



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2000

No. 31

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, Sovereign of history and personal Lord of our lives, this week we join with Jews throughout the world in the joyous celebration of Purim. We thank You for the inspiring memory of Queen Esther who, in the fifth century B.C., threw caution to the wind and interceded with her husband, the King of Persia, to save the exiled Jewish people from persecution. The words of her uncle Mordecai sound in our souls: "You have come to the kingdom for such a time as this."—Esther 4:14.

Lord of circumstances, we are moved profoundly by the way You use individuals to accomplish Your plans and arrange what seem to be coincidences to bring about Your will for Your people. You have brought each of us to Your kingdom for such a time as this. You whisper in our souls, "I have plans for you, plans for good and not for evil, to give you a future and a hope."—Jeremiah 29:11.

Grant the Senators a heightened sense of the special role You have given them to play in the unfolding drama of American history. Give them a sense of destiny and a deep dependence on Your guidance and grace.

On Purim, we renew our commitment to fight against sectarian intolerance in our own hearts and religious persecution in so many places in our world. This is Your world; let us not forget that "though the wrong seems oft so strong, You are the Ruler yet." Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHUCK HAGEL, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Today the Senate will be in a period of morning business throughout the day, and tomorrow the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 5, the Social Security earnings test legislation. Under a previous agreement, there will be approximately 4 hours of debate with three amendments in order to the bill. I expect votes will occur during Tuesday's session of the Senate on one or two of the amendments to the bill. However, I expect final passage will not occur until Wednesday morning at approximately 10 o'clock. I will need to consult further with the Democratic leadership as to the exact time for that vote.

During the remainder of the week, the Senate will also consider any of the following items: Crop insurance legislation that was reported out of the Agriculture Committee a couple of weeks ago, plus any nominations from the Executive Calendar that might be cleared. Therefore, votes should be expected throughout the remainder of the week, certainly Wednesday and Thursday. Also, Senators should be on notice that we expect to begin the budget resolution next week, the week of March 27, and Senators may expect votes likely will occur on Friday, March 31.

We had indicated earlier in the year that if we saw a Friday where there would very likely be some votes, we would let Senators know as soon as we could, in order to comply with the budget resolution rules, which is up to 50 hours of debate and amendments in

order. Senators will recall that sometimes we have a number of amendments at the end of the process, so it could take us into Thursday night or over into that Friday, March 31. Of course, if there is a change in that, we will let Senators know, but we need to conclude that budget resolution as soon as possible so the Appropriations Committee can go forward with its bills.

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will take just a few minutes of my leader's time to talk about the Social Security earnings limitation.

I am very proud that the Senate is going to be taking up that issue this week and that we have a unanimous consent agreement which will limit us to only two or three amendments. One of those amendments is a technical correction, and then we have one by Senator KERREY of Nebraska and one by Senator GREGG of New Hampshire.

We have talked for years about the unfairness of Social Security recipients losing Social Security money if they need to continue working or want to continue working. At a time when we have a need for seniors who are 65, 66, 67 years old to meet the demands of our increased job availability market in America, it is the logical thing to do. Unfortunately, for many years we talked about it and did not do anything.

The House of Representatives deserves credit for taking the lead on this issue, and now we find it is developing bipartisan support of Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and an indication that the President will sign it. It is long overdue, and I think it is an important issue. I hope a number of Senators will comment on it today and that we will have debate on the two amendments tomorrow and conclude this no later than Wednesday morning.

So I am pleased we are able to proceed in this way, and I look forward to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1441

completing action on this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

SOCIAL SECURITY, THE BUDGET RESOLUTION, AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we on this side of the aisle look forward to working on eliminating the Social Security earnings limitation. I just returned from Nevada. It was amazing the number of people who came up to me and said, Are you going to do finally something about eliminating the earnings test on Social Security? As the leader has said, we have talked about this a long time but done nothing. It is time now that we join together, as we are going to do Wednesday, to pass this important bill.

This legislation will pass overwhelmingly with both Democrats and Republicans voting for it. Why? Because the America of today is much different from the America of 1935 when Social Security came into being. People are living much longer lives, healthier lives, more productive lives, and there is no reason in the world why we do not have people working as long as they want and as hard as they want. We need to remove this limitation. We have a problem in America today in its lack of productivity. This legislation will help a great deal because some of the most productive people in the world are people who are over age 65. So I look forward to joining Senators on both sides of the aisle to make sure we pass this bill as quickly as possible. As the leader said, we should do it Wednesday afternoon.

In looking forward to next week, to the budget resolution, this is a time where we have an opportunity to look at what the Nation is going to do financially for the coming year. I think it is important we all prepare for this debate. There is a limited amount of time we can debate this issue. There is no limitation on the number of amendments that can be offered. We certainly hope there is not an unlimited number of amendments, but that people will give thought and consideration to the ones that are most important.

The Democrats today are going to take some time to talk about a number of issues, and leading the debate will be the chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee, Senator BYRON DORGAN. When he is called upon, he is going to talk about a number of issues.

The Senator from North Dakota has certainly been a leader on the issue of the Federal Reserve System, and there is no one who has been more articulate when talking about the need to do something about the Federal Reserve System and its secretive nature, and the fact that, as an example, they have a \$3.5 billion slush fund that is there to be used for many other programs in the Federal Government.

There is no need to have the Federal Reserve with this amount of money, this pot of money, this \$3.5 billion that they simply have never used since its inception. This money can be used for education. It can be used for many of the other programs for which we are searching for money. I hope during today we will have a good discussion on issues that are affecting this country and that tomorrow we move forward on the social security earnings legislation.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is my intention to seek recognition for the purpose of making a presentation. My understanding is Senator BYRD has a presentation. I will defer my presentation so that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia can proceed. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized following the presentation of the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the very distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota, but he is the dean of the delegation. He served in the House several years.

DREAM OF SPRING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today, as we observe the arrival of the vernal equinox and, with it, the official arrival of spring, the words of the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge come easily to mind:

All Nature seems at work. Slugs leave their lair—

The bees are stirring—birds are on the wing—

And Winter slumbering in the open air,
Wears on his smiling face a dream of Spring!

Washington has turned her smiling face towards spring as well. The roadsides, so recently painted gray-brown with grit and dirt in the wake of receding glaciers of snow mounded up by mastodon plow trucks, have greened again. The brave crocuses have forced their way through the still-cold Earth to offer their first bright promise of warmer weather, the merry forsythia mirrors the Sun's golden light, and the pear and magnolia trees are softening the gray weave of bare branches with

their pink and white petals. Washington's famous cherry blossoms will soon be adding their dainty petals to the spring breezes.

It is time for the soft whisper of falling snow to be replaced by the conversational patter of spring rains. It is time for the volume to be turned up from the quiet solos of solitary winter birds to the rousing, full-throated chorus of springtime birdsongs.

I asked the robin, as he sprang
From branch to branch and sweetly sang,
What made his breast so round and red;
Twas "looking at the sun," he said;

I asked the violets, sweet and blue,
Sparkling in the morning dew,
Whence came their colors, then so shy;
They answered, "looking to the sky";

I saw the roses, one by one,
Unfold their petals to the sun,
I asked them what made their tints so bright,

And they answered, "looking to the light";

I asked the thrush, whose silvery note
Came like a song from angel's throat,
Why he sang in the twilight dim;
He answered, "looking up at Him."

We have this full-throated chorus of springtime voices—the violets, the roses, the robin, the thrush, the other bird songs—and it is time to spade up the garden, releasing the intoxicating perfume of rich, moist earth. How my little dog, Billy, loves that scent. He stands watch over the spade as I prepare the ground for my tomatoes, and his ears are pricked up, his tail is wagging, his eyes are shining with anticipation, waiting to chip in with paws flying, heedless of the dirt he will track into the house on his white coat. You see, he is a Maltese. This is Billy Byrd—Billy Byrd II. I used to have another dog. It was a cocker spaniel, but it was Billy Byrd I.

It is also time to marvel at the mysteries of God's designs as we watch daffodils burn their way through dense layers of last year's leathery leaves in order to put on their bright show. It is time to wonder how a tiny crocus bulb, no larger than a thumbnail and no heavier than a dust-dry clod of earth, can push aside frozen Earth, melt its way through snow or ice, just to put out four colorful petals. I sometimes wonder for whom the crocuses' show is, for surely crocuses bloom too early for even the hardiest bee.

William Shakespeare observed that, "There is no ancient gentlemen but gardeners . . . They hold up Adam's profession." There is indeed a kinship among gardeners, whether serious gardeners whose gardens are their lifelong avocation, or the duffer with a few beds who buys plants at the local hardware store each spring. All gardeners are, at heart, optimists. They have to be. This season allows the gardener each year to fall in love all over again, and to wear on his smiling face a dream of spring and of greatness in the garden. He stands outside, shovel in not-yet-blistered hand, and has visions. He sees, not the patchy lawn and unkempt flowerbeds worn by winter, but some grand turf flowing like a green sea between islands of color, Sun, and shade.

He foresees the abundance of the garden overflowing from his table to those of his friends and family. In March, it is not possible to truly believe that there will ever be too many tomatoes, too many zucchini, too many cucumbers. Each seed in the brightly colored envelope, each small budding plant, is precious and deserving of an opportunity to grow. Each is a gamble, but a gamble in which the gardener believes the odds are on his side. And why not? God is also on his side. Not all the plants will make it, but enough will, and those survivors will often exceed his most fecund imaginings.

West Virginia is full of master gardeners. Their pantries and cellars are treasure houses filled with jewel-tone quart jars of ruby tomatoes, emerald green beans, and sapphire blueberries. Crystal quilted jelly jars hold not precious unguents, but the ambrosia of the gods—homemade jams, jellies, and preserves distilled from the freshest strawberries, plums, cherries, quinces, apples, and blackberries. West Virginia's home canners are well prepared to cope with the bounteous overflow of the overambitious gardener.

To be a gardener is not only to be optimistic, but also to be patient. If something does not work out this year, there is always a different scheme next year. Over time, even the most scraggly sapling will reach majestic maturity, towering over the landscape and altering the microclimate of the yard with its shade and its earthmoving roots. The sun-loving flowers near it will gradually be replaced by those which tolerate increasing amounts of shade. No garden is a static place—how could it be?—filled with so much polite but fierce competition among its denizens, and always under attack by invading insects and dreaded diseases—black spot, to be sure, rather than the Black Plague, but dreaded, nonetheless.

To be a gardener is to be close to the Creator, to follow in His example. You see, God made the country; man made the town. To be, as Shakespeare said, holding up Adam's profession, that is what it is to be a gardener. We each try to create, at least in our dreams, our own small Eden. We learn the great lessons of life as we cultivate patience and nurture our optimism. In a garden one sees, up close—up close, up real close—the great mysteries of birth, life, struggle, death, yes, and renewal, writ small enough to comprehend and only then, to translate into some larger understanding that may, with age, approach wisdom. My chaplain will say, in a garden, God speaks to us simply, in the language of flowers.

The kiss of the sun for pardon,
The song of the birds for mirth,
One is nearer God's Heart in the garden
Than anywhere else on earth.

So said Dorothy Frances Gurney, and surely her words are even more true in the spring garden than at any other time of year. It gives me joy to watch the greening of the earth, once again,

and to witness the triumph of each little bulb and each little bud as it bursts forth, victorious over the chill of winter. I am filled with warmth that is easy to share, as I and my colleagues in Adam's profession emerge from our winter hibernation into the soft spring air and, with smiling faces, dream of spring.

The year's at the spring
And day's at the morn;
Morning's at seven;
The hillside's dew-pearled;
The lark's on the wing;
The snail's on the thorn;
God's in His Heaven—
All is right with the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from West Virginia. In many ways, you have never really heard spring described until you have heard it described by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. It also fits with something I come to the floor to talk about.

FAMILY FARMERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have over 2,000 family farmers who have arrived in Washington, DC, this morning. In other times and other circumstances, they would be preparing for spring planting.

Spring is a time for farmers to begin thinking about getting to the field to plant their seeds and do the work family farmers do. But instead of preparing for spring planting, 2,000 family farmers are here in Washington, DC, today.

I intend to leave this Chamber and have lunch with them. They are holding a "farmer's share lunch", just steps from the Capitol on the lawn in the upper Senate park beside the Russell Building. A customer buying this same lunch at a restaurant or in some other venue in Washington, DC would pay \$10. These farmers are charging the portion of the food dollar they get: From a \$10 lunch, they get approximately 39 cents. So over in the park, farmers will be providing lunch for 39 cents to demonstrate how little of America's food dollar family farmers are getting.

We have such a serious problem on America's family farms. Two thousand of those family farmers have come to Washington, DC, to say to the Federal Government that the public policy dealing with family farmers simply isn't working. If it is in the interests of our country to preserve a network of family farms to produce America's food—if those are our policy interests in America—then we must change public policy because the current farm program does not work.

There is a fellow in North Dakota named Dave Smith. He is a farmer in Makoti, ND. Frankly, I have never met Dave Smith. He calls himself the Flying Farmer. He has developed a hobby of jumping over stock cars. He builds a ramp, jumps these cars, and dives over

to the other side. He wears a helmet and performs at the county fairs and the State fairs.

I have seen him do these tricks a couple of times and have always wondered what would persuade someone to do these things?

Let me tell you how he got in the "Guinness Book of World Records". Dave Smith, the Flying Farmer, from Makoti, ND, set a world record by driving in reverse for 500 miles at an average speed of 34 miles per hour.

I am thinking to myself: Why would someone want to do that? But then I recognized that it reminds me of public policy as it affects family farmers, an endurance race in the wrong direction.

The question is, What do we do to stop this movement in the wrong direction and start it in the right direction? What do we do for family farmers?

I have on previous occasions talked in the Senate about what one finds when going to Europe. Go to the European countryside, visit with their farmers and go to the small towns that rely on families who live off the land. Get a feeling for how things are going in rural Europe.

Farmers are doing well in Europe. Small towns are doing fine in Europe. There is life; one can feel it. One can sense it. Why? Because Europe has decided that as a matter of public policy, the kind of economy they want is an economy that has food production based on the family unit. They want to maintain and retain family farmers in their future. It is a deliberate public policy in Europe. They have been hungry, and they don't intend to go hungry again. They want broad-based ownership of food production in Europe.

I found it interesting that the European trade representatives, who are often vilified—and perhaps I do it from time to time—talked about trade in agriculture in the context of families and communities when I met with them at the WTO meeting in Seattle. "Multifunctionality" is the term they used. They talked about the impact on family farmers and the relationship to building communities as a result of a network of farms in the countryside.

Our trade negotiators look at trade through the pristine view of one word—markets, as though it doesn't have anything to do with families or communities. As if somehow there is no relationship between virtue and math when it comes to the question of profits and losses. I want to talk for a couple of minutes about the fallacy of all of that.

These days, when there is so much economic prosperity in so much of our country, and we are blessed with so many things, we find that in the granaries, garages and in the machine sheds of America's family farms, families are gathering trying to figure out: How do we get this equipment ready for the field work in the spring to plant a crop? Will our banker lend us the money to buy seeds and fuel and fertilizer, for example, to once again try

to make a living on the family farm? Or are we now going to lose our dream? Will we, after 30 years of trying, lose the opportunity to continue farming this year because prices have collapsed and our trade agreements have not been good for agriculture?

Interest rates are going up. So many other things are confronting the farmer over which they have no control.

I will show a few charts that describe what is happening to America's family farms. The families who have come to town, the 2,000 of them, to say there is something wrong that needs to be fixed, here is what they are confronted with. Look what has happened to the farmer's share of the retail beef dollar. It has dropped precipitously.

This chart shows the farmer's share of the retail pork dollar—it is almost interchangeable—a dramatic collapse in 19 years. For North Dakota, where we raise a great deal of grain, this chart shows the farmer's share of the cereal grains dollar. Some might say, well, we are importing a lot of food; consumers are able to access cheaper food. Have you been to the grocery store lately and taken a look at the bar codes of hamburgers or bread or that which is made from cereal grain or livestock? Have you noticed that food prices have come down? I don't think so. Grain prices have collapsed.

For a while, we had a very substantial collapse in livestock prices. In fact, at one point about a year ago, a hog that brought the hog producer \$20 on the market for an entire hog had its meat sold for \$300. So what happened between the \$20 the farmer got for selling an entire hog and the \$300 that was charged at the grocery store counter for the meat from the very same hog? The middle folks, the folks who handle all of that, are making a lot of money. The farmer is left with the carcass.

I will mention a couple of other items with respect to the family farm. Farmers have come to the Nation's Capital to ask for a change. We passed a piece of farm legislation some years ago. I voted against it, but nonetheless it passed. It essentially pulled the rug out from under family farmers. It said they should all just operate in the marketplace.

That sounds good enough, if the marketplace were a fair marketplace and farmers were involved in fair competition with others who produce food around the world. That is not the case. Our trade agreements injure family farmers rather than help them. They don't have an opportunity to pay a fair interest rate because the Federal Reserve Board is jacking up the cost of money in a manner that is totally unjustified. They deal with monopolies in every direction they turn. If they want to put their grain on a railroad, the railroad is overcharging them. What is going to happen is if they are going to sell their cattle to packing companies, three or four packing companies are involved in 80 to 85 percent of all the steer slaughter in this country. It is

the same with pork and lamb. Family farmers are competing in a game in which the deck is stacked.

We have a policy establishment in Washington that views all of this through a very clear lens. It is a limited vision, but the direction they look appears clear to them. This, in some of their minds, is kind of a "stuff Olympics." Those who produce the most stuff get the most medals, even if you are producing stuff you already have too much of and not producing what you need. For example, in rural America, if you are producing what nurtures and strengthens communities, that is irrelevant according to these folks. The policy establishment says that is not what we are about. We are about the "stuff Olympics." Those who produce the most stuff win.

Of course, that is not a proper way to look at who we are and what we want to be. The markets are fine, but markets are not always fair. We, as a country, have a right, as Europe has a right and has done, to decide what kind of economy we want. What kind of things do we want produced from the arrangements of production? If we say we need better communities, stronger families living on the land and a network of producers producing America's food, then we need to question whether our economic arrangements contribute to that end. Clearly, the answer now is no.

Should we not support the form of agriculture that contributes to that kind of economy and that kind of society? What is the farm program really for? These farmers have come to town saying the farm program doesn't work. What is it really for?

In my judgment, we don't need a farm program. We could abolish it if its goal is not simple and singular. We should have a farm program that is designed to support and sustain a network of families living on America's agricultural land. If that is not the goal of the farm program, then we don't need one. If someone wants to farm an entire county, God bless them, but they don't need the Government's help. But when prices collapse, if families who are living on that farm don't have a bridge across those price valleys, they are simply not going to make it from one side to the other.

My belief is that the contribution a network of family farms makes to our country is irreplaceable and invaluable. Let me tell my colleagues about that contribution, that lifestyle, because I come from a State I dearly love. It embodies those values that America needs more of.

We have a man and a wife in Sentinel Butte, ND, who own a gas station. Perhaps I have told the Senate about this before. They are near retirement age and don't want to keep the gas station open all day. This is a town of under 100 people. They decided that when they close at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, they would hang the key on a nail. If you need gas, you drive up and take the key, unlock the pump, and fill

up. Then you are supposed to make a note that you did that.

Yes, that is true. Yes, that happens in my home State, a small community of under 100 people who understand the value of the small town cafe, the hub of life in a small community, and can't afford to keep the small town restaurant open. How do they do it? A signup sheet. Everybody in town has to volunteer to work for nothing to keep the restaurant open.

Yes, that is the way the restaurant works in Havana, ND. Tuttle, ND, a town of under 100 people, lost their grocery store. What to do? They could not find anybody to start a grocery store. So the town itself—the community—built a grocery store. Yes, the town owns the grocery store because that is the kind of town they want and the kind of life they want.

I may have told the Senate about the woman who owns the flower shop in Mott, ND. A town 14 miles from Regent, my hometown. My parents are buried in the cemetery in Regent, ND, a town of 270 people. We always send flowers to my mother's grave on Mother's Day from the Mott Florist Shop. They are always apologetic for charging a couple of dollars extra to send them to the Regent cemetery, which is 14 miles away.

The Mott Florist Shop is quite a place. This year, my brother called them—he or I usually call them—and he asked them to deliver flowers for Memorial Day. He said, "By the way, I forgot to call on Mother's Day when we usually order flowers for my mother's grave." She said, "That's all right. I figured you forgot so we sent flowers over to your mother's grave anyway. I figured I would send you a bill later, and if you paid it, OK; if not, that's OK, too."

Where does that happen in this country? It is pretty special to have those kinds of communities and people.

About the same time that happened, I read an article in the newspaper—and I don't mean to be pejorative about New York City because it is a wonderful city, but a fellow died on the subway and he continued riding 4 or 5 hours on the subway before somebody discovered he was dead. Big difference. Rural values, community, responsibility, looking out for each other, helping each other, knowing each other—that is part of what we need to be as a country.

I worry so much that we are losing a great deal of that in the way we deal with public policy. Thomas Jefferson used to say that the kind of agriculture we choose in this country affects the kind of communities we have. It affects the kind of Nation we are going to be. He was dead right about that.

That is why the issue that these folks have come to town to discuss, the 2,000 farmers, who otherwise would be in their machine shed getting ready for spring's work, working on the transmission, greasing the tractor, going to town to get the seed, all excited about

being able to finally get that tractor started and getting out and plowing the ground and putting seeds in the ground, are instead over here about a block away. And I am going to get there soon. They are here to say family farming matters to this country and Congress must do something to help or we will be left with corporate agriculture from California to Maine, and it will be different. A part of America will be gone forever. Some say: Well, that's the way it is. The family farm is like the little diner left behind when an interstate highway comes through, and it is too bad; it was a wonderful place to have soup and sandwiches. But that is life.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Of course, I will.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let us go back 2,000 years to the small family farms on the Italian peninsula. Those small family farms produced the rugged soldiers who helped ancient Rome to conquer all of the countries around the Mediterranean basin. Those family farms produced men and women who believed in the gods. They were pagan gods, but those ancient Romans believed in those gods, venerated their forefathers, their ancestors, taught their children to respect authority, to respect law, to respect the state. And the ancient Romans felt that the gods had in mind a particular destiny for their country. Each Roman felt that it was his duty to help to promote that destiny of his state. And then came the latifundia, the great corporate farms. Senators bought up land. They became huge farms. The farmers, the peasants, left the land and migrated into the cities and became a part of the mob that sought the theater and free bread.

And when that happened, remember that the Roman legions, which constituted the greatest military fighting machine of that time, were able to get their recruits from the farms. When the peasants left the land, left the home, and the home deteriorated and the belief in the gods dimmed and faded, the great Roman Senate weakened, lost its way, lost its nerve, and without being forced to ceded to the dictators—the Caesars, and later the Emperors—the power of the purse, that was the beginning of the end. Rome collapsed.

The same thing has happened here in America. When we look at our colonial forebears, they had the stamina, the stern discipline of the ancient Romans. They believed in a creator, and the home was where the values were inculcated into the young people. They respected the law, they respected authority, they respected their fathers and mothers, and they took seriously the Biblical injunction “honor thy father and thy mother.”

We can take a lesson from the ancient Romans and many a leaf out of their history because there were several parallels between those ancient Romans and our colonial ancestors and the America that was—not the Amer-

ica that is, but the America that was—up until 50 years ago, or some such.

I am in the very mood at this moment to commend my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, when he talks about these farmers. They are the people who toil the earth. They have to depend upon the weather; it is uncertain. They can't count on, from month to month or year to year, what the weather is going to be, how dependable it is going to be. What a life they have to live. It is a rugged life, but it is a clean life—clean in that they understand what it is to be near the soil and near God's great tradition. I wish that more of our young people grew up on the farm. There was a time in this country when 90 percent of the population was from the farms. That day is long gone.

I thank the Senator, who so often enlightens this great body on issues of importance to the country. He has his head screwed on right. His heart is where it ought to be. He has sound wisdom. He has done a great service today speaking about the small farmers. I personally thank him for what he means to the Senate and to the people of his State.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague from West Virginia that I am humbled by his words. I was on a radio talk show earlier this morning for an hour or so. When he said I had my head screwed on right, I just say that is the nicest thing said about me all day.

I appreciate very much the comments the Senator made.

I also say this is not about nostalgia. It is about a country having to choose the kind of future it wants, a country measuring what it wants to achieve with its economy, and a country that determines what has value.

It is so much a disconnection to me that we are the largest arms seller in the world by far—somewhere around \$10 to 12 billion a year. A fair amount of those purchases are from countries that can least afford to purchase jet fighter planes, tanks, and weapons of war, and, yet, they do.

In those same Third World countries that are purchasing arms, people are desperately hungry. At the same time that people are desperately hungry for food in so many places in the world, and hundreds of millions of people go to bed with an ache deep in their belly because they haven't had enough to eat, then in Mohall, ND, in the morning someone will load a two-ton truck with wheat and drive to the elevator and will be told by the grain trade: Your food doesn't have value. Your food just doesn't have value. Yet we know it costs you \$4.50 a bushel to produce it, but it is only worth \$2.30 a bushel because it just doesn't have value.

What a serious disconnection. We need to find a way to create value in our country for that which matters: the production and work of family farmers and the risks of what family

farmers produce; yes, food for a hungry world, but also the social structure of a community and a rural economy.

Mr. Critchfield, a wonderful author, wrote a book called “Those Days.” He talked about the “seed bed” of family values in America for over two centuries from family farms to small towns to big cities. It was always the “seed bed” of family values.

When a man named Ernest in Regent, ND, collapsed of a heart attack right near harvest, his neighbors brought the combines over to take his wheat off the field? If his neighbors were in corporate America, they would be called competitors. But on family farms, they are neighbors. And they are part of a social structure that works together. But they can't work together and make a living when grain prices have collapsed. They need a safety net of some type that says: You matter, you have value, and you are important to our country's economy.

I wish to mention two other quick items that affect family farmers in a very significant way. They came to town today. In fact, I was on an airplane with some of them last evening. Most of them came by bus but a few came on the airplane—last evening, today, and tomorrow.

Two things will happen here in Washington, DC: One, the Federal Reserve Board will meet. When they do, it won't be as if they are doing it in front of television cameras. It will be behind closed doors. They will make a decision in secret. We will not be a part of it. There will be no discussion and no debate. These central bankers will make a decision about whether to increase interest rates once again. All of the evidence is that they will do so.

Those poor farmers who are coming to town asking for some assistance when prices have collapsed will find one more time that the Federal Reserve Board has boosted their cost of production by increasing interest rates.

What is the justification for that? The answer is none. There is no justification. Workers' productivity is up in this country—way up. Do workers in this country not have a right to more compensation if they are more productive?

Mr. Greenspan and the Federal Reserve Board are worried about inflation. The core inflation rate that has been recently announced in both the Producer Price Index and the Consumer Price Index, which indicates that inflation is not a serious threat in this country. As I said, productivity is growing. Yet, somehow, Mr. Greenspan fashions himself as a set of human brake pads whose sole mission in life is to try to slow down the American economy.

It is wrong for the Federal Reserve Board to believe that too many people are working and that we are growing too fast. They are worried about that because they believe it will provoke more inflation. They have believed

that for the last several years, and they have been wrong, wrong, wrong in every circumstance. But it has been used as justification to increase interest rates. That adds to the burden these family farmers have to bear as they go out to try to borrow money to buy the seeds, the fertilizer, and the fuel with which to put in their spring crops.

The Federal Reserve Board tomorrow will add to the burdens of these farmers, in my judgment, in a manner that is wholly unjustified. Productivity last year grew at a substantial 3 percent rate. That surge pushed the unit labor costs down by 2.5 percent in the fourth quarter in 1999.

I have talked at length about the Federal Reserve Board. I don't mean to cast disrespect on their motives as people. I have said that I commend Alan Greenspan for his public service but disagree with him from a policy standpoint very significantly.

But there is no justification for this Federal Reserve Board, the last dinosaur of our government, that does all of its business in secret. What other unit of government closes its doors and then says, "Let's decide what we want to do next to the American people"?

If Mr. Greenspan, as has been the subject of some of his recent pronouncements, believes that the stock market is moving too high—"irrational exuberance" he once called it—then he can take action to deal with that. He could increase margin requirements, which I think he probably ought to do. But instead of doing that—and he doesn't want to do that—he says: I will have all the American people, especially producers, pay higher interest charges. It is unwise, unfair, and risky, in my judgment, to raise interests at a time when fuel costs are rising and commodity prices all across the board have collapsed. I think it risks a significant slowdown in this economy.

I regret that they will take that action tomorrow. If they do, I will be here to speak again briefly about it.

Let me take 2 additional minutes to talk about one other issue that will be announced tomorrow. In addition to the Federal Reserve Board meeting, there will be an announcement tomorrow morning by the Commerce Department about America's trade deficit. I expect once again that the monthly trade deficit will be near record level.

What does that mean? It means that those family farmers who are gathered today in Washington, DC, asking for some help will once again see the consequences of a trade policy that has not worked.

We are not exporting nearly enough. We are importing too much. We find closed markets for agricultural commodities all around the world. Even when we negotiate new trade agreements, the negotiations are not the independent, kind of hard-nosed negotiations that you would expect on behalf of our producers. We do not, as a country, stand up for our producers' interests.

I will talk at some later time about the recent bilateral trade agreement with China. I have spoken at great length about the NAFTA agreement, and Canada and Mexico, and so on. But family farmers and others have a right, in my judgment, to be very concerned about these kinds of policies.

I will show a chart about the trade deficit. This chart shows what is happening to this country's merchandise trade deficit. It was \$347 billion in 1999.

Let me mention China. I want to mention it just in a microcosm. We reached an agreement with China only months ago. A significant part of this \$347 billion was nearly \$70 billion with China alone.

Let me take automobiles, for example, because there is not a lot of trade in automobiles between the United States and China. But in our trade agreement with China, as I understand it, after a phase in, we reached an agreement by which China will have only a 25-percent tariff on U.S. automobiles that will be sent to China. We would have a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese automobiles into this country. So we reached a trade agreement which says we will phase this in slowly. But after it is fully phased in, China, you can have a 10-times greater tariff on automobiles going into China than we would have.

I ask a question: Who is negotiating, and on whose behalf? We should get some uniforms and jerseys that say "U.S.A." on them. At least when they sit down we would understand who they are and we could demand that they work for our interests and demand reciprocal agreements that say treat us like we treat you. Open your markets.

I mention automobiles, because it is not of great consequence in that particular trade agreement. But I am going to talk at greater length about some of the other issues as well. I mention it, because tomorrow the Commerce Department will, once again, announce the monthly trade deficit. It will, in my judgment, signal the storm clouds that exist in this area to which we must respond. Our economy is wonderful. We live in a great country. We are blessed with all kinds of good news. However, we must address this issue.

I finish by telling the Senator from West Virginia what happened to me at the WTO meetings in Seattle in December. Everyone remembers how raucous those WTO sessions turned out to be, especially with demonstrators in the street. Something happened I will relate that reminds everyone once again of who we are and where we are. A group of House and Senate Members were meeting with a group of 10 or 12 European parliamentarians across an oblong table, talking about the differences between Europe and the United States in trade, the beef issue, and the Roquefort trade issue.

Mr. Rocard, the former Prime Minister of France, leaned over and said: Mr. Senator, I want you to understand

something. We are talking about disputes between the United States and Europe. I want you to understand how I feel about your country. I was a 14-year-old boy on the streets of Paris, France, in 1944 when the Liberation Army marched into my country and removed the Nazis from my country. When I was a 14-year-old boy, standing on the streets, when those American soldiers marched into my country, a young black American soldier reached out his hand and gave me an apple. I want you to understand that I will never, ever forget that moment and what it meant to me and what it meant to my country.

I got chills as I listened to that. We have, as a country, done so much for so many around the world. We are self-critical and tend to forget the remarkable things we have done.

This fellow said to me: I will go to my grave having very special feelings about what your country, what your soldier, what your commitment was to me, to my family, and to my country.

That is something we should understand. We have a great capacity to do good things. As a democracy, we make some mistakes from time to time. But we have a great capacity to do good things in our abilities to make choices regarding public policy, in developing the kinds of policies that are produced in this Chamber. All of us must, from our various centers of interest around America, come here and with passion make the case for the things we think are important.

The Senator from West Virginia makes passionate arguments on behalf of the families who have been mining America's coal in the hills of Appalachia. I listened with wonder to his description of what is happening in those small communities. He understands that those from farm country, from North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and elsewhere feel the same way, with the same passion, about the people we represent who are struggling and in many ways confront the same problems of collapsed commodity prices. There is the notion by some that this is just all nostalgia, not hard-nosed market economics.

That is why, as we do all of this, as we engage in these debates, we must as a country think through the public policy questions with better clarity, especially with the understanding that tomorrow's economy and tomorrow's country is what we decide it will be. We have a right to make these decisions. Europe has decided it wants family farmers in its future. It wants rural Europe to be healthy and family farmers to make it. Why? Because they understand that family farms produce more than just grain or livestock. They produce something that is social in nature—community, a rural lifestyle and culture that is important. That is something Europe is already reconciled to, and we ought to, as well.

I have taken far more time than I intended. Let me end as I started. I will

go to the farmers' lunch near the Russell Building. They are serving a \$10 lunch for 39 cents because farmers are here, 2,000-fold, saying: This is our share of the food dollar. It is not enough. We cannot make a living. We need help. We don't need charity. We need a little attention from Congress, better trade agreements, a better farm program, a little action on the anti-trust front to deal with the concentrations of monopolies that exist, and a little understanding that we matter to America's future. We produce food. It is a hungry world. Food matters. Congress, pay attention. That is all they are saying.

With that, I will have lunch with friends of mine.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Before the distinguished Senator goes to lunch, would he agree with me that Oliver Goldsmith, writing in "The Deserted Village," must have had our family farmers in mind when he said:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills of prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and Lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;

But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

Is there anything more fitting by way of poetry than Oliver Goldsmith's words in "The Deserted Village" when he talked about the bold peasantry?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as always, the Senator from West Virginia has captured in just a minute, with verse that comes from memory, something that I have not been able to say in 45 minutes. He is absolutely correct.

Again, let me thank him for being on the floor as I made the presentation.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

ELEVEN-MONTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRAGEDY AT COLUMBINE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today marks the 11-month anniversary of the tragic school shooting at Columbine High School in Colorado. On April 20, 1999, 2 boys walked into their high school, armed to the hilt, and killed 13 students and faculty members before taking their own lives. Despite the horrible nature of this crime, and those that have followed it in Georgia, in Michigan, in the District of Columbia, and in other places throughout the country, the Congress has shown precious little leadership in exploring ways to help prevent mayhem in our schools.

Last May, in response to the Columbine shooting, this Senate passed the Juvenile Justice bill by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 73-25. Despite this strong show of bipartisan agreement, the legislation is bogged down in a morass of election year poli-

tics. Despite the fact that the American people are crying out for some leadership on this issue, the Congress is proving itself to be uncaring, if not irrelevant.

There is plenty of controversy to go around anytime any measure comes before the Congress which deals with gun violence. We have all heard repeatedly the cautionary slogan chanted by some, "guns don't kill people, people kill people." But increasingly in recent years it has been children who are wielding guns against their classmates. Perhaps the slogan should be changed to "guns don't kill children, children kill children." Sadly, that slogan now has the ring of reality, but, I doubt that anyone will be lobbying for gun rights with those words imprinted on their lecture.

The Senate-passed legislation contained a number of important provisions to not only crack down on violent juvenile offenders, but also to reduce the potential for weapons to fall into the hands of children who may not understand all of the dangers that the weapons pose.

The Senate legislation is a compromise between the rights of the individual to keep and bear arms and the safety of the public to be protected from those who should not have those guns. The bill would require that every handgun sold must have a trigger safety lock or secure container. It would require background checks on all buyers at gun shows. The legislation would ban the youth possession of semiautomatic assault weapons and their high-capacity ammunition clips. And it would bar anyone convicted of a violent felony as a juvenile from possessing a gun. These are commonsense provisions on which I hope parents and gun owners alike could agree.

Last week, the Nation's leading gun manufacturer, Smith & Wesson, imposed upon itself many of the provisions contained in the Senate version of the Juvenile Justice bill, including trigger locks and background checks. If Smith & Wesson can see the wisdom of balancing public safety with private ownership rights, why can this Congress not do the same?

The last time—and, in fact, the only time—that the conference committee on the Juvenile Justice legislation met was last August. Time is of the essence. I urge the conferees on both sides of the hill to meet and to settle their differences. The longer they wait, the longer the delay, the better the chances are that some further tragedy will come along and steal the lives of more innocent children. We might make a difference. We might save a life. Why not have the courage to try?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who always has most interesting remarks. I am pleased to associate myself with his comments as well.

HIGH FUEL PRICES

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, it is hard to pick up a newspaper or turn on a television set or read any kind of political commentary or watch one of the Sunday morning talk shows without having the subject very quickly turn to the high price that we in this country are paying for gasoline. There is a certain amount of *deja vu* when you look at some of these situations: Here we go again. Many Members remember quite well the problems this country faced in the 1970s when we had the long lines at our gas stations around this country. People were screaming and hollering about the lack of gas for their automobiles and were also complaining about the price of that gas if they were lucky enough to get it.

Here we are in the year 2000, and basically the problem is very similar to what it was back in 1973. It is interesting to me to see so many people wringing their hands, struggling to find out exactly what is causing this problem. It is not, indeed, a mystery at all. The problem is one of supply and demand. We are using far more gas and oil in this country than we were in the past decade, than in the past 5 years, in fact, more than we used last year. Yet we are producing substantially less than we are using.

During the 1970s oil embargo, many of us, particularly those from oil-producing States, were saying the problem would only get worse unless we did something to become energy self-sufficient. In those days, the 1970s, we were importing about 36 percent of the oil we consumed in the United States. When the OPEC nations just slightly tightened their valves and started producing a little bit less, that 36 percent brought this Nation to its knees and created the long lines at the gas stations.

Many of us at that time said it was only going to get worse unless we concentrated on trying to be more energy self-sufficient in this country; we would have to concentrate on making sure we were producing, in an environmentally safe manner, the necessary energy to run this Nation.

I wonder what people would say if we imported 50 percent of all the food we needed to feed the citizens of our country. I bet that if we were 50-percent dependent on foreign countries for food in this country, there would be long lines marching in Washington, people clamoring for our Nation to get its act together and become more self-sufficient, producing the food we need. I wonder why it is any different when it comes

to producing the energy this country needs.

If food is important to our Nation and to our Nation's economy, to our Nation's well-being, to our security, certainly energy, which runs this country, is important to the security of this Nation. Yet in the year 2000 we are not importing 36 percent of the energy we use, as we were in the last major crisis back in the 1970s. Today we are importing 55 percent; 55 percent of all of the energy from oil and gas that we use in this country is coming from other countries. We cannot depend on many of these countries to give us the supply of energy we need in this country.

So I question why there is so much difficulty in figuring out why we have this problem. In the last 13 years, our domestic oil production has fallen by 2.7 million barrels a day. In the past 2 years, domestic production has fallen about half a million barrels per day. In the last decade, there has been a 17-percent decline in the domestic production of oil and gas in this country, while at the same time our domestic oil consumption has increased by 14 percent. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that we have a huge problem. We are producing less and less and we are consuming more and more. We are depending more and more on foreign sources for the energy we need to run America.

Whether you are a farmer in Louisiana or in Kansas or any other part of the United States, or whether you are a housewife taking the children to school, whether you are a small businessman who is dependent on deliveries, or whether you are an independent trucker anywhere in America, you are starting to feel serious economic pressure because of the dramatic and rapid increase in the price of oil, in the price of gas at the pump.

The reason I bring this to my colleagues' attention is not any mystery. I have outlined why I think the problem is as it is. When you become over 50-percent dependent on other countries for something that is so important to your domestic survival and economic security, as we are dependent on oil, our country is facing very difficult times.

Some may ask: Senator, that is all fine and good. I understand what you are saying. But is there any oil for us to produce in this country?

The answer is: Absolutely. The problem, however, is that so many of our Nation's most valuable energy areas have been arbitrarily shut off from any potential exploration and development by actions of Government, actions by the Congress, actions by the previous President, actions by this President. They have all said: There are certain areas we are not even going to look for oil and gas. We would rather depend on OPEC to be generous and give us all the oil we need at the price we want.

In fact, that is not happening. On the chart I have here on the floor, the orange shows the areas in the Outer Con-

tinental Shelf around the United States where we have said, by Presidential edict or by acts of Congress: You cannot even look for oil and gas.

From Maine to Florida, from Washington State to the Mexican border, we have said we are not going to look or explore or even offer for lease these areas where there are known quantities of oil and gas.

The distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, talked about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the fact that it has been closed to any kind of production. An interesting fact is, our own Department of the Interior has estimated we have enough oil in that area to replace the amount of oil we are getting from the country of Saudi Arabia. Yet that area has been closed to even looking to see if oil might be there and in recoverable quantities.

I remember the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge issue very well. I was in the House of Representatives when Congress made a decision as to how to handle that area, which is located right next to Prudhoe Bay, which arguably has been one of the largest oil deposits anywhere in North America.

I remember when we were doing the National Alaskan Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980. We were not sure about what to do with that area because not enough was known at that time, some said, to make a decision on whether or not we should explore for oil in that area.

The House of Representatives—and it was also adopted in the Senate—said: All right, we are going to take this area and set it aside, and we are going to study it.

A lot of times, when Congress does not know what to do, it studies something and delays it by having a study.

We required the Department, working with industry, to do a study about whether, No. 1, there were resources there, and, No. 2, whether they could be environmentally, safely produced by actions of industry if we allowed them to do it. That was in 1980.

In 1987, the studies were completed and the results were in. The Department of the Interior looked at the results of that study and recommended the area be leased for exploration and development. But Congress would not let them do that. The administration would not let them do that. Even though the Department of the Interior, based on the study we required them to do in this area, recommended the area be leased for exploration and development, there has been no exploration. We will not even look to see whether there is any oil in that area for use by the people of this country. Yet the estimate is that there could be as many as 16 billion barrels of oil sitting there. By governmental action, by Presidential order, we are saying we are not even going to look there.

Some say: Senator, are you advocating we have oil production in a refuge? I only point out, we have oil pro-

duction in my State of Louisiana in practically every wildlife refuge. In the congressional district I represented, which is on the coast of Louisiana, we had oil and gas production on every single one of the wildlife refuges.

The test is whether it is compatible with the purpose of the refuge. The question is whether they can be done together in an environmentally safe manner. The answer has clearly been shown to be yes, it can, in most circumstances. The wildlife refuge benefits from some of the royalties from that oil and gas production, and the country benefits because we are producing oil where it is found. We can do both at the same time.

The Department of the Interior said that in 1987 after this extensive study Congress required. People in Congress said: We will study it because we think the answer will come back no. But when the answer came back, yes, it can be done, Congress said: We are going to say no anyway.

If one looks at the map on the chart, they will notice that from Maine, up to the Canadian border, down to the middle of Florida, we have 25 leases. That is it—25 leases. In the Gulf of Mexico off Louisiana and Texas, we have over 10,000 leases—oil that is being produced on the Outer Continental Shelf that is being used by everybody in the United States. About 75 percent of our Federal oil comes from off my State and the States of Texas and Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico. Over 10,000 leases are producing oil every day, ensuring economic security for this country.

We cannot do it by ourselves. Selfishly, I could say: Look, I hope they do not do it anywhere else. It is great for Louisiana if we have all the production and we get all the benefits, all of the jobs, all of the construction; that is fine for my State. But it is not good national policy to say we are only going to do it off one State.

On the other hand, look at the west coast. There are a lot of cars on the west coast. There are a lot of SUVs on the west coast. There are a lot of people hurting who want prices to be lower on the west coast. Yet the entire coastline from Canada to Mexico is off limits. There are only 83 leases from Canada to Mexico, and these are old leases which have been there for years and years.

With regard to this orange area on this map, we are saying: No, don't look at it; don't touch it; don't consider it. Are they saying that because we do not need it when we import 55 percent of our oil, or are they saying things have to be done perfectly to proceed and, unless things are done perfectly, we are never going to proceed?

It seems to me we have to have a balanced approach to energy development in this country. We cannot continue to send our Secretary of Energy—which is where I understand he is this week—to meet with OPEC hat in hand, saying to these foreign countries, please, please, give us more oil, when at the same

time we are not doing nearly enough to develop the legitimate resources in our own country.

If we had an aggressive development and production program in our country, we would not be importing 55 percent of the oil we need to run America. Yet when we say we are not going to do anything between Canada and Mexico and between Canada and Florida and we are only going to do it off Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi, that is not a balanced approach to energy development in the United States.

Some say: We don't want to have it off our coast because it may pollute the environment; we may have an oil spill from an offshore platform. The truth is, it is far more dangerous to import oil in tankers every day than it is to produce in offshore waters. There was a study done by the National Academy of Sciences—and it is on the minerals management web site—which talks about where oil is coming from that is polluting the waters of the world. Does it come from offshore production? No. Offshore oil and gas development is actually 2 percent of the oil that is found in offshore waters around the world. A little less than 2 percent comes from offshore development.

Where does it come from? It is no surprise: Importing oil and moving oil around the oceans of the world in ships. Marine transportation accounts for 45 percent of all the oil that is found in the ocean waters that is not supposed to be there. Municipal and industrial waste and runoff, which comes from when it rains and the rain runs off the streets and works its way ultimately to the oceans of the world, accounts for another 36 percent. Atmospheric fallout is about 9 percent, and natural seepage, which comes up from the ocean floor, is about another 9 percent. But less than 2 percent of the oil that is found in oceans comes from drilling for oil and gas off the coast of the countries where oil can be found.

I do not know what the answer is. There is no simple answer. I know the President made some proposals in a radio address this week. I encourage the administration to continue to seek solutions to the problem.

I have a suggestion, and one of the suggestions is right from the minerals management office. They have a chart that talks about the undiscovered resources in areas that are currently under moratorium. They make an estimate of how much oil is in areas of the country that we cannot even enter. Their estimate is probably the most accurate in the world.

For areas under moratorium—either congressional or Presidential moratorium—they estimate there are 15.2 billion barrels of oil sitting out there in areas where we are saying: Don't even go look. And there is an additional 61.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that could be found in these areas. But you know what. If we don't look, we will never know. It would seem to me that as long as we have these huge areas

where we have x'd out any ability to take a look to see what energy is there, we are not on very solid ground when we blame OPEC for the problems we are facing today.

With 55 percent of the oil used in the United States being imported, OPEC has the ability, by turning that faucet off just a little bit, to bring this country to its knees. Can you imagine what it would do if they turned a full turn and really reduced it?

No nation should ever allow itself—certainly not a nation as strong as the United States—to become dependent on foreign sources for things that are critical to our economic well-being and our national security and, indeed, our survival. Yet over the years we have allowed just that to happen with regard to energy.

We would not allow it to happen in the area of food. We would not allow it to happen in the area of planes or tanks or warships or anything else that we depend on for our national security—except in this one area. We have made a conscious decision to say: It is all right to import over half of the energy we use.

It is unacceptable. It is bad public policy. It needs to be changed; otherwise, every so often we will be faced with what we are faced with today.

In his radio address, the President has made some suggestions which I have noted. One was the creation of an environmentally sound home heating oil reserve for the Northeast. My question is, Where does the oil for that reserve come from? Are we just going to buy it from OPEC at \$30 a barrel? That is not going to solve the problem of high energy prices for the Northeast if we are filling up their oil reserve with oil coming from OPEC at \$30 a barrel. It would come out of the reserve at the same price.

The second suggestion is to immediately reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is located in Louisiana and Texas, where we have oil underground. I am all for doing that, but we are going to be putting oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at \$30 a barrel because of what OPEC has done to us.

Neither one of these two suggestions domestically produce any additional oil. It will continue to be filled with 55 percent of oil coming from foreign sources at \$30 a barrel or at whatever price OPEC determines.

The President has some other suggestions on promoting energy efficiency. We are all for that. He has some suggestions for tax incentives for energy efficiency. I am for that. He has some suggestions on promoting the use of alternative fuels—I am for that—and also support for domestic oil production, which I think is very positive.

But if you have all of these areas that are roped off, if you will, and you say, "Don't go here," when we know some of these areas have as much as Saudi Arabia exports to us—such as, in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge—I suggest

that as long as we have huge areas, thousands of miles of areas where we are saying don't even look for energy, then we are never going to address the heart of the problem, which is a lack of energy self-sufficiency for the United States of America. We cannot ever say we are going to be energy self-sufficient just by producing energy off the coast of one or two States.

Certainly, the Congress in the past has accepted the fact that we would let these areas be roped off. I guess the thought is always: Let's produce it somewhere else.

That is what we are doing. We are producing it somewhere else. It is called OPEC. Its nations have formed a cartel. They have done very well in controlling the price. They know they can bring this country—indeed, the world—to its knees simply by turning the valve off just a little bit. They will continue to do that.

I hope they open up the spigot just a little bit, but as long as we are importing 55 percent of the energy for the United States of America, they will always have the ability to bring us to our knees. That is something that should be unacceptable for the United States of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield myself 10 minutes on the time of Mr. THOMAS.

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

(The remarks of Mr. GREGG pertaining to the introduction of S. 2249 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2252 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, asks unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until 3 p.m.

There being no objection, at 2:38 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:59 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank you for your graciousness in allowing me to precede you on the Senate floor this afternoon. It is typical of my friend's graciousness and friendship. I appreciate it.

SENIOR CITIZENS FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Americans today are leading healthier and longer lives than ever before. By the year 2030, one-fifth of our American population will be age 65 or older. Given the demographics of the 21st century, it is clearly in our national interest to encourage people to stay in the workforce longer. Today, however, older Americans age 65 through 69 are currently discouraged from working since they lose \$1 in Social Security benefits for every \$3 they earn over \$17,000. I am, therefore, very pleased this week the Senate will consider H.R. 5, the Senior Citizens Freedom to Work Act, to eliminate the Social Security earnings test that unfairly penalizes senior citizens who need or want to keep working.

The elimination of this penalty will be particularly helpful to women. Women frequently have interrupted work histories because they take time off to raise their families. Historically, unfortunately, they also earn less than men. As a result, women are twice as likely to retire in poverty as men. Many women do not have sufficient savings or a private pension, and they depend upon the money they earn to supplement their Social Security benefits in order to make ends meet. These low-income seniors are particularly hard hit by the earnings test, which amounts to a 33-percent tax on their earned income over and above what they are already paying in Federal, State, and Social Security payroll taxes.

Moreover, the Social Security earnings penalty takes money away from seniors that is rightfully theirs. According to the Social Security Administration, 800,000 senior citizens sacrificed some of their benefits last year by exceeding the earnings limit. These were benefits they had earned through a lifetime of hard work in contributions to the Social Security system.

Finally, this penalty is most burdensome for those seniors who have to work and depend upon their income for survival. More well-to-do seniors gen-

erally supplement their Social Security benefits with what we refer to as "unearned income" from savings and investments, none of which is affected by the current earnings limit.

Earlier this month, in an overwhelming display of bipartisan cooperation, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to repeal this unfair penalty on our senior citizens. They voted to say no to discriminating against seniors and discouraging them from working. It is my hope the Senate will follow suit this week with another unanimous vote on this historic measure.

Our Nation's seniors should be free to work without penalty. Older workers have the skills, the wisdom, and the judgment that all employers value. Given our tight labor market and our historically low rate of personal savings, it simply does not make sense for Washington to discourage the most experienced workers we have from remaining in the workforce when they want to do so. I hope all of our colleagues will join me in passing this important legislation before the end of the week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the Senator from Maine regarding the elimination of the Social Security earnings test.

I rise in support of the Senior Citizens Freedom to Work Act, H.R. 5. I am pleased the Senate is considering this legislation expeditiously and that the legislation reflects the intent of Senator ASHCROFT's bill, S. 2074, of which I am a cosponsor.

Arkansas is a State that has one of the highest percentages of senior citizens in the Nation. We traditionally are just behind Arizona and Florida—very high. When you look at the population of our State, there are about 2.6 million senior citizens.

But when you look at low-income or lower income senior citizens, we are easily at the top and by far the leading State as a percentage of our population that has senior citizens who are in economic deprivation or lower income. These are the individuals, as the Senator from Maine so eloquently said, who are most in need of equity in the way we treat their Social Security income.

Earlier today I had lunch with a doctor who is a dentist in Arkansas and has his practice in primarily a retirement population area. He was relating to me how many of his patients are now 65-plus, many 70, 75 years old, and

about the remarkable health that they enjoy today and the opportunity, from a physical standpoint, that they have to go out and be a part of our labor market. In being a part of that labor market, they can use the experience and the expertise they have gained through a lifetime in our society and contribute that to the economy of today.

I think this is long overdue. The law that we are proposing to change is truly a vestige of the 1930s. It begs for its elimination. Our Nation's working seniors deserve immediate relief from the earnings limit—a longstanding and outdated provision of law. Persons aged 65 to 69 are losing \$1 in program benefits for every \$3 they earn beyond \$17,000, creating a very clear and a very real disincentive to work at all.

According to the Social Security Administration, more than 800,000 seniors lose either part or all of their Social Security benefits because of the program's earnings limitation. That is almost one million working seniors. That is 12,755 people in the State of Arkansas whose lives will improve if we pass this legislation and the President signs it into law.

Since I was elected to Federal office on the House side a few years ago, I have witnessed a steady commitment among the Republican leadership to provide greater flexibility, training, and financial relief to our Nation's workforce. We have advocated legislation that would provide private sector workers with the choice of flexible weekly work schedules—a perk that has been enjoyed by all of us on the Federal payroll for over 20 years.

In 1998, we passed a comprehensive overhaul of America's job training laws, giving more funding and flexibility to States, municipalities, and businesses to provide essential job skills to its employees. More importantly, though, we have an impressive record for putting taxpayer money back into the pockets of those who need it most, the American people.

The legislation before us complements our leadership's commitment to giving advantages to the worker—in this case, our country's most seasoned and experienced employees.

This bill would end that longstanding practice of penalizing seniors for working—something that we ought to encourage; something we should commend. No different than providing tax relief to all working Americans, we want to help senior employees who choose to remain in the workforce.

I disagree with the notion that "you can't teach an old dog new tricks." In fact, we could learn a thing or two from our seniors. We could learn a lot from our seniors. That is why we are debating this bill.

This legislation would not just help our senior workers; it also benefits employers, too. President Lincoln said: "You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer." Social Security's antiquated barriers not only

penalize seniors who want to work but employers who want to hire them. Seniors are turning down employment opportunities that business owners need to fill in order to compete in the global economy.

America posts one of the lowest unemployment rates in four decades, making good, plentiful workers harder than ever to find. Employers and our most experienced employees stand to gain considerably from the passage of this legislation.

H.R. 5 passed the House of Representatives 422-0. I anticipate it will pass the Senate with a similar kind of margin with great success.

The bill's language has the support of a bipartisan coalition of Senators who advocate comprehensive Social Security reform—reform based on a continuation of existing benefits while ensuring the program's financial long-term solvency. In fact, H.R. 5 is part of many of the comprehensive reform packages introduced in the last 2 years. It has been included in a lot of the plans to totally reform Social Security. We all understand that if left unchanged, the future of Social Security is in jeopardy as the program begins running deficits in about 2013 when 71 million of my fellow baby boomers begin collecting their retirement benefits. We know the number of retirees will double between 2008 and 2018, narrowing the ratio of workers to beneficiaries to less than 3 to 1. When Social Security first started, there were 45 people working to take care of 1 retiree. In 1950, there were 16 workers working for every beneficiary. We all know that all trust funds will be completely exhausted in the next 30 years when the beneficiaries far outnumber the working contributors.

I remember back in December 1998, when the President hosted the White House Conference on Social Security, Members of Congress were asked to participate and share their ideas, with the common understanding that restoring the program's financial solvency was not only necessary but imminent. The Speaker and the majority leader reserved the first bill in the House and Senate for the President's legislation. It was to be accompanied by several bipartisan bills offered by our colleagues. Although several bipartisan bills were introduced by Members of this body, H.R. 1 and S. 1 remain vacant.

Although H.R. 5 represents an important step toward equitable reform, it definitely sets aside provisions that would address the future financial stability of this vital program. We must not allow the passage of this legislation to be the "last rites" of Social Security reform. Frankly, I am disappointed by the President's lack of participation in this important debate.

The next step after passing H.R. 5 should be to lock up the Social Security surplus. Not only do our working and retired seniors need penalty relief, they deserve assurances that their future benefit checks are not being spent

on other Federal programs, no matter how good those other programs may be.

The very reason Social Security has a solvency problem is that it is a federally administered program that has IOUs disguised as trust funds. Our Nation's seniors deserve a program that delivers long term and is based on real money. I am confident that passage of H.R. 5 will open the door for more bipartisan legislation that enhances the strength of the Social Security program.

In time, Presidential leadership will mean more than words and with it will bring forth reform that preserves the program's financial stability for our children and our children's children. I ask my colleagues to continue supporting that cause and join me in supporting H.R. 5.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I am pleased to come to the floor this afternoon with my colleagues from Maine and Arkansas and others who are here to discuss the Senate's consideration of H.R. 5.

It is an interesting moment for me because when I first came to Congress in 1981, one of the first pieces of legislation I cosponsored was the elimination of the earnings limit test on those seniors who were taking Social Security and, as we know, limited in the amount of money they could earn at that point in time.

In 1983, the Congress decided, along with then Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, and President Ronald Reagan, that an entire reform of the Social Security system was necessary and that there should be a substantial tax increase to create solvency in the Social Security system. It seemed reasonable to me and my colleagues in the House at that moment; why should we not encourage those who were retiring and taking their Social Security benefits at age 62 or 65 to go on and earn an income beyond the Social Security benefit and pay into the system.

We were still caught in the Depression-era mentality that somehow you took an older person and shooed them away from the labor market by some kind of, what I called, perverse incentive; that is, we will tax you out of the labor market if you choose to be a productive citizen in it. As a result, we did not put the reform into Social Security in 1983 as we should have.

We know Social Security today is very solvent. It is solvent as a result of that 1983 initiative that was a bipartisan effort on the part of the House and the Senate.

The reform we are here to discuss today is one that was clearly debated at that time and denied, denied by a Congress that was still under the control of groups in this country that had dominated labor policy for years and believed that at age 65 you left the labor force and went into retirement

and some younger person took your slot. They had failed to recognize that economies expand and grow; if you treat an economy right, there is not only always need for new hires, but there is oftentimes a tremendous demand for the kind of knowledge, what I call institutional knowledge, that older workers bring to the workplace. Of course, we know that is very much the case today.

I guess my mother would probably have called me strong willed in my youth. That was a polite way of saying I was bullheaded. I would persist, if I could, until I won the issue in which I was interested.

Over the years, I and others of the House and the Senate have persisted. Every year, we went out and introduced the earnings limitation elimination. Every year, we were either defeated or the appropriate committees simply would not recognize it. That was through the 1980s and the early 1990s. Of course, as we know, the economy in large part has dramatically changed.

During that period of time, my father considered retiring from the farming and ranching business in his midsixties. He found it was of no value to do so because he would have denied himself a substantially larger income than he could have ever received from Social Security. So it wasn't until after age 72, when the earnings limitation did not apply, that my father and my parents, along with a good many other seniors in our country who were self-employed and who were clearly entitled to receive Social Security benefits, simply denied themselves the benefit because they couldn't afford to take it. They waited until much later in life to decide to retire or, as my dad said, slow down a little bit to 12-hour workdays instead of 18-hour workdays, which was quite typical of his generation in the labor force. Now, at age 84, he still thinks a 12-hour workday is a modest effort for any one individual to make in his or her contribution to society. I say that with a bit of jest, but it is very true of that workforce.

It was only at that time I think they recognized that my persistency, along with others of my colleagues in trying to eliminate the earnings requirement, was the right and appropriate thing to do.

So we were saying to seniors, age 65 through 69, they could only continue to earn up to a certain limit, \$17,000 a year, while receiving the full benefits of Social Security. But for every additional \$3 of earnings beyond that limit, the Government reduced their benefit by \$1—in other words, again, still penalizing them, still saying: We want you out of the workforce. Even if you are healthy, even if you are productive and can be a major contributor to the workforce, get out, if you want to receive the full benefits of the Social Security system that you had paid into all of your productive life and that you were certainly entitled to receive.

Well, as we have worked this issue over the last decade, one thing has changed. The President, for example, instead of expressing open opposition, is now saying this is a bill he will sign. As my colleagues from Arkansas and Maine have said the House, in almost a unanimous vote, declared their support for H.R. 5 in the last several weeks. I think the Senate will respond in kind this week.

I have set forth a lot of the reasons it is important. It is fundamentally important because it is fair. That is the No. 1 reason we ought to be doing it. It is fair for an individual who has paid into the system all of his or her productive life, at age 62 or 65, to gain those benefits and go on to continue to work if they wish.

Do we say to a young Federal employee who has vested his or herself in the retirement program of the Federal system and who chooses to step out and gain those benefits that they can't go on working? Do we say that to a military retiree? In fact, quite the opposite—we expect them to go on working.

Now, of course, as our seniors live longer and find out that some of their retirement benefits are simply not enough and they are outliving them, there is not just the accommodation of fairness to a senior in the workplace, there is the accommodation of necessity.

Many of our seniors find it necessary to work beyond age 65 to provide for themselves, to try to sustain the lifestyle they had when they were once full employees at a different period in their lives. So a combination of other forces is now working out there. I am proud that, as a Republican, I and many of my colleagues have worked over the last several years to change the character of the workplace, to recognize the flexibility that is necessary in a new and very different world from 1935, or 1945, or 1955, or 1965, or 1975, or even 1985.

We know that the workplace of the year 2000 is even different than the workplace of 1995. Now both spouses are working. Now we offer flexibility in kind. Now we allow people to stay home and work from their homes as major contributors in the workforce, and we offer flextime, and so forth. Yet we have said this up until now to a senior at the appropriate age of receiving full benefits from the Social Security system: If you go out and find a job, you can only earn up to a certain limitation and beyond that we will penalize you substantially until you are probably old enough not to want to work anymore, and then you can have the full benefits even if you do work.

Shame on us. Shame on a Congress and a Government that has held that policy as long as we have. Now, of course, as my colleague from Arkansas states, this is the longest sustained period of near full employment that our country has seen in decades. Now we need the senior in the workforce more

than ever, for all of the right kinds of reasons. As the House has spoken, I hope the Senate will speak in a unanimous vote and that we can send this to the President and say: Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is ready to knock down the decades-old law that no longer fits the American workforce or the American culture—if it ever did. And we have done this in a unanimous way.

That is the kind of expression I hope the Senate will make this week. The House has already spoken. I think that is probably due to my persistence, along with many colleagues over the past decade and a half; we have argued that this is something that is right and fair, in the first instance, and now is a combination of necessity, in the second instance, as the culture and economy of this country have changed significantly over the period of time in which this provision has been a part of the labor and Social Security laws of our country.

Madam President, I will proudly vote for H.R. 5 and encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.R. 5, SENIOR CITIZENS' FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 5, the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act, which the Senate will begin considering tomorrow.

Seniors in my home State of Utah and around the nation have waited a long time for the relief H.R. 5 will bring. I am so pleased that not only did the House pass this bill on March 1 by a vote of 422 to 0, and the Senate is very likely to follow suit tomorrow, but also that the President has finally come around and has indicated he will sign the bill.

Under current law, over 800,000 Social Security recipients between the ages of 65 and 70 are affected by the so-called earnings limit. Over 6,100 of these live in Utah. This limit provides that senior citizens who this year earn more than \$17,000 in wages or self-employment income will lose some of their Social Security benefits. More specifically, for every \$3 earned over the \$17,000 threshold, \$1 in benefits is lost. The bill we will take up tomorrow will remove this unfair limitation.

There are at least five reasons why H.R. 5 should be passed by this body with a resounding margin so this oppressive limitation, which holds back senior citizens to the detriment of everybody in this country, can be lifted.

First, the earnings limit is plainly unfair to senior citizens. What kind of

a message does the current law send to a worker turning age 65, Mr. President, when he or she learns that there will be a 33 percent penalty for continuing to work once his or her earnings exceed \$17,000?

Yet, at the same time, senior citizens who are fortunate enough to have interest, dividend, or capital gains income from stocks, bonds, or mutual funds, or income from a private pension, are not penalized, no matter how much of these kinds of income they receive. Even if the earnings limit otherwise had merit, which it doesn't, it punishes the very people who most need to work to make ends meet.

Second, the earnings limit is outdated. The limit was a feature of the original Social Security Act in 1935. It was included to encourage seniors to retire so their jobs would be available to the millions of younger workers who were unemployed in the difficult job market of the Great Depression. That was a different era. What was appropriate in 1935 is clearly not appropriate in 2000, when it is workers, not jobs, that are scarce.

Third, the earnings limit places extremely high marginal tax rates on workers between the ages of 65 and 70 who continue to work. Consider the example of a 66-year-old plumber I will call Howard. Along with his son, Howard has run a small plumbing business in Ogden, UT, for over 20 years. Now that he is over 65, Howard has decided to turn the management of the business over to his son. However, Howard still wants to work, and because of an aged mother whom he takes care of, he still needs some income. Howard works three days a week and earns \$35,000 per year.

Believe it or not, when the earnings limit penalty of 33 percent is combined with the income tax rate of 28 percent, the self-employment tax rate of 15.3 percent, and the effect of taxing his Social Security benefits at 85 percent, Howard faces a marginal tax bracket of 88.8 percent, not counting the Utah income tax. This high a marginal tax rate is unconscionable and indefensible any way you look at it.

Fourth, the earnings limit is terrible for our economy. The biggest problem our economy faces right now is a severe shortage of workers. This is especially true in the high technology fields, where our shortages are so severe that we must increase the number of H-1B visas allowed this year so our high tech firms can stay competitive.

However, turning to overseas workers is only a temporary solution. We need a long-term answer to this problem, which is only going to be exacerbated by current demographic trends, and the retirement of the baby boom generation. Our senior citizens are a wonderful resource that is not being tapped enough. Only 17 percent of males over age 65 are now working, compared with 47 percent in 1948. These workers are experienced, and in many cases, they want to keep working. In

order for this to happen, though, we need to scuttle outdated relics like this Social Security earnings test.

Finally, the earnings limit is no longer relevant, considering the growing longevity of Americans. In 1935, when the earnings limit was added to the Social Security Act, life expectancy in this country was 62 years. Now, it is 77 years. Moreover, senior citizens are the fastest growing segment of our population. There is absolutely no reason these citizens cannot keep on working if they desire to do so. I have read articles that the life expectancy of the American people may soon be approaching 85.

Therefore, I am very gratified to see that this earnings limit repeal is about to pass the Senate. And again, I am especially pleased that President Clinton has agreed to put aside election year politics and sign this legislation.

As important and long awaited this earnings limit repeal is, I want to emphasize that it does not lessen the need for comprehensive Social Security reform. Besides the repeal of the earnings test, there are many other vital issues that must be addressed to ensure the long-term viability of the system. These include the large and difficult question of how to best increase the system's rate of return in order to lessen the need for any benefit cuts or payroll tax increases once the Social Security trust fund runs out of spending authority. Other important issues that need to be addressed in the context of fundamental Social Security reform include work disincentives for blind workers.

Many of our blind citizens are also subject to a type of limit on their earnings, in which they lose Social Security disability payments once their earnings reach \$14,040 per year. For many of the same reasons that the earnings limit is unfair to senior citizens, the "substantial gainful activity" limit is unfair to those workers disabled by blindness.

I wish H.R. 5 could accommodate this unfairness by ameliorating this earnings limit and removing the disincentive these workers face today. I wish President Clinton would have used some of his political capital in this final year of his Presidency to lead the way to major Social Security reform. Regrettably, the President has made it clear that broad reform will have to wait for the leadership of another President.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes for H.R. 5 and let's finally repeal the unfair earnings limit on senior citizens.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING MY FRIEND MARSHALL COYNE

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, it is with deep regret and personal sorrow that I come to the Senate today to report the death of my good friend Marshall Coyne. He died in his sleep on March 16. He was 89 years old. Marshall became my friend years ago. Actually, it was with former Senator and Ambassador Saxbe that I first met Marshall Coyne. He had served on the symphony board with my wife Ann. The two developed a great friendship. Following her death, he continued to be my friend, and has continued now for many years to be a dear and loyal friend to me and my wife Catherine, our daughter Lily, and our whole family. He was a rare man.

First, let me state that in all the time I knew him, he never asked me how I voted, suggested how I should vote, or indicated that he had anything he wanted me to do on this floor. He did ask me for some information once in a while about various things going on in the city, the District, that is. But he was a very different person.

We developed such a close friendship that as I chaired Senate delegations going overseas, he would ask me where I was going, and he would show up there. He showed up in Geneva when we were there for the Senate arms control talks with the Soviets—going back that far. He showed up in London when we had the British parliamentary talks with Members of the Senate. And he showed up in Paris when we were there for the Paris Air Show. Marshall was the kind of friend who was always welcome. I never knew any Senator to object to the fact he was there. They all knew he was my friend and that he would come along.

We have had such a rare relationship. He had lunch with me every Friday that I was in the District of Columbia, I think, in the last 10 years. He had been to my home either one or two times a month during that whole time when we would be in Washington, DC.

He was the kind of friend I think every Senator needs and should have. We fished together. We fished together in Alaska. I remember how surprised he was one time when he saw a bear when we stopped at a stream. He, with my late friend Mike Joy, traveled around Alaska with me many times fishing. We fished off the coast of Costa Rica. We fished in Florida. He discussed his trips with me when I was not able to go. He went to Mongolia once, and he came back very impressed with that place.

Of course, our mutual interest was China, where I had served in World War II. He was one of the first Americans to reenter China after President and Mrs. Nixon's historic visit. He personally once a year visited Iceland. Another example of Marshall's interest in international affairs was his support for the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a premier public policy institution dedicated to policy analysis

on the world's major geographic regions.

He was, I think, a friend to many Members of the Congress and to many members of the military. Mr. Coyne organized the Ambassadors' Round Table at his Madison Hotel here in Washington so that new ambassadors to our country got to meet each other socially.

He also organized a series of meetings for former Cabinet members and distinguished military leaders who had reached the top of our military structure so they could come together and share their interests and remember old times together.

He said to me once: A person really was not your friend unless he really remembered you after he left office. He developed friendships that I think the memories of will last for a long time.

It is a difficult thing for me to think of not having my friend in the Senate dining room with me for years to come. But I want the Senate to know that I think this is one man who contributed a great deal to the friendships of our Senate. Oftentimes he had dinners at his home, at my suggestion, to help bring together some of the Members of the Senate and the House, so we might meet together socially and discuss non-business subjects and get to know one another better.

I am hopeful that the District will remember that he was a member of the board that controlled the District of Columbia before the District became independent and elected its own Mayor. Marshall served on the Opera Board at the Kennedy Center and he served on the Boards of both Georgetown and George Washington Universities. He was proud to call himself a Mason.

He had a collection of rare manuscripts and books. I will be very interested to see what happens to them. He had signatures he collected of almost every well-known politician, President, and Cabinet officer in the history of the United States.

He obviously had a very large Lincoln collection, for he was a great admirer of Lincoln. Since I have been Chairman, when one enters the anteroom of the Senate Appropriations Committee, they will see a bust of Lincoln—it is really a reproduction of a bust of Lincoln that Mr. Coyne gave me—so people might understand the importance of Lincoln to the process we all are pursuing here; that is, equal justice for all.

I do hope other Members who have known Mr. Coyne will share their knowledge of his activities with us on the floor. But in any event, Madam President, thank you very much for the privilege of addressing the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article from March 17 concerning Mr. Coyne be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 2000]
MARSHALL COYNE DIES AT AGE 89; DEVELOPER
BUILT MADISON HOTEL

Marshall B. Coyne, the Washington developer whose best-known holding was the Madison hotel, which hosted prime ministers and celebrities such as Frank Sinatra, died of complications from a broken hip March 16 at his home in Washington. He was 89.

Mr. Coyne was a New York native who moved to the Washington area in the 1940s. With his late business partner, Charles Rose, he started Roscoe-Ajax Construction Co. and built apartment and office buildings, mostly in the District. They opened the Madison luxury hotel at 15th and M streets NW in 1963, and Mr. Coyne later became the sole owner and proprietor.

Rival hoteliers were skeptical of the Madison's potential, predicting that no one would pay the \$27 daily minimum to stay in a place simply because it offered deep-pile carpets, rosewood paneling and Czech crystal chandeliers. Rooms at the Madison now average \$465 a day.

Mr. Coyne hoped the hotel would rank with Claridge's in London. He said, "We'll start looking at the balance sheet later, after we've built up the kind of clientele we're seeking and after we have the hotel operating at capacity."

He envisioned an attentive staff whose members knew their guests by name and always had a cigarette lighter handy to aid a smoker. In the first year, clients included newspaper heir William Randolph Hearst Jr. and Robert Six, the former president of Continental Airlines Inc.

Notable guests in recent years included the Russian delegations during the 1987 and 1990 summits between the former Soviet Union and the United States.

Because of his clientele, Mr. Coyne maintained a private persona.

"He was not the kind of guy who would stand on the street corner shouting about how he had lunch with the Dalai Lama, which he did a couple of times," said Sheldon S. Cohen, the former IRS commissioner who was a longtime friend and estate trustee.

Another close friend was Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), who described Mr. Coyne as "the kind of friend every senator should have. He never talked business. He talked fishing or stamps or books, and often of his trip to Mongolia, because of our mutual interest in China."

Stevens said Mr. Coyne also organized the Ambassadors' Round Table, an informal gathering of potentates who had lunches and dinners at the Madison.

Hotel food, in fact, put Mr. Coyne in the news briefly in 1982, when he was fined \$5,000 for buying Canada geese with the intent to turn them into pate, a violation of the Migratory Bird and Treaty Act. He denied charges that he served the geese at the hotel's Montpelier Restaurant—he said they were for private consumption—but pleaded guilty and paid the fine.

His wealth then was estimated to be \$50 million to \$100 million, and he told The Washington Post that the fine was "like a parking ticket. You pay the \$3 and forget about it."

The Madison, with 353 rooms, is one of about 10 area properties run by Madison Management and Investment Co., which Mr. Coyne had headed since the 1970s. Until last year, he also owned the Shoreham Building at 15th and H streets NW.

He served on the boards of the Kennedy Center, the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Georgetown University. He belonged to Washington Hebrew Congregation. His hobbies included rare books and manuscripts.

His marriages to Sylvia Shefkowitz and Jane Gordon ended in divorce.

His daughters from his first marriage predeceased him, Ellen Coyne Stichman in 1993 and Linda Coyne Fosburg Lloyd in 1996.

Survivors include five grandchildren and a great-granddaughter.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, at the close of business Friday, March 17, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,728,671,330,064.36 (Five trillion, seven hundred twenty-eight billion, six hundred seventy-one million, three hundred thirty thousand, sixty-four dollars and thirty-six cents).

One year ago, March 17, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,641,695,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-one billion, six hundred ninety-five million).

Five years ago, March 17, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,841,552,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred forty-one billion, five hundred fifty-two million).

Twenty-five years ago, March 17, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$502,644,000,000 (Five hundred two billion, six hundred forty-four million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,226,027,330,064.36 (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-six billion, twenty-seven million, three hundred thirty thousand, sixty-four dollars and thirty-six cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE VERMONT INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE OFFICE

• Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I congratulate the dedicated Vermonters responsible for the grand opening of the Vermont Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force's new office in downtown Burlington. This new office should build on the success of the Vermont ICAC Task Force to coordinate between local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies from around the region in their efforts to combat the emerging problem of computer crime.

Unfortunately, far too many State and local law enforcement agencies cannot afford the cost of policing against computer crimes themselves. In Vermont, there are few law enforcement officers among the more than 900 serving in our state who have training in investigating computer crimes and analyzing the evidence. Without the necessary educational training, technical support, and coordinated information, our law enforcement officials will be hamstrung in their efforts to crack down on computer crimes against children.

But the Vermont ICAC Task Force is helping our law enforcement officers meet this new challenge in the information age. Through the collaborative

training and public education programs of the ICAC Task Force, Vermont law enforcement officials are able to use the resources of the Department of Justice and the Vermont community to fight cyber-criminals.

I have introduced Federal legislation, the Computer Crime Enforcement Act, S. 1314, to provide the Vermont ICAC Task Force and other Vermont law enforcement agencies with additional resources. My legislation would authorize a \$25 million Department of Justice grant program to help states prevent and prosecute computer crime. Grants under my bill may be used to provide education, training, and enforcement programs for state and local law enforcement officers and prosecutors in the rapidly growing field of computer criminal justice.

It is hard for our law enforcement community to keep up with criminals in the computer age. Lawbreakers have integrated highly technical methods with traditional crimes and developed creative new types of crime. They use computers to cross State and national boundaries electronically, creating jurisdictional problems. They also use sophisticated equipment that makes them difficult to trace.

But we Vermonters can prevent, capture and prosecute cyber-criminals by following the model set by the Vermont ICAC Task Force. The Vermont ICAC Task Force has done, and will continue to do, great work to protect Vermont's children from Internet crimes in its new home.

TUNISIA'S 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise today to commend Tunisia on its 44 years of independence and to congratulate the people of Tunisia on their many successful endeavors.

In 1997, Tunisia and the United States celebrated the bicentennial of the "Treaty of Peace and Friendship." This celebration marked the longest unbroken friendship treaty in the history of the two countries. Throughout our long relationship, the United States and Tunisia have experienced cooperation based upon respect and mutual commitment to freedom, democracy, and the peaceful resolution of conflict.

Tunisia has been a leader in promoting stability and peace in Africa and the Middle East. It was the first Arab state to host an Israeli delegation and hold a multilateral meeting promoting peace. In 1996, Tunisia and Israel opened interest sections in each country and established full diplomatic relations.

In addition to supporting peace in the Middle East, Tunisia has made impressive economic strides. The people of Tunisia enjoy a high standard of living, and the country has successfully graduated from development assistance

to self-sufficiency. These improvements have come about through the devotion of vital resources to the promotion of its people, education, and economic reform. Tunisia's market-oriented economy has flourished under increasingly privatized companies. And, Tunisia's membership in the World Trade Organization is indicative of its willingness to engage the world and maintain involvement with other nations.

Tunisia has been a friend and ally to the United States for many years. I look forward to continued cooperation and friendship in the years to come. As Tunisia celebrates its 44th Anniversary of Independence, I offer my sincere congratulations on their many successful accomplishments.●

TRIBUTE TO THE 190TH AIR REFUELING WING

● Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I rise to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Kansas Air National Guard, specifically, the 190th Air Refueling Wing. The enormous sacrifice and dedication of the 190th personnel reflects great credit upon themselves, the 190th Air Refueling Wing and the Kansas Air National Guard. These dedicated Americans participated in two consecutive deployments from February 24 to April 9, 1999 in support of Operation Northern Watch and Operation Allied Force. The 190th Air Refueling Wing deployed again from July 11 to August 20, 1999 in support of Operation Northern Watch. The 190th flew 209 combat support sorties and off loaded over 10 million pounds of fuel to coalition aircraft during the three deployments. Their service directly impacted the success of Operation Northern Watch in Iraq and Operation Allied Force in Kosovo. I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to the 190th Air Refueling Wing and their remarkable dedication to duty and service to our great country.●

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL ANDREW A. GRANUZZO, USN

● Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise today to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Naval Officer, Rear Admiral Andrew A. Granuzzo as he prepares to retire upon completion of forty-two years of distinguished service. It is a privilege for me to honor his many outstanding achievements and commend him for his devotion to the Navy and our great nation.

A native New Yorker, Rear Admiral Granuzzo's Navy career began in 1958 upon his enlistment. During the years that followed, he was commissioned as a naval officer and earned his wings of gold as a naval aviator. His assignments included sea duty with helicopter antisubmarine squadrons on both coasts, service with an attack helicopter squadron in Vietnam, and exchange duty in the United Kingdom with the Royal Navy. He commanded

Helicopter Anti-Submarine Squadron 15, was navigator of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Forrestal* and commanded two ships, U.S.S. *Inchon* and U.S.S. *Saipan*.

Rear Admiral Granuzzo was selected for Flag rank in 1991, and commanded Amphibious Group Two, leading a 22-nation NATO exercise at sea. Twice, he commanded Joint Task Groups interdicting the flow of drugs through the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico.

Perhaps his most significant contribution to the Navy is the role he has played in reshaping the Navy's diverse and often divergent aspects of safety, environmental protection, and occupational health. As Commander of the Naval Safety Center, he introduced the principles of risk management to naval operations. During his tenure, accidents and fatalities, on and off duty, was dramatically reduced and the lowest accident rate in naval aviation history was achieved.

As the Director of Environmental Protection, Safety and Occupational Health Division for the Chief of Naval Operations, Rear Admiral Granuzzo provided dynamic, inspirational and brilliant leadership during a critical, highly visible period for the Navy. As advocate for both naval operations and the environment, he pioneered new initiatives, including the first-ever, capped cost, commercially insured, installation environmental clean up contract, which has the potential of saving tax payers hundreds of millions of dollars. Additionally, he spearheaded savings in workers' compensation costs; accelerated field tests of a new bioremediation method for the biohazard perchlorate; and conceived a program that reduced shipboard oil spills. Rear Admiral Granuzzo's innovations have positioned the Navy to ensure its ships leave a clean wake, its facilities and installations preserve and protect the natural environment, and its people embrace their role as good stewards of the environment.

From the beginnings of the cold war, through Vietnam, the gulf war, and beyond—forty-two years in all—Rear Admiral Granuzzo has served as a warrior of uncommon valor. He is an individual of rare character and his professionalism will be sincerely missed. I am proud, Mr. President, to thank him for his honorable service in the United States Navy, and to wish him "fair winds and following seas" as he closes his distinguished military career.●

HONORING THE ROBINSONS ON THEIR 70TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. ASHCROFT. Madam President, families are the cornerstone of America. Individuals from strong families contribute to society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken seriously the commitment of "till death us do part", demonstrating

successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

For these important reasons, I rise today to honor Ramah and Herbert Robinson of Lee's Summit, Missouri, who on April 9, 2000, will celebrate their 70th wedding anniversary. Many things have changed in the 70 years this couple has been married, but the values, principles, and commitment this marriage demonstrates are timeless. As the Robinsons celebrate their 70th year together with family and friends, it will be apparent that the lasting legacy of this marriage will be the time, energy, and resources invested in their children, church, and community. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone.

The Robinsons' commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized.●

RECOGNITION OF MIKE KELLY OF GVEA, FAIRBANKS

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I rise to recognize an Alaskan that has done so very much for his state and his community. I am referring to Mike Kelly, the President, General Manager and Chief Executive of Operations of Golden Valley Electric Association of Fairbanks, Alaska. You see Mr. Kelly retired last week after 33 years of service—the last 17 as President—service not just to his company, but to the citizens of Alaska.

Mr. Kelly is a recognized leader within Alaska's utility industry. Over the past three decades he has grown Interior Alaska's sole electric co-operative into a multi-million-dollar enterprise providing reliable electric service to more than 80,000 people. And providing dependable electric service in Alaska is no small feat. Keeping power flowing in a state where temperatures vary by 150 degrees between summer and winter and where high winds, blizzards and harsh conditions are common, requires skill, organization and perseverance. And his leadership is even more remarkable in that he has accomplished this level of excellence without raising his company's power rates once in the last 18 years.

Mr. Kelly has dedicated his career at GVEA to fighting for projects and progress that have benefitted consumers both in Alaska's Railbelt and in Alaska's remotest regions. He spearheaded GVEA's successful purchase of the Fairbanks Municipal Utilities System, has been the prime mover in the construction of the Northern (power) Intertie Project and has served well in many leadership positions within the industry and in the community of Fairbanks.

He has volunteered to share his skills and leadership with many organizations, including the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska, the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club of Fairbanks, and the Fairbanks Industrial Development Corp.,

along with the Boards of Fairbanks Memorial Hospital Foundation and Denali State Bank.

He is the winner of the Northwest Public Power Association Raver Award (1986) for displaying outstanding community service through leadership. He was the 1999 recipient of the Mason Lazelle Award, the highest honor awarded by the industry in Alaska. And he has been singled out for well deserved recognition by the Associated Students of Business, the University of Alaska Fairbanks Alumni Association as the Outstanding Alumni of the Year, and by many other groups.

While Mr. Kelly now will have more time to spend on the river fishing, out hunting and with his family, I'm sure Alaska has not seen the last of his efforts on behalf of Fairbanks and the state has a whole. My congratulations go to him for his many accomplishments and Nancy and I offer our best wishes for a wonderful retirement. Alaska is a better place because of your service to your city and your state.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

REPORT OF THE TEXT OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND BANGLADESH CONCERNING THE PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 93

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 (b), (d)) (the Act), the text of a proposed Agreement Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh to extend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy signed at Dhaka, September 17, 1981 (the Agreement for Cooperation).

The proposed Agreement to extend the Agreement for Cooperation (the

"Extension Agreement") was originally approved and its execution authorized by President Bush based on his written determination that the performance of the Agreement for Cooperation for an additional period of 20 years would promote, and would not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. A copy of President Bush's written approval, authorization, and determination is enclosed. Also enclosed is a copy of the unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) prepared at that time by the Director, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The proposed Extension Agreement was effected by an exchange of diplomatic notes at Dhaka on January 5, 1993, and February 6, 1993. The terms of the Extension Agreement condition its entry into force on each State notifying the other of the completion of its respective legal requirements for entry into force. However, before the proposed Extension Agreement could be submitted to the Congress in 1993 for review pursuant to section 123 of the Act, the Government of Bangladesh asked to consult with the United States regarding a possible modification of the term of extension. These discussions proved to be very protracted, but both Governments have now agreed that their original intention to extend the Agreement for Cooperation for an additional period of 20 years from the date of the original Agreement's expiration (i.e., to extend it until June 24, 2012) should stand, and that the Extension Agreement should be brought into force as soon as each Party has notified the other in writing that it has completed its legal requirements for doing so.

Section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277) now also provides that each Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement prepared pursuant to the Act shall be accompanied by a classified annex prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information. The Secretary of State is submitting to the Congress under separate cover such a classified annex. It contains, inter alia, the Secretary of State's reaffirmation of the conclusions reached in the original unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (a) that continued implementation of the Agreement for Cooperation is consistent with all requirements of the Act, and (b) that the safeguards and other control mechanisms and the peaceful-use assurances contained in the Agreement for Cooperation are adequate to ensure that any assistance furnished under it will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose.

I am pleased to reconfirm President Bush's approval of the Extension Agreement and authorization of its execution and implementation. Ban-

gladesh is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is fully in compliance with its nuclear nonproliferation commitments under that Treaty. In my judgment, continued performance of the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy will promote, and not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Apart from the proposed extension, the Agreement for Cooperation will remain in all other respects the same as that which was favorably reviewed by the Congress in 1982. The Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have reconfirmed their favorable views regarding the original NPAS as well as the conclusions contained herein.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the period of 30 days of continuous session provided for in section 123 b., the period of 60 days of continuous session provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2000.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 10, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 376, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution:

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 15, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2001.

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee

on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 10, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 376. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 15, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1000. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announce that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1695. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal public lands in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to Clark County, Nevada, for the development of an airport facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2372. An act 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; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution.

H.R. 3843. An act to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3081. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax benefits for small businesses, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3699. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building."

H.R. 3701. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building."

H.R. 3845. An act to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 101(f)(3) of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (42 U.S.C. 1320b-19), the Speaker has appointed the following members on the part of the House to the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel: Mr. Steve Start of Spokane, Washington, to a 4-year term and Ms. Susan Webb of Phoenix, Arizona, to a 2-year term.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND) announced that on today, March 20, 2000, he had signed the following enrolled bill previously signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1000. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1695. A act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal public lands in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to Clark County, Nevada, for the development of an airport facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2372. An act 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; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3843. An act to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 3699. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3701. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3845. An act to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that during the adjournment of the Senate on March 10, 2000, he had pre-

sented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 376. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-7950. 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 "Customs Brokers" (RIN1515-AC34), received March 9, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7951. 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 #6550-4), received March 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7952. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on DoD reimbursement of contractor environmental response action costs; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7953. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "EPA Operator Certification Guidelines State Implementation Guidance"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7954. A communication from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Estimates of Revenues of the District of Columbia for FY 2001"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7955. A communication from the Co-Chair, Presidential Members, U.S. Census Monitoring Board transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the 2000 census; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7956. A communication from the Acting Solicitor, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Application Examination and Provisional Application Practice" (RIN0651-AB13), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-7957. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterans Education: Increased Allowances for the Educational Assistance Test Program" (RIN2900-AJ87), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-7958. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Child; Educational Institution" (RIN2900-AJ54), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-7959. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing

Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dried Prunes Produced in California; Changes in Producer District Boundaries" (Docket Number FV00-993-1 FIR), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7960. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Changing the Term of Office and the Nomination Deadlines" (Docket Number FV00-955-2 FIR), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7961. A communication from the General Sales Manager and Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the availability, distribution and value of commodities donated by the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out assistance programs in both developing and friendly countries; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7962. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tribal Revenue Allocation Plans" (RIN1076-AD74), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7963. 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 "Indian Environmental General Assistance Program, Final Guidelines on the Award and Management of General Assistance Agreements for Indian Tribes", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7964. A communication from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on Military Assistance, Military Exports, and Military Imports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7965. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State transmitting, pursuant to law, the FY 1999 Annual Report on U.S. Government Assistance to and Cooperative Activities with the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7966. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7967. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices: Exemptions from Premarket Notification; Class II Devices; Vascular Tunnelers" (Docket No. 99P-4064), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7968. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices: Anesthesiology Devices; Classification of Nitric Oxide Administration Apparatus, Nitric Oxide Analyzer, and Nitrogen Dioxide Analyzer"

(Docket No. 96P-0436), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7969. A communication from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cargo Preference—Subcontracts for Commercial Items" (DFARS Case 98-D014), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7970. A communication from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Prison Industries Waiver Threshold" (DFARS Case 2000-D005), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7971. A communication from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Construction and Service Contracts in Noncontiguous States" (DFARS Case 99-D308), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7972. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report for calendar year 1999 entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7973. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the amount of DoD purchases from foreign entities during fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7974. A communication from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Restructuring Costs Associated with Business Combinations"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7975. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation Y (Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control; Securities Underwriting, Dealing, and Market-Making Activities of Financial Holding Companies)" (R-1063), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7976. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation H (Membership of State Banking Institutions in the Federal Reserve System)" (R-1064), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7977. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation Y (Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control)" (R-1062), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7978. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Editorial Clarification and Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7979. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations; Administrative Enforcement Proceedings", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7980. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations—Requirement that Money Transmitters and Money Order and Travelers Check Issuers, Sellers, and Redeemers Report Suspicious Transactions" (RIN1506-AA20), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7981. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency declared with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7982. A communication from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7983. A communication from the Chairman, Appraisal Sub Committee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7984. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to danger pay in Uganda; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7985. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to danger pay in Uganda; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7986. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates", received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7987. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of recommendations for legislative action; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-7988. A communication from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Petitioning Requirements for the H-1B Nonimmigrant Classification under Public Law 105-277" (RIN1115-AF31) (INS No. 1962-98), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-7989. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Personal Watercraft Use Within the NPS System" (RIN1024-AC65), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7990. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Regulations for Real Estate and Chatel Appraisals; Correction" (RIN0560-AF69), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7991. 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 "Cucurbitacins; Exemption

from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL #6485-3), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7992. A communication from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7993. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "Section 1018—Disclosure Rule Enforcement Response Policy"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7994. 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 for New Mexico: Transportation Conformity Rule" (FRL #6561-6), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7995. 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 "Award of Grants for Special Projects and Programs Authorized by this Agency's FY 2000 Appropriations Act"; received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7996. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for *Holocarpa macradenia* (Santa Cruz tarplant)" (RIN1018-AE80), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7997. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule for Endangered Status for Four Plants from South Central Coastal California" (RIN1018-AE81), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7998. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List Purple Amole (*Chlorogalum purpureum*) as threatened" (RIN1018-AE76), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7999. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of SMR Systems in the 800 MHz Frequency Band, Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services, and Competitive Bidding" (PR Docket No. 93-144; GN Docket No. 93-252; PP Docket No. 93-253; FCC 99-270), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8000. A communication from the Chief, Legal Branch, Accounting Safeguards Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Review of Depreciation Requirements for Incumbent

Local Exchange Carriers" (FCC 99-397; CC Docket No. 98-137), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8001. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities" (FCC 00-56), received March 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8002. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast and Western Pacific States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Adjustment in the Opening Date of Recreational Seasons From Point Arena to the U.S.-Mexico Border" (02220E), received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8003. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Closes Directed Fishing for Pacific Cod for Inshore Processing Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8004. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Closure of the Commercial Hook-and-Line Fishery for King Mackerel in the Florida West Coast Subzone", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8005. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Fishery Management Plan for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Extension of an Interim Rule", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8006. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Framework 12 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan", received March 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8007. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.318B, SA.318C, SA.319B, SE313B, SE3130, SE3160 and SA3180 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-SW-76 (3-9/3-9)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0134), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8008. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90-85B Series Turbofan Engines; Request for Comments; Docket No. 2000-NE-06 (3-9/3-9)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-

0135), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8009. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bob Fields Aerocessories Inflatable Door Seals; Docket No. 99-SW-76 (3-9/3-9)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0136), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8010. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher GmbH and Co. Model ASW-27 Sailplanes; Docket No. 99-CE-70 (3-8/3-9)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0137), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8011. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200PF, and -200CB Series Airplanes Powered by Rolls-Royce RB211-535C/E4/E4B Turbofan Engines; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-SW-76 (3-9/3-9)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-01324), received March 10, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

POM-430. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Maine relative to the entry of China into the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the nation of China has taken steps to become a member of the World Trade Organization; and

Whereas, membership in the World Trade Organization would give China recognition and status as an equal, legitimate partner with other countries in world trade; and

Whereas, China has an abysmal record of human rights, imprisoning those who attempt to engage in legitimate political opposition and oppressing those whose religious or political beliefs differ from those of the regime; and

Whereas, China ignores the rights of its workers and intimidates and imprisons those who seek to improve labor conditions in the country; and

Whereas, China's neighbors consider it a military threat; and

Whereas, the World Trade Organization, through its promotion of global markets, promotes multinational corporations that exploit child labor and sponsor sweatshops and poor working conditions; and

Whereas, the World Trade Organization has not shown itself to be a champion of reform in member countries; and

Whereas, membership in the World Trade Organization would increase import of cheap textiles, made inexpensive by the low pay and poor working conditions of Chinese laborers; and

Whereas, these cheap textile imports would unfairly compete with and would harm Maine's shirt, textile and manufacturing industries; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully request that the members of the

Congress of the United States vote against any proposal to grant permanent normal trade relations status to China, which is a precursor to the granting of World Trade Organization membership, and take whatever other actions is in their power to deny membership in the World Trade Organization to the nation of China; and be it further

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

POM-431. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Maine relative to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are 325,000 households in the State of Maine dependent upon heating oil; and

Whereas, the retail price of heating oil has doubled in the last year; and

Whereas, the supply of heating oil is well below demand, creating a critical shortage; and

Whereas, 8 weeks of the heating season remain; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Energy to release fuel from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for sale to critically affected regions; and be it further

Resolved, That policies necessary to help with the emergency delivery and distribution of this fuel to refineries be implemented, with priority of sale given to critically affected regions; and be it further

Resolved, That policies conducive to the establishment of a home heating oil reserve for the benefit of the Northeast Region be implemented; and be it further

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

POM-432. A resolution adopted by the Ocean County (NJ) Board of Health relative to disposal of contaminated materials in the Atlantic Ocean at the Mud Dump site; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-433. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Michigan relative to tuberculosis testing and research; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 288

Whereas, The spread of bovine tuberculosis in Michigan has reached a critical level, threatening the viability of the livestock and dairy industry in this state; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Agriculture is poised to revoke Michigan's TB-free status, thereby requiring the testing of all cattle in the state; and

Whereas, The testing of all cattle in the state will not be possible with currently available resources and the lack of existing facilities; and

Whereas, No known vaccination exists to prevent cattle from acquiring bovine tuberculosis, and the only method to control the

spread of the disease is through the slaughter of the infected animal; and

Whereas, The policy of the United States Department of Agriculture is to require the destruction of the entire herd, even if only one animal in the herd is infected; and

Whereas, Current indemnification rates for the destruction of cattle are inadequate, placing an extreme burden on livestock owners; and

Whereas, The Michigan House of Representatives is leading a coordinated and committed effort with Michigan farmers, hunters, and business owners to eradicate bovine tuberculosis in this state and restore Michigan's TB-free status; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide funding for the construction of a diagnostic laboratory at Michigan State University to handle the increased testing requirements resulting from a loss of Michigan's TB-free status; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we memorialize Congress to fund initiatives at Michigan State University to study the spread of bovine tuberculosis through crops and soil; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we memorialize Congress to provide increased indemnification for the destruction of cattle and federally subsidized loans for the replacement of destroyed herds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and other appropriate administration officials.

POM-434. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia relative to local television satellite signals; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 4

Whereas, Current telecommunications legislation pending in the United States Congress will set national policy for decades to come for all Americans; and

Whereas, Current legislation will authorize the retransmission of local television signals by satellite; and

Whereas, Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) companies have testified before Congress that they only intend to retransmit certain local television broadcast signals within certain local television markets, those being highly populated urban markets where the infrastructure will support a for-profit venture; and

Whereas, More than fifty million households in small- and medium-sized markets must be treated as equals to their urban counterparts. These citizens pay the same taxes and deserve the same news, weather, emergency forecasts and community-building programs that larger urban areas will be receiving; and

Whereas, Sixteen states, including West Virginia, are not included in any satellite company's initial plans to provide "local-into-local" service; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Senate hereby urges the United States Congress to adopt legislation that will establish loan guarantee programs or other mechanisms for the delivery of local satellite signals to markets otherwise not receiving local satellite signals; and, be it

Further resolved, That the purposes of such national legislation will be to guarantee the

delivery by satellite of over-the-air local television stations to small- and medium-sized markets to ensure the "digital divide" is not made wider by national satellite policy; and, be it

Further resolved, That the Clerk is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and the Secretary of the United States Senate for distribution to the members of each legislative chamber.

POM-435. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Alabama relative to the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 18, 1979, and became an international treaty on September 3, 1981; and

Whereas, the convention established a comprehensive framework addressing women's rights within political, cultural, economic, social, and family contexts that serves to strengthen the existing body of standards respecting fundamental human rights by providing a uniform and universal definition of discrimination; and

Whereas, the convention has already demonstrated its value by serving as the instrument by which women in Sri Lanka and Zambia have improved their status; and

Whereas, in 1992, Sri Lanka adopted a charter that was based on the convention and which guaranteed women equal status; in 1985, Zambia also ratified the convention and in 1991 extended its Bill of Rights to cover sex discrimination; and

Whereas, as of June 1997, 161 nations had ratified the convention's provisions; and

Whereas, although the United States is considered a world leader in the protection of basic human rights, supports and has a position of leadership in the United Nations, and was an active participant in the drafting and is a signatory of the convention, the United States is one of the few nations that has not ratified the treaty; and

Whereas, although women have made progress in the struggle for equality in the political, cultural, economic, social, and family contexts, there is much more to be accomplished; and through its support, leadership, and prestige, the United States can help create a world where women are no longer discriminated against and would achieve one of the most fundamental of human rights, that of equality; now therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama, That we urge the United States Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and to support the convention's continuing goals.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and every member of the Alabama Congressional Delegation.

POM-436. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Alabama relative to the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women was adopted by the

United Nations General Assembly on December 18, 1979, and became an international treaty on September 3, 1981; and

Whereas, the convention established a comprehensive framework addressing women's rights within political, cultural, economic, social, and family contexts that serves to strengthen the existing body of standards respecting fundamental human rights by providing a uniform and universal definition of discrimination; and

Whereas, the convention has already demonstrated its value by serving as the instrument by which women in Sri Lanka and Zambia have improved their status; and

Whereas, in 1992, Sri Lanka adopted a charter that was based on the convention and which guaranteed women equal status; in 1985, Zambia also ratified the convention and in 1991 extended its Bill of Rights to cover sex discrimination; and

Whereas, as of June 1997, 161 nations had ratified the convention's provisions; and

Whereas, although the United States is considered a world leader in the protection of basic human rights, supports and has a position of leadership in the United Nations, and was an active participant in the drafting and is a signatory of the convention; the United States is one of the few nations that has not ratified the treaty; and

Whereas, although women have made progress in the struggle for equality in the political, cultural, economic, social, and family contexts, there is much more to be accomplished; and through its support, leadership, and prestige, the United States can help create a world where women are no longer discriminated against and would achieve one of the most fundamental of human rights, that of equality; now therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama, That we urge the United States Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and to support the convention's continuing goals.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and every member of the Alabama Congressional Delegation.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 2000, the following report of committee was submitted on March 15, 2000:

By Mr. GRAMM, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2097: A bill to authorize loan guarantees in order to facilitate access to local television broadcast signals in unserved and underserved areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-243).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 408. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the City of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center (Rept. No. 106-244).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1218. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to the Landusky School District, without consideration, a patent for the surface and mineral estates of certain lots, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-245).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. No. 106-246).

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2251. An original bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to improve crop insurance coverage, to provide agriculture producers with choices to manage risk, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2248. A bill to assist in the development and implementation of projects to provide for the control of drainage water, storm water, flood water, and other water as part of water-related integrated resource management, environmental infrastructure, and resource protection and development projects in the Colusa Basin Watershed, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BREAU, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 2249. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the Commissioner of Social Security to provide Congress with an annual report on the social security program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

S. 2250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain restaurant buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 2251. An original bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to improve crop insurance coverage, to provide agriculture producers with choices to manage risk, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2252. A bill to provide for the review of agriculture mergers and acquisitions by the Department of Agriculture and to outlaw unfair practices in the Agriculture industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2253. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint United States-Canada commission to study the feasibility of connecting the rail system in Alaska to the North American continental rail system; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Res. 274. A resolution to designate April 9, 2000, as a "National Day of Remembrance

of the One Hundred Thirty-Fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Saylor's Creek"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 275. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding fair access to Japanese telecommunications facilities and services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROBB, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) who are being awarded the AHEPA Medal for Military Service in the Armed Forces of the United States; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2248. A bill to assist in the development and implementation of projects to provide for the control of drainage water, storm water, flood water, and other water as part of water-related integrated resource management, environmental infrastructure, and resource protection and development projects in the Colusa Basin Watershed, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

COLUSA BASIN INTEGRATED RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN LEGISLATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce this bill which provides a comprehensive watershed plan to protect against flooding in the Colusa Basin. Last year such flooding caused approximately \$4.9 million in damage. In 1995 a major flood caused an estimated \$100 million in damages to public and private property and crops.

This bill would provide the necessary authorization for the Secretary of Interior to participate in the Colusa Basin project on a cost-shared basis. The Colusa Basin project would build the necessary infrastructure (small impoundments) to catch flood water, control the rate of release, restore wetlands and vegetation and ultimately protect the area against flooding. This authorization is needed for the project to continue.

I introduced an identical bill in the 105th Congress which passed both Houses of Congress but fell victim to the politics surrounding the omnibus budget bill. This bill once again enjoys bipartisan support.

I urge Congress to consider this bill before the end of the 106th Congress.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BREAU, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 2249. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the Commissioner of Social Security to provide Congress with an annual report on the Social Security program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY REPORTING
IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to speak today about the issue we are going to take up tomorrow, the Social Security earnings limitation, and the fact that we are going to pass a bill tomorrow which will eliminate a limitation on the ability of people once they retire to make money independent of Social Security benefits they receive and not have their Social Security benefits reduced.

Under present-day law, unfortunately, a retired individual—or not even retired person, a person who has reached eligibility age for Social Security benefits—the age for eligibility retirement is really the wrong term to apply to that individual. That person is penalized if he goes out and gets a job because his benefits under Social Security are reduced if he makes a certain amount of money under that job.

That is wrong. It is something I have tried to correct, and a number of Members of this Senate have tried to correct, for a number of years.

I have a bill, cosponsored by Senators KERREY, BREAU, GRASSLEY, THOMPSON, ROBB, and THOMAS. It is a very bipartisan bill, obviously, and is strongly supported by many of the Members on the Finance Committee. That bill is, in substance, a reform bill for the entire Social Security system to allow us to have a Social Security system which is solvent for the next 100 years. It is a creative and imaginative piece of legislation, and it accomplishes that growth which is to create solvency in the Social Security system over the next 100 years and do it without raising taxes.

One of the elements of that bill is the repeal of the earnings limitation. It has been something I have supported and I have backed up with legislative language, cosponsored by myself, as I mentioned, and also by other Members of the Senate. Over the years, we have worked in this area. It is a very appropriate area to go into. However, tomorrow when we take up the bill for repealing the earnings limitation, we are going to take it up as sort of an isolated event. We are not taking it up very much as an isolated event but as part of a Social Security reform package. I guess that is where I have my concern, because we know the Social Security system, although solvent today and running very large surpluses, is headed towards the disastrous crash.

When the baby boom generation, the Bill Clinton generation, arrives at retirement, which starts in the year 2008 and accelerates aggressively so that by the year 2014 we actually are running a cash deficit within the Social Security system, we will have so many people retired in this country during the post-2008 period that we will have too many people retired for the younger generation to be able to support them effectively under the present structure of the Social Security system.

It will cost the next earnings generation—that generation who are my chil-

dren, the children of the Members of this Senate, and their children's children—over \$7 trillion in general fund revenues. We are not talking about Social Security taxes; we are talking about general fund revenues over the period from 2014 to 2034. It will cost \$7 trillion of general fund revenues to keep the Social Security system solvent.

What does \$7 trillion in general fund revenues mean? That means there will have to be tax increases of \$7 trillion in order to pay for those benefits, or, alternatively, we will have to cut them.

Some of us have said let's not force this crisis on the next generation, let's not turn to our children and say, Here is the problem; we are going to give it to you. Many of us have said let's look at the problem today and try to solve it, let's try to put in place systems that will allow us to build up a process which will protect our children from having to face the catastrophe of having to support our generation in retirement at levels which they could not possibly afford to support and which would put an undue burden on the next generation in the area of tax increases.

We have put together substantive pieces of legislation. The one I mentioned, for example, the Gregg-Kerrey-Breaux-Grassley-Thompson-Thomas-Robb—Senator Roth is also on that—is one of the proposals.

There is another bill in the House called Kolbe-Stenholm, an aggressive piece of legislation. Senator MOYNIHAN has a piece of legislation. Senator GRAMM from Texas has a piece of legislation. The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman ARCHER, and Congressman SHAW have proposals. Congressman KASICH and Congressman SMITH have proposals.

There are a lot of proposals out there. Many of them are very substantive and thoughtful. I would like to think ours is. Almost all of them will do a lot more than we are doing today trying to put in place and under control a system that will address the Social Security problem as it is facing us and as it is facing the next generation.

I see the pages down here. These folks are going to end up paying a huge bill as a result of our inaction today in Congress. It is not fair and not right for us to put the next generation in this position.

As we take up the earnings limitation repeal tomorrow, it is necessary and appropriate. It is something we should do. But we should be much more aggressive on this issue. We should be addressing the fundamental problems that are facing us in the Social Security system, the most fundamental of which is that it is an unfunded liability.

Essentially, the Social Security system says we promise you, the baby boom generation, all of these benefits. But we don't do anything about getting the baby boom generation into a posi-

tion where we can pay those Social Security benefits. Rather, we go on a pay-as-you-go basis. One dollar taken in today is paid out today, or spent on some other operation of government today. So when the baby boom generation retires, there are no dollars available for them to support their benefit structure.

We ought to address that. The best way to address it is to do something which will be called prefunding liability. That is probably a technical term which is sort of lost in its translation. It basically means giving people savings, assets, and gives people something they can physically own and possess, so that when they retire, they will have assets they can use to pay for their retirement benefits under the Social Security system.

In our proposal, this is called a personal savings account. Essentially, we reduce the payroll tax today. We say let's reduce the payroll tax today because it is running a surplus, take that money we save on payroll taxes and give it to all of the Social Security earners today, and allow those Social Security earners to save that money for themselves. So that by the time they retire, they will have a nest egg, a physical nest egg that is based in stocks, Treasury notes, and bonds, which will be available to them to spend on their retirement. It is called free-funding liability, so their actual assets are there when they retire. They actually physically own something they can use to benefit them in their retirement and to support the costs of their retirement structure in Social Security.

That is the essence of what we propose in our bill—to prefund the liability through personal savings accounts. It is an idea for which the time appears to be coming.

I notice Governor Bush is talking about this aggressively. Other people who are running for the Presidency are talking about this aggressively. Regrettably, this administration has not been willing to talk about this aggressively. This administration has walked away from the opportunity to fundamentally reform and improve Social Security so we can pass on to our children a solvent system instead of passing on to them an insolvent system.

I and a number of Members on the other side of the aisle have great frustrations. I know Senator KERREY from Nebraska has on numerous occasions—and will tomorrow, I suspect, when he offers his amendment—expressed the frustration he feels and many of us feel about the fact we are unable to get White House leadership on this critical issue of moving forward Social Security reform so the next generation isn't passed a sour lemon but is given an opportunity to have a lifestyle that is equal to ours, or hopefully significantly better, and isn't instead passed a huge bill from our generation that they have to pay off in order to support our generation's retirement. I believe

this administration refuses to take any aggressive action in this area for political reasons because they want to keep the issue alive for the next election cycle.

Clearly, there is bipartisan support in the Senate. As I mentioned, the Members of the Senate supporting the bill are Senator KERREY, Senator BREAUX, and Senator GRASSLEY—a bipartisan group. Their philosophies are significantly different. We could build a coalition in this Senate to pass substantial Social Security reform which would make the system solvent for the next 100 years without raising taxes on the next generation.

If we could get leadership and assistance from the White House, we could do that. Unfortunately, we have not gotten that. Instead, we are getting one little snippet of the Social Security issue, the earnings limitation test. It has been passed by the Senate, passed by the House, and the President says he will sign it if it is a clean bill.

What is the effect of taking up one little part of the whole puzzle? This happens to be a part of the puzzle that ends up costing more money to the system. In other words, when we repeal the earnings limitation, we end up actually putting the system in a less financially sound position than it is today. It is an appropriate thing to do because the earnings limitation is bad public policy. We should not be saying to senior citizens: You shouldn't go out and work; or, if you do work, we will reduce your Social Security benefit.

That is bad policy, especially bad policy when we have a potentially large soon-to-retire generation, the baby boom generation. When our generation retires, as a nation we are going to need to keep people working even though they may be retiring. We won't have enough workers in this country. That is going to be a demographic fact.

The earnings limitation is bad policy. It has a negative impact on Social Security long-term solvency. It aggravates the problem for the next generation by repealing it as a freestanding event. It should, rather, be repealed in the context of an overall reform effort. By doing that, we can adjust for the fact that this may negatively impact the financial situation of the Social Security system, while other things could positively impact it, and we can weigh them off.

But we are not going to do that. We are doing just Social Security limitations. If that is all we can do, that is what we should do. But we should be honest with the American people. We should tell them what the effect of it will be. More importantly, we should tell them the present status and the future status of the Social Security trust funds. We shouldn't continue this babble about how solvent the Social Security trust fund is. Although it is running a surplus today, it is as predictable as night follows day, as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, it

is an absolute known fact that beginning in the year 2008, as the large baby boom generation retires, we are going to see the system head toward massive insolvency if we don't have massive tax increases or major benefit cuts.

We ought to tell the American people so they know it is coming and they can plan. If the Congress isn't going to plan, if the White House isn't going to plan, at least give the American people the information they need to plan.

I hope to have this bill agreed to because I think it is reasonable. I am introducing a proposal which was essentially the proposal put forward in November 1999 by the Technical Panel On Assumptions and Methods of the Social Security Advisory Board. It is a professional group, an independent bipartisan group set up by the Social Security trustees for the purpose of reviewing what should be done with the Social Security system. This Technical Panel on Assumptions and Methods of the Social Security Advisory Board put out a series of recommendations regarding information that should be available in plain English—they stress “in plain English”—to the American people. I have suggested we amend this effort by putting in place that recommendation, have the panel's recommendations become a requirement of law, and thus they will be disclosed to the American people.

What will be disclosed? The following:

What the program will cost each year;

What is the projected cash-flow deficit in dollars, real and nominal;

What are the benefits the system can actually fund as opposed to what we tell the public;

What is the impact of all of the above on the Federal budget.

These are not complicated. These can be simply stated. But they are very important facts for the American people to know.

Some don't want the American people to have this information. They realize if people were actually informed about the significant financial crisis we are facing in the Social Security system beginning when the baby boom generation retires, people would get pretty upset. They would ask: Why hasn't Congress acted? Why isn't the White House displaying leadership? Some would rather not have this information on the table. It is “vanilla” information. It is information the American people have the right to know. It is information I am suggesting be made available. It is information the Social Security Advisory Board is suggesting be made available. It is not a partisan effort on my part; it is simply a desire to, hopefully, further the effort to inform the American people of the problems we face if we do not get on this issue of Social Security and begin to solve it.

That is the amendment I will offer. That is the bill I am introducing today. I see the Senator from Iowa, the rank-

ing Republican on the Finance Committee. He has been a leader on the issue of Social Security reform in this Congress. I greatly appreciate his support, cosponsorship, and initiation in drafting the bill which solves the overall problem. I thank him for his support.

I thank the Chair for its indulgence, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2252. A bill to provide for the review of agriculture mergers and acquisitions by the Department of Agriculture and to outlaw unfair practices in the agriculture industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE AGRICULTURE COMPETITION ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, agriculture is one of the most crucial industries to my State, Iowa. The small, independent family farmer is a common thread running throughout the cultural, economic and social fabric of my State. I firmly believe that if that thread is pulled, the entire fabric of Iowa could come unraveled.

All my life I have lived and worked on a farm. I recognize that Iowa and the world are changing and that agriculture cannot stagnate and stay the same decade after decade. If we are to continue to survive and thrive into the 21st century, Iowa must diversify and adapt. But the best way to do that is not by throwing away the past and the present. The best way to prepare for the future is to build on the best of our heritage. And the family farmer is one of the best things about Iowa's heritage. I am committed to preserving and supporting this valuable member of Iowa's communities.

Any farmer knows that agriculture is a risky business. If you are going to be a farmer, you had better be prepared for ups and downs. But farmers feel more vulnerable now than at just about any time I can recall and with good reason.

We all know there's been a so-called “merger-mania” going on throughout our nation's economy. Large corporations are joining forces with other large corporations to form new business giants in every sector of the economy and agriculture is no exception.

In the last couple of years, the AG industry has seen a significant number of multi-million and multi-billion dollar mergers affecting grain and livestock. In the face of all these mergers and new alliances, the independent producer farming a thousand acres or less, sees himself getting smaller and smaller in comparison to many of his competitors. He sees himself having fewer and fewer choices of who to buy from and sell to. Yet, those farmers know, as I do, that the independent farmer is one of the most efficient businessmen in our nation's economy. That's why the United States can feed itself and a good portion of the world. So long as

the market place is fair and open, the family farmer can compete.

I am not suggesting that all mergers are in and of themselves wrong or unfair to family farmers. Businesses may be in situations where their survival and success is dependent on joining forces with another. That right is a fundamental principle of a capitalist system and has to be preserved. Indeed, I believe that farmers do not need to be protected from the marketplace. But I believe we should protect their access to the marketplace.

That is why I will be introducing legislation to guarantee greater openness and accountability to the merger review process as it pertains to agri-business.

My bill will give USDA, the Federal department with the background and expertise in agriculture, a more prominent role in assessing AG mergers. Furthermore, my bill will provide a much-needed balance in the focus of AG merger reviews.

Currently, when the Department of Justice assesses a proposed merger, their focus is weighted towards the impact a merger would have on consumers. No one, certainly not I, would argue against ensuring that a merger does not harm consumers. However, given the fact that AG mergers, more so than other kinds of mergers, impact a way of life, not just an industry, it is critical that we give equal importance to the effect these mergers have on producers.

My bill will do just that by requiring USDA to do an assessment of how a proposed corporate union will affect producers and their access to the market. My bill will keep DOJ in the driver's seat on mergers, but will make the expertise and knowledge of USDA a prominent part of the merger review record.

I am aware other proposals reforming the agri-business merger review process are being crafted. I am certainly willing to consider all suggested reforms. Nonetheless, I believe my bill is strong and balanced in several respects. As I mentioned, my bill provides a heightened role for USDA in the merger review process, giving producers a seat at the table when mergers and acquisitions are being reviewed by DOJ or FTC.

In addition, I would like to highlight the following provisions in my bill.

There is a requirement that USDA do a merger review that focuses on the needs of producers and whether the transaction would cause substantial harm to farmers' ability to compete in the marketplace. This review will be conducted simultaneously with the Hart-Scott-Rodino review now done by DOJ. There is no disruption in the current DOJ/FTC merger review process. My legislation allows for negotiations between USDA and the parties to a proposed merger in order to work out any concerns USDA has.

Under my bill, if USDA's concerns are not satisfied, USDA may challenge

the merger in court to either stop the merger or impose conditions on the transaction.

Furthermore, this measure calls for the creation of a special counsel in USDA for competition matters, which is subject to Senate consideration. My bill provides money for additional staff at USDA and DOJ.

This measure also prohibits the enforcement of confidentiality clauses in livestock production contracts that prevent producers from getting the advice they need to make business decisions in their best interests.

My bill provides contract poultry growers the same protections under GIPSA that other livestock producers have.

Finally, under my bill, the competition protection authorities of USDA's packers and stockyards division is extended to include anticompetitive practices by dealers, processors and commission merchants of all AG commodities.

Several components of this bill are based on proposals by the American Farm Bureau, the largest organization representing producers of all commodities.

I believe that bringing to the table a greater understanding of AG producers' needs when examining AG mergers is the biggest missing element to make the merger review process as fair as possible. Closing this gap is the heart of my proposal.

I realize that DOJ currently has consultations with USDA on AG mergers. But I believe the current process is not consistent or open enough to assure producers' their concerns are adequately addressed.

The approach I advocate will ensure that producers' concerns and needs are fully discussed when Federal agencies examine proposed AG business mergers. By guaranteeing inclusion and openness for small, independent producers, we can go a long way toward alleviating their understandable anxiety.

As my colleagues from rural states know, AG concentration is one of the most important issues in agriculture today. It is imperative that we make meaningful progress on this issue before this Congress adjourns. As I stated earlier, I am aware of other efforts, principally by Senator DASCHLE and Senator LEAHY, to craft a legislative response to the recent wave of AG mergers.

I commend them for their hard work and I appreciate their efforts to keep me informed of their progress. I did not feel I could offer my unreserved endorsement of the proposal they have crafted thus far and I have chosen to introduce my own bill.

However, I believe our proposals are close enough in scope, direction and intent that we can achieve a bipartisan compromise sooner rather than later. I want it to be clearly understood that it is my desire to work with Members from both sides of the aisle to calm farmers' fears about high levels of AG concentration.

I am certain Congress will need to take additional steps to secure the freedom of small producers to compete in the marketplace.

But my bill will assure that when AG mergers are given the necessary review, the small, independent family farmer who I am proud to serve, will not be left out.

I urge my colleagues to join me in holding the door open for farmers across the country and I ask for the support of all those who want to preserve the best of our Nation's agriculture heritage and ensure the superiority of U.S. Agriculture for decades to come.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2253. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint United States-Canada commission to study the feasibility of connecting the rail system in Alaska to the North American continental rail system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RAILS TO RESOURCES ACT OF 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to establish a bilateral U.S. and Canadian commission to study the feasibility of extending the continental railroad system to Alaska via a land link through Canada.

Mr. President, there are three things critical to the establishment of long-term economic stability for any state, region or country. The first is the availability of resources necessary to the production of goods. The second is the availability of labor to manufacture those goods. And the third is the availability of transportation systems to get those goods to market.

My State of Alaska, unfortunately, remains deficient in the third of these critical elements. We have the resources, and we have the labor, but we do not yet have the same essential transportation infrastructure.

The idea of connecting the transcontinental rail system to Alaska is not a new one. The original congressional action to establish the Alaska Railroad called for laying 1,000 miles of track in Alaska, which would have been sufficient to carry it to the Alaska-Yukon border. Canada has at various times also looked at rail connections to the north country. Unfortunately, none of these have been carried through.

During World War II, the United States actually surveyed a route from Prince George, British Columbia all the way through Alaska to tidewater at Teller, on Alaska's Seward Peninsula. But again, this effort was never completed, largely due to wartime shortages of steel.

While someday it would be beneficial to follow through on that World War II plan, what I am proposing today is far less grandiose.

My bill would create a process for appointing members to the U.S. side of a bilateral commission to study the feasibility of extending the current continental rail system from its present terminus in British Columbia, through

the Yukon Territory, to the present terminus of the Alaska Railroad near Fairbanks. The distance to be traversed is on the order of 1,200 miles. Mr. President, this is not pie in the sky. I believe that the extension of the railroad would pay for itself, not immediately, but in the foreseeable future.

The area through which the rail line would pass holds some of the richest mineral prospects in North America. The Yukon-Tanana uplands stretch from Fairbanks down through much of the Yukon. This heavily mineralized area holds gold, silver, copper, nickel, lead and zinc in great quantities, plus substantial amounts of other elements. Further south along the possible routes, there are large quantities of high value timber, and vast amounts of lower quality wood that we now utilize for paper, fiberboard and other products.

Mr. President, some individuals and organizations will no doubt argue against even exploring this prospect because of a bias against the use of natural resources, or opposition to "development" in the wilderness. To them I would suggest that the construction of a railroad is an opportunity to control development—to avoid areas of particular sensitivity—which would be impossible with other transportation systems. A rail line has far less of a "footprint" than even a one-lane road, and its stops are known quantities. Properly constructed, a rail line would make possible the development of vast resources, without creating the kind of uncontrolled situation that can lead to the degradation of highly valued wild lands.

Others may point to the current volume of freight moving to and from Alaska and say, "There is no way such a tiny amount of freight can support a railroad." They would be missing the point. The question is not whether rail is a more effective means to carry the existing volume, it is whether access to rail would spur enough new economic activity to support the venture. I suggest that it might. Experts have suggested there may be the potential for up to 120 million tons of freight per year, which would be more than enough to pay back any investment.

I am not an expert. I cannot verify that contention, any more than I can refute it. That is why we need a comprehensive feasibility study.

In January, a conference to discuss the potential for such an extension was held in Vancouver, British Columbia. Participants were extraordinarily supportive, adopting a strong resolution in favor of proceeding with a joint U.S.-Canada study.

I have drawn from that resolution to prepare the legislation I am introducing today. Specifically, it would provide authorization to for a \$6 million, five-year effort to refine our understanding of both the positives and the negatives of a rail extension.

This is in no way an attempt to second-guess the feasibility process. We

need an objective, thorough survey of both costs and opportunities.

To that end, I am suggesting that the United States component of the commission include local government, business, academic and Alaska Native leaders with expertise in the relevant fields. I am confident that Canada will choose similarly well-qualified individuals for its own side of the commission.

Let's make no mistake about this—it is not universally supported, and I want my colleagues to be aware of that from the very beginning. Most of those who currently operate companies carrying goods to and from Alaska by truck and by water will find all kinds of reasons to suggest that there is no way a railroad can be made to work.

Mr. President, it is only natural that those with a vested interest in the status quo should oppose change. It is their absolute right to do so. But it is wrong to stifle debate. We should be free to accept and explore new ideas. That is what this commission is all about.

If the railroad connection is economically and environmentally and socially sound, then let's move ahead. If it is not, then let's drop it. But at the very least, let's give it an honest hearing. That's what this bill is about.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2253

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 "Rails to Resources Act of 2000."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) rail transportation is an essential component of the North American intermodal transportation system;

(2) the development of economically strong and socially stable communities in the western United States and Canada was encouraged significantly by government policies promoting the development of integrated transcontinental, interstate and inter-provincial rail systems in the states, territories and provinces of the two countries;

(3) U.S. and Canadian federal support for the completion of new elements of the transcontinental, interstate and interprovincial rail systems was halted before rail connections were established to the state of Alaska and the Yukon Territory;

(4) Both public and private lands in Alaska, the Yukon territory and northern British Columbia, including lands held by aboriginal peoples, contain extensive deposits of oil, gas, coal and other minerals as well as valuable forest products which presently are inaccessible, but which could provide significant economic benefit to local communities and to both nations if an economically efficient transportation system was available;

(5) per ton of freight moved, rail transportation systems emit lower levels of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds than other modes of freight transportation;

(6) rail transportation systems are capable of moving cargo with up to nine times the energy efficiency of highway transportation;

(7) rail transportation in otherwise isolated areas facilitates controlled access and reduced overall impact to environmentally sensitive areas;

(8) the extension of the continental rail system through northern British Columbia and the Yukon territory to the current terminus of the Alaska Railroad would significantly benefit the U.S. and Canadian visitor industries by facilitating the comfortable movement of passengers over long distances while minimizing effects on the surrounding areas;

(9) extension of the Alaska Railroad system to the Canadian border is consistent with the intent of Congress as expressed in the Alaska Railroad Organic Act of 1914, which called for a system of up to 1,000 miles in length; and,

(10) ongoing research and development efforts in the rail industry continue to increase the efficiency of rail transportation, ensure safety, and decrease the impact of rail service on the environment.

SEC. 3. AGREEMENT FOR A UNITED STATES-CANADA BILATERAL COMMISSION.

The President is authorized and urged to enter into an agreement with the government of Canada to establish a joint commission to study the technological and economic feasibility of linking the rail system in Alaska to the nearest appropriate point on the North American continental rail system.

SEC. 4. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) TOTAL MEMBERSHIP.—The Agreement should provide for the Commission to be composed of 18 members, of which 9 members are appointed by the President and 9 members are appointed by the government of Canada.

(2) GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS.—The Agreement should provide for the membership of the Commission, to the maximum extent practicable, to be representative of—

(A) the interests of the local communities (including the governments of the communities), aboriginal peoples, and businesses that would be affected by the connection of the rail system in Alaska to the North American continental rail system; and

(B) a broad range of expertise in areas of knowledge that are relevant to the significant issues to be considered by the Commission, including economics, engineering, management of resources (such as minerals and timber), social sciences, fish and game management, environmental sciences, and transportation.

(b) UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP.—Under the Agreement, the President shall appoint the United States members of the Commission as follows:

(1) Two members from among persons who are qualified to represent the interests of communities and local governments of Alaska.

(2) One member representing the State of Alaska, to be nominated by the Governor of Alaska.

(3) One member from among persons who are qualified to represent the interests of Native Alaskans residing in the area of Alaska that would be affected by the extension of rail service.

(4) Four members from among persons involved in commercial activities in Alaska who are qualified to represent commercial interests in Alaska, of which one shall be a representative of the Alaska Railroad Corporation.

(5) Two members from among scholars employed in institutions of higher education in Alaska, at least one of whom must be an engineer with expertise in subarctic transportation.

(c) CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP.—The Agreement should provide for the Canadian membership of the Commission to be representative of broad categories of interests of Canada as the government of Canada determines appropriate, consistent with subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 5. GOVERNANCE AND STAFFING OF COMMISSION.

(a) CHAIRMAN.—The Agreement should provide for the Chairman of the Commission to be elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the members.

(b) COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES MEMBERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission appointed by the President who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. Each such member who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for services as an officer or employee of the United States.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission appointed by the President shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Agreement should provide for the appointment of a staff and an executive director to be the head of the staff.

(2) COMPENSATION.—Funds made available for the Commission by the United States may be used to pay the compensation of the executive director and other personnel at rates fixed by the Commission that are not in excess of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) OFFICE.—The Agreement should provide for the office of the Commission to be located in a mutually agreed location within the impacted areas of Alaska, the Yukon Territory, and northern British Columbia.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Agreement should provide for the Commission to meet at least bi-annually to review progress and to provide guidance to staff and others, and to hold, in locations within the affected areas of Alaska, the Yukon Territory and northern British Columbia, such additional informational or public meetings as the Commission deems necessary to the conduct of its business.

(f) PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES.—The Agreement should authorize and encourage the Commission to procure by contract, to the maximum extent practicable, the services (including any temporary and intermittent services) that the Commission determines necessary for carrying out the duties of the Commission. In the case of any contract for the services of an individual, funds made available for the Commission by the United States may not be used to pay for the services of the individual at a rate that exceeds the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 6 DUTIES.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Agreement should provide for the Commission to study and assess, on the basis of all available relevant in-

formation, the technological and economic feasibility of linking the rail system in Alaska to the North American continental rail system through the continuation of the rail system through the continuation of the rail system in Alaska from its northeastern terminus to a connection with the continental rail system in Canada.

(2) SPECIFIC ISSUES.—The Agreement should provide for the study and assessment to include the consideration of the following issues:

(A) Railroad engineering.
(B) Land ownership.
(C) Geology.
(D) Proximity to mineral, timber and other resources.

(E) Market outlook.
(F) Environmental considerations.
(G) Social effects, including changes to the use or availability of natural resources.
(H) Potential financial mechanisms.

(3) ROUTE.—The Agreement should provide for the Commission, upon finding that it is technologically and economically feasible to link the rail system in Alaska as described in paragraph (1), to determine one or more recommended routes for the rail segment that establishes the linkage, taking into consideration cost, distance, access to potential freight markets, environmental matters, and such other factors as the Commission determines relevant.

(4) COMBINED CORRIDOR EVALUATION.—The Agreement should also provide for the Commission to consider whether it would be useful and technologically and economically feasible to combine the power transmission infrastructure and petroleum product pipelines of other utilities into one corridor with a rail extension of the rail system in Alaska.

(b) REPORT.—The Agreement should require the Commission to submit to Congress and the Secretary of Transportation and to the Minister of Transport of the government of Canada, not later than 5 years after the Commission commencement date, a report on the results of the study, including the following:

(1) FEASIBILITY.—The Commission's findings regarding the technological and economic feasibility of linking the rail system in Alaska as described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) ROUTE.—If such an action is determined technologically and economically feasible, the Commission's recommendations regarding the preferred route and any alternative routes for the rail segment establishing the linkage.

SEC. 7. COMMENCEMENT AND TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

(a) COMMENCEMENT.—The Agreement should provide for the Commission to begin to function on the date on which all members are appointed to the Commission as provided for in the Agreement.

(b) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 6.

SEC. 8. FUNDING.

(a) RAILS TO RESOURCES FUND.—The Agreement should provide for the following:

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The establishment of an interest-bearing account to be known as the "Rails to Resources Fund".

(2) CONTRIBUTIONS.—The contribution by the United States and the government of Canada to the Fund of amounts that are sufficient for the Commission to carry out its duties.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The availability of amounts in the Fund to pay the costs of Commission activities.

(4) DISSOLUTION.—Dissolution of the Fund upon the termination of the Commission and distribution of the amounts in the Fund be-

tween the United States and the government of Canada.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to any Fund established as described in subsection (a)(1) in the total amount of \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term "Agreement" means an agreement described in section 2.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means a commission established pursuant to any Agreement.

(3) COMMISSION COMMENCEMENT DATE.—The date determined under section 6(a).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 526

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow issuance of tax-exempt private activity bonds to finance public-private partnership activities relating to school facilities in public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

S. 801

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 801, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to provide collective bargaining for rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1139

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1139, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to civil penalties for unruly passengers of air carriers and to provide for the protection of employees providing air safety information, and for other purposes.

S. 1197

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to prohibit the importation of products made with dog or cat fur, to prohibit the sale, manufacture, offer

for sale, transportation, and distribution of products made with dog or cat fur in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1487, a bill to provide for excellence in economic education, and for other purposes.

S. 1558

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for holders of Community Open Space bonds the proceeds of which are used for qualified environmental infrastructure projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to establish the Immigration Affairs Agency within the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1886

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1886, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to permit the Governor of a State to waive the oxygen content requirement for reformulated gasoline, to encourage development of voluntary standards to prevent and control releases of methyl tertiary butyl ether from underground storage tanks, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor 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. ROBB, his name 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 fire-fighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1988, a bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1993

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1993, a bill to reform Government information security by strengthening information security practices throughout the Federal Government.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2068, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States.

S. 2087

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2087, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve access to benefits under the TRICARE program; to extend and improve certain demonstration programs under the Defense Health Program; and for other purposes.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2217, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

S. 2235

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 2235, a bill to amend the Public Health Act to revise the performance standards and certification process for organ procurement organizations.

S. CON. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 60, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the *U.S.S. Wisconsin* and all those who served aboard her.

S. CON. RES. 76

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 76, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a peaceful resolution of the conflict in the state of Chiapas, Mexico and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 88

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 88, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning drawdowns of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 88, *supra*.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 87, a resolution commemorating the 60th Anniversary of the International Visitors Program

S. RES. 248

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 248, a resolution to designate the week of May 7, 2000, as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week."

S. RES. 260

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 260, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the Federal investment in programs that provide health care services to uninsured and

low-income individuals in medically under served areas be increased in order to double access to care over the next 5 years.

S. RES. 263

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 263, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should communicate to the members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries ("OPEC") cartel and non-OPEC countries that participate in the cartel of crude oil producing countries, before the meeting of the OPEC nations in March 2000, the position of the United States in favor of increasing world crude oil supplies so as to achieve stable crude oil prices.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 96—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION (AHEPA) WHO ARE BEING AWARDED THE AHEPA MEDAL FOR MILITARY SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 96

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) has provided 78 years of service to Greek-Americans and to American society and is continuing to serve into the twenty-first century through its 20,000 active members in 521 chartered chapters;

Whereas the mission of AHEPA is to promote the ideals of Hellenism, which include philanthropy, education, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence;

Whereas since its inception, AHEPA has instilled in its members an understanding of their Hellenic heritage and an awareness of the contributions made to the development of democratic principles and governance in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas AHEPA has done much throughout its history to foster American patriotism;

Whereas AHEPA has fostered patriotism by raising \$162,000,000 for United States War Bonds during World War II, for which AHEPA was named an official Issuing Agent for United States War Bonds by the United States Treasury Department, an honor that no other civic organization was able to achieve at the time;

Whereas the members of AHEPA have fostered patriotism by donating over \$400,000 collectively toward the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, New York, for which AHEPA received special recognition by the Department of the Interior;

Whereas members of AHEPA and its affiliated organizations, the Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles and Maids of Athena, served in the Armed Forces of the United States to protect American freedom and to preserve those democratic ideals which are part of the Hellenic legacy; and

Whereas on Monday, March 20, 2000, AHEPA is honoring the members of the AHEPA family who are veterans of service in

the Armed Services by presenting those members with a special commemorative AHEPA Medal for Military Service at the 2000 AHEPA Family Biennial Banquet in Washington, District of Columbia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) joins the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) in recognizing the members of the AHEPA family whose service as members of the Armed Forces of the United States and sacrifices made in such service have contributed so much to the preservation of freedom for Americans and for so many others throughout the world; and

(2) acknowledges the honor with which that service is being commemorated by the presentation of the special commemorative AHEPA Medal for Military Service to those members at the AHEPA Family Biennial Banquet in Washington, District of Columbia, on Monday, March 20, 2000.

SENATE RESOLUTION 274—TO DESIGNATE APRIL 9, 2000, AS A "NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF SAYLER'S CREEK"

Mr. WARNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 274

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE 135TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF SAYLER'S CREEK.

That the Senate—

(1) designates April 9, 2000, as a "National Day of Remembrance of the 135th Anniversary of the Battle of Saylor's Creek; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day of remembrance for the soldiers, the families of such soldiers and others who suffered, endured, and sacrificed during the four-year war known as the American Civil War.

SENATE RESOLUTION 275—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR ACCESS TO JAPANESE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. RES. 275

Whereas the United States has a deep and sustained interest in the promotion of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform in Japan;

Whereas new and bold measures by the Government of Japan regarding regulatory reform will help remove the regulatory and structural impediments to the effective functioning of market forces in the Japanese economy;

Whereas regulatory reform will increase the efficient allocation of resources in Japan, which is critical to returning Japan to a long-term growth path powered by domestic demand;

Whereas regulatory reform will not only improve market access for United States business and other foreign firms, but will also enhance consumer choice and economic prosperity in Japan;

Whereas a sustained recovery of the Japanese economy is vital to a sustained recovery of Asian economies;

Whereas the Japanese economy must serve as one of the main engines of growth for Asia and for the global economy;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Japan reconfirmed the critical importance of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform when the 2 Governments established the Enhanced Initiative on Deregulation and Competition Policy in 1997;

Whereas telecommunications is a critical sector requiring reform in Japan, where the market is hampered by a history of laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices that do not meet the needs of a competitive market;

Whereas as the result of Japan's laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices, Japanese consumers and Japanese industry have been denied the broad benefits of innovative telecommunications services, cutting edge technology, and lower prices that competition would bring to the market;

Whereas Japan's significant lag in developing broadband and Internet services, and Japan's lag in the entire area of electronic commerce, is a direct result of a non-competitive telecommunications regulatory structure;

Whereas Japan's lag in developing broadband and Internet services is evidenced by the following: (1) Japan has only 17,000,000 Internet users, while the United States has 80,000,000 Internet users; (2) Japan hosts fewer than 2,000,000 websites, while the United States hosts over 30,000,000 websites; (3) electronic commerce in Japan is valued at less than \$1,000,000,000, while in the United States electronic commerce is valued at over \$30,000,000,000; and (4) 19 percent of Japan's schools are connected to the Internet, while in the United States 89 percent of schools are connected;

Whereas the disparity between the United States and Japan is largely caused by the failure of Japan to ensure conditions that allow for the development of competitive networks which would stimulate the use of the Internet and electronic commerce;

Whereas leading edge foreign telecommunications companies, because of their high level of technology and innovation, are the key to building the necessary telecommunications infrastructure in Japan, which will only be able to serve Japanese consumers and industry if there is a fundamental change in Japan's regulatory approach to telecommunications; and

Whereas deregulating the monopoly power of Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation would help liberate Japan's economy and allow Japan to take full advantage of information technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the appropriate officials in the executive branch should implement vigorously the call for Japan to undertake a major regulatory reform in the telecommunications sector, the so-called "Telecommunications Big Bang";

(2) a "Telecommunications Big Bang" must address fundamental legislative and regulatory issues within a strictly defined timeframe;

(3) the new telecommunications regulatory framework should put competition first in order to encourage new and innovative businesses to enter the telecommunications market in Japan;

(4) the Government of Japan should ensure that Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) and its affiliates (the NTT

Group) are prevented from using their dominant position in the wired and wireless market in an anticompetitive manner; and

(5) the Government of Japan should take credible steps to ensure that competitive carriers have reasonable, cost-based, and nondiscriminatory access to the rights-of-way, facilities, and services controlled by NTT, the NTT Group, other utilities, and the Government of Japan, including—

(A) access to interconnection at market-based rates;

(B) unrestricted access to unbundled elements of the network belonging to NTT and the NTT Group; and

(C) access to public roads for the installation of facilities.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to make two sets of comments on Japan today. The first relates to Japanese telecommunications deregulation. The second involves a recently issued report about the lack of compliance by Japan with the trade agreements it has signed with the United States.

I am introducing today, along with Senator GRASSLEY, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution designed to encourage the Japanese Government to deregulate and open the Japanese telecommunications sector. Intense negotiations are going on between our government and Japanese authorities, and I hope that the Senate, by speaking out forcefully, will give support to the progressive elements in Japan as they do battle with the eternal forces of protection.

The United States has worked tirelessly to promote deregulation and openness in the Japanese telecommunications sector over the past 20 years. These efforts have led to significant changes in the procurement policies of Nippon Telegraph and Telephone, or NTT, which used to be the government owned, monopoly domestic telecommunications provider, and is still the 800-pound gorilla in the sector. The efforts included agreements on devices for interconnection, cellular phones, and international value added networks. It involved use of U.S. laws like section 301 and section 1377, the MOSS talks, the GATT, the WTO, and the Information Technology Agreement.

The United States has probably negotiated more on Japanese telecommunications than we have with any other nation over one specific sector. We have made a lot of progress, going from almost no sales by Americans in this sector in Japan two decades ago to several billion dollars today.

But considerable work remains, and the focus now is under the rubric of the Enhanced Initiative on Deregulation. Japan, despite a decade of stagnation, is still the world's second largest economy with incredible cutting edge technology. Nevertheless, its pattern of consumption of high tech telecommunications goods and services makes it look more like a second tier economy. While Japan's penetration of cellular phones is among the highest in the world, it falls far behind in many other measures of high tech telecommunications usage. For example, Japan has only 20 million Internet

users, compared to 80 million in the United States. Japan hosts two million web sites, while the United States hosts over 30 million. Electronic commerce in Japan is valued at less than one billion dollars, versus at least 30 times as much in the United States. And only 19 percent of Japan's schools are connected to the Internet, while in the United States 89 percent of schools are:

The explanation is that Japan has a non-competitive regulatory system in telecommunications that prevents market forces from fully operating. Foreign telecommunications service and equipment providers are limited in their ability to do business in Japan. This means that Japanese consumers are prevented from obtaining the highest quality telecommunications technology at the lowest price. They are not allowed to choose from the incredible array of services and products available around the world. And they pay higher prices than they should. Japanese firms also suffer for the same reasons in their procurement of telecommunications goods and services. They cannot get the best, and they overpay for what they can buy. Many modern services are simply unavailable in Japan.

If the Japanese Government wanted to follow a path that would lead to higher economic growth, greater choice and lower prices for its consumers, and increased efficiency for its industry, it would deregulate this sector immediately.

The sense-of-the-Senate resolution I am introducing today simply stresses the need for significant regulatory reform in Japan, supports USTR in vigorously pursuing this, and sends the message to Japan that the Senate is strongly behind such an effort. Deregulation serves American and international business. It serves the Japanese economy. It serves the Japanese consumer. It serves Japanese industry. And it serves the regional and global economy which needs a growing Japan. In the long run, everyone would be a winner if Japan let market forces operate.

The second issue I want to address today is a report issued earlier this month by the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, the ACCJ, on Japan's compliance, or, rather, insufficient compliance, with trade agreements. The study, "Making Trade Talks Work 2000: An On-the-Ground Analysis of US-Japan Trade Agreements by American Businesses," looked at 58 major United States/Japan trade agreements reached between 1980 and 1999. The ACCJ rates 51 of them on a numerical basis, using four measures. Their astounding conclusion was that 53 percent were fully or mostly successful, while 47 percent were rated as partially successful, successful in only one or two ways, or unsuccessful.

This rating, performed by American companies and industry associations on the ground in Japan, working every

day in the trenches to penetrate the Japanese market, should be a wake-up call to all of us. Despite all the attention spent on opening the Japanese market during the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations, barely half of the agreements signed actually worked. This is an utterly unacceptable result. I commend this report to my colleagues. Not only is its analysis excellent, but the ACCJ offers a range of recommendations for future action.

Compliance by other nations with trade agreements is a serious problem for our country, and it will likely get worse. Many of the easy trade barriers around the world, such as tariffs and quotas, have been significantly reduced or eliminated. Now, we face the tougher trade barriers, such as anti-competitive practices and internal regulations and standards designed to keep out foreign goods and services. These barriers are harder to identify, harder to get agreement on, and it is harder to measure the results.

I am very worried about our government's system of monitoring trade agreements and ensuring that our trading partners will comply with their commitments. The GAO has told us that there is not even a place in the government where you can go to get a list of all trade agreements. When the ACCJ did its earlier study in 1997, they spent months just assembling all United States-Japan bilateral trade agreements. If you don't know what agreements exist, how can you enforce them?

In its most recent report on this subject, the GAO concluded that the Executive Branch needed a more integrated approach to monitoring and enforcing trade agreements and should pursue a process of comprehensive and sustained strategic planning. GAO also concluded that declining staff levels have limited agencies' monitoring and enforcement activities. Some of the special skills needed to deal with the new complex trade agreements is also lacking.

I deeply appreciate the ACCJ's diligence in presenting us with an objective analysis of the Japanese market situation. But, as GAO indicates, this may be just the tip of the iceberg internationally. The problem is pervasive, and I don't see any trends that will make it better.

That is why, among other reasons, I recently introduced the China WTO compliance bill to make sure that, once China enters the WTO, we won't have this massive violation of our trade agreements as has happened with Japan. That is why I recently introduced a bill to establish a Congressional Trade Office to provide the Congress with precisely the type of objective information that the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan has provided, and to help those of us in the Congress ensure that trade agreements reached are trade agreements implemented. I call on my colleagues to work with me to develop a system that will ensure that American workers,

farmers, and businesses will benefit from the trade agreements that our trade officials so diligently negotiate.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate of Tuesday, March 21, 2000, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 2102, a bill to establish a permanent homeland for the Timbisha Shoshone. The hearing will be held in the committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

Those wishing additional information may contact committee staff at 202/224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet a 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 22, 2000, in room SR-301 Russell Senate Office Building, to receive testimony on the Constitution and campaign reform.

For further information concerning this meeting, please contact Hunter Bates at the Rules Committee on 4-6352.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 22, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Thomas N. Slonaker to be Special Trustee for American Indians. The hearing will be held in the committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building. The hearing will be preceded by a business meeting to mark up S. 1586, Indian Land Consolidation and S. 1315, Oil and Gas Leases on Navajo Allotted Lands.

Those wishing additional information may contact committee staff at 202/224-2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTRY, CONSERVATION, AND RURAL REVITALIZATION

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Forestry, Conservation, and Rural Revitalization of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on March 22, 2000 in SR-328A at 3:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss legislation regarding the appraisal process to make it fair for cabin owners and taxpayers.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

For Thursday, March 23 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the nomination of Thomas A. Fry

III, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

For further information, please contact David Dye of the committee staff at (202) 224-0624.

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, March 29, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1778, to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir; S. 1894, to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Park County Wyoming; and S. 1969, to provide for improved management of, and increased accountability for, out-fitted activities by which the public gains access to and occupancy and use of Federal land, and for other purposes.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mike Menge or Bill Eby at (202) 224-6170.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. to mark up S. 1507, Native American Alcohol and Substance Abuse Program Consolidation Act of 1999, and S. 1509, Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act Amendments of 1999; followed by a hearing on S. 1967, to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians. The hearing will be held in the Committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

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, April 13, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2034, a bill to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mike Menge or Bill Eby at (202) 224-6170.

HONORING THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 96 introduced earlier today by Senators SARBANES, SNOWE, DASCHLE, and others.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 96) recognizing and honoring the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) who are being awarded the AHEPA Medal for Military Service for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and preamble be agreed to, en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 96) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 96

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) has provided 78 years of service to Greek-Americans and to American society and is continuing to serve into the twenty-first century through its 20,000 active members in 521 chartered chapters;

Whereas the mission of AHEPA is to promote the ideals of Hellenism, which include philanthropy, education, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence;

Whereas since its inception, AHEPA has instilled in its members an understanding of their Hellenic heritage and an awareness of the contributions made to the development of democratic principles and governance in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas AHEPA has done much throughout its history to foster American patriotism;

Whereas AHEPA has fostered patriotism by raising \$162,000,000 for United States War Bonds during World War II, for which AHEPA was named an official Issuing Agent for United States War Bonds by the United States Treasury Department, an honor that no other civic organization was able to achieve at the time;

Whereas the members of AHEPA have fostered patriotism by donating over \$400,000 collectively toward the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, New York, for which AHEPA received special recognition by the Department of the Interior;

Whereas members of AHEPA and its affiliated organizations, the Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles and Maids of Athena, served in the Armed Forces of the United States to protect American freedom and to preserve those democratic ideals which are part of the Hellenic legacy; and

Whereas on Monday, March 20, 2000, AHEPA is honoring the members of the

AHEPA family who are veterans of service in the Armed Services by presenting those members with a special commemorative AHEPA Medal for Military Service at the 2000 AHEPA Family Biennial Banquet in Washington, District of Columbia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) joins the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) in recognizing the members of the AHEPA family whose service as members of the Armed Forces of the United States and sacrifices made in such service have contributed so much to the preservation of freedom for Americans and for so many others throughout the world; and

(2) acknowledges the honor with which that service is being commemorated by the presentation of the special commemorative AHEPA Medal for Military Service to those members at the AHEPA Family Biennial Banquet in Washington, District of Columbia, on Monday, March 20, 2000.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 106-31, as amended by Public Law 106-113, appoints the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) to the Russian Leadership Program Advisory Board.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2000

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. Tuesday, March 21. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately fol-

lowing the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN, or his designee, 60 minutes; Senator ASHCROFT, 15 minutes; Senator BROWNBACK, or his designee, 30 minutes; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, 30 minutes.

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

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

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

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. tomorrow. Following the recess for the weekly party caucus luncheons, the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 5, the Social Security earnings legislation. There will be approximately 4 hours of debate with three amendments in order to the bill. The majority leader has announced that any necessary votes on those amendments will occur on Tuesday afternoon. However, a vote on final passage is expected to occur on Wednesday morning.

During the remainder of this week, the Senate may begin consideration of

the crop insurance legislation or any other executive or legislative items cleared for action. As a reminder, Senators can expect votes throughout the week of March 27, including March 31, in anticipation of the consideration of the budget resolution.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:20 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 21, 2000, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GREGORY ROBERT DAHLBERG, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE BERNARD DANIEL ROSTKER.

BERNARD DANIEL ROSTKER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS, VICE RUDY DE LEON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM A. EATON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ADMINISTRATION), VICE PATRICK FRANCIS KENNEDY.

MARC GROSSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE EDWARD WILLIAM GNEHM, JR.

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN MCADAM MOTT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE TRUMAN ALDRICH MORRISON, III, RETIRED.