

Office at Norton Air Force Base, California, and as Director of Program Control, Joint System Program Office for the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile, at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. In 1985 General Moore was selected for the prestigious Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Following completion of the Air War College, General Moore was the Director of Cost, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Comptroller, Headquarters Air Force Systems Command, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, and then the Small ICBM Deputy Program Director at Norton Air Force Base.

In 1989 General Moore attended the Program Manager's Course at the Defense Systems Management College, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. General Moore then returned to the Small ICBM Program as the Program Director. He then served as the Deputy Director of Strategic, Special Operation Forces and Airlift Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C. In 1992, General Moore was assigned as the Vice Commander of the San Antonio Air Logistics Center. In 1993 General Moore was promoted to Brigadier General.

In 1994, General Moore served as the Program Executive Officer for Bombers, Missiles and Trainers, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C. In 1995, General Moore became the Director of Special Programs in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In this capacity, he was responsible for coordinating the planning, budgeting, and management of extremely sensitive Department of Defense special access classified programs. In 1997, General Moore received his second star, in 1998, was assigned as the Deputy Director for the newly formed Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). As the Deputy Director of DTRA, General Moore held and excelled in one of the most complex and challenging assignments in the Department of Defense—the creation of DTRA. DTRA was created, in the words of the Secretary of Defense: "to fill a major void in the defense of the nation against weapons of mass destruction". Established by a Defense Reform Initiative in November 1997, General Moore led the successful accomplishment of a vital and monumental strategic task—consolidation into one organization the bulk of DoD's arms control, cooperative threat reduction, and technology security regimes, as well as weapons of mass destruction (WMD) related research development test and evaluation (RDT&E) programs. DTRA also coordinates and prioritizes Chemical/Biological programs for the Joint Staff, and provides an integrated national architecture for response to WMD threats to civil and military populations; and is a full partner with the Departments of Energy, Justice and State to provide national deterrence for WMD.

General Moore is a fully certified acquisition professional whose awards include two Defense Distinguished Service Medals, the legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the National Defense Service Medal with service star, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

During his long and distinguished career, General Moore served the nation with excellence and distinction. He is a visionary leader, and a true warrior who has had a profound impact on the United States Air Force, and made significant contributions to the strategic defense of the United States and its allies.

General Moore will retire from the Air Force on May 1, 2000, after more than thirty years of exceptionally distinguished service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would like to recognize General Moore's accomplishments and his service. Congratulations on the completion of a long and distinguished career.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 10, 2000, to Senators LOTT and DASCHLE from myself and Senator BRYAN regarding S. 2089, the Counterintelligence Reform Act of 2000.

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

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2000.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader,
Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

SENATORS LOTT AND DASCHLE: It is our understanding that S. 2089, the Counterintelligence Reform Act of 2000, contains provisions affecting intelligence activities and programs. As you know, these are issues of significant interest to, and clearly within the jurisdiction of, the Select Committee on Intelligence. Therefore, pursuant to Section 3(b) of Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress, we hereby request that S. 2089 be referred to our Committee for consideration.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman.
RICHARD H. BRYAN,
Vice Chairman.

H.R. 1000, FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last week the Senate acted resoundingly and passed the critically needed conference report for funding the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). I commend the efforts of our majority leader, Senator LOTT, the Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator STEVENS, and Budget Committee chairman, Senator DOMENICI. My colleagues here and over

in the House have worked hard to arrive at this consensus. Both as a Senator and frequent flyer, I appreciate their efforts.

At this time, I would like to reiterate several points I made during last year's debate in the Senate having to do with allowing exemptions to the current perimeter rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. I believe that the conference report balances the interests of states inside the perimeter with those of us from Western States who lack convenient access to Reagan National.

I know my colleagues are aware of my support for efforts to ensure that these limited exemptions must benefit citizens throughout the West. I believe we must make it clear that these limited number of exemptions should not be awarded solely or disproportionately to one carrier. I fully anticipate that the Department of Transportation will ensure that the maximum number of cities benefit from these slots.

While I would have preferred to eliminate the perimeter rule altogether, which I believe would have substantially improved access to the West, I am hopeful that DOT will ensure that small and midsized communities in West, especially in the Northern tier, have improved access through hubs like Salt Lake City.

I believe an important component of aviation reform is to improve air service for communities that have not experienced the benefits of deregulation to the extent large markets have. Today, Utahns must double or even triple connect to fly into Reagan National. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the DOT to ensure that citizens in the west have improved access and a variety of options when they travel.

LEVEL III DIRECT ACCESS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to clarify an important issue contained in the conference agreement on S. 376, the satellite reform bill, with respect to "Level III direct access."

The conference agreement provides authority for so-called "Level III direct access"—which is the ability of customers other than INTELSAT signatories to enter into agreements with INTELSAT for ordering, receiving and paying for space segment capacity—but it says nothing about the signatory fee that COMSAT is entitled to receive from direct access users as determined by the FCC's direct access order made effective December 6, 1999. I understand it is the intent of the conferees to preserve this signatory fee to compensate COMSAT for the costs it incurs as the U.S. signatory to INTELSAT during its brief transition to a procompetitive privatization.

Nothing in the conference agreement is intended to vacate the FCC's "Level III direct access" order made effective December 6, 1999, including its assessment of a signatory fee to be charged

to direct access users to offset COMSAT's signatory costs. I would also add that Congress is addressing direct access to INTELSAT before it privatizes. After privatization, when INTELSAT become a commercial company like any other, it can make whatever business decisions it wants with respect to marketing or distribution arrangements—again, just as other companies do. Once privatized, the government should not be interfering, let alone dictating, these arrangements one way or another.

EDUCATING OUR CHILDREN

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue of paramount importance to this nation, how we educate our children.

We in the Senate have the difficult task before us of passing legislation that re-authorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which determines how the Federal Government allocates money to our public schools.

Unfortunately, all signs from the Committee point to yet another political stalemate and neither side appears to be pushing any closer toward common ground.

In hopes of breaking this unproductive dynamic, I have joined with a group of my moderate Democratic colleagues here in the Senate to promote a "Third Way" on ESEA, one that synthesizes the best ideas of both sides into a whole new approach to federal education policy.

We are calling this bill the "Three R's" and it is a bold effort at streamlining numerous Federal education programs and refocusing federal resources on raising academic achievement. This blueprint will give more funding and flexibility to local school districts, in exchange for greater accountability.

Mr. President, today I would like to specifically talk about the component of the bill that focuses on teacher quality. We call our bill the "Three R's" and a similar acronym can apply to our efforts to improve teacher quality. Our plan can best be summed up by "Four R's": recruiting, retention, resources, and above all . . . RESPECT.

The difficulty schools experience today in recruiting and retaining quality teachers is one of the most enormous obstacles facing our education system. We cannot expect students to be successful if they don't work with quality teachers; and we can't expect quality teachers to stay in the profession if they don't get adequate training, resources or respect.

Most experts agree that teacher quality is as important as any other factor in raising student achievement. The legislation we are introducing today would consolidate several teacher training initiatives into a single formula grant program for improving the quality of public school teachers, principals and administrators.

This proposal would increase professional development funding by 100 per-

cent to \$1.6 billion annually and target that funding to the neediest school districts. In my home State of Arkansas, this will mean an additional \$12 million for teacher quality initiatives.

In addition, the "Three R's" would give States and school districts more flexibility to design effective teacher recruitment and professional development initiatives to meet their specific needs.

One overreaching goal we propose today is to require that all teachers be fully-qualified by 2005. Even the best teachers can't teach what they don't know or haven't learned themselves. To be successful, we must work harder to reduce out-of-field teaching and require educators to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the subjects they teach.

I have the highest respect for the teachers, principals, and superintendents who dedicate their talent and skills everyday to prepare our children for tomorrow. I think they have some of the hardest, and most important, jobs in the world. Our Nation's future, in large part, depends on the work that they do. Our teacher quality proposal is an example of how combining the concepts of increased funding, targeting, flexibility and accountability, we can join with state and local educators to give our children a high-quality education every child deserves.

I hope this plan will serve as a blueprint to improving public education as we enter into what is sure to be a lengthy and contentious ESEA debate.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY STATEMENT BY THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week, the Friends of Ireland in Congress released its annual St. Patrick's Day Statement. The Friends of Ireland is a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives opposed to violence and terrorism in Northern Ireland and dedicated to a United States policy that promotes a just, lasting and peaceful settlement of the conflict, which has taken more than 3,100 lives over the past 30 years.

I believe this year's Friends of Ireland Statement will be of interest to all of our colleagues who are concerned about this issue, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND, SAINT PATRICK'S DAY 2000

On this first St. Patrick's Day of the new millennium, the Friends of Ireland in the United States Congress join 45 million Irish-Americans of both traditions in celebrating the unique bonds between our two nations. We send greetings to the President of Ireland, Mary McAleese and warmly welcome the Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern, on his third St. Patrick's Day visit to Washington. We share the hopes of the Irish people that the current impasse in the Northern Ireland peace process will be broken soon.

We are deeply troubled by the suspension of the democratically elected Government of Northern Ireland by the British Government and the stalemate over decommissioning. We urge all political leaders in the North to recommit themselves to the spirit and letter of the Good Friday Agreement. We have provided strong and consistent support throughout the peace process to all parties committed to peace, and we reaffirm our commitment to the full implementation of the Agreement.

The Good Friday Agreement was endorsed decisively by the people of Ireland both North and South with majorities from both traditions. It is a mandate given to those working on behalf of peace, justice and the creation of a new beginning in Northern Ireland. Successful implementation is predicated on the concurrent resolution of all the interdependent aspects of the Agreement. The successful implementation of the agreement must be the clear goal for all who want to consolidate the progress that has been made and to avoid the danger of failure for yet another generation in Northern Ireland.

At this time, the institutions of devolved government are suspended. The suspension was not caused by any failure of the institutions themselves, nor by any violation of the Agreement, but by an internal political crisis focused on the issue of decommissioning. We encourage the political leaders to bridge this crisis of confidence and secure the reinstatement of the institutions as soon as possible. Their absence creates a gap which the enemies of peace can and will exploit. It is vital that they are not permitted to succeed. The ongoing cease-fires are major confidence building measures, and it should be made clear that any return to violence is not an option. We condemn unequivocally all acts of violence.

We call on all sides to implement additional confidence building measures. Root causes of violence—prejudice, religious intolerance and sectarianism—must also be eliminated. The nationalist and unionist communities must see that politics is working and believe their future can rest with the actions of their democratically elected representatives in the Assembly.

The issue of confidence in the integrity of the democratic institutions set up under the Good Friday Agreement must not be seen as confined to the agenda of any one side. It is a shared requirement which all have a vital stake in restoring. Each party is committed under the Agreement to ensure the viability and effective operation of the political process pledged in the Agreement by persuading those who hold weapons that such weapons can have no role whatsoever in a democratic system.

In spite of discouraging setbacks, we believe that a way forward can be found on this difficult issue by building on the progress already made. We welcome the acknowledgment by the IRA that "the issue of arms needs to be dealt with in an acceptable way and this is a necessary objective of a genuine peace process." We also welcome the work in identifying and advancing the context where this goal can most successfully be achieved. We consider a crucial test to be whether the electorate in Northern Ireland can be reassured that their democratic wishes will not be undermined by actual or threatened recourse to guns from any side.

We believe there is now an acceptance of this fundamental principle across the entire political spectrum which offers a basis for reaching an accommodation, provided the parties approach it in a spirit of reciprocal action, and with sensitivity about the real constraints on each side and the need for skillful and patient management of these constraints. We urge renewed dialogue in