leadership in this area through the funding it provides through the E-rate, the Technology Innovations Challenge Grant and Literacy Challenge Fund programs, to name a few. Still, making technology integral to and effective in the learning process is not something that can be done by the federal government alone. To be successful, it will require creating strong and committed partnerships of schools, teachers, institutions of higher education, local and state governments and of course the business community.

There are many businesses that are leading by doing—creating partnerships for the educational benefit of kids. They are investing time and resources in our nation's schools to help make technology a positive and powerful educational tool. Intel is one such company.

The Intel Teach to the Future program brings together expertise and resources from leading high-tech companies to improve technology use in the classroom. This comprehensive teacher development initiative has been designed to address the barriers teachers face in effectively applying computer technology to enhance student learning. In spite of the potential for technology to improve education, only 20% of today's 3.17 million teachers feel prepared to use technology in the classroom. Barriers to success include: lack of access to adequate equipment; lack of training on specific software tools; lack of training on tools to evaluate how, when and where technology should be applied to teach specific subject matter; and finally, lack of an evaluative process that measures success and provides for continuous improvement. Intel has learned from its own and others' experiences and partnered with leaders in the computer industry to deliver a program that can tackle these barriers head-on.

The Teach to the Future program provides a flexible, modular curriculum delivered by teachers for teachers. The training incorporates the use of the Internet, web page design and multimedia software. Every participant is guaranteed access in their classrooms to the hardware and software necessary to put their training into practice. The training of a cadre of local master teachers ensures the knowledge and expertise remains within the school district and provides for ongoing support.

Key elements of the Teach to the Future program include hands-on, face-to-face learning. The curriculum is based on the award-winning Intel ACE Project, authored by the Institute for Computer Technology. It has been delivered to some 3,200 teachers in nine communities over the last two years in cooperation with Microsoft Corporation and Hewlett-Packard Company. Responses from Intel ACE participants show that 98% of the participants found the training to be valuable; 97% developed new skills and knowledge and 94% felt the training would benefit their students. A follow-up study with teachers who participated in the training in 1998 found that more than 84% felt the use of computers had improved their instruction and more than 80% felt their students' learning was enhanced. I heard a great deal about the program that Intel sponsored in Washington, DC and was excited to learn of what a positive impact it had on students and teachers there.

Intel will develop online communities via its web site to support the Regional Training Agencies, Master Teacher and teacher participants. Some of the areas will facilitate administration of the program itself such as registration and evaluation; other services include case studies, a lesson plan database, and chat capability.

In its first three years the program will reach 100,000 teachers in the United States. Giving teachers the tools, know-how and confidence to apply technology effectively in the classroom will have a big payoff in improving educational opportunities for our nation's young people. I applaud Intel and its partners as well as all the other businesses for their commitment to education in the 21st century.●

REAR ADMIRAL JOAN M. ENGEL

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Rear Admiral (Upper Half) Joan M. Engel as she retires after more than thirty years of active duty service in the United States Navy. Rear Admiral Engel culminates her distinguished career as the Assistant Chief for Operational Medicine and Fleet Support at the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. As the first non-physician officer in medical department history appointed to this position, Rear Admiral Engel brought a fresh dedication to improving Navy Medicine's ability to deploy health care worldwide. She formally directed sweeping changes to the missions of her subordinate commands and instituted many progressive initiatives such as: a robust Force Health Protection program; Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Environment agent threat assessment and education programs; the creation of Forward Deployed Preventive Medicine Units; the establishment of the Navy Operational Medicine Institute, a new command focused on advanced operational aviation, undersea, and surface medicine

training; and the complete restructuring of Navy Medical Research and Development laboratories and programs.

Rear Admiral Engel was the first female, and first Nurse Corps officer, to be selected by a board to the rank of a two-star Admiral within the Navy Medical Department. She served as the Director of the Navy Nurse Corps and Assistant Chief for Education, Training, and Personnel at the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Through collaboration with other military nursing leaders, Rear Admiral Engel ensured that a Bachelor of Science degree became the minimum level of education for entry into practice for military nurses, and championed the establishment of a military nursing constituency within the American Nurses Association. Rear Admiral Engel was instrumental in advancing the extensive Tri-Service Nursing Research Program which focuses on research to develop best practices for nursing care. Attuned to issues related to women in the Navy, her participation in the landmark 1990 Navy Women's Study Group was the catalyst for enhancing the delivery of culturally competent women's health care and increasing the number of operational assignments for Navy nurses. Her contributions are far-reaching, and will positively impact military nursing and health care for years to come.

Mr. President, more than fifty years ago, as I was recovering in a military hospital, I began a unique relationship with military nurses. Rear Admiral Engel embodies what I know military nurses to be—strong, dedicated professional leaders, stepping to the forefront to serve their country and committed to caring for our Sailors, Marines, Airmen, Soldiers and family members during peacetime and at war. Rear Admiral Engel's many meritorious awards and decorations demonstrate her contributions in a tangible way, but it is the legacy she leaves behind for the Navy Nurse Corps, the United States Navy and the Department of Defense for which we are most appreciative. It is with pride that I congratulate Rear Admiral Engel on her outstanding career of exemplary service.●

WINNERS OF THE 1999-2000 EIGHTH
GRADE YOUTH ESSAY CONTEST

• Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate a group of young Indiana students who have shown great educative achievement. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the winners of the 1999-2000 Eighth Grade Youth Essay Contest which I sponsored in association with the Indiana Farm Bureau and Bank One of Indiana. These students have displayed strong writing abilities and have proven themselves to be outstanding young Hoosier scholars. I submit their names for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because they demonstrate the capabilities of today's students and are fine representatives of our Nation.

This year, Hoosier students wrote on the theme, "International Market Baskets Begin on Hoosier Farms." Considering the importance of our expanding global economy, students were asked to imagine themselves shopping in an exotic marketplace, anywhere in the world, and then describe what Hoosier agricultural products they might find there. I would like to submit for the RECORD the winning essays of Clayton Owsley of Washington County and Emily Ripperger of Franklin County. As state winners of the Youth Essay Contest, these two outstanding students are being recognized on Friday, February 4, 2000 during a visit to our Nation's Capitol.

The essays are as follows:

INTERNATIONAL MARKET BASKETS BEGIN ON
HOOSIER FARMS

(By Clayton Owsley, Washington County)

Our ship arrived on the Island of Aruba early this morning. Our family had been sailing on the Caribbean all night.

Our first stop was to shop in the town of Oranjestad. As we browsed in the marketplace, we saw Aruban art and merchants selling fresh fish off their boats.

While we were in the marketplace we picked up some items to take back to the condominium. I forgot to pack my toothpaste, so I purchased a tube of Crest (peppermint flavored). As I was paying for it, I realized the peppermint used in it could have originated in Indiana. Indiana is the 4th leading peppermint exporter in the United States.

My dad loves popcorn, so he bought some microwave popcorn to fix in the room. I told dad this popcorn might have come from Indiana, since Indiana is the number one popcorn exporter in the United States.

Before we left to go back to our room we ate lunch at a restaurant by the marketplace. The special of the day was roast duckling, which is another export of Indiana. We tried to find many items on the menu that could have originated in Indiana. The vegetable oil and dressings may have come from Indiana soybeans. The soy sauce used to marinate the duckling could also have come from Indiana soybeans.

Dad reminded us that the ketchup on the table could also have come from diced tomatoes grown in Indiana. He informed us that 55% of Aruban imports come from the United States. So it is possible these things could have originated in Indiana.

We realized that there is a little bit of Indiana all over the world.

INTERNATIONAL MARKET BASKETS BEGIN ON
HOOSIER FARMS

(By Emily Ripperger, Franklin County)

Have you ever wondered where Hoosier crops are sent after they are harvested? When I took my first trip to Europe, I found the answers to this question.

It began a few years ago, when I visited London, England, and was amazed at what I found. After visiting famous landmarks, I arrived at Portobello Market, which is on the west side of the city. When I got there, I was in awe at the sights and the sounds of this new place. People were walking down the crowded roads, talking in different languages, and there were more booths than imaginable. As I pushed my way through the crowds, I found myself gazing at crates filled with almost every kind of foreign fruit or vegetable that you could think of. Then, something caught my eye. There were boxes of soybeans, corn, tomatoes and other fami-

lar things. Immediately, I recognized this as something from my home state, Indiana. This really came to me as a shock, because being in a foreign country, I had the impression that I would only be seeing foreign objects. I spoke to the merchant, and he told me that although some of these crops were grown locally, most of them, even the peppermint and spearmint, were grown on Indiana farms. This information sparked my interest, so I did some extensive research. It turns out that Native Americans who lived mostly around the Ohio Valley, and the Great Lakes brought many of these crops grown in Indiana, there. When I returned home, I thought about Hoosier farms and the workers who help keep them running, in a new way.

Going to Europe made me realize the importance of Indiana farms and crops, and how they are useful, not only in the United States, but all around the world.

1999-2000 DISTRICT ESSAY WINNERS

District 1: Wyatt Reidelbach (Pulaski County), Emily Ann Lawrence (Starke County)

District 2: Drew Englehart (Noble County), Alyxandra Schlotter (Noble County)

District 3: Kent Kohlhaugen (Jasper County), Laura Lachmund (White County)

District 4: Brad Rogers (Howard County), Jenell Hierholzer (Miami County)

District 5: Matthew Fry (Putnam County), Tarrah Bernhardt (Hendricks County)

District 6: David Baird (Wayne County), Cassie Bird (Hamilton County)

District 7: Shawna Asher (Knox County)

District 8: Jonathan Brookbank (Union County), Emily Ripperger (Franklin County)

District 9: Drew Baker (Posey County), Amy Moore (Posey County)

District 10: Clayton Owsley (Washington County), Paige Roberts (Washington County)

1999-2000 COUNTY ESSAY WINNERS

Cass: Jeff Plummer, Mollie Graybeal

Delaware: Jason Perkins, Amanda Pollard

Dubuois: Dustin Schwartz

Fayette: Ashley Steele

Franklin: Zackary Reisert, Emily Ripperger

Hamilton: Ryan Kunkel, Cassie Bird

Hancock: Shelby Gues

Hendricks: Nathan Bayliss, Tarrah Bernhardt

Henry: Rebecca Robertson

Howard: Brad Rodgers

Jasper: Kent Kohlhaugen, Cristen Liersch

Jay: Danielle Look

Knox: Shawna Asher

Madison: Zamir Wolfe, Jessica Loveall

Marion: Mike James, Jessica Davis

Miami: Jenell Hierholzer

Newton: Curt Schriner, Lacy Padgett

Noble: Drew Englehart, Alyxandra Schlotter

Orange: Ryan Barwe, Kimberly Kee

Posey: Drew Baker, Amy Moore

Pulaski: Wyatt Reidelbach

Putnam: Matthew Fry

St. Joseph: Colin Ethier, Julie Vander Weide

Shelby: Amanda Denton

Starke: David Jensen, Emily Ann Lawrence

Union: Jonathan Brookbank

Vermillion: William Ealy, Alyssa Burch

Wabash: Greg Martin, Tiffany Livesay

Warrick: A.J. Wilks, Alyssa Davis

Washington: Clayton Owsley, Paige Roberts

Wayne: David Baird, Katy Baumer

White: Austin Waibel, Laura Lachmund

CELEBRATING ST. PAUL SCHOOL

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to tell you about St. Paul School in my hometown of Wilmington, Dela-

ware. In a country that can only be measured by the well-being of its least-advantaged citizenry, St. Paul has a special story that is too often left untold.

St. Paul Church and the adjoining school are landmarks on the Wilmington skyline, visible from Interstate 95 heading North through Wilmington. Surrounding it are remnants of a once heavily-populated Irish and German immigrant communities and now is in the heart of the Hispanic section of the city. It sits at the base of the West Side and since the 1800's, has been a safe haven for generations of children and families newly arriving to American shores and settling in our community.

St. Paul School was founded in 1874. Its 125 year history is clear—providing quality education to immigrant and minority children. Yet at St. Paul, there is a much deeper, much more powerful message. While St. Paul is a school of 235 kindergarten through eighth graders, 99% of whom are urban children of color from some of Wilmington's most distressed areas, its students are prepared well and consistently perform above the national indicators of student achievement.

There is no culture of poverty or sense of hopelessness in any child, in any classroom in this school. St. Paul's dispels the assumptions and myths about the innate inability of inner-city minority children from very precarious circumstances to succeed academically and socially in mainstream society. At St. Paul, parents are properly engaged, teachers are supremely dedicated and most important, children come ready to learn. This in a school where more than half the students enter with limited English-speaking ability, most of the families live on the margins of poverty and the teachers and administration work for pay well-below their parochial, public and private counterparts.

St. Paul is indeed a special place, but in my view, it is one of so many other stories we need to find out about, embrace and share with America. Furthermore, it is the reason that we must continue to invest in the education of our children. On February 9, 2000 in Wilmington, there will be a Commemorative Mass benefiting the Saint Paul School Scholarship Fund. It is a time when St. Paul School will take center stage for many in our community. It makes perfect sense because every day, education and its importance takes center stage in the lives of St. Paul children.

Our community—both now and in future—will be better because of the efforts of schools like St. Paul around the country where truly no one child is left behind. We in Wilmington salute St. Paul School.●

RECOGNITION OF STEPHEN AND LAURA ERDEL

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a couple that has had a tremendous impact on my hometown of Mexico, Missouri; my good friends Stephen and Laura Erdel. Mr. President, these two have served the community in a variety of roles and on January 22 they were the recipients of the Mexico Area Chamber of Commerce 1999 Community Service Award.

Steve has served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Handishop, Inc. the Handi-Shop Endowment Fund, the Mexico Rotary Club, The Mexico Country Club, The Arthur Center Advisory Board, Mexico/Audrain County Community Development, Enterprise Development Corporation, Audrain Medical Center Charitable Foundation, the Advanced Technology Center Foundation, the Westminster College Board of Trustees, Missouri Military Academy, the Alan Woods Scholarship Foundation, the Roy Creasey Scholarship Foundation and the Ross D. Ferris Scholarship.

He has served as president of the Mexico Area Chamber of Commerce and as vice president of Economic Development. He was also president of the following organizations: Handishop, Inc., Mexico Country Club, Arthur Center Advisory Board and as chairman of the Audrain Medical Center Charitable Foundation, the Advanced Technology Center Foundation and as their fundraising chairman. He is currently on the Westminster College Executive Committee.

Mr. President, Laura Erdel also has an outstanding record of community service. Laura served as a member of the Mexico Board of Education for 6½ years. In 1996 she was the first woman to be elected president of the school board. She was vice president of the board for four years and is certified by the Missouri School Board Association. For seven years she also served as a weekly volunteer at Eugene Field School.

Laura was co-founder of the A+ for Mexico Education, Inc. and president for two years. She has served as a board member of the Methodist Preschool and on various committees of the Eugene Field PTO, Mexico Junior High School PTA, and Mexico High School PTA.

As a member of the White family, long-time publishers of the Mexico Ledger, Laura has supported the Audrain Historical Society as publicity chairman for five years, and was co-chairman of the Audrain County Fair in 1990. She is currently a member of the Presser Hall Restoration Society and has served on their board of directors. She has been a strong supporter of the YMCA as a board member and has worked on numerous fund drives.

Laura is a former member of the Mexico Women's Club, a past president of the Wednesday Club and served as president of P.E.O. Chapter MB from 1989 to 1991 and again in 1998-99. Fur-

thermore, Laura was also the physician recruiter for Audrain Medical Center for ten years and has been a freelance reporter for the Mid-Missouri Business Journal.

Mr. President, it is people like this, who are willing to serve, that make our communities better places to live. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognition of Steve and Laura Erdel, who serve as an example to us all.●

A TRIBUTE TO U.S. ATTORNEY MICHAEL SKINNER

• Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I wish to note the departure from public life of one of our state's most gifted public servants. Michael Skinner, who has served for the past six years as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Louisiana, the largest geographical district in my home state, left office on January 15 and has returned to the private practice of law in Lafayette.

It is no exaggeration to say that Michael Skinner will be remembered as the most effective and successful U.S. Attorney in the history of the Western District of Louisiana. From almost his first day in office, he set about to make it clear to the people of his district that the U.S. Attorney's office was their office, administering justice on their behalf and for their benefit. In short order, he threw open the doors of his office, demystified the work of the U.S. Attorney and instilled a renewed sense of confidence and enthusiasm for the administration of justice in the Western District of Louisiana. Judges, attorneys, citizens and scores of public officials from Lafayette to Lake Charles to Alexandria to Shreveport to Monroe agreed that Michael Skinner's appointment was a true breath of fresh air.

Mr. Skinner's record as U.S. Attorney is an impressive one. He successfully prosecuted scores of cases involving public corruption, violent crime, drugs, health care and other types of program fraud, environmental crime and civil rights violations. Some of his most successful cases included: Food stamp and Medicaid/Medicare indictments and convictions that uncovered millions in fraud; a child pornography investigation that broke a child prostitution ring in South Louisiana; an environmental investigation that resulted in the cleanups of several south Louisiana toxic waste dumps; and the prosecution of literally hundreds of drug dealers who admitted or were convicted of selling drugs in Louisiana.

Mr. President, I am proud to have recommended Michael Skinner's nomination to President Clinton in 1993. In the years since his confirmation by this body, I have watched with a mixture of pride and admiration as he performed the duties of his office with a rare combination of skill, integrity, compassion and determination. Mike Skinner represents the best that our country has to offer in its public servants and I believe that he will serve as

the model for every person who follows him in that office. I know that I speak for the citizens of Louisiana and for every member of this body in thanking him for a job well done and in wishing he and his family all the best in this new phase of their lives.●

IN MEMORY OF EMILY ANN JORDT

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of an extraordinary and courageous young lady. Emily Ann Jordt, daughter of Bill and Deb Jordt of Hinton, Iowa, passed away on March 15, 1999, after fighting cancer for three years. My heart is heavy for the Jordt family. No one would disagree that cancer is a devastating illness. However, when cancer touches the life of a child, it seems an especially harsh reality. I know from personal experience the difficulties that follow a cancer diagnosis. My wife, Barbara, is a breast cancer survivor and we believe early detection saved her life. I have long supported biomedical research, and Emily's story reminds all of us the importance of remaining vigilant in providing funding for cancer research. To quote Emily, "We can do this together." It is my hope that by sharing Emily's story with my colleagues in the Senate, Emily's memory may be truly honored.

EMILY'S STORY—A LIFE OF STRENGTH AND COURAGE

Emily was diagnosed with rhabdomyosarcoma, an aggressive childhood cancer, in 1996 when she was only nine years old. While this cancer is usually found in muscle tissue in an extremity, Emily's was in her jaw and neck. Emily was frightened. Her grandfather had died of lung cancer. Emily came to understand that there were many kinds of cancers, and that not everyone dies of this disease. Emily joined her family and doctors in what was to become a three-year fight for her life.

Emily had surgery to remove a tumor below her lower right jaw. Her best chance for remission was simultaneous radiation and chemotherapy treatment. Even though interruptions in the harsh protocol were needed for her body to recover, radiation was completed, and chemotherapy resumed.

After radiation Emily had difficulty with muscles of her tongue and throat. A feeding tube was surgically implanted and she used a suction machine to clear her throat and airways. She bravely adjusted to this life-style.

Emily dearly loved school. She maintained an A-B average throughout her illness. She played trumpet in the school band. When a facial nerve was impaired because of surgery, she switched to percussion and continued on. She served as a customer representative of the Westerner Bank in her school. She was an ardent fundraiser for school projects. Her classmates regarded her as a peacemaker.

Emily played soccer in a YMCA league throughout her treatment. She loved the sport. She was back on the soccer field and played most of a full game only 11 days after having major surgery to remove the tumor a second time.

Emily planned and presented a writer's workshop entitled "Getting through the Tough Stuff" where she encouraged young people her age to use writing as a vehicle to deal with the difficult challenges of life and be sensitive and caring to others.

Picture a nine-year-old presenting her concerns about and suggestions for pediatric

care to the Board of Directors of the hospital where she spent a great deal of time. Emily did it. She believed that one person can make a difference. And Emily did make a difference.

Emily was active in 4-H, serving as vice-president of her club. She chose many categories in which to participate, everything from showing her 4-month old filly to playing the piano in Share the Fun. She presented a written and visual display of items used throughout her surgeries and treatment. For this she was awarded an Outstanding Junior Achievement Ribbon.

Emily took an active part in Relay for Life in her county. She served as Junior Chairperson, giving a speech the night of the event. She enlisted the help of her classmates and teachers to help publicize events.

As only a child can, Emily leaned on her faith to see her through. Church was important to Emily. She took communion instruction, participated in youth group activities, sang and provided special music for worship. She willingly served church dinners. She helped to organize a basketball team and enlisted a neighbor to be their coach. This team won the Good Sportsmanship trophy.

Emily maintained a positive and determined attitude. When traditional treatments became ineffective, she willingly tried non-traditional methods. She clung to the hope that she would again be as normal as the other kids. While the disease took her life on March 15, 1999, it could not crush her spirit. It was that very same spirit that caused her to fight to the very end.

Emily fought this illness for three long years, showing that with strength, determination, and courage, life is to be lived. Emily strongly believed the scripture verses that say, "Let the children come to me for such is the kingdom of God," and "A Child Shall Lead." Let us capture the essence of Emily's spirit, follow her lead, and make a difference.

IN MEMORY AND CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF
EMILY ANN JORDT, FEBRUARY 15, 1987–
MARCH 15, 1999

Emily's life is meant to be more than just one more sad account of how a child, a person, died from cancer. It is meant to make us uncomfortable. It is meant to make us weep. Then, it is meant to make us determined to act—to do something.

Finding a cure for cancer is a very difficult but not impossible task. What is needed to do that? An open mind. When we keep our minds open, ideas and possibilities can flow. One of Emily's favorite movies as a young child was Cinderella. In that movie we hear the line, "Impossible things are happening every day."

As lawmakers, do not tie the hands of researchers because dollars are limited. Do not tie the hands of researchers from exploring avenues that may be out of the ordinary.

Emily did not care about the insurance companies and the drug companies playing the games that they play to control what happens to people's lives. What she cared about was playing soccer, learning, sharing her talents, having birthday parties, being a friend, all the things that children do best.

We must listen to her story with renewed commitment of why most of you were elected, to make a difference.

Emily continues to make a difference each time her story is told. Her video continues to play at fundraisers for Children's Miracle Network. Each time "Em's Environmental Mobile Lab" (that was purchased through memorials and a grant) is taken on site to provide hands on learning for the students at Akron-Westfield Community School, Emily continues to make a difference. When the

CEO of the hospital where Emily spent so much times says, "I am a different person because of what Emily has taught me and that will make me a better CEO," you know that Emily has truly made a difference!

Have you made that kind of difference? Emily sacrificed her life so that we, you and I, might see more clearly what our job is.

A phrase that Emily and her family adopted as their motto is, "We can do this together." We as her family and friends are making a difference by addressing you as our representatives. Now, It is your chance to make a difference, to vote for additional funding for cancer research, and to clear the way for the impossible to happen.

"Let us capture the essence of Emily's spirit, follow her lead, and make a difference."

DEBRA L. JORDT.
WILLIAM G. JORDT.
BETTY V. JORDT.●

BRIGADIER GENERAL BETTYE H. SIMMONS

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Brigadier General Bettye H. Simmons as she retires after twenty-nine years of active duty service in the United States Army. General Simmons culminates her distinguished career as Chief, Army Nurse Corps and Commander, United States Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine.

General Simmons' distinguished career began in 1971 when she entered the Army nurse Corps through the Army Student Nurse Program. Her numerous military assignments have been diverse, including leadership roles in clinical services, staff education and development, and Army Medical Service administration and policy. As the Chief, Army Nurse Corps, General Simmons demanded the highest standards for military nursing. With other military nursing leaders, General Simmons ensured that a Bachelor of Science education is the minimum qualification for entry on to active duty for any military nurse. She was the driving force behind the multi-million dollar Triservice Nursing Research Program, a program focused on research that develops best practices for nursing care. General Simmons initiated a post-deployment program for injured Army Reserve soldiers that determined the appropriate level of medical care before the soldier returns home. This program saved countless dollars in civilian health care costs and honored the commitment to care for our Reserve Forces. As Command Surgeon for Forces Command, General Simmons improved unit medical readiness by 20 percent. She redesigned the battlefield evacuation process, providing a lightweight, robust capability to ensure the right medical care is provided to the soldier at the right time and at the right place. Her contributions are far-reaching, and will impact military nursing and health care for years to come.

Mr. President, more than fifty years ago, as I was recovering in a military hospital, I began to understand the

critical role of military nurses. General Simmons embodies what I know military nurses to be—strong, professional leaders who are committed to serving their fellow comrades in arms and their country. General Simmons' many meritorious awards and decorations demonstrate her contributions in a tangible way, but it is the legacy she leaves behind for the Army Nurse Corps for which we are most appreciative. It is with pride that I congratulate General Simmons on her outstanding career of exemplary service.●

RECOGNITION OF BRENT STANGHELLE

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Brent Stanghelle who has been an integral asset to Montana's agricultural scene.

Brent Stanghelle has been the voice of agriculture for North Central Montana for several years. Broadcasting from Great Falls, Montana at KMON, Brent has brought the agricultural news to producers faithfully. Brent has proven himself to be a true friend of Montana's natural resource-based economy.

Brent Stanghelle has made the decision to move on and pursue other agriculturally related interests in his life. With his parting, there will be a quiet spot on the air for many listeners.

I extend my thanks to Brent Stanghelle for a job well done. He was trusted and relied upon by many producers. He has dedicated many years to keeping the voice of agriculture alive and "on the air" in North Central Montana. His work and dedication have not gone unnoticed.●

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

● Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, today is the fifth day of the 26th annual Catholic Schools Week, and tomorrow, we will observe National Appreciation Day for Catholic School Teachers. I want to take this opportunity to recognize the 167,000 teachers in our nation's Catholic schools for their valuable contributions to the education of many of America's children.

There are over 2 million students enrolled in the nation's 8,217 Catholic elementary and secondary schools today. These schools are attractive to many parents because they combine an intellectually stimulating environment with an emphasis on the spiritual and moral development of their students.

Catholic school teachers are widely recognized for offering an excellent scholastic education, which may explain why 41 percent of these schools have a waiting list for admission. According to the National Catholic Educational Association, the student-teacher ratio in Catholic schools is 17 to 1, and the graduation rate of Catholic school students is an extraordinary 95 percent. Only 3 percent of Catholic high school students drop out of

school, and 83 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college, the Association has estimated.

But Catholic school teachers provide students with more than just a solid academic background. They encourage the spiritual and moral development of their students as well.

Catholic school teachers are educating an increasingly diverse group of students. Since 1970, the percentage of minorities enrolled in Catholic schools has more than doubled to 25 percent. More and more non-Catholic students are enrolling in Catholic schools: today, as many as 13 percent of Catholic school students are non-Catholic, according to the National Catholic Educational Association (compared to 2.7 percent in 1970). In some city schools, a majority of the students are non-Catholic.

This week, a delegation of over 100 Catholic school teachers, students, and parents are in Washington, D.C. to meet with Members of Congress. They hand-delivered information about Catholic schools to every congressional office yesterday, which was National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools. I would like to close by welcoming these teachers, students, and parents to the Nation's Capitol, and by congratulating the Catholic schools across the country that received Excellence in Education Awards from the U.S. Department of Education.●

THE TENNESSEE TITANS' SEASON

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Tennessee Titans on their outstanding season and tremendous effort in Super Bowl XXXIV.

This past Sunday, football fans across America and around the world witnessed the most exciting and hard-fought Super Bowl in recent memory, if not all-time. Trailing by sixteen points in the third quarter, the Titans rallied to tie the game. They fell behind once again, but drove down to the St. Louis one-yard-line before time ran out.

The road to Atlanta was not an easy one for the Tennessee Titans. The team has played in four stadiums in three cities and two states in four years. But, despite this adversity, Titans Coach Jeff Fisher motivated his players, orchestrated comebacks and led a team that fought until the last second, the last yard. Ultimately, they ran out of time.

Who will forget Kevin Dyson stretching to reach the goal line when the clock ran out on the most important game of his life? Who could ever forget the Titans' "Music City Miracle," the kick-off return that clinched a play-off victory over the Buffalo Bills, the outstanding defensive effort in the win at Indianapolis, the incredible second half in Jacksonville that propelled the team to the Super Bowl, the indomitable will of Steve McNair or the power and determination of Eddie George?

The Titans came so close to winning it all, and they have so much of which they can be proud.

The Tennessee Titans can be proud of the way they played with heart and introduced the world to a team that many hadn't heard much about. The Titans energized the state of Tennessee and nearly shocked the world. Most important, the Titans gave their young fans an example of the character and sportsmanship to which we should all aspire. And they inspired us with their refusal to give up when they were pegged the underdogs.

Mr. President, I'd also like to congratulate my good friends from the state of Missouri on the success of the St. Louis Rams. They too overcame a tough recent history and many naysayers to win the most exciting Super Bowl in history. Their wide receiver, Isaac Bruce, a former player for my alma mater the University of Memphis, stunned us all with his winning 73-yard touchdown in the fourth quarter. And the Super Bowl's most valuable player, Kurt Warner, is an inspiration on the football field and in his personal life. I congratulate them both and all of their Rams teammates.●

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 106-20

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on February 3, 2000, by the President of the United States:

Treaty with Romania on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Treaty Document No. 106-20).

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Romania on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on May 26, 1999. The report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty is enclosed.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including terrorism and drug trafficking offenses. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal mat-

ters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes taking the testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and items of evidence; locating or identifying persons or items; serving documents; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to immobilization and forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 2000.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2000

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, February 7. I further ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions:

Senator DURBIN, or his designee, from 12 noon to 1 p.m.;

Senator THOMAS, or his designee, from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1052, the Mariana Islands bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. For the information of all Senators, when the Senate convenes on Monday, it will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of the Mariana Islands legislation. Any votes ordered on that bill will be scheduled to occur on Tuesday, February 8. Therefore, Senators may expect the first vote of next week to occur on Tuesday at a time to be determined. Also, on Tuesday the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the nuclear waste bill. It is hoped that action on that legislation can be completed by the end of the week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. 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 following the remarks of Senator DODD and Senator DORGAN.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, is the Senate in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I consume.

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

AIDS IN AFRICA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I know we are nearing the end of the day, and there are no further votes today or tomorrow. I will be reasonably brief.

I wanted to come to the floor when my colleague, Senator DURBIN, and others were speaking about the crisis dealing with AIDS in Africa. I wasn't able to come. I would like to mention that issue for a couple of moments; then I would like to talk about the issue of trade.

Today in the Democratic Policy Committee luncheon, we heard from the President's chief adviser on the subject of AIDS policy, and we also heard from Rory Kennedy, who has done a 12-minute documentary film, an award-winning film on the issue of AIDS in Africa. I know my colleagues came out to the floor and spoke on that subject following the Democratic Policy Committee luncheon.

It is almost unthinkable what has happened, especially in Africa, with respect to the subject of AIDS. AIDS is a scourge, a plague that is affecting the entire world. It is the first plague since the bubonic plague for which there is no cure, no vaccination, no significant remedy. It is devastating to a number of parts of this world, especially the continent of Africa. Twenty million people have died in Africa from AIDS; 14 million people are currently infected with HIV or AIDS in the continent of Africa.

We can't pretend it doesn't matter to us. AIDS is affecting all of the world, including our country. It has a devastating effect on Africa, a devastating impact on the millions and millions of children in Africa who now have no parents, who are left homeless by this scourge called AIDS. We must, as a country, gather with others in the world and combat this deadly plague.

We are spending substantial resources to try to find a cure for AIDS. We are also joining with others to try

to find ways to educate people about how to stop the spread of HIV and AIDS. Some countries in Africa have begun to take emergency steps and have been successful and are beginning to stem the tide of the spread of AIDS, but it is not nearly rapid enough. These steps need to be taken with much greater urgency, and our country needs to be a part of that with other countries in the international community.

I would first like to compliment Rory Kennedy, who appeared today and played for us a 12-minute documentary film that almost takes your breath away when you see on film what has happened to the children and the families in Africa with the decimation of so many families as a result of death from AIDS.

We must do more. I compliment my colleagues, Senator DURBIN, Senator BRYAN, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator FEINGOLD, and others, many of whom have traveled to Africa in recent months, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well who are involved in this. We must work together to address this issue.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. I will talk for a moment about the issue of the trade deficit that faces this country. I would like to do so, understanding that this country is full of good economic news. And there is a lot of reason for all of us to be optimistic about the future. The good economic news that was described last week—in fact, a week ago this evening—by President Clinton in the State of the Union Address tells us that unemployment is way down and more people are working than virtually ever before in this country; home ownership is up at record levels; inflation is down, down, way down; income is up; the stock market is up. There are so many evidences of good news in our country. Crime rates are also down. There is evidence all around us that things are better in America. All of us feel good about that. We live at a wonderful time in a wonderful country. It is quite a remarkable opportunity all of us have.

But we must be vigilant about some storm clouds on the horizon. One of those storm clouds for this country's economy is the burgeoning trade deficit, the imbalance between what we buy from other countries and what we sell to other countries and the resulting deficit that comes from selling less and buying more.

The trade deficit in this country is virtually exploding. We have a trade deficit that is higher than any trade deficit ever experienced anywhere on this Earth at any time. Does it matter? Is anybody talking about it? Was it mentioned in the State of the Union Address last week? No. Everyone wants to ignore the fact that we are rolling around pretty well, even though the trade deficit is increasing dramati-

cally, and it somehow doesn't matter. We have wrestled this "500-pound gorilla" called the Federal budget deficit, with great pains, over many years. Finally, the scourge called the budget deficit, which was growing like a tumor—growing forever—is now gone.

But the budget deficit, while gone, is being replaced by a trade deficit that is growing at an alarming rate. I want to describe part of that today. Everyone talks about the past 107 months of economic expansion. I want to talk about that, but I also want to talk about the trade deficit that could put an end to that economic expansion if we don't do something to resolve this burgeoning deficit.

I will put up a chart that describes what we face for a trade deficit. This chart goes back to 1991. It shows the amount of goods and services we export and the amount we import. The red, of course, represents the imbalance, the trade deficit. In January, the Commerce Department announced that the trade deficit had widened to \$26.5 billion in November alone, a new monthly record. But a new monthly record was set in 8 of the last 11 months. Our goods and services trade deficit—that is, all goods and services—in 1999 will be \$266 billion. That will exceed the previous year's \$164 billion by 62 percent. Understand that the goods and services trade deficit will have ratcheted up by 62 percent in 1 year alone.

We imported \$92 billion worth of goods and exported \$59.5 billion in goods in November. Now, if current trends continue, the growth in our international debt will simply not be sustainable. The foreign debt in this country is projected to be \$1.7 trillion in 1999. That is not debt we owe to ourselves as the Federal budget deficit was; that is debt owed to foreigners who have a claim to assets in this country—\$1.7 trillion. Almost all economists will tell us that is not sustainable and we must do something to address it.

When we become more dependent on receiving and retaining foreign capital to finance this imbalance, the day will come when foreigners lose faith in this economy and begin to pull out of our financial markets. When that happens, the value of the dollar will fall, interest rates will rise, corporate profits and stock prices will decline, and then we will have a slowdown in this economy.

Senators BYRD and STEVENS and I authored legislation, which is now law, creating a trade deficit review commission. That commission is now impaneled and underway, looking into the nature, causes, consequences, and remedies of this trade deficit. They will report their findings in August. In the meantime, this trade deficit escalates. This is the deficit in goods alone—what is called the merchandise trade deficit. This shows what happens to your manufacturing base. This is the most alarming deficit of all—\$343

billion—and you can see what has happened to this trade deficit since 1991. It is a dramatic escalation—\$343 billion in a single year.

It would be useful to look at how our bilateral agreements have contributed to our bilateral goods deficit.

Between 1998–99, our merchandise trade deficit with Canada went from \$14 billion to \$28 billion. Mexico—incidentally, I might mention that, before Congress passed NAFTA—without my vote; I didn't vote for it—we had a trade surplus with Mexico and a relatively small deficit with Canada. NAFTA turned that into a large deficit with Canada and a very large deficit with Mexico.

The European Union: You can see what happened in the last year with respect to trade deficits with the European Union. They have increased dramatically.

China and Japan: What happened there is almost unforgivable in terms of an economic relationship. China had, in 1999, a merchandise trade deficit of over \$60 billion with the United States, up from about \$53 billion in the previous year. Japan's is \$67 billion. These aren't getting better, they are getting worse.

What does all that mean for this country? We just negotiated a trade agreement with China. One of the major issues of great controversy in this Chamber in the coming months will be whether China should be granted permanent normal trade relations, the same as we grant other countries. We will debate that sometime soon.

That will be the source of great controversy for a number of reasons. Some in this Chamber will believe the Chinese have not made progress on human rights. Others will perhaps believe the Chinese are not abiding by fair labor standards that we would consider important in this country. Still others will believe China hasn't complied with previous trade agreements. So there will be a substantial amount of debate about this issue.

I have been interested in the bilateral trade agreement negotiated with China because we have a very large trade deficit with China. I wonder, when our negotiators negotiated, did they negotiate with some idea that we will bring that into balance? Can we send more goods into China? Can we sell more to China? Or will we simply continue to be a sponge for China and watch their goods come here while they still retain a relatively closed market to many of our goods?

Once when I was in China, I met with the President of that country. I talked to the President of China about trade issues. I said: You must buy more pork from the United States. You must buy more wheat from the United States. You must buy more from the United States. You ship us your trousers, your shirts, your shoes, your trinkets. Boats come from China loaded with all of the things you produce. Our consumers are happy to buy them. But we are not so

lucky when American producers are trying to sell goods into the Chinese economy. We are told: No, you can't sell wheat in these circumstances in China; no, we won't purchase your pork; or, no, we won't purchase this or that. In fact, the things we do have, you want to make copies and violate the intellectual property rights of our producers. And we are not going to enforce that. We are going to look the other way when your plants press out the CDs with copyrighted music made by American artists.

My point is this: I think China is a very big, strong, interesting country that is going to be a significant part of our lives in the future. I am not sure what kind of influence they will have on our future, but it will be significant. I want China to play a constructive role in our future. I want us to play a constructive role in their future. So I want us to have engagement and opportunity. I want us to have trade relationships that are fair. I want China to move in a more significant way to improve their record on human rights and to move in a way that provides more opportunity for their workers to have a fair say in their economy. But having said all of that, I don't have great confidence that the trade agreements we have with countries such as China are intent on ending these kinds of trade circumstances that are unfair to our country.

Two weeks ago, for example, after a bilateral trade negotiation with China was announced as a great success, the Chinese WTO negotiator, Vice Minister Long Yungtu, went to Kweichow in south China to talk about it. He was quoted in the South Asia Post as saying: You know, the agreement we have with the United States, this notion of buying a certain number of millions of tons of wheat doesn't mean we are going to buy any wheat in the United States. That is just theory. That is all theoretical. The notion that we will now accept meat from several thousand meat-packing plants in the United States doesn't mean we intend to have any U.S. meat come into our country. That is all just theoretical.

When I read what Minister Long, the man who negotiated the Chinese side of the agreement, said, I wrote to him and asked about that. I understand people get misquoted from time to time. I also asked Charlene Barshefsky, our trade ambassador, to find out what this means. So far I have not heard a word from the Chinese negotiator. I have not heard a word from the U.S. trade ambassador. I hope to hear from both.

I would like to see some progress in these areas. I want us to have a good trading relationship with China, Japan, Europe, Canada, and Mexico. But a good trading relationship to me is not defined as a circumstance where they plug our market with all of the goods from their country and then keep their market closed to many of our producers of commodities and goods. That doesn't make any sense to me.

This country can't allow that to happen any longer. We must insist on a reciprocal opportunity in foreign markets. A trade relationship with another country must be mutually beneficial to us and to them. We have far too often negotiated trade agreements that are one-way streets with foreign goods coming into the U.S. economy, but not a similar opportunity for U.S.-produced goods, including agricultural commodities and manufactured goods, to go into other economies. That is one of the reasons we have this massive trade deficit that is growing at an alarming rate.

I was going to speak about our situation with Canada and durum. I will reserve that for another time. I know we are nearing the end of the day. Some have other things they want to do. I am going to close with a point about trade enforcement.

It is one thing to have trade agreements that are bad agreements. We have had plenty of those. Our trade negotiators have not done well for this country, in my judgment. But it is another thing to have trade agreements that are reasonably decent but are unenforceable. That is also, I think, what happens even with those agreements that were decent agreements in the first place.

In the Department of Commerce where we monitor trade agreements, the number of people whose job it is to work on enforcement issues with respect to China and our trade agreements with China is 10. We have nearly a \$65 billion merchandise trade deficit with China. We have all kinds of problems getting into the Chinese marketplace with American goods, and we have 10 people whose job it is to work on the issue—10.

Or Japan—we have had a trade deficit with Japan of \$45 billion to \$60 billion forever. Do you know how many people work on that issue? Sixteen.

Canada and Mexico together—we turned a surplus with Mexico into a big deficit, and we doubled the deficit with Canada. That is all the result of this wonderful trade agreement called NAFTA for which we had people stand up and brag on the floor of the Senate saying that you have to pass this because if you do we will have more American jobs. It will be better for everybody.

I didn't vote for NAFTA. But the Congress passed it. Guess what. All of those economists are now unwilling to show their face around here because they predicted several hundred thousand new American jobs. In fact, we lost several hundred thousand opportunities, and a trade surplus with Mexico turned into a huge deficit. And a trade deficit with Canada doubled because this country didn't negotiate a reasonable trade agreement with Canada and Mexico. This country lost. Do you know how many people are working on this issue at the Department of Commerce? Ten for two countries, and a combined trade deficit of over \$50 billion. We have 10 people working on it.

There was a story not too long ago that said that U.S. officials who are responsible for monitoring trade agreements sometimes couldn't even locate the text of the agreements. It is one thing to be incompetent. It is another thing to exercise benign neglect over things that are your responsibility. But it is quite another thing to be in charge of something and then just lose it.

Do those of us who have concerns about this have legitimate concerns? Yes. We need to negotiate better trade agreements. We need to enforce trade agreements. And we need to make certain that the relationships we have with other countries are mutually beneficial to us and to them. That has not been the case, sadly.

At the WTO conference in Seattle, which turned out to be such a fiasco with demonstrators in the streets, with some thugs in the streets who defaced buildings, broke windows, and that sort of thing, one thing happened that was quite remarkable. I want to say, however, there were very few people who I call thugs who used paint cans up and down the streets of Seattle. It was regrettable that they defaced buildings and destroyed property. But the bulk of the people in the streets of Seattle—literally tens of thousands of them—were perfectly peaceable. They demonstrated up and down the streets in ways that were perfectly peaceable. They were there to demonstrate for legitimate reasons. They demonstrated about a range of issues about which they cared deeply and passionately.

There will never be, in my judgment, a place in the world where there are negotiations about trade in which there won't be people showing up to ask legitimate questions about labor standards and environmental standards because you can't fight in a country such as ours for 75 years and have people die in the streets demonstrating for the right to form unions and then decide, well, we will just pole-vault over all of those things and go and produce our goods in Sri Lanka or some other country where you do not have to worry about labor unions because they don't allow workers to form unions. We won't pay a livable wage, we won't have safe workplaces, and we won't restrict people from dumping chemicals into the streams and into the air. We'll hire kids for 12 cents an hour, work them 12 hours a day, and put them in unsafe plants. And, if you do not like it, tough luck.

That is the attitude of some in the rest of the world, and the people who demonstrate in the street are saying that isn't fair because we fought 75 years in this country for a minimum wage, for safe labor standards, and for a whole range of issues that are very important to who we are and what we are, and we are not going to allow those to be traded away in trade agreements. They have a legitimate concern. There will always, in my judgment, be Americans in the streets unless they

are part of the negotiations. That is why the WTO needs to be much more open and much more inclusive. Having secret negotiations and excluding people is not a way to resolve these issues.

Globalization, galloping along, must be accompanied by rules that are fair and thoughtful dealing with these serious issues of labor standards, environmental standards, and other issues. They must be accompanied by thoughtful rules.

In Seattle, I met with a group of Parliamentarians from Europe. I and a number of my Republican and Democrat colleagues went together to the WTO meetings in Seattle with great hope, and regrettably those meetings didn't produce much in terms of agreement. They produced a great deal of chaos in the streets, and among the negotiators nothing much happened. But during one memorable meeting for me with a group of Parliamentarians from Europe something happened that was quite remarkable. Michel Rocard, who was a former Prime Minister of France and is now a member of the European Parliament in Europe, leaned across the table to me and said something interesting. He said:

We talk about the beef dispute, beef hormones, and the dispute with Roquefort cheese, and all of these issues we have with Europe. They are nettlesome, difficult issues with Europe on the trade disputes.

As we were talking about the differences between Europe and the United States, Mr. Rocard, who was the former Prime Minister of France, leaned forward to me and he said:

I want you to understand something, Mr. Senator. We talk about our differences, but I want you to understand something about how I feel about your country. I was a 14-year-old boy standing on the streets of Paris, France, when the U.S. Army came in to kick the Nazis out of our country. A young black American soldier handed me an apple as he walked past. It was the first apple I had seen in several years. I will never forget how a 14-year-old boy felt about this young American soldier walking down the street in Paris, to liberate my country, and this young soldier handing me, this young French boy, an apple.

It occurred to me that we forget, I think, what this country means, what it has been to so many others in the world; what we have done and what we have yet to do in the world. I tell you that story only to say that while we have substantial trade disputes, our country has done a lot for a lot of people around the world. We liberated Europe. We beat back the forces of fascism. This country was perhaps the only country that was capable of doing that at that time.

After the Second World War, for the first 25 years after that, we said to Europe not only did we kick the Nazis out of France and American soldiers moved across Europe and liberated the Europeans and defeated Hitler, not only that, but this country has decided to create a Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. We rebuilt the economies of Europe.

For 25 years, in addition to spending money for the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe and rebuild the economies of Europe, we also said our trade policy will be our foreign policy. We made concessional trade agreements with everybody because it was not a problem for us. We were big enough and strong enough so that with one hand tied behind our backs, we could beat almost anybody in the world with international trade. So our trade policy was our foreign policy, and it was to help other countries get back on their feet.

But things changed. After about a quarter of a century, from the Second World War on, at that point we began to see our allies gaining strength, having better economies, doing a better job. All of a sudden, we had some tough, shrewd economic competitors. And in the second 25 years post-Second World War, our competition has changed. Our competition has been tougher in international trade. But in this country, much of our trade policy has remained foreign policy.

Instead of our being hard-nosed competitors with a reasonable trade policy that cares about our producers and the economic health of our producers, our trade policy has remained largely focused on foreign policy. That needs to change. We cannot always say it does not matter what our deficits are with China or Japan. We cannot say it does not matter—of course it matters. This has economic consequences to us. Our trade policy with respect to Japan needs to be a hard-nosed trade strategy that says you have tough competitors. But we need to compete with fair rules, and the rules of trade between the United States and Japan are fundamentally unfair. They are fundamentally unfair. I will come some other time to talk about the specifics of that. That was all fine, post-Second World War for a quarter of a century, but it is not fine anymore, and it is going to begin to injure this country and sap economic strength from this country.

No one wants a future of economic growth for this country more than I do. But the way to assure continued months of economic prosperity and continued years of prosperity will be to deal with problems that exist. One set of problems and storm clouds on this country's horizon is a huge, growing trade deficit that nobody seems to care about and nobody seems to want to talk about and no one seems willing to do anything about. I just hope one of these days enough of us in the Senate can say to our colleagues, can say to the administration, and can say to our trading partners and our allies, that things are going to have to change. We believe in the global economy. I believe in expanding trade opportunities. I do not believe in putting up walls, and I do not believe in restricting trade. But I believe very much this country needs to say to our trading partners that we insist and demand fair trade rules. We demand it.

It was fine 40 years ago that we did not have them because we did not need

them and we were helping other countries get back on their feet. That is not the case any longer. With Japan, we need some equilibrium and fairness. If you want to ship your products to this country, God bless you. They are welcome, and our consumers will be advantaged by having the ability to buy them. But we demand the same of your consumers. We demand the ability of your consumers to buy that which is produced in this country.

When you go to a grocery store in Tokyo and pay \$30 or \$35 for a pound of T-bone steak, you do that because they do not have enough beef. They don't have enough beef. That is because we don't get enough American beef in, because it is limited. Why? Because we have a trade agreement that provides, as we speak, a 40-percent tariff on every single pound of American beef going into Japan. If we did that on anything Japan sends into this country, it would be considered an outrage. We would be held up to ridicule, saying how on Earth dare the United States do this? Yet for every single pound of U.S. beef going into Japan as I speak, today, there is a 40-percent tariff attached to it. It is not fair.

My point is this country can compete. Its producers can compete anywhere in the world any time. But only if we negotiate trade agreements and enforce trade agreements that are fair to our country and our producers and that are mutually beneficial to us and to our trading partners.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, February 7, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:36 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 7, 2000, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 2000:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

EDWARD MCGAFFIGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2005. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LUIS J. LAUREDO, OF FLORIDA, TO BE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE VICTOR MARRERO, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

PEACE CORPS

MARK L. SCHNEIDER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, VICE MARK D. GEARAN, RESIGNED, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

FRANK S. HOLLEMAN III, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE MADELEINE

KUNIN, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

LEONARD R. PAGE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE FREDERICK L. FEINSTEIN, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CLIFFORD GREGORY STEWART, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS (REAPPOINTMENT), TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

STUART E. WEISBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2005 (REAPPOINTMENT), TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

JANIE L. JEFFERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE JASPER R. CLAY, JR., TERM EXPIRED, TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

MARIE F. RAGGHIANI, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE GEORGE MACKENZIE RAST, RESIGNED, TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 3, 2000:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ALAN GREENSPAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

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.