that of promoting our relations with the Hispanic community in the U.S. I am particularly encouraged by the fact that this will be one of the issues to be discussed in this III Forum, both in the context of education and promotion of people to people links as well as from the perspective of image and mutual understanding. In fact, the U.S.-Spain Council which owes much of its existence to the talent and the perseverance of Ambassador Bill Richardson is, in itself, a good example of the special predisposition that Spaniards and Hispanics share to understand each other.

Finally, I would like to make reference to the third convergence that makes our relationship unique: the security and defense issues, the military component of the Spanish-American ties. Historically, Spain has evolved from contributing to the struggle for American independence 200 years ago, to its accession to the Washington Treaty in 1982 and common membership in N.A.T.O. It can even be said that, since 1975, the major change in our growing exchanges with the American Government and society has been a progressive reduction of the military issue in the relationship as a whole. We are no longer primarily a military ally, as we have become above all a partner in the International Community, engaging in excellent and extensive political, economic and cultural relations, that do not, however, exclude the security and defense link.

The N.A.T.O. Summit held in Madrid last July, was a crucial moment in the design of a new post-Cold War N.A.T.O., both in its internal renovation and its external adaptation. Spain and the United States share a common view in practically all issues: the new design of the command structure; the development of the European Identity in Security and Defense, involving the effective participation of the W.E.U.; the full support to the new Council of Euro-Atlantic Association; the enlargement understood as a historical challenge that demands an undeferable response and as a evolving process that began with three countries but has been left open to the future; the full support to the new Council of the Euro-Atlantic Association; the N.A.T.O. Russia cooperation, and the special relationship with the Ukraine; the strengthening of the Mediterranean dialogue, and the creation of a Group for Cooperation in the Mediterranean.

Consequently, we have arrived at a juncture in which we feel that the transformation of the current model of our presence in the renewed Alliance, and our entrance in the new command structure is deemed advisable. We believe that the necessary adjustments are practically concluded, in a conceptual design that is acceptable both to Spain and to the Other N.A.T.O. partners. We trust that this decision will be formalised next December, without undue interference from any extraneous bilateral dissension, foreign to the Alliance, which ought to be solved in other fora.

Ladies and Gentleman;

Our world is irrevocably and unquestionably different. Globalization—of markets, of finance, of technology, of challenges—is not an option but a reality. International relations are predominantly multilateral; the expansion of democracy can be demonstrated; the proliferation of new conflicts within states, rather than between states, is a proven fact and an unfortunate truth,; and the revolution in communications and information technology is the result of the most significant and drastic technological changes since the Industrial Revolution.

And within such complex and changing framework, that is so contradictory in its inequalities and its fortunes, it seems appropriate that as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain I encourage the United States to continue to be the most visible international spokesman in favour of stability, sustainable development, peace and security. This is not a responsibility that must be carried out alone. Europe must participate since we share a common world, since the United States is a European country and Europe is an Atlantic Continent. This is Spain's understanding which has been postulated numerous times over the last years. The United States can rest assured that in the conflict-stricken scenarios of the world and in the daily life of the international community, it will always find a Spaniard striving towards peaceful co-existence, democracy and the rule of law.

This does not imply that no differences exist between the policies of both and countries, or that we will not encounter situations in which, while agreeing on the goals, we dissent on the means. In such a complex and vital relationship, perpetual consensus or systematic unanimity are unattainable. It is in exploring doubts and in the search for alternatives, that the intelligence of thought is expressed. On occasion's, this is the only manner in which partner of good faith can effectively help one another, in a relationship as plural and conditioned by the World's diversity as ours.

I would like to end by congratulating, once again, the U.S.-Spain Council for having maintained this initiative and the continuity of its meeting. The ambitious originality and imagination of its members allows us to harbour great expectations about their practical proposals which we shall listen to with great attention.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WALTER J. KEISKER

Mr. ASCHROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a tremendous individual who exemplifies citizenship, character, and service to humanity, Rev. Walter J. Keisker.

On November 12, 1997, the Lutheran Family and Children Services [LFCS] of southeast Missouri will host The Second Annual Walter J. Keisker Dinner. I commend LFCS staff for their foresight in choosing Reverend Keisker to lead their mission. As our Nation looks increasingly for moral guidance in an era of moral decay, Reverend Keisker's example provides inspiration for others to follow in building family life.

Anyone ever associated with Reverend Keisker knows of his unique spirit and tenacity which has brought about a rich lifetime of accomplishments. This special servant of God and man was bestowed a honorary degree of doctor of divinity in 1993 by Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. Reverend Keisker generously gives his time to the Boy Scouts, Ministerial Alliance, Chamber of Commerce, and Historical Society. His dedication is an enduring example of service, integrity, faithfulness, and love in the highest and best spirit of American citizenship.

From Matthew, Chapter 25, Verse 21, ''Well done, my good and faithful servant!'' With God's blessing, and the benevolent commitment of Rev. Walter J. Keisker as a guiding light, the lutheran family and children's services will continue to be successful in building a stronger family life.

CONGRATULATIONS TO EDITH BARCOMB CELEBRATING HER 88TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating Edith Barcomb of Springfield, MO, who will celebrate her 88th birthday on November 26. Edith is a truly remarkable individual. She has witnessed many of the events that have shaped our Nation into the greatest the world has ever known. The longevity of Edith's life has meant much more, however, to the many relatives and friends whose lives she has touched over the last 88 years.

Edith's celebration of 88 years of life is a testament to me and all Missourians. Her achievements are significant and deserve to be recognized. I would like to join Edith's many friends and relatives in wishing her health and happiness in the future.

1997: A BANNER YEAR OF WORK FOR SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this past week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held its final business meeting of the 1st session of the 105th Congress. At that meeting, the committee approved 50 nominations as well as three pieces of legislation. This was the culmination of an ambitious 1997 agenda which included 97 committee meetings—the first on January 8 when the committee convened to consider the nomination of Madeleine Albright to be Secretary of State.

With this past week's business meeting, the committee had approved and sent to the Senate, in 1997, 119 nominations, approved 1,004 Foreign Service promotions and reported out 37 pieces of legislation, while approving 15 treaties. Among the nominations were the Secretary of State, numerous Assistant Secretaries of State, and Ambassadors to the United Nations, Canada, the United Kingdom, Japan, Greece, Korea, Israel, and Egypt.

But this, Mr. President, does not begin to tell the full story. Thanks to the able members of the committee staff, hard work of the committee members—the subcommittee chairmen and ranking members—and thanks to the bipartisan spirit which we, all of us, have worked to establish, we have—all of us together—succeeded, in the opinion of, at least, two former Secretaries of State, in returning the Foreign Relations Committee to top-drawer relevancy for the first time in decades. I believe it is fair to say that, thanks to the joint efforts of so many, the committee is today a force to be reckoned with in terms of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. President, the most concrete evidence of this rejuvenation came in May and June, when the committee wrote and approved sweeping bipartisan legislation to reorganize and revitalize the

U.S. foreign policy apparatus, and reform the United Nations. This bill passed the Senate by an overwhelming 90 to 5 vote stipulating the abolishment of two antiquated temporary Federal agencies—the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and brings another—the Agency for International Development—under the authority of the Secretary of State.

And, just as importantly, it strikes a grand bargain regarding the United Nations, paying $819 million in so-called U.S. arrears in exchange for deep-seated and meaningful U.N. reforms.

In addition, since the August recess, the full committee, and its various subcommittees, have convened literally dozens of hearings on a wide range of foreign policy matters. During the fall months, the committee began hearings on what will surely be next year's most important foreign policy debate: The expansion of the NATO alliance.

The committee has already held six hearings—beginning with testimony from Secretary of State Albright—hearings which I believe will have a real impact in ensuring not only that NATO expansion is approved by the Senate next spring, but that the plan presented to the Senate for its advice and consent is done the right way, taking into account the legitimate concerns various Senators have presented.

It is difficult for me to express in any adequate way my gratitude to the members of this committee for all their efforts this past year. The chairmen and ranking members of the various subcommittees have done splendid work in the consideration of all the nominations, the bilateral tax treaties that are so important to American industry, and to hold oversight hearings on so many important matters.

It is because of their work—not Senator BIDEN's nor mine—that this committee has been restored to the world stage as an important player in American foreign policy. I am proud of them and, it has been a privilege to serve with them on the Foreign Relations Committee.

JUDGE IN MINNESOTA BLOCKS CLASS I DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this week Senator LEAHY and I addressed the Senate about our concerns and disappointment with the recent order by the U.S. District Court of Minnesota which enjoined the Secretary of Agriculture from enforcing class I differentials in 28 of the current 33 Federal milk marketing orders. If the November 3, 1997, ruling stands, it will throw the entire milk pricing system into chaos threatening the continued existence of thousands of dairy farms nationwide.

Mr. President, it is imperative that Secretary Glickman move immediately to seek a stay and file an appeal to the court's decision. I am joining several of my colleagues in a letter to Secretary Glickman to formally request that the U.S. Department of Agriculture appeal the decision. I urge others to contact Secretary Glickman to recommend that he act swiftly in this request as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter being sent to Secretary Glickman appear in the RECORD.

This ruling should not impact the current reforms of the Federal milk marketing orders with respect to the basic formula price and class I differentials. It is important that the Department of Agriculture continue to use sound public policy in determining a pricing structure that is in the best interest of dairy farmers and consumers alike. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have expressed in overwhelming fashion to the Secretary of Agriculture the support and importance of maintaining our class I differentials. Recently, 48 Senators wrote to Secretary Glickman supporting class I differentials and endorsing the Department's option 1–A proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of October 10, 1997, regarding overwhelming support for option 1–A appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, those of us who value dairying in our States should recognize the dangerous precedent of this ruling. The success of an appeal to overturn in this case is of vital importance to the survival of dairy farmers across this Nation.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 10, 1997.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: Considering the recent district court decision out of Minnesota, we want to reconfirm our views on milk marketing orders and strongly recommend that the USDA seek a stay and appeal the decision.

In reviewing the various options for the pricing of Class 1 fluid milk, it is still our view that Option 1–A is the most viable and economically sound approach to the future pricing of fluid milk.

Last month forty-eight Senators and one hundred and thirteen Members of the House of Representatives indicated to you that Option 1–A reflects good public policy necessary for effective milk marketing order reform. Our support for Option 1–A is based upon a number of important factors:

It recognizes the transportation costs involved in moving fluid milk from the farm to the consumer.

It takes into account the importance of balancing the supply and demand for milk, ensuring adequate production to meet all fluid milk needs.

It recognizes the costs of producing and marketing milk and, therefore, does not inflict economic hardship on dairy producers in any one region to benefit others.

It is sensitive to the need for attracting supplemental milk supplies to regions of the country that occasionally face production deficits.

These are some of the reasons that most of the dairy producing regions of the country support Option 1–A for the regional pricing differentials for fluid milk.

Under the November 3, 1997, court decision in *Minnesota Milk Producers, et al.* v. *Dan Glickman*, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to end the Class I differentials in the milk marketing order system. If this decision stands, it will throw the entire milk system into chaos threatening the continued existence of thousands of dairy farms nationwide.

Appealing the court's ruling is in the best interest of milk producers and consumers across the country.

We look forward to your comments and to working closely with you on the federal order reform process.

Sincerely,

JIM M. JEFFORDS.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 1997.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: In reviewing the various options for the pricing of Class 1 fluid milk, it is clear that Option 1–A is the most viable and economically sound approach to the future pricing of fluid milk.

Option 1–A reflects good public policy necessary for effective milk marketing order reform. Our support for Option 1–A is based upon a number of important factors: It recognizes the transportation costs involved in moving fluid milk from the farm to the consumer; it takes into account the importance of balancing the supply and demand for milk, ensuring adequate production to meet all fluid milk needs; it recognizes the costs of producing and marketing milk and, therefore, does not inflict economic hardship on dairy producers in any one region to benefit others; and it is sensitive to the need for attracting supplemental milk supplies to regions of the country that occasionally face production deficits.

These are some of the reasons that most of the dairy producing regions of the country support Option I–A for the regional pricing differentials for fluid milk.

As part of the reforms to the Basic Formula Price (BFP), we urge the Department to seriously consider partially ''decoupling'' fluid milk prices from the volatile cheese-based pricing system that has resulted in wide fluctuations in milk prices.

This pricing system has dramatically reduced farm milk prices and has left permanently high consumer prices. In our view, maintaining price stability is an extremely important order reform goal for both dairy farmers and consumers.

We look forward to your comments and in working closely with you on the federal order reform process.

Sincerely,

James M. Jeffords; Patrick Leahy; Susan Collins; Lauch Faircloth; Chris Dodd; Bob Graham; Alfonse D'Amato; Joe Biden; Mary L. Landrieu; Bill Roth; John Breaux; Jesse Helms; Jeff Bingaman; John F. Kerry; Tim Hutchinson; Max Cleland.

Connie Mack; Daniel P. Moynihan; John H. Chafee; Patty Murray; Joe Lieberman; Edward Kennedy; Larry E. Craig; Charles Robb; Paul Coverdell; Barbara A. Mikulski; Ron Wyden; Richard Shelby; Pete V. Domenici; Mitch McConnell; Jack Reed; Jeff Sessions.

Ernest Hollings; Olympia Snowe; Strom Thurmond; John W. Warner; Dale Bumpers; Bob Smith; Slade Gorton; Christopher Bond; Thad Cochran; Rick Santorum; Arlen Specter; John Glenn; Dirk Kempthorne; Mike DeWine; Judd Gregg; Paul S. Sarbanes.