



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 24, 2000

No. 97

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, July 21, 2000)

The Senate met at 12:01 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Lord God, You know us as we really are. You know the inner person behind highly polished exteriors. You know when we are tired and need Your strength. You know about our worries and anxieties and offer Your comfort. You understand our fears and frustrations and assure us of Your presence. You feel our hurts and infuse Your healing love. Flood our inner being with Your peace so that we can live with confidence and courage.

At 3:40 p.m. today, we will remember the sacrifice in the line of duty of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson. Continue to bless their families. Help us to express our gratitude to the officers who serve in Congress with such faithfulness. Now we commit this day to You, for You are our Lord. Amen.

†

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHARLES GRASSLEY, Senator from the State of Iowa, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

†

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

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

†

SCHEDULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. For the leader, I would like to announce today's program. The Senate will be in a period of

morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators DURBIN and THOMAS in control of the time.

Following morning business, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill with amendments in order to that bill. Those Senators who have amendments should work with the bill managers on a time to offer their amendments as soon as possible.

†

ORDER FOR MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. As a reminder to all Members, on this date 2 years ago, Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson were killed in the line of duty while defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun. In honor of this anniversary, I now ask unanimous consent that at 3:40 p.m. today, there be a moment of silence to honor these two officers.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank my colleagues for their attention.

†

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 not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee, 12 to 1 p.m.; Senator THOMAS or his designee, 1 to 2 p.m.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business, with the

time to come from Senator THOMAS' time.

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

†

HOCUS POCUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to note that there are some things happening around here of late that make me wonder if we are in an episode of the X-Files. I am troubled with the mysterious appearance and disappearance of funds within the conference report for Military Construction. In the effort to develop an emergency spending package, the House included money for meth lab clean-up. It voted on money. The Senate-passed bill had money for meth lab clean-up. Both Houses of Congress recognized that there was a real emergency. Both bodies recognized the need to provide emergency money to DEA to help pay for the costs of cleaning up the toxic waste dumps caused by illegal meth production.

I and other members of this body have been concerned for some time about this problem. We have written the President, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, the Attorney General, and the Majority Leader and members of the Committee on Appropriations. The Majority Whip of the Senate had an emergency meth spending item accepted as part of the bill passed by the Senate. But it seems we've had a case of alien abduction. All—all the meth money disappeared in conference and no one seems to know how or why. The House included money. The Senate included money. The conference to reconcile the differences, however, included no money. What this means is strange math in which one plus one equals zero.

Mr. President, I have participated in various conferences with the other body, and I know they can be complicated affairs. Strong disagreements can exist over how to phrase a section,

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7459

or how much funding this particular project should receive. But there have always been some guidelines governing a conference. First, you are working toward a compromise. This means, by definition, you are not going to get everything you want. However, it also means you will get something that will work. Second, in a conference, you aren't starting from scratch. Each body has reviewed, debated, and passed a version of legislation—a starting point, if you will, for compromise.

These compromises, often difficult to arrive at, are worked out behind closed doors. Out of the watchful eye of the public. Legislating can be an ugly process, and often negotiations continue in a much more open and frank manner in private than under the media microscope. But compromise should not be the occasion for legislating afresh, for ignoring the expressed intent of majorities in both Houses.

Looking through the Military Construction Appropriations bill this last week, I was distressed at some of the items I found that seem to have magically appeared. 6 C-130Js and a new Gulf Stream 5 for the Coast Guard, for example. So far as I know, the Coast Guard did not ask for a Gulf Stream, and we did not vote for one. But there it is.

At the same time, it seems that needed funds to support the DEA's continued assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies to clean up methamphetamine labs have disappeared—and no one seems to know where it went.

Heading into the conference, it was clear what the situation was. The House had provided \$15 million in emergency funds for needed methamphetamine lab-cleanup. The Senate provided a total of \$50 million for meth-related activities by the DEA—\$10 million was added in Committee, and an additional \$40 million was adopted on the floor for "initiatives to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking." So you would think—I certainly thought—that the conferees would return with some funding—most likely between \$15 and \$50 million—for meth lab clean-up.

But something happened in the conference. Someone waved a magic wand, and "Poof!" The money is gone. Where did it go? The conferees don't know. Why is it gone? The sponsors of the funds don't know. I don't know. Inquiries have left me feeling like Jimmy Stewart commenting on the evidence in his case in the 1959 movie classic, "Anatomy of a Murder," where he notes evidence appears and disappears in a ghostly fashion. But what I do know is that I have to explain this to my constituents—to the law enforcement agencies in Iowa who are dependent upon these funds to support their clean up efforts of these mini environmental catastrophes. I am not alone.

All of this funding hocus pocus I find to be very troubling. I hope we can solve the mystery and avoid its like in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask to speak as if in morning business, and I believe my time is taken from the time controlled by Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

£

THE CONFERENCE PROCESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want to follow on with the comments of my good friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and praise him for pointing out that the conference system is becoming bankrupt.

Way too often conferees put in measures and take out measures that have nothing to do with the underlying bill that goes to conference. It is becoming so bad that I think sometime—my hope is in the next Congress—the Senator from Iowa, myself, and others should meet with our leadership to prevent this from continually happening. It bankrupts the process. It also causes more Americans to become even more concerned about the political process. We, as Senators, cannot go home and say what is or is not happening. Rather, we have to go home and report just what the Senator from Iowa reported—that somehow, by magic or by mystery, things sort of appear and disappear. It does not make us feel good as Senators because we like to know what is occurring. It certainly doesn't help our constituents feel any better about the process because they hope we know what is happening. More than that, they hope we are fighting for their case. But if we don't know the contents of the conference process, we don't know how something gets put in or taken out, and we look foolish. It is a major abrogation of our responsibility as a Senate to the American people for whom we work. They are, after all, our employers. At times, the Senate is too secretive.

It reminds me of an incident I was involved in when I first came to the House more than 20-some years ago. At that time, I was a freshman House Member. I had a few free minutes one afternoon—about an hour or two. I thought that I would go to the conference on the tax bill; I might learn something. I thought I would go to the conference and learn a little about tax law and the conference process.

I called around to try to figure out where the conference was meeting. Nobody would tell me. At that time, Mike Mansfield from Montana was the majority leader of the Senate. I thought I could call Senator Mansfield's office; certainly they could tell me where the conference was meeting. They did. They told me. It was in the big hearing room over in the Longworth Building. There was a policeman standing at the door leading to the executive room. I knew what was going on. He challenged me. I said I was a Member. I intended to reply that I was a member of the

conference, but, rationalizing, I said I was a Member of Congress, and he waved me in.

I walked back into the executive room. There were Senate Members in the hearing room on one side of the table with conferees, and Russell Long was at the table with House conferees. Russell Long was talking about when he was a kid in Louisiana. It was great listening to it. There was a sea of executive branch people. In the hearing room with Treasury Secretary Simon was a sea of Treasury employees.

I took an out-of-the-way spot. I found a chair over on the side, and I sat down out of the way to watch. After about 10 minutes, Congressman Jim Burke from Massachusetts shuffled over to me—an elderly man. He came to me and said: I am sorry. I have to ask you to leave. Leave? Why? He said it was just the rules. I said respectfully that I would like to know what rule was requiring me to leave. He said, well, it is the Senate rules. So I said, well, I appreciate that. As a House Member, I wanted to know which Senate rule it was that prohibited my attendance as a Member of Congress watching this conference. He said, well, it is just the Senate rule.

I thought for a while. I thought: That is wrong; it is not right. I am not going to make a big fuss about it right here; I will later. I am going to leave because he asked me to leave, but I will see what I can do about it. It is the rule.

For example, Congressman Bill Green couldn't be there either. Bill Green was then a Congressman and the member of the House Ways and Means Committee in the House who authored a provision to delete the depletion allowance that was in the House bill. Even he could not attend, the rule then being nobody could attend a conference except conferees—nobody else. But there were more people from the executive branch. They were there, along with Treasury Secretary Simon.

I came over to the House floor. I mentioned this to Congressman Mikva from Illinois. He said: MAX, you are entirely right. That is wrong. I have been fighting that rule for years.

A few of us stood up on the House floor that afternoon and explained how we thought it was wrong. In the next session of Congress, the rules were changed. Afterwards, all conferences were totally open to the public.

I know some Members of Congress don't like that. They do not like the sun shining in conferences. But that was the rule. We started it back then. I think it is in the public interest. It is a good rule.

It seems things have changed slowly; conferences should not be secret. They are bipartisan. Both political parties attend, but often the minority party is shut out. One wonders what is happening. The real danger is, if and when the Democrats are in the majority, the Democrats are going to be tempted to do the same thing. It is wrong. Neither side should do that. They should be

much more open and much more closely should enforce that rule, and matters not pertaining to the conference should not be included in the conference report. It is something we have to stand up and enforce for the good of the Senate and for the good of the country; otherwise, there will be chaos, or anarchy, or a dictatorship—whatever it is.

Based upon the comments of my good friend, I am very inclined to work with him next year to see if we can do something about that. I think there are many others in the Senate who share the same view. It has gotten out of hand.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for the statement.

f

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADING RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to speak a few words on a matter that will be coming before this body, I hope, later this week; that is, beginning the process of the United States agreeing to extend permanent normal trading relations status with China.

I would like to step back for a few moments and reflect a bit on its significance and on its implications. The irony is that we are even talking about this today because I think the bill to grant China PNTR has the strong support of at least three-fourths of the Senate. It is deeply in our national interest. I wish it had been passed some time ago. Actually, we should have passed it months ago. Instead, we have had to struggle to find time to consider it in this chamber. We are now approaching the eleventh hour of this session of Congress with a week left this month and a few weeks in September.

I personally believe this issue should have been handled differently. We should have brought it up much earlier. But later is better than never. I am glad we are finally approaching the denouement.

For over two millennia, China was ruled by a series of imperial dynasties. The last Emperor was overthrown in 1912. Warlords, dictators, and the Japanese military then took over parts of the country at various times.

In 1949, the Chinese Communists took control of the entire Chinese mainland. Chiang Kai-shek and his supporters were forced to flee to Taiwan. Then followed three decades of absolute, totalitarian, Communist rule by Mao Zedong.

To oversimplify, in 1979, Deng Xiaoping signaled the beginning of the end of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology as the underlying construct of the Chinese economy, polity, and society.

Another critical turning point was Deng's so-called "Southern Journey" in 1992. He visited Shenzhen, other parts of Guangdong Province, and Shanghai. On that journey, he advocated more economic openness, faster growth, and more rapid progress toward a market-based economy.

For the next two decades, we witnessed both progress and retreat in China's economic and political developments. Dramatic opening to foreign products and foreign investment. Yet a continuing government effort to maintain control over telecommunications.

The massacre of students at Tiananmen Square in 1989. Yet relatively unfettered access today by many Chinese to the Internet. Repeated violations of contract sanctity. Yet the development of domestic stock markets and Chinese companies placing issues on foreign stock exchanges.

The battle in China between the forces of reform and the forces of reaction continues. No one can predict how it will end, or when. But it is certainly in the vital interest of the United States to do everything we can to support those who favor reform over totalitarianism. Those who favor private enterprise over state-owned enterprises.

That means we must work to incorporate China into the international community. We need to engage China with the goal of promoting responsible behavior internally and externally. Encouraging them to play by international rules. Integrating the Chinese economy into the market-driven, middle-class, participatory economies of the West.

Economic reforms never have an easy time. And the forces in China that want to maintain the status quo are strong.

But, economic reform, moving to a market economy, transparency, direct foreign investment, listing of companies on overseas markets. Progress in all these areas is of vital importance to the United States as they relate to stability in China, accountability, and the development of a middle class. China's entry into the WTO will help anchor and sustain these economic reform efforts and empower economic reformers. China will not become a market-driven economy overnight. But it is in our interest that they move in this direction. And the WTO will help the process.

Around the world, we have seen that economic growth leads to the development of a large and strong middle class. Eventually, the middle class makes demands on political leaders for greater participation, accountability, and openness. It takes time. For example, eighty years ago, the Kuomintang, the KMT, was created by the same Soviet advisors who created the Chinese Communist Party. Fifty years ago, the KMT massacred Taiwanese citizens. Twenty years ago, the KMT still ruled Taiwan under martial law. Yet Taiwan just held its second truly democratic election.

There are many other examples. Look at Korea. A quarter of a century ago, the Korean government tried to murder the dissident Kim Dae Jung. Now, President Kim Dae Jung has begun to transform Korea's economic structure. He has traveled to Pyongyang in one of the most remarkable initiatives in modern world his-

tory. He is worried about being turned out of office in the next democratic election; such is the way of democracy.

The Philippines in 1986, Thailand in 1990, Indonesia in 1999. They all showed us the power of the development of a middle class. There is nothing fundamentally unique about China that makes a similar type of change impossible, or even improbable, over time.

Once China joins the WTO, China will be accountable for its behavior to the outside world, for perhaps the first time in history. The dispute settlement system at the WTO is far from perfect. Many members are working to open up dispute settlements and make it more available to the outside world. I have been among its most vociferous critics. But WTO dispute settlement will allow other countries to examine Chinese domestic economic practices.

It will force China to explain actions that other members believe violate global rules for the first time in world history. When a violation is found, it will put pressure on China to change and comply with the internationally accepted rules of the WTO. Not a perfect organization, but certainly better than none. This type of external scrutiny of China is virtually unprecedented. It has implications that may go far beyond trade, as China learns about the need to respect the rule of law among nations.

Let me turn to Taiwan for a moment. Taiwan will accede to the WTO very shortly after China does. What will happen when both enjoy full membership?

They will participate together, along with all other WTO members, in meetings ranging from detailed technical sessions to Ministerial level gatherings. There will be countless opportunities for interaction at many levels. Under the WTO's most-favored-nation rule, they will have to provide each other the same benefits that they grant to all other members. That is a very important principle. Taiwan's current policy limiting direct transportation, communication, and investment with the mainland will not stand up to WTO scrutiny. Each will be able to use the WTO dispute settlement mechanism against the other. They will have to meet directly and deal with economic differences in a peaceful way.

Presumably, either could take reservations, such as a national security exception, against the other in certain areas. That is a decision still to be made. But, no matter what, membership in the WTO and WTO-induced liberalization will increase and deepen ties between Taiwan and the PRC in trade, investment, technology, transportation, information, communications, and travel. And that has to contribute to the maintenance of peace across the Taiwan Strait.

China is emerging from one hundred and fifty years of national torpor. How we in America, and how the leadership in China, manage this relationship will

set the stage for regional and global politics, security, and economics for decades to come.

We must make a profound choice. Do we bring China into the orbit of the global trading community with its rule of law? Or do we choose to isolate and contain China, creating a 21st century version of the cold war in Asia?

It is a truism in international relations that rising powers have proven to be the most dangerous. Germany at the end of the 1800s and the Soviet Union in the 1940s. But this is not 1900 or 1945. As the world has become smaller for us because of revolutions in information, transportation, and production, so for China has the world come closer.

China is not our enemy. China is not our friend. The issue for us is how to engage China, and this means engagement with no illusions. Engagement with a purpose. How do we steer China's energies into productive, peaceful and stable relationships within the region and globally? For just as we isolate China at our peril, we engage them to our advantage.

Incorporation of China into the WTO, and that includes granting them PNTR, is a national imperative for the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

f

THE BELL TOLLS FOR THEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today, as the Senate recalls the tragic loss two years ago of two fine Capitol Police Officers, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, our hearts also bear fresh bruises from the loss of a Senator and a former Senator.

Mr. President, on Saturday I traveled with several other Senators to Atlanta, GA, to attend the funeral of our late Senate colleague, Paul Coverdell. Senator Coverdell's departure from this life had been sudden. It had come without warning. Paul was only 61 and he could look forward to many fruitful years of service to the Nation and to his people. But it was not to be. The Scriptures tell us:

As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field. So he flourishes. For the wind passes over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more.

On Wednesday of last week, I journeyed to Rhode Island with several other Senators to pay our last respects to a late departed former colleague, John O. Pastore, and to commiserate with his bereaved family and a great host of friends. We said the last goodbye to a man who had given much to the service of his country and who had retired from this body 26 years ago. A great throng paid homage to the remembrance of one whom they loved and who had served them so well, as was the case with our beloved late colleague, Paul Coverdell. There was a great throng, a large church filled to overflowing.

In both instances to which I have just referred, the choirs sang beautifully, the eulogies came forth from wounded hearts, the final farewells were spoken; then the crowds departed, and each person went on his or her own way to family hearth and home.

Over a long life of more than 80 years I have traveled this same journey many times. It is always the same. We travel the last mile with a departed friend and we come to the end of the way, when we can go no farther. That is as far as we can go. There we must part forever—insofar as this earthly life is concerned. From there, the loved one must go on alone, to "The undiscovered country," as Shakespeare said, "from whose bourne no traveler returns".

So it is, and so it has been since the very beginning of our race, and so it will be in all the years to come. We are here today, and gone tomorrow.

The clock of life is wound but once, And no man has the power to know just when the clock will strike,

At late or early hour.

Now is the only time you have, so live, love, work with a will;

Put no faith in tomorrow for the clock may then be still.

Mr. President, John Pastore lived to be the ripe old age of 93; for Paul Coverdell, the grim reaper beckoned earlier, and the end came at 61. For those of us who remain on this side of the vale of trials and tears, the message from both of these lives is clear: be ready, be ready to go. William Cullen Bryant said it for you and for me:

All that breathes will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh when thou art gone, the solemn brood of care plod on, and each one as before will chase his favorite phantom;

As one who has lived in this town of inflated egos for nearly half a century, I can testify that William Cullen Bryant had it right. I have seen the great, the near great, those who thought they were great, those who would never become great, and each incoming wave of life's sea surges forward on the sands of humanity's rocky coast, and then, just as quickly recedes into the vast emptiness of the past. But what cannot be washed away is the love and the memory of man's deeds and service to his fellowman.

So, each of us will carry within ourselves the memory of Senator Pastore's, Senator Coverdell's, Officer Chestnut's, and Detective Gibson's deeds and service to his fellow man. They have touched all of us, and we have been changed by them, because it was Tennyson who said, "I am part of all that I have met." And so, in this small way, they live on in our hearts and in our dedication to do good with the hours and days that remain to us. The poet John Donne expressed it well, how each man's life—and each man's death—touches ours:

No man is an island, entire of itself;
Every man is a piece of the continent,
A part of the main;

If a clod be washed away by the sea,

[America] is the less,

As well as if a promontory were,

As well as if a manor of thy friend's

Or of thine own were;

Any man's death diminishes me,

Because I am involved in mankind;

And therefore

Never send to know for whom the bell tolls:

It tolls for thee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

f

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I realize there are some 6 minutes left under the time agreement for the Democratic leadership to be able to have comments during the first hour; and then we will have an hour under the control of Senator THOMAS. But I will use my leader time now so we will not take the remaining 6 minutes of the Democratic time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, with regard to the week's schedule, we had hoped we would be making progress now on the energy and water appropriations bill. But a disagreement developed on Friday afternoon, and we are continuing to see if we can work through that. I have spoken to Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the energy and water appropriations subcommittee, about trying to find a way to proceed.

It is very important legislation for our country. It does involve appropriations for the Energy Department, the very important nuclear weapons labs, as well as water projects all over this country in which Members and States and various groups are very interested. So I hope we can find a way to proceed on that.

It has been held up, basically, by a disagreement over how to handle the water levels on the Missouri River, affecting the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, and perhaps others downstream. It is not easy to reconcile or to come to an agreement because there are very strong feelings about it, and it is very important to local areas. I know Senator DOMENICI is ready to proceed. He will be over later to make some comments about the importance of this legislation.

We also hope to take up the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill this week. It should not be that controversial. I understand there may be some amendments to it; It may take some time, but that is understandable. That is fine. We could do that and still

conclude that legislation probably in a day or so.

We had hoped that during the pendency of the week we could also go to the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. We had hoped to do all three of them, or at least two of the three, and make some progress on Commerce-State-Justice.

We also would like to proceed to the intelligence authorization bill. As is always the case, after the Armed Services Defense authorization bill for the year is done, we, in relatively short order, then go to the intelligence authorization. I do not need to talk about the importance of the intelligence authorization bill and what it means to the security of our country, but we have not been able to work out exactly how to proceed on that either.

Then on Wednesday, we had indicated we would go to the China PNTR issue. Indications had been that there would be resistance to moving forward on the motion to proceed, and I would have to file cloture on that, with that cloture motion then ripening on Friday. So we would go ahead and go to that and get over the first hurdle in being able to complete the China trade legislation when we come back in September.

We had hoped to go to the Executive Calendar and get some nominations completed this week and also consider some additional judges that might be reported from the Judiciary Committee during the week.

All of that right now is in abeyance. We have not been able to get an agreement on how to proceed at this time. I think that is unfortunate because we do have 4, 4½ days this week in which we need to make real progress on appropriations bills and other issues, as well as the China trade legislation.

If we cannot get an agreement here in the next couple of hours or so, then I will have to try to proceed to one of the appropriations bills and the intelligence authorization bill, and perhaps even file cloture on them. Both of those will then ripen on Wednesday. Of course, if cloture is obtained, then we will be on those bills, which will then get tangled up in the China permanent normal trade relations issue. So this is not a good way to proceed, but that may be our only alternative.

But I have talked to Senator DASCHLE this morning. I have talked to Senator HATCH. We will continue to work with Senators on both sides of the aisle to see if we can find a way to make some good progress this week, because this is the last week before the August recess, and it will have an effect on what we are able to do in September.

f

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise at this time to talk about our beloved friend, Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia. I had hoped to be able to make some further comments last week,

after it fell my duty to come to the floor and announce his very untimely death, but I just could not do it because I was so emotionally disturbed and grieving over the loss of this good friend.

I guess maybe the week and the services in Georgia on Saturday have helped me come to peace with this very difficult loss and to say a fond farewell to my good friend from Georgia. But I wanted to speak now because I felt, even this morning, a void for this week; Paul will not be here. He will not be here saying, What can we do next? How can I help? He was willing to work with all of the Republicans and all of the Democrats, going over to the Democratic side of the aisle and seeking out Senator HARRY REID or Senator TORRICELLI, trying to find some way to make a bipartisan piece of legislation possible. So we will have a void this week.

But, as I was thinking about it a few moments ago, there will be a void forever in the Senate with the loss of Paul Coverdell because his was an unfinished symphony. A lot more beautiful sounds were going to come from that somewhat uncertain trumpet from Georgia.

Folks have talked about his flailing hands and his squeaky voice, but that is what really made Senator Coverdell all the more attractive. He was not always as smooth as some of us like to think we might be, but he was always effective. Maybe it was because of the way he presented his speeches and the way he came across in his daily relationships with all of us.

The Chaplain of the Senate, Lloyd Ogilvie, at the church services in memory of Paul Coverdell on Saturday, referred to him as a peacemaker. And maybe this is a good time of the year to be thinking about the beatitudes because I think it really did describe Paul. Even though he felt very strongly about the issues he believed in or that he was opposed to, he was always binding up everybody else's wounds. He would find a way to make peace and get results.

I thought the Chaplain's description of him as a peacemaker was apropos. When I did my Bible study this morning, I came to that particular passage, "Blessed is the peacemaker." Again I thought, that is just one more message about Paul and the great job he did in the Senate.

I met Paul years ago actually, way back in the 1970s when there was a very fledgling Republican Party in Georgia. We didn't have much of a Republican Party at that time in my State, but we were beginning to make progress. Maybe Georgia was even a little bit behind us. I remember going down to Atlanta and then having to go to Albany, GA, to attend events, then back into Atlanta. It was one of those occasions where a number of Congressmen and Senators came in for a fly around the State, and then we all came back in for the big dinner. It was logistically hard

to orchestrate. Then I finally met the maestro; the maestro was Paul Coverdell.

Typically, I learned later, it was the way he would work. He had five or six of us come in. We went to five or six different places in the State like spokes on a wheel. We came back. We had dinner. It was a very effective event. Everything worked like clockwork. It worked like clockwork because Paul Coverdell was making it happen.

In those days, as I recall, he was in the State legislature, in the State senate. They had three Republicans. He was the minority leader. They had a minority whip and they had a whipee. There were three of them. That is the way he used to describe his powerful role in the senate, although, as I came to find out a lot later, he was a very effective member of the State senate, working as always both sides of the aisle, even though he only had three in his party in the State senate at that time.

Of course, he went on to work in the Bush administration in the Peace Corps. I wasn't quite sure what that meant, but I am sure he did a great job at the Peace Corps. I remember then supporting him when he actually ran for the Senate in 1992. I wasn't that intimately involved in the campaign but knew him to be a good man. I remember making a pitch for him both here and in Georgia.

When I really got to know him was when he came to the Senate. Almost immediately he started throwing himself into the fray, whatever was going on. I remember we had the Clinton health care plan. I think he made 147 appearances in one State or another, on one occasion or another, against the Government takeover of health care. He felt passionately about it. He took off on the trail with Senator PHIL GRAMM and Senator JOHN MCCAIN. They had a lot to do with the eventual, and in my opinion, appropriate demise of that legislation. I learned that he wouldn't just talk a good game or wouldn't just give direction; he would put his body on the line. He would go anywhere, anytime to see that the message was delivered.

Immediately he started saying: If we are going to do this in a positive way, if we are going to be fighting this legislation, how are we going to get our message out? He would be persistent about it. He would follow you around and keep wanting to talk about it. I remember he actually instigated meetings, at that time between the Speaker of the House and me, first as whip and then as majority leader, in which he would get the two of us together. He would have charts. Here he is from Georgia in probably his fourth year in the Senate, and he is using charts to explain the situation to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader. Only we listened because he had thought about it; he was organized. He had some ideas.

I remember one occasion he said: You have to come to Atlanta.

I said: I don't want to come to Atlanta.

He said: Just come for lunch; Newt and I want to sit and talk with you.

So I flew down. We had lunch. He had charts and he had a video this time. He talked about how we should be planning our strategy. Then we flew back. I thought about that many times, in a way, the temerity of that. But that was Paul. Nobody objected. Nobody took it as a threat. Nobody worried he was stepping on their turf. And thank goodness, somebody was thinking and planning. That was Paul.

Then after that, of course, he got involved as a member of the leadership team. I really liked that because I can remember very early on I realized that if there was a task that needed to be performed that nobody else would do, I could call on Paul; he would be glad to do it. I can remember going down the leadership line: Would you have the time to do this? Do you have the staff to do this? It would come down to the third person. He always sat at the other end of the leadership table. I would get to Paul, having had three turndowns, and Paul would say: Sure, I'll do it.

Very quickly I developed the moniker for Paul of "Mikey." I like to nickname Senators. Most of them wouldn't like for me to talk about it publicly. But Paul actually kind of liked being called Mikey. Mikey came from the television cereal commercial where the two kids are pushing a bowl of cereal back and forth saying: You eat it; no, you eat it. Finally, they push it to the third little boy and say: Give it to Mikey; he will try anything.

That was the way Paul was. When all the other great leaders of the Senate were not willing to take the time, not willing to do the dirty, difficult, time-consuming job, Mikey would do it. I remember every time I called him Mikey, he would break out in a big smile. Tricia, my wife, picked it up, too. We liked to talk to Nancy about how sorry we were to have kept him tied up a little extra, too, sometimes in the Senate. But Mikey had his work to do. So it was a very affectionate term I had for him, and it described him so perfectly.

He was not a funny, ha-ha sort of guy, but he was willing to laugh. He had a sense of humor. He was willing to laugh at himself, which really made him attractive. He was self-effacing. There was no grandeur there. He was, as PHIL GRAMM said in his remarks at the services Saturday—I believe it was PHIL—or as somebody said: An ordinary man with extraordinary talents. He was willing to work hard to make up for whatever he lacked in some other way. He surely was loyal. I never had to worry about anything I said or asked Paul to do being used in an inappropriate way against me or against anybody else. He would handle it properly. And he was sensitive. He was al-

ways sensitive: Did I do the right thing? Did this Senator react some uncertain way?

I remember asking him to come and help us on the floor on issues he cared about. He really cared about education. He wanted education savings accounts. He believed it would help parents with children in school. He believed it would help low-income parents have the ability to save just a little bit of their money, just a little bit to help their children with clothes or computers or tutoring. If we ever find a way to pass that legislation, instead of education savings accounts, it should be the Coverdell savings accounts. That would be an appropriate memorial and monument to Paul Coverdell. He believed in it. It wasn't a partisan political thing. It was something he thought would make a difference.

As for drugs, I remember him following me around in the well heckling me about the need to pay more attention to the drug running in the Gulf of Mexico area across the borders in the Southwest. The Senator from Arizona worked with him on that issue. I remember his commitment to trying to be helpful to the Government in Colombia to fight drug terrorism there. He was passionate about it because he felt it threatened our country, threatened our very sovereignty, and it threatened our children. Once again, as with education, he saw it in terms of what it was doing or could do to our children. Again, he was involved.

One of the last discussions I had with him was on the intelligence authorization bill. There is a provision in it which he didn't particularly like. He was determined to have a way to make his case on that. In his memory, we will make sure his case is made by Senator KYL, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator DEWINE, perhaps others. He really would dig into issues and make a difference.

I also called on him at times when there really was nobody else who could take the time to do the job.

He worked with us for a solid week on the floor on the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill. I came in one day and found that we had over 200 amendments pending. Somebody had to take the time to work with both sides to begin to get those amendments reduced, accepted, eliminated, withdrawn, or whatever. To his credit, Senator SPECTER said: I would like to have Paul spend time helping me with this.

Other leadership members were involved in other issues. I could not be here. Senator NICKLES could not be here. We had other things we had to do. Within a short period of time, the 200 became 50. Before the week was out, it was done.

Senator REID will tell you that Paul really made the difference. He didn't just hang out on this side of the aisle; he was rummaging around on the other side trying to see if we could work through it. I remember at the end of the week he was a little pale and, obvi-

ously, a little stressed. He came to my office and said: Boy, do I understand a little bit better what your job entails.

Well, he was able to do it because nobody felt threatened by Paul. He wasn't getting in my hair, stepping on Senator NICKLES' turf, or inappropriately shoving amendments away. He was working with everybody involved. Nobody got mad. Nobody got even. It is sort of a unique thing for a Senator to be able to do that.

So I guess I will be trying to find another "Mikey." But I don't think there is one. And so as I thought about doing this speech, I tried to find some statement, some poem, something that would pay a final appropriate treatment to Senator Coverdell. I came across a passage from a poem, "The Comfort of Friends," by William Penn.

He said:

They that love beyond the world
Cannot be separated by it.
Death cannot kill what never dies,
Nor can spirits ever be divided
That love and live in the same divine principle:

[Because that is] the root and record of their friendship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his comments and his very strong feelings about friends, people with whom he has worked.

I had a little different experience, I guess, with Paul Coverdell in that he was here when I came. So I was not in this business of leadership with him. Indeed, he took time to spend time with those of us who were new and to say: How can I help you? How can we work together? This was the kind of man that Paul Coverdell was. Certainly, he was an image that each of us should seek to perpetuate—that of caring, that of really feeling strongly about issues, and then, of course, being willing to do something about it. So I want to share with the leader my sorrow and sadness in not having Paul Coverdell here with us. I extend our condolences to his family.

f

GOALS FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to take some time today to talk about some of the things we are doing, some of the goals I hope we have, and the position we find ourselves in now as we come down to the last week prior to the August recess.

When we come back from the August recess, we will have, I suppose, about 20 working days to finish this 2-year session of Congress, the 106th session. We will have a great deal to do. As we go forward, as we take a look at the day-to-day tasks and activities that we have before us, I hope always that we look at where we want to go and what the goals are.

Sometimes I feel as if we get wrapped up in the day-to-day operations and the day-to-day problems and we lose sight

of where it is we want to be. But overall, as a Member of the Senate, or as an American citizen who is interested in Government, and as a voter, it seems to me that we ought to look at where we want to be over a period of time. Many things are involved, of course, in that. I think we have to take a look at where we are with respect to the Constitution. Most of us believe this Constitution has given us the greatest country in the world. This Constitution has given us more freedom, more opportunity, and more privileges than anywhere else in the world. Are we continuing to support that Constitution? Where will we be in 50 years? Where will we be in 10 years?

With regard to the role of the Federal Government, where do we want to be? What is our goal in terms of the future? What is the role of the Federal Government with regard to individual freedoms? What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to local government—the States and counties? Do we want a Federal Government that dominates all the things that we do? I don't believe so. So as we do each of these steps, it seems to me that it is appropriate to try to evaluate a little what we are doing and how that contributes to where we want to go. I know it is difficult. I think it is a challenge for each of us as we go about what we are doing.

I am, frankly, proud of what we have been able to do in this session. I am pleased about the direction the majority in the Senate has taken with regard to many of the issues; with regard to the balanced budget; with regard to Social Security; with regard to spending as it reflects Social Security and the changes that we have made to stabilize Social Security, making it strong; what we have done in terms of education; where we are in terms of the military and the security of this country, which is probably the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government.

So I think we ought to look at where we are. We are close now to finishing up. We have a number of things to do. But our determination, I believe, should be to stay within the budget we established. We have a budget program in which early this year we established spending limitations that we wanted to live within. It is difficult to do that. Everyone has a good idea as to where we can spend money. There are thousands of opportunities to spend money.

Frankly, when you have a surplus, spending becomes easier; it becomes something that everybody sort of gets into doing. We have a balanced budget. We maintain Social Security without spending Social Security dollars. We have been working on strengthening Medicare and pharmaceuticals, and we must continue to do that. We need to set up the technique for paying down the debt that we ought to pay. We have an obligation to pay that so our children don't have to. We are dedicated to returning the surplus back to the taxpayers, the people who have paid in the

dollars. The surplus, indeed, should go back to them.

So it seems to me that we have a principle in our party, in this majority of the Senate, and in the Senate generally, for fiscal responsibility, for preserving Social Security, tax relief, and education. I am very proud of what we have done.

With regard to balancing the budget, actually in the last several years—it is the first time since the Eisenhower administration in 1957 that we balanced the budget with funds outside of Social Security. As the money comes in, of course, it comes in a unified budget. Social Security money has been borrowed and spent on programs other than Social Security. In 1995, when the Republicans took control of Congress, for the first time in 42 years, we began to balance the budget. I am pretty proud of that. I hope that we continue to be.

In terms of Social Security, of course, the first obligation is to set aside those dollars so that they are not spent on something else. Under our system, all that we can do with Social Security dollars is to put them into the trust fund, a Federal investment, which yields a relatively low return. We are seeking to take a portion of the Social Security funds now and let that account belong to the individual, so that when young people take their first job and have 12.5 percent of their earnings set aside, a portion of that can be in an account that belongs to them, which can be invested in the private sector at their direction, which can return a much higher yield so that over time there will be benefits for young people, probably leaving the ones 55 and older not doing anything at all and making sure they stay as they are.

Young people years from now will not have a return unless they do something different. We could increase taxes. Nobody is much interested in that. We could reduce benefits. That is not an answer. But we can increase the return on the trust funds. We are doing that.

We are funding education at a higher level than before, at a higher level than the administration requested. But probably more important is the effort made to return the decisions made with regard to elementary and secondary education back to the schools—closer to the school districts and closer to the school boards, rather than having those decisions being made in Washington. I can tell you that the needs in Pine Bluffs, WY, are much different from those in Pittsburgh.

You have to have some flexibility. We have the Ed-Flex bill so that those kinds of decisions can be made. I am pretty proud of that. I am very pleased with that. As the leader said, Senator Coverdell was the leader in doing those kinds of things.

As for strengthening the military, we are finding ourselves, of course, at a time when we don't have the cold war, where the inclination is for the empha-

sis to be off the military. This is not a simple world. We find ourselves at times needing a strong defense. We have a voluntary military, which we should have. But you have to make it relatively attractive for people to go into the military and stay there. You bring people into the military and train them to be pilots and mechanics; then they leave. We have done something there. We have increased the appropriations. We have increased, hopefully, the pay. Of course, if you are going to have an up-to-date military, there has to be science moving forward in new weaponry. We have to have new weapons. It is most difficult to do that.

This weekend I visited the Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, WY, one of the major bases. It is really one of the stable portions of our defense. We have to support that, of course.

Health care, naturally, is one of the things that is most important. We have moved to improve some of the payments that were made. We made some reductions in the balanced budget amendment in 1996. However, the administration has made those even larger than was intended. We have to go back and reclaim some of those payments—particularly for outpatient care and hospitals.

These are the things the majority party has worked toward and continues to work on.

We find ourselves now in the appropriations process. There are 13 appropriations bills to be passed. Hopefully, we will get 11 of them passed by the time this week is over. But it is very difficult. We have to challenge the administration. If they don't get their way—if they don't get the money they want in a particular appropriations—they are going to veto it. The President has threatened to shut down the Government, as he did before, and blame the Congress, of course. We have to keep that from happening. Nobody wants to shut down the Federal Government. We have different points of view. We have a different philosophy.

That is what this is all about. We debate those philosophies. Some people think government ought to be involved in all of life's activities. Others think there is no end to the amount of abuses that can take place. Others believe there ought to be some limit on the rules of the Federal Government. After we strengthen Medicare and pay down the debt, we ought to return additional money to those people who have made the payments.

With regard to paying down the debt, I am hopeful we can consider the proposition of a plan to do that. Again, our goal is to pay off the national debt of \$6 trillion. It seems to me we ought to do it in an organized way—do it a little as a mortgage where you decide every year you are going to pay off some on the debt—and move toward doing that. If you keep saying, we will pay it down one of these days, it never happens. The interest on that debt becomes one of the largest items in the budget. We can fix that if we are willing to do it.

I am very proud of what we have accomplished in this Congress. I think we have established a philosophy and a direction of providing adequate programs for controlling the size and growth of expenditures of the Federal Government; doing those things that are necessary, yet moving many decisions back closer to the people and the local governments; taking care of the obligations we have, such as paying down the debt and returning those dollars.

One of the real controversies, of course, is going to be the tax relief that passed the Senate. The tax relief is in two areas that seem to be particularly appropriate—the marriage penalty tax, where two people who are working for x amount of dollars get married, continue to make the same amount of dollars, and then pay more taxes. It is a fairness issue. There is something wrong with that. We have changed that. The President has threatened to veto it.

The other one that needs to be changed, in my opinion—and the Presiding Officer has been a leader in this—is the death tax, the estate tax, the idea that when someone dies, up to 50 percent of their earnings throughout their life can be taken by the Federal Government.

The alternative, of course, is to not let death be a trigger for taxes but, rather, let those moneys be passed on to whomever they wish to pass them on to, and whenever things are disposed of and sold, there is a capital gains tax, of course, on the growth that has taken place. It seems to me that is a fairness issue.

That is where we are. Those are some of the exciting things that I think are happening, and things that fit in, I believe, with the goals most of us have in terms of moving forward with this Federal Government.

We now have a fairly short time to continue doing what has to be done. Appropriations have to be done. We need to continue with our tax reductions and continue with strengthening education. We need to continue in health care. We are on the road to doing that. I am very pleased with how we are doing it.

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

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

†

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to take a few moments to reflect on some things you said and also on what the majority leader said a little while ago.

After our colleague Paul Coverdell died, I made a very brief statement on the floor. I knew I should speak briefly because it would be difficult to talk very long about Paul without becoming too emotional.

I think at a time when politics generally and politicians specifically are the subject of a lot of humor—they are denigrated because of cynicism about the political process, and in fact in some cases the denigration of some politicians is probably warranted—it is important for the American people to be reassured that there are some extraordinarily fine public servants who toil very hard on their behalf and who are responsible for whatever good comes out of these institutions—the House and the Senate.

Paul Coverdell was such a man. All of us who have spoken about him have shared with our colleagues and with the American people the same general notion that it is amazing what you can do if you are willing to let others take the credit for it. That was Paul Coverdell—self-effacing, very hard working, totally trustworthy and honest. Everyone could rely upon him to do the things that had to be done without fear he would in any way attempt to take advantage of any situation. He was as solid as a rock and a very important part of this institution—someone who really helped to make it run, and run in a good way.

I am sure my constituents in Arizona for the most part are unaware of Senator Coverdell, but they and others all around this country need to know how sorely he will be missed—not only personally but professionally—and how important a contribution he made to this country. There are truly some wonderful public servants, and Paul Coverdell was one of the best.

†

CONCERNS OF ARIZONA CONSTITUENTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when I was in Arizona this weekend, there were three things that seemed to come up frequently. One, of course, was the Vice Presidential selection of Governor Bush for the Republican nomination this fall. The other two subjects were the issues of tax relief, and I will briefly discuss that, and missile defense, which I will add to the mix, to share some of my constituents' concerns.

On the matter of Vice President, obviously, that is a subject of which Governor Bush will speak today or tomorrow, perhaps. Those on the Republican side will be, I am sure, very supportive. If it is former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, I think we will be especially pleased. I can't think of anyone who could make a better contribution, not only to the ticket but also to a future Republican administration, than Dick Cheney. He is from the Presiding Officer's State of Wyoming. He represents the kind of values that both the Presiding Officer and others from that great State represent: Straightforward-

ness, plain-spokenness, honesty, directness, a good strong sense of values, a willingness to do the hard work without having to take a lot of the credit, traits we treasure in someone such as Senator Paul Coverdell, and which Dick Cheney would certainly bring to the job. His experience and the great respect which people not only in this country but around the world have for Dick Cheney would serve the ticket well. I am not attempting to influence Governor Bush in any way, but if his choice is Dick Cheney, there couldn't be a better choice.

Now the other two subjects my constituents raised this past weekend. I was astounded that these were the two things they wanted to talk about: The tax relief that the Republican Congress continues to pass, and pass on to the President; and, secondly, the matter of missile defense, which I will get to in a moment.

I was amused to hear the Democratic candidate for President talk about a do-nothing Congress. This is rather strange, considering the fact that we have passed over and over and over legislation to help the American people, particularly to relieve them of some of the tax burden which imposes upon them an extra burden that they need not bear and that is inhibitive of future economic growth.

I am surprised that a Congress which has been so active—and, indeed, President Clinton has criticized us for being so active in this regard—would be accused then of being “do-nothing.” In truth, it is not the Congress that isn't willing to do these things; it is the Clinton-Gore administration that is unwilling to do these things.

Let me give some cases in point. We passed the estate tax relief about which the Presiding Officer talked. It passed overwhelmingly in both bodies, with bipartisan support. But the Clinton-Gore administration says it will veto this tax relief. We passed the marriage penalty, something that President Clinton said, in his State of the Union speech, was a top priority for him. He says he will veto that legislation. We can pass all of these things, but we can't get them into law unless the President signs them. We are doing our best in the Congress. It is now up to the President.

He did sign one thing that we passed this year. The Social Security earnings limitation was finally repealed. That was an important part of tax relief for an important part of my constituency, our senior citizens. There is more work to do there.

We want to also repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security which was imposed by the Clinton administration and the Democratic Congress when it controlled the House and the Senate, and Vice President GORE is always proud to remind everyone that he had to cast the deciding vote. This was the 1993 tax increase which, among other things, imposes a tax rate of up to 85 percent on the Social Security earnings of our senior citizens. This is

wrong and it ought to be repealed. If and when we do it, I will call upon the President to sign that.

We will probably send to him a repeal of the Spanish-American War era telephone tax. I think we can safely do this. The war has been over now for some time. We don't need to fund the Spanish-American War anymore. Like many other taxes and programs in Washington, once they are instituted, it is very difficult to ever get rid of them.

We are finally going to take the step to do that, as we did with the marriage penalty, as we did with the estate tax, as we did with the Social Security earnings limit. We are going to repeal this tax, as well, and call upon the President to sign this.

We have not been doing nothing. We have been doing something, something very worthwhile for the American people. I ask the President to reconsider his threat to veto these important tax cuts. Now, his argument is, maybe we can't afford it; it is a lot of money—this after receiving news that our tax surplus is going to be in the trillions of dollars—not billions, not hundreds of billions, but trillions of dollars. This is not a budget surplus; this is a tax surplus. It is a tax surplus because the taxes we have imposed on the American people bring in far more money than we should or can spend. I say "can" because, of course, Congress has the capacity to spend an unlimited amount of money.

We have set some standards in the Republican-controlled Congress. We have said we are not going to touch a dime of the Social Security surplus. The Social Security surplus is much larger than the non-Social Security surplus. This is the money that comes in as a result of the payment of our FICA taxes. Those are far greater than the need to pay the benefits under the Social Security program right now. And we are applying every dime of the Social Security surplus to a reduction of our Federal debt. That is why our Federal debt is being reduced so dramatically now.

The question is, What should be done with the non-Social Security surplus? It does not seem too much to me to return a dime, a dime on a dollar of that surplus, in the form of the marriage penalty relief and the estate tax relief to the American people. Under the most liberal interpretation of how much that would cost—and it is not nearly as much as this figure would suggest—but under the most liberal interpretation, it would be 10 cents on the dollar of the surplus we have.

It seems to me, since we are collecting more in taxes than we need—even after huge increases in spending in virtually every program we have—it is not too much to return 10 percent of this tax surplus to the American people. That is the magnitude of the issue. When President Clinton says it costs too much, he is saying the Federal Government ought to spend that

money, rather than allowing the American people to keep this 10 cents on the dollar. That is arrogance of the first magnitude. That was one of the concerns my constituents presented to me this week.

The other had to do with missile defense. My constituents understand the need to protect America. They understand that Secretary Cohen has said we have a threat from North Korea, from Iran. There will be a threat from Iran; certainly China has been rattling its sabers these days. They understand that there is no way we can prevent an attacking missile from landing on the United States today and that it will be at least 5 years before we can do that if we proceed as rapidly as we possibly can. They are anxious we get on with the job of getting a missile defense program in place to protect the American people and to prevent other countries from blackmailing the United States from being involved in issues around the world in which we know we need to be involved.

This last weekend, there was a successful test—it didn't get much publicity—of the Patriot missile against a cruise missile target. This is another important component of missile defense. The last national missile defense test was a failure. From that, many people have said they conclude that there can't possibly be a successful program and we ought to just pack up and go home, ignoring the fact that the threat exists; also, Mr. President, ignoring something else. There is a phrase that has found its way into our jargon these days: "It is not rocket science." Mr. President, this is rocket science, and it ain't easy. Sometimes it takes some failures in order to get to the successful conclusion of a program. There are over 20 tests in this particular program scheduled, most of them yet to be conducted. It is rocket science. It is hard. But we can do it. The people involved in the program are confident of that.

The failure in this last test, incidentally, was not a failure of any of the high technology. It was one of those quirks that can occur when something you have done hundreds of times before just did not happen to work on this particular occasion. But it was not a failure of the high-tech end of this missile defense program which we need to test to make sure it can work.

To my colleagues who may have been concerned as a result of the failure of this last test, I suggest to them we stay the course and continue the program as outlined by the Department of Defense, which I believe will be successful and will enable us to deploy a missile defense to protect the American people.

Final point. There are many who have urged the President to defer a decision, that he not make a decision. We have already made that decision when we passed the Missile Defense Act and President Clinton signed it into law. That decision was to deploy a national

missile defense as soon as technologically feasible, and we believe it will be feasible. Therefore, we need to move forward with the program. That is why the President should not defer a decision. He should make a decision to go forward, but he should, of course, defer the specifics as to exactly what that program is for the next President to decide. That can be done, but there should be no backing away from going forward, and that is the decision the President should make.

Ultimately, of course, I think Governor Bush is correct. There will need to be not just one element of a system but, rather, the flexibility to deploy a multilayered defense for the American people which involves both land-based assets as well as sea-based assets and space-based assets. You need satellites to detect and track the trajectory of a missile. You can also be benefited by other assets in space. Certainly a missile defense would be augmented very well with sea-based capability, which could, under certain circumstances, even have a boost-phase intercept capability because of its proximity to the launching of the offensive missile.

All of this is well understood. I believe the Congress should stay the course and urge the administration to go forward with its decision. Of course, the details will be left to the next administration, but we should not signal we are not willing to protect the American people from missile attack.

Mr. President, you mentioned, in closing, we are hoping to take up the permanent trade relations with China toward the end of this week. I very strongly support the efforts by Senator THOMPSON to ensure that at the same time we are moving to open our trade with China, we make it clear to China that there are certain things which are inimical to peace around the world and certainly to our security. Included in that is China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver those weapons to other countries, countries of concern—the so-called rogue nations of Iran and Iraq and North Korea. It may also be proliferating to other countries that we would prefer not have large arsenals of these weapons.

The bottom line is that although we can and should move forward in developing closer and more robust trade with China, we cannot allow that kind of activity to suggest to China that we do not care about our own national security and about peace and stability and security in the world. That is why I think it is appropriate for us to also adopt the Thompson legislation which will make it clear that, for those who are involved in the proliferation, sanctions will result. I am hoping we can take that up at the end of this week.

Those are concerns that were expressed by my constituents this weekend. I told them I would share them with my colleagues. I have now done that and I appreciate the indulgence of the Presiding Officer, whose time I have been taking.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

¶

VICE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION FOR DICK CHENEY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in the last part of our time here I want to follow up a little bit on your comments about the prospects for the Vice Presidential nomination for Dick Cheney. Partly, I guess, that is because it is a personal thing. As you mentioned, Dick Cheney is from Wyoming. Indeed, he is still a resident and now I understand he is voting in Wyoming. Certainly he is a friend. As a matter of fact, I took Dick Cheney's place in the House when he took the job as Secretary of Defense. I was more delighted about his promotion than anyone else, I suppose.

Aside from that, I guess I am really impressed with the opportunities that might bring about. Of course, it is up to the Governor, Governor Bush, to do whatever he chooses. He has not yet made an announcement. But it seems to me it is satisfying to think of someone being on that ticket who is just a basic person, who has demonstrated his ability to do so many things in government and outside of government. I think it is kind of unusual in today's political scene for it to be someone who just says it like it is, not the great spin.

I was thinking about that yesterday. I was hearing some things on the radio, trying to make one thing sound like another. That is not the way Dick Cheney does things. He just says it.

He has a great background in government. He worked in the White House, was Chief of Staff. By the way, I saw him at the airport in Denver. He seems to be doing well. Of course, he was in the House of Representatives, I think, for six terms—a number of terms, anyway. He rose to leadership there. He was selected then, as you know, to be Secretary of Defense. He did a super job in the gulf war and the activities there.

So it just seems to me he would bring to anyone's ticket this ideal of a strong, stable person, knowledgeable, ready to move in and do the kinds of things that are required of the leadership of this country.

I guess I am a cheerleader for Dick Cheney. Hopefully, we will have a chance to continue to do that over the next several months.

Mr. President, our time is nearly expired. 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. LOTT. 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.

¶

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN HONOR OF PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 341, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 341) authorizing the printing of certain materials in honor of Paul Coverdell.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution (S. Res. 341) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 341

Resolved, That the eulogies and other related materials concerning the Honorable Paul Coverdell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, be printed as a Senate Document.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I note, again, for all Senators, that this authorizes the printing of certain materials to honor Senator Paul Coverdell. We will designate a specific period of time later on this week so Senators who have not spoken will have an opportunity to do so. Of course, we will then pull together into a package all of the statements that have been made about Senator Coverdell for his widow, Nancy Coverdell.

¶

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we have worked this morning, in some ways long distance because Senators who have been involved in these discussions are on their way back, and we have been trying to get agreements on how to proceed. We have not gotten it worked out yet. But in a full measure of precaution, because we want to make sure we are doing everything we can to complete our work this week, it is necessary for me to go ahead and move to call up an appropriations bill and the intelligence authorization bill and file cloture. They would then be ripened on Wednesday. We would be prepared to vote on cloture, if necessary, on Wednesday.

It is my hope that, through communications and meetings that will take

place—perhaps later on this day or in the morning—we will be able to vitiate that because there is no need, really, to have to invoke cloture on the motions to proceed. But it is the only way I can begin the discussion and be assured that we get to the substance of these two bills some time this week.

¶

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4871

Mr. LOTT. So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4871, the Treasury-Postal Service and general government appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

¶

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment for 1 minute, and when the Senate reconvenes, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and the time for the two leaders be reserved.

The motion was agreed to, and at 3:21 p.m., the Senate adjourned until 3:22 p.m. the same day.

The Senate met at 3:22 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SUSAN COLLINS, a Senator from the State of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I note that we had hoped this week to complete action on some additional judicial nominations, to complete at least two appropriations bills and begin a third one, and have the first cloture vote on China PNTR. It is still our hope, but at this time, at least, there is objection from our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to proceeding on appropriations bills. We have a lot we can do this week, and I certainly hope we will do that. Under this action we have just taken, we can have some discussion by the chairman of the Treasury, Postal Service appropriations subcommittee. I see the manager, the chairman of the subcommittee, is here. I am sure he will want to make some comments and outline what is included in the bill.

¶

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.R. 4871, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar number 704, H.R. 4871, a Bill Making Appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Trent Lott, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Pat Roberts, Richard G. Lugar, Jesse Helms, Jeff Sessions, Larry E. Craig, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, Don Nickles, Strom Thurmond, Michael Crapo, Mitch McConnell, Fred Thompson, Judd Gregg, and Ted Stevens.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I repeat my hope that we will be able to work out an agreement on how to proceed and that a vote on the cloture motion will not be necessary on Wednesday morning. But until we can get that done, we need to get the proceedings started. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

f

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we also need to get the intelligence authorization bill done this week. I don't think it will take that long to complete it, although I suspect there are at least a couple issues that will have to be debated and voted on. I had the impression maybe half a day or a night would be all that would be necessary to complete this. I am hoping maybe sometime even Thursday we might complete it, and before, if possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 654, S. 2507, the intelligence authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I say to my friend, the majority leader, on the minority side we also want to move on. We think there is a lot of work that could be done and should be done. For example, on Friday, with the energy and water appropriations bill, there was a provision in there that is very objectionable to a number of people on this side of the aisle, not the least of whom is the minority leader. The minority leader said take that out; it can be dealt with in conference. We think that is the case.

That is my bill. It is a very important bill, almost \$23 billion. All of this

money is discretionary money. It is a very important appropriation bill on which Senator DOMENICI and I have worked. We wish we could move that forward. We think it should move forward.

I also say to my friend, the majority leader, I think it is unfortunate that we have been unable today to deal with Senator HATCH. I understand there is a big celebration in Utah, Pioneer Day, on July 24, and he is committed to be there. I hope this evening or tomorrow we can sit down and talk. For example, I believe the judge's name is White, a Michigan judge, who has been before the committee and has not had a hearing; the nomination had been sent to the committee almost 1,200 days ago. In meeting with Senator HATCH and learning what his problems are, we will try to be as understanding as we can of his problems. I hope he will be as understanding of our problems as we are of his.

Senator DASCHLE and I said this on Thursday: We appreciate very much the work the majority leader has done. As powerful as he is, he still cannot overrule all the committee chairmen. They are here by virtue of their seniority. It makes it very tough to do that. We want to work to move this along. We believe the energy and water bill could move in a day or a day and a half.

Treasury-Postal: We don't believe that is a difficult bill. There are a couple touchy issues on that, but we believe we could work with the majority and move that along. We don't want it to appear that we are trying to hold things up. I think we have a pretty good record the past month or so of working with the leader.

In short, we hope in the meeting with Senator HATCH, either tonight or tomorrow, we will be in a position where we can expedite the rest of the work this week and move on to other things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I want to note that I did not move to proceed to the energy and water appropriations bill. I did that on purpose. I did it out of respect for the Democratic leader and the objection he has made to a particular section and the fact that it is obviously something very important to him and the Senators from North Dakota and South Dakota and other States.

But there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who actually support section 103 because of the impact this might have on the Missouri downriver in States such as Missouri, Illinois, and perhaps even, most importantly, as far as my own State of Mississippi. I talked to Senator DOMENICI and Senator DASCHLE this morning. I still hope we can find a way to resolve that. If that one issue can be resolved, I think that bill might take a couple hours and

could be completed. I still have that on our list as one of the three bills we really must do this week.

With regard to the judges, I have made a commitment to try to continue to move judges who have been reported by the Judiciary Committee. I continue to urge the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to act on those judges who could be reported out. They did report out five judges last week, including a circuit judge from the State of Nevada who will wind up being on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in California, I guess, and so I think I have been keeping my word to try to move those.

I believe the Judiciary Committee is prepared to have a hearing or is having a hearing tomorrow and will move at least four more judges tomorrow. I think it would be unfortunate if those four got tangled up in these difficulties we are outlining now.

It is very hard for me to understand why these appropriations bills and this authorization bill, the intelligence authorization bill, would be held up over one circuit court judge or even two circuit court judges who may still be acted on or have hearings and be reported out. But the majority leader cannot just direct the Judiciary Committee or the chairman that he must report a specific judge. I think it is responsible for me to say: Report those judges where you can and that can be cleared and voted on. But I am not now in a position to guarantee that a specific one judge will be reported by the Judiciary Committee. We will keep working with the chairman of the committee, and hopefully some solution can be found. I think we can find it.

In the meantime, we are losing a day here. I hope we don't lose all day tomorrow. But that is our goal this week, to try to get some judges, try to do two or three appropriations bills, try to do intelligence authorization, and to begin debate on the China PNTR issue.

I guess there is no option for me at this time, though, but to move to proceed to the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I move to proceed to S. 2507, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar number 654, S. 2507, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001:

Trent Lott, Richard Shelby, Connie Mack, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Michael D. Crapo, Rick Santorum, Wayne Allard, Judd Gregg, Christopher Bond, Conrad Burns, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, Robert F. Bennett, Orrin Hatch, Pat Roberts, and Fred Thompson.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, this cloture vote will occur on Wednesday, unless we are already in a post cloture situation on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, or unless, of course, we have done away with the procedure and found a way to go directly to the substance of the bill. And, again, I hope we can do that.

I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before the leader leaves the floor, I want to say very quickly—and we need not discuss the issue of judges—this Senate really did well last week. Around the country, there were a series of editorials that were supportive of what the Senate did regarding the appellate judge; they were all positive for the majority and minority. That was a good move.

One reason, as I indicated, is that one of the Senators is upset because his judge is taking some 1,200 days before a hearing. Also, we recognize that the number of judges approved, while we have done quite well in the last few weeks, is still way behind what it should be.

I wanted to direct a question to the majority leader. Are we still going to have a vote at 6 o'clock? We are getting telephone calls in both Cloakrooms.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we could manufacture a vote, as the Senator knows, and force that vote. But in light of all that is going on, I don't see

that it would serve any purpose other than sort of a bed check vote. It had been my intent to have votes on amendments to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, but that is not possible. I think since we have had to take this action and file cloture, we should announce that there will not be a recorded vote or votes tonight at 6 o'clock.

The next opportunity to vote, I presume, will possibly be in the morning. I hope we can begin to make progress in some way during the day today, or early tomorrow, so votes can be held, if necessary, before the luncheon, or immediately thereafter.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I want the RECORD to reflect that during the past week, on Mondays—last Monday, we had lots and lots of votes. The preceding Friday, we had lots and lots of votes. If the public is looking at the number of votes cast, we are doing pretty well.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I don't know what the number was, but I think on Thursday, Friday, Monday, and Tuesday of last week and the previous week, we probably cast at least 20, 25 votes—maybe 30. So we certainly are turning out votes and getting our work done. We had a very good week last week and the week before. I hope we are going to have one yet this week. We are just not ready to make a lot of progress today.

f

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

f

CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect amounts provided for an earned income credit (EIC) compliance initiative.

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	\$541,593,000,000	\$554,214,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	869,380,000,000	895,988,000,000
Adjustments:		
General purpose discretionary	+145,000,000	+146,000,000
Highways		
Mass transit		
Mandatory		
Total	+145,000,000	+146,000,000
Revised Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	541,738,000,000	554,360,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	869,525,000,000	896,134,000,000

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 budget aggregates, pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Surplus
Current Allocation: Budget Resolution	\$1,467,698,000,000	\$1,452,935,000,000	\$50,265,000,000
Adjustments: EIC compliance initiative	+145,000,000	+146,000,000	-146,000,000
Revised Allocation: Budget Resolution	1,467,843,000,000	1,453,081,000,000	50,119,000,000

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago Friday, Saturday, Sunday and today.

July 21: Benjamin Brown, 42, Gary, IN; Howard Brumskill, 23, Philadelphia, PA; Preston Butler, 18, Philadelphia, PA; Jennifer Casals, 57, Miami-Dade County, FL; Steven Cooks, 27, Memphis, TN; Shena Counts, 13, Baltimore, MD; Ronnie Loundon, 25, Nash-

ville, TN; Calvin Maclin, 42, Detroit, MI; Kevin McCarthy, 29, Philadelphia, PA; Marc Mull, 19, Chicago, IL; Tavon Price, 21, Baltimore, MD; Jessica Roman, 56, Miami-Dade County, FL; Amanda Snow, 31, Houston, TX; Unidentified male, 15, Chicago, IL.

July 22: Chris Cantie, 26, Philadelphia, PA; Richard JOHNSON, 28, Chicago, IL; Ignacio Molina, 28, Houston, TX; Alfonse Roberts, 20, New Orleans, LA; Andrew Sandoval, Jr., 28, Denver, CO; Thomas Correll Walker, 22, Washington, DC; Howard Westly, 22, Philadelphia, PA; Michael R. Williamson, 50, New Orleans, LA; Peter Sao Xiong, 18, St. Paul, MN; Unidentified male, 16, Portland, OR.

July 23: Alva Anglin, 73, Memphis, TN; Jerome Cole, 25, Nashville, TN; Kewon Core, 22, Chicago, IL; Ronald Gates, 30, Chicago, IL; Marcos Guerra, 27, Houston, TX; Leon Hunter, 26, Detroit, MI; Luther Johnson, 21, Philadelphia, PA; Darroll Love, Washington,

DC; Chelsea Martin, San Francisco, CA; Keila McDonald, 20, Oakland, CA; Khorosh Merrikkh, 24, Houston, TX; Kimberly D. Price, 33, Oklahoma City, OK; Gerard Ouriel Robinson, 20, Washington, DC.

July 24: Tyrone Blackwell, 20, Baltimore, MD; Billy Gissendanner, 30, Detroit, MI; Lorena Gonzalez, 38, Fontana, CA; Raphael Gonzalez, 57, Miami-Dade County, FL; Tyrone Green, 24, Baltimore, MD; David Rivera, 15, El Paso, TX; Sammie Simpkins, 50, Washington, DC; Ernest White, 20, Knoxville, TN; Anthony Wilson, 29, Chicago, IL.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned was 38-year-old Lorena Gonzalez of Fontana, California. Lorena was shot and killed one year ago today in front of her 2-year-old son by a man who robbed her of a mere three dollars while she was waiting in a parking lot for her husband to return from a nearby store.

Another gun violence victim, 29-year-old Anthony Wilson, was shot and killed one year ago today in a drive-by shooting in front of his home on the south side of Chicago.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The time has come to enact sensible gun legislation. The deaths of Lorena and Anthony are a reminder to all of us that we need to act now.

†

CHIROPRACTIC BENEFIT FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for a provision included in the House-passed Department of Defense (DOD) Authorization bill which provides a permanent chiropractic benefit to all active military personnel. Iowans have a long history of support for the chiropractic profession. In fact, the nation's oldest institution of higher chiropractic learning—Palmer College—is located in Davenport, Iowa.

I am pleased that both the House and Senate have included provisions in their respective DOD authorization bills which expand access to chiropractic services for members of the military. These provisions follow on the heels of a multi-year pilot program enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. The pilot program demonstrated that military personnel who received chiropractic care had higher levels of satisfaction with the care they received as compared to personnel who only received traditional medical care. Furthermore, the pilot project demonstrated that chiropractic care would reduce hospitalization, return injured patients to work more quickly, and would result in a net savings to the Department of Defense in excess of \$25 million annually.

The Defense Authorization Act passed by the House of Representatives begins the process of fully integrating chiropractic care into the military health care system on a direct access basis. The Senate-passed bill, however, limits chiropractic care through a medical gatekeeper. Direct access to chiropractic care would expedite the delivery of chiropractic care to those patients most in need of services and would free up existing health care providers to concentrate their time and efforts in other areas requiring attention. Therefore, I join the chiropractic profession in asking the conferees of the DOD Authorization legislation to accept the House-passed provision and provide direct access to chiropractic services to all active military personnel.

†

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a former member of this body, Senator Edward W. Brooke. Sen-

ator Brooke has served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as both a Massachusetts Attorney General and United States Senator. Recently, I had the privilege of attending the dedication of the New Chardon Street Courthouse in Boston on June 20th, named in honor of Senator Brooke. Given the former Senator's prestigious record of service to both the citizens of Massachusetts and the Nation, it is fitting that this honor be bestowed upon him.

During his distinguished career which spanned the course of two decades, Senator Brooke earned the prominent distinction of being the first African-American directly elected to both a State Attorney General position and the United States Senate. While in each office, Senator Brooke spearheaded efforts to achieve civil rights and equality for women, minorities, and the poor.

Elected Massachusetts Attorney General in 1962, Senator Brooke earned his reputation as a crime-fighter through his extensive work with the newly created Massachusetts Crime Commission. He actively combated corruption in State government and singlehandedly organized and completed the extensive investigation of the infamous "Boston Strangler" homicides.

Only 4 years later, he became the first African-American Senator to serve since Reconstruction, and the first and only to be re-elected. During his two terms in Congress, Senator Brooke figured prominently into all aspects of the Senate. He vigorously opposed escalation of the Vietnam war and supported arms control treaties like the MIRV and ABM proposals that would eventually become the catalysts in establishing improved relations and recognizing the People's Republic of China. Senator Brooke was the first Republican Senator to call for President Nixon's resignation after the Watergate scandal. In addition, Senator Brooke was a tireless champion of the poor. He authored the "Brooke amendment," which provided that public housing tenants pay no more than one-fourth of their income for housing.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Brooke's comments at the New Chardon Street Courthouse dedication ceremony be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDWARD W. BROOKE COURTHOUSE DEDICATION

I respectfully ask that you join me in a moment of silence in memory of a dear and cherished friend, Roger H. Woodworth, a former Massachusetts Assistant Attorney General, who served his country in war, and his fellow man all the days of his life.

I could not write nor can I speak words which adequately convey the appreciation of my wife, Anne, our daughters, son, grandchildren and all of our family for this splendid recognition. It is, of course, an honor for me, but, more importantly, the naming of this courthouse also recognizes the exemplary service of the men and women with whom I was privileged to work in the Boston

Finance Commission, the Office of the Attorney General and in the United States Senate.

I am particularly grateful to Senator Brian Lees, Governor Paul Cellucci, Senate President Thomas Birmingham, House Speaker Thomas Finneran, the 200 members of the Great and General Court, and all of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for this honor.

I also want to thank Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood, for their architectural vision and creativity and the contractors O'Connor & Dimeo & O'Connor for building this magnificent structure.

Thanks also go to those who labor within, Chief Justice Barbara Dortch-Okara, the judges who dispense justice, clerks, administrators, and especially those who secure and maintain this courthouse and who bear the responsibility for present and future safety, cleanliness and decorum.

I extend my warmest appreciation to all who have organized and participated in this ceremony, the clergy, the officials, the speakers, the singers, the band, the color guard, the police, the Metropolitan District Commissioner David Balfour and the dedication committee, and to all of you who have come from Maine to California, from the Berkshires to the Cape and Islands, and from the Caribbean.

My association with Massachusetts began on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941, when I received a telegram from the United States Army ordering me to report to the 366th Infantry Combat Regiment at Fort Devens, in Ayer, Massachusetts. It was to be the first time for me to set foot on Massachusetts soil.

I could not possibly have foreseen that after the war I would have returned to Massachusetts to study law at the Boston University School of Law, to practice law in Roxbury and in Boston and to serve in public office. Nor could I have known that the people of Massachusetts were to give me the greatest opportunities and challenges of my life.

This building and its location have special meaning for me. In my law school days I lived a stone's throw away, at 98 Chamber Street in the West End of Boston before I moved to Roxbury to live with my old Army buddy Al Brothers and his wife, Edith. I attended classes at Boston University Law School at 11 Ashburton Place, a few blocks up the hill from here and studied contract and constitutional law on a bench in the Boston Commons just behind the Robert Gould Shaw Monument. I practically boarded at Durgin Park, over there, near Faneuil Hall, where the servings of pot roast, mashed potatoes and cornbread were generous and the price was right.

Later, after practicing law on Humbolt Avenue in Roxbury, I practiced law in Pemberton Square across the street from the old Boston Municipal Court just up the hill. It was during those days that I practiced in the same probate, land and juvenile, now the more civilly named family court, all now in this new building. And, at first, to make a living, I searched many a title in the musty volumes upstairs in the office of the old Suffolk County Registry of Deeds. Later, I worked in the offices of the Boston Finance Commission, just down the street from the Parker House, and still later, in the Office of the Attorney General in the old bullfinch State House, all within a short walking distance of this new building.

My relationship with Boston has now come full circle within the naming of this courthouse and my involvement in the restoration of another old Bullfinch Building built in 1804 at the corner of Beacon and Park Streets. It was also in Boston close by, where my fraternity, Alpha Phi Alpha, inducted a

young Boston University Divinity School student named Martin Luther King.

In order to be on time for this ceremony, Anne and I came to Boston last Friday morning, which enabled me to lunch at the famous Doyle's Pub in Jamaica Plains with some of the retired newspapermen of yesteryears. Having been married 21 years, and still being young lovers and on Saturday Anne and I strolled hand-in-hand Saturday through the historic Boston Commons, founded in 1634, and the beautiful Boston Gardens with its spectacular beds of flowers. We walked over the footbridge and looked down at the ducks and the swan boats. We later ate streamed mussels and broiled bluefish at Legal Seafoods just behind the Four Seasons Hotel. We continued our walk up Newbury and Boylston Streets, miraculously without incurring major debt, and at noon, sat in silence, prayed and listened to the beautiful rehearsal music of the choir of Trinity Church in old Copley Square where I worshipped years ago, heard the wonderful sermons of the rector, Dr. Theodore Ferris, and where my daughters were confirmed. I shall always remember election night 1966 when I received my first congratulatory telegram. It simply read: "Hallelujah" and was signed Ted Ferris.

It has been said that this may well be the first state courthouse named for an African-American and perhaps the only one in Massachusetts named for a living person. If true, both are sad commentaries. It would be shameful with all of the qualified and talented African-American men and women in this country, that it has taken 137 years since the Emancipation Proclamation to give such recognition. And as for the recognition of the living versus the dead, I, of course, vote for the living.

In fact, in the present case, the new name of this building was approved by the Massachusetts legislature on a budget bill to which it had been attached by Senate President Birmingham and Senate Minority Leader Lees, and signed into law by Governor Cellucci on November 22, 1999. The Governor is his wisdom, wanting to have an outdoor ceremony and being assured of perfect weather, set the date for this dedication ceremony for June 20th, 2000. Of course, politicians always claim credit for things with which they had nothing whatsoever to do. So with due respect, Governor Cellucci, I give credit for the beautiful weather to Richard Winkleman, a dear friend who goes to church every day of his life, and who has been praying continually for good weather for today. During the interim between the passage and the signing of the budget bill, when told that this might be the first for a living person, my response was, "Well, you'd better hurry up or your record may stay in tact."

Today is not one to dwell on criticism of the past no matter how valid that criticism may be. It is a day of joy, a day of celebration and a day of acknowledgement and appreciation for what has been accomplished. It is also a day for a commitment to accelerate our efforts for greater progress in the present and in the future. Massachusetts Governors Michael Dukakis, William Weld and Paul Cellucci are to be commended for having appointed many highly-qualified women, African-Americans, Jews and representatives of other minorities to the judiciary and elsewhere in their administrations. I trust that successor governors will continue that record including the appointment of Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans. Like justice, appointments and recognition should be racial and gender-blind, and I respectfully urge other states across the country to follow the example set by this Governor, this legislative body, and the citizens of Massachusetts.

As we look to the future and the generations to come who will avail themselves of equal justice under law in this gleaming symbol of civil society, let us all pledge to work for a nation in which barriers of race, religion and ethnic origin do not stand in the way of achievement or recognition, a nation that continues to strike down the barriers that make us weak and lives up to the noble principle that make us strong. In the strength of unity and purpose may we recall the words of that old hymn:

"God of justice save the people from the wars of race and creed, from the strife of class and friction make our nation free indeed.

"Keep her faith in simple manhood, stronger than when she began, till she finds her full fruition in the brotherhood of man."

For this high honor, thanks be to Almighty God and the people of Massachusetts.

£

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act and urge that it be brought to the Senate floor for a vote.

Sadly, breast and cervical cancer will afflict nearly 200,000 women this year, and take the lives of more than 45,000. Women in every State and every community in the country are today facing the daunting challenge of overcoming these diseases. They are not strangers; they are our sisters, mothers, aunts, and grandmothers. They are people we love and care about.

The statistics are disturbing. The family stories are sobering. But let us find hope in the strides that we have made so far. In 1991, Congress created the Early Detection Program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which provided low-income, uninsured women with breast and cervical cancer screening services. It was a positive first step toward ensuring that every woman, regardless of her annual income and insurance situation, could request a screening for breast and cervical cancer. I wholeheartedly support the program, and I know many of my colleagues do as well.

However, just as critical as guaranteeing universal access to cancer screening is the need to provide treatment options following a diagnosis of cancer. While the CDC Early Detection Program supplies participating women with an evaluation, it offers nothing in the way of treatment should that evaluation reveal cancer. The very same women who are not expected to pay for a screening are somehow expected to finance their own treatment program. It simply does not make sense.

We must, therefore, draw a line from A to B, from screening to treatment. The Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, a bill I am pleased to cosponsor, does just that. It gives States the option of offering Medicaid coverage to women that participated in the CDC Early Detection Program and were diagnosed as having breast or cervical cancer. In so doing, it provides a much-needed complement to the Early Detection Program.

We have broad bipartisan support in the Senate to pass this bill. Nearly 80 Senators have cosponsored it. The program was included in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget. But we need a vote.

As time in this Congressional term wanes, we are increasingly forced to make difficult choices about which bills to address. But I believe this bill must be a top priority. It is unacceptable that women who are diagnosed with cancer often go without life-saving treatment simply because they cannot afford it. Congress has the responsibility to act quickly on this issue.

In the spirit of the CDC Early Detection program, which is approaching its 10th anniversary, I urge the leadership to bring S. 662 to the floor as soon as possible, and advance America's fight against breast and cervical cancer.

£

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 21, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,667,708,257,883.47 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-seven billion, seven hundred eight million, two hundred fifty-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-seven cents).

One year ago, July 21, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,630,350,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred thirty billion, three hundred fifty million).

Five years ago, July 21, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,936,736,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred thirty-six billion, seven hundred thirty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 21, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$533,588,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-three billion, five hundred eighty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,134,120,257,883.47 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, one hundred twenty million, two hundred fifty-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

£

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF EXPO 2000, A BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY MARKETPLACE

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the Houston Minority Business Council and the other groups and individuals who are now preparing for "EXPO 2000, a Business Opportunity Marketplace," to be held on August 31, 2000, in the George R. Brown Convention Center in Houston, Texas. This annual event is Texas' largest minority business trade fair and offers a meeting ground for corporations seeking to identify experienced minority entrepreneurs.

Over the last decade, the number of minority owned businesses grew in the

U.S. by an impressive 168 percent. These businesses generate half a trillion dollars in revenue and employ nearly four million workers. This success has been in large measure due to the efforts of groups like the Houston Minority Business Council and the dedicated individuals throughout Texas and this nation who seek to expand economic opportunities for all Americans.

The EXPO has been an outstanding example of such efforts, and has opened the doors of the marketplace by successfully pairing minority business owners with representatives from more than 220 local and national companies. The event provides these minority entrepreneurs with direct marketing opportunities with corporations, government agencies and educational and financial institutions that need capable contractors to support their missions. The EXPO has produced real results, with two thirds of participants reporting having obtained contracts for as much as two million dollars within a year of the event.

I have worked hard in the U.S. Senate to build upon efforts like this to expand Federal contracting opportunities to small and disadvantaged business entrepreneurs. I have helped lead the efforts to defend programs such as the 8 (a) Federal business development program, worked to curb the "bundling" of Federal contracts that hurt small businesses, and I have served as a champion of Small Business Development Centers, which assist small businesses in getting the capital and assistance needed to get started and expand.

I again commend the organizers, supporters, and participants of EXPO 2000. These fine men and women represent the best of Texas' entrepreneurial, hard-working and neighborly spirit. I wish them all much future success, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to ensure that all Americans share in the fruits of our economic prosperity.●

f

A TRIBUTE TO BERNIE WHITEBEAR

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is with great admiration that I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Bernie Whitebear, of Seattle, Washington, who passed away at the age of 62 on Sunday, July 16, 2000.

A long-standing advocate and leader in the fight for tribal self-determination, Bernie Whitebear was an outstanding role-model for tribal and non-tribal people alike. Known for his vision, humor and commitment, he lives on in the minds and hearts of everyone who knew him.

Bernie Whitebear was born on September 27, 1937 on the Colville Indian Reservation in Eastern Washington. Born into a large family, Bernie grew up confronting many of the barriers facing reservation children, including poverty and discrimination.

As an adult, he moved to Seattle, attended the University of Washington

and worked as an engineer for Boeing. He later joined the Army as a paratrooper in the 101st Airborne Division and served as a Green Beret.

During the activism of the late 1960's, Bernie Whitebear emerged as one of the central tribal leaders in the Pacific Northwest and was a tireless advocate for American Indian recognition and empowerment. We often remember his social action, seen through his leadership in the "invasion" of Fort Lawton in Seattle in 1970. Bernie and others occupied the Fort Lawton property after plans were announced to list the Fort as surplus property for the city to designate as a park. He felt local tribes had a historic right to the land, which could be better used as a central service base for Seattle's largely unserved urban Indian population.

The 3-month occupation, civil arrests and resulting media attention prompted Congress to order the city of Seattle to negotiate a settlement, which included a 99-year lease on a 20-acre parcel for Whitebear's group. The settlement provided space for construction of the Daybreak Star Art Center, which currently stands in Discovery Park.

I want to share with the Senate one of my favorite memories of Bernie Whitebear. Bernie had invited me to attend the Mini-Pow Wow in my state on February 7, 1998. He asked me to stop by to talk about the People's Lodge, to see the artwork, and to have a quick look at some of the traditional dances. I told Bernie I would stop by, but that I only had a short while because I had a lot of events I needed to attend that day.

I remember when I arrived at the University of Washington Bernie welcomed me with his big bright smile and an outstretched hand. We watched some of the traditional dances, and then I realized that if I didn't leave soon I would be late for my next event. It was one of those days when I was trying to meet as many people as possible. Well Bernie didn't let me just meet the people at the Mini-Pow Wow, he made me stay and understand them. He started by introducing me to everyone in the room.

Then Bernie leaned over to me and explained that it was customary for a visiting United States Senator to move to the front of the dancing group. You know, it was one of the many Native American traditions Bernie told me about that always sounded a little invented to me. Like another old tradition he told me about: That anytime a U.S. Senator stepped foot in Discovery Park he or she had to pay a visit to the Daybreak Star Center. Well there was Bernie asking me to move to the front, and who could say no to Bernie?

He had his arm around me. He was leading me to the front. Everyone was watching, and I went along. The next thing I knew, I was leading about 300 people in a tribal dance. Even though I was not born to be a dancer and I certainly didn't know that particular

dance, Bernie made it easy. He had such an open, loving, and compassionate nature that you just couldn't help but feel a part of it. As I looked around, people were smiling, and there was a real sense of comradery and respect shared by everyone in the room. About two hours later, as the event was winding down, I said goodbye to Bernie, and I got into my car.

As I drove away, I realized what Bernie had really done for me that day. He helped me understand Native American cultures from the inside, not as someone sitting on the sidelines watching, but as someone in the middle of the festivities. I felt the sense of community and respect that Bernie was always so proud of. Anyone can talk about those qualities and traditions, but Bernie let me experience them, and he did it with a big grin on his face. I know I'm better off for that experience.

That day shows just how effective Bernie was at getting us to shed our expectations, to realize what we have in common, and to work together.

Throughout his life, Bernie used his own unique style and generous heart to accomplish many things. He founded the United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, which provides education and counseling resources for the estimated 25,000 American Indians in the Puget Sound area. Along with the Daybreak Center and the United Indians Foundation, he worked to sensitize Seattle police to urban Indian issues. Recognizing the persistent need for American Indian health services, he also helped create the Seattle Indian Health Board and later served as its first executive director.

For his many contributions, Bernie Whitebear was awarded numerous honors. In 1997, Governor Gary Locke named him a "Citizen of the Decade." He recently received Seattle's Distinguished Citizen Medal. In 1998, the University of Washington gave him the Distinguished Alumnus of the Year Award. Bernie was a remarkable man with spirit and a warmth that touched everyone he encountered. My thoughts and sympathies are with all of Bernie's family and friends.

Bernie Whitebear acted as a beacon for compassion, cultural understanding and tribal sovereignty in the Puget Sound Region. His legacy is left in all of us who have tremendous respect for the history and cultures of the tribes, a history Bernie would draw us into, by his passion, by his words and by his deeds. I will miss him.●

f

TRIBUTE TO CARDINAL HILL REHABILITATION HOSPITAL

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the directors and staff of Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital in recognition of providing physical rehabilitation services for the past fifty years to the people of Kentucky.

Cardinal Hill Hospital treats more than 6,000 patients every year from virtually every county in the state. The

Hospital, beginning as a convalescent home for children with polio, has now developed into a leading physical rehabilitation center for Lexington and its region. This anniversary not only reaches a significant milestone, but marks a time for recognition and celebration.

Dedicated to treating children and adults, some of Cardinal Hill's patients have been treated for catastrophic accidents or disabling diseases like multiple sclerosis, spina bifida, or cerebral palsy. Two of the more publicized patients would include Missy Jenkins, survivor of the Paducah Heath High School Shooting and Palmer Harston, of Lexington, 2000 National Easter Seals Child Representative, that have been given care and treatment by Cardinal Hill Hospital. Cardinal Hill has provided for patients who have dealt with all kinds of tragedies, whether small or large.

Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital continues to display an unswerving commitment to the people of Kentucky and possesses the respect and gratitude of many in the community. The significant work accomplished at this hospital promises a successful future for the citizens of this state as they can be ensured that disabilities will be continued to be treated at Cardinal Hill.

I am certain that the legacy of dedication that Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital has left will carry on. Congratulations to the directors and staff of Cardinal Hill on 50 years of service to Kentucky. Best wishes for many more years of commitment, and know that your efforts to better the lives of those in the region will be felt for years to come. On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the United States Senate, thank you for giving so much of yourself for so many others.●

‡

CITY KIDS WILDERNESS PROJECT

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." When our parents and grandparents told us that, they probably weren't talking about the problem of crime in America. But they might have been.

So many times in our debates, in the testimony given by experts from law-enforcement professionals to psychologists and social workers, the value of prevention—of keeping kids away from crime before they ever get into it—is clear and indisputable. And it is just as clear that one of the best ways to keep kids out of trouble is, simply, to give them something else to do.

Terrance Collier, a 13-year-old from Washington, DC, had something else to do this summer. In fact, he had a lot to do. Through a program called City Kids Wilderness Project, Terrance went to Wyoming, where he camped, cooked, helped with cleaning up, paddled a canoe, went rafting, made new friends and, in the process, learned about nature, himself, teamwork and responsibility.

Randy Luskey started City Kids Wilderness Project and continues to fund the program himself. A few years ago, Randy donated his Wyoming ranch to the kids. But, Randy is not just a blind donor. Randy leaves his own family in Colorado every year to actively participate with the kids in Jackson Hole.

Cathy Robillard takes time away from her home and family in Vermont every summer to work with the kids in Wyoming. She is the person that runs the nuts and bolts of the program and does so with a measure of care and discipline.

City Kids Wilderness Project is one of the best possible examples of time and money well spent. And it is an example that should be followed.

A lot of the participants get into City Kids Wilderness Project through Boys and Girls Clubs, the kind of partnership that gets the best out of both programs, the kind of partnership that has proven successful time and time again.

In debating funding for crime-prevention programs and public-private partnerships, we hear testimony from the experts and professionals, as we should, but we will never have a witness more important than 13-year-old Terrance Collier. Terrance found his time in Wyoming to be rewarding, it made a difference to him, he thought it was important and it kept him off the street.

Let's listen to that testimony, and let's thank the people like Randy Luskey and Cathy Robillard who are offering "an ounce of prevention" to kids like Terrance, brightening the promise of the future for all of us.●

‡

TRIBUTE TO PAUL M. MONTRONE— NEW HAMPSHIRE BUSINESS IN THE ARTS LEADERSHIP AWARD WINNER

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Paul Montrone upon his recognition as the 2000 New Hampshire "Business in the Arts-Leadership" award winner.

In order for arts programs to run smoothly and efficiently, there must be a strong leader behind the operation. Paul has been instrumental in the development of the arts in New Hampshire for many years. He has been a leading figure in enhancing corporate and individual financial support both regionally and nationally, and has a demonstrated interest in improving the operation and effectiveness of arts organizations.

Paul's strong leadership has proven to be an effective model for others to follow. He gives generously of his time by serving on the boards of many non-profit organizations such as the Wang Center in Boston and the New England Conservatory, and also serves as the president and CEO of the Metropolitan Opera. He personally assists the Mayer Arts Center at Phillips Exeter Academy which attracts visiting artists to display their work on campus and establish residencies and workshops in

the surrounding community. He also supports the scholarship program at Phillips Exeter Academy, designed to help support gifted students pursue their dreams in the arts. His early and consistent support of the Music Hall in Portsmouth is yet another testament of his vision and long-term commitment to the community.

Without the support of generous financial donations, arts programs would suffer tremendously. Paul has long patronized arts organizations and has convinced major corporations to do the same through "challenge" grants. These grants are made at significant points of the fund drive, thereby motivating other potential donors to donate. His keen business skills are evident in the large amounts of financial support he earns for particular programs.

It is citizens like Paul who exemplify the importance of civic responsibility. His work in making the arts more accessible to the community is commendable. Without the support of such dedicated people like Paul, the arts would not be able to thrive in New Hampshire. It is an honor to serve him in the United States Senate.●

‡

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF BEDFORD

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the town of Bedford on its 250th anniversary, an important and historic milestone in New Hampshire's history.

The town was incorporated on May 21, 1750. Once an unsettled wilderness located in the heart of New Hampshire, Bedford has grown into a booming residential and commercial community. Its close proximity to the center of Southern New Hampshire makes it very convenient for residents to commute to bigger cities like Manchester and Nashua. Bedford is a thriving small town with a strong commitment to family and community values, evidenced by a first-rate school system and active participation by many residents in civic groups such as the Rotary Club and the Lions Club.

The town has come together to celebrate its anniversary with year-long events, such as town picnics, exhibits and a parade marking the town's official birthday. A 250th anniversary ball is planned as the culmination of the year's events. These celebrations strengthen town organizations' staying-power and provide an opportunity for residents to congregate and enjoy all the town has to offer. The overwhelming number of Bedford residents who attended these events is a testament to their commitment to town and civic affairs.

Slowly but surely, this quiet former farming town has seen tremendous commercial growth within the last 50 years. Bedford is now home to many small businesses and office parks, but has certainly not lost that small-town charm. With 16,500 citizens, it is easy

to meet familiar faces in passing. Although the town may be steadily expanding its collection of businesses, the residents have not let them overwhelm their beautiful scenic community.

Once again, I want to congratulate the town of Bedford on its 250th anniversary. Stable and secure communities such as Bedford are essentially the backbone of this great nation. It is an honor to serve its citizens in the United States Senate.●

f

TRIBUTE TO TOM SCHWIEGER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the outstanding leadership of Tom Schwieger, President and CEO of the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce. Tom's seventeen years of service have been marked by integrity, vision and dedication, earning him the respect and admiration of the people of New Hampshire.

During his tenure at the Manchester Chamber, Tom has initiated and overseen some of the most important revitalization projects of the last fifty years. He was the driving force behind the development of the Manchester Airport and the newly approved Civic Center. In 1998, as a testament to the success of Tom's efforts, Manchester was named the best small city in America in which to live.

When I speak with Tom, I am always left with the impression that he truly loves what he does. His energy and enthusiasm is contagious and Tom has assembled a very prestigious Board of Directors. As BJ Eckhardt of Business New Hampshire Magazine remarked, "people are honored to serve on the board; no one says 'no' to Tom."

In addition to his many professional achievements, Tom has served as a mentor and an inspiration to many members of the Chamber staff. Many current New Hampshire community leaders credit Tom with giving them their start and helping to shape their careers.

Walter Lippman once said, "The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men, the conviction and the will to carry on." In his seventeen years at the Chamber, Tom has given the organization direction, drive, and a sense of mission. He has served with spirit and devotion, and his legacy will serve as an example to his successors for years to come.

Tom, it has been an honor and a pleasure to serve you in the United States Senate. I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors. May you always continue to inspire those around you.●

f

TRIBUTE TO SITESURFER PUBLISHING—NEW HAMPSHIRE "BUSINESS IN THE ARTS" AWARD WINNER

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute

to Sitesurfer Publishing upon its recognition as a 2000 New Hampshire "Business in the Arts" award winner in the microenterprise category.

Sitesurfer Publishing has proven that a little bit of time and energy is all it takes to make a significant impact in the arts. This company has allowed such organizations as the Capitol Center for the Arts in Concord to become more competitive in today's high-tech world of on-line business. Sitesurfer created a website for the Capitol Center which resulted in thousands of dollars worth of contributions and tickets sold. This type of competitive edge has attracted worldwide visitors and increased the appeal of corporate sponsorship packages, proving to be the sort of revenue needed to continue the Capitol Center's many programs.

Sitesurfer has gone a step further in assuring the future of the Capitol Center's newest technology by providing the necessary hands-on training for the Center's staff to maintain and update the website, while still making itself available for support and hands-on work when it is needed. Sitesurfer understands the importance of making the arts accessible to others by providing memberships and complimentary tickets to their employees and clients.

Without the support of dedicated businesses, the arts would not be able to flourish in the state. Despite its small size, Sitesurfer Publishing has demonstrated that even small businesses can take an active role in the community not only by donating money, but by investing time and hard work into civic causes. Sitesurfer truly signifies the deep personal commitment of small businesses across the state to supporting the causes that make New Hampshire the place to call home. It is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

f

TRIBUTE TO LOU SISSON—WAKEFIELD CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lou Sisson upon her recognition as the Wakefield Citizen of the Year by the Greater Wakefield Chamber of Commerce.

Lou's tireless efforts to better her community are truly inspirational in a time where civic duties are declining. Aside from her duties as owner of the Wakefield Inn, Lou has been an active member of the Lions Club, the Women's Club, the Heritage Commission and a founding member of the Wakefield Arts Club. Her long list of involvements are a testament to her strong dedication to the community and her commitment to making various events and programs available to all Wakefield citizens.

Lou's hard work on the Sidewalk Committee led to the construction of numerous sidewalks throughout downtown Wakefield, making the streets safer for pedestrians. She is also in-

involved in a summer youth program which recently created a two-mile heritage trail that outlines information about the town's historic sites, providing educational and recreational opportunities for all town residents. Lou truly enjoys volunteering and cites the friendly, personable town atmosphere as the true motivation for her efforts.

It is citizens like Lou who make our communities stronger and exemplify what is good about America today. Lou's dedication to making her community a better place to live is commendable. It is truly an honor to serve her in the United States Senate.●

f

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. OBEY, as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

f

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-9937. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic rollover of involuntary cash-out" (Rev. Rul. 2000-36) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9938. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance on section 403(b) plans" (Revenue Ruling 2000-35) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9939. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Default rollover of involuntary cash-out" (Rev. Rul. 2000-36) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9940. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Retention of Income Tax Return Preparers' Signatures" (RIN 1545-AW52) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9941. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telefile Voice Signature Test" (RIN 1545-AR97) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9942. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Center for Health Plans and Providers, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program: Medicare and Choice" (RIN 0938-A129) received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9943. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Commission, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737-600, -700, and -800 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 2000-NM-209" (RIN 2120-AA64 (2000-0376)) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9944. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Commission, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Oakley, KS; Docket No. 00-ACE-20 [7-14/7-17]" (RIN 2120-AA66 (2000-0175)) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9945. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Crystal Falls and Republic, Michigan" (MM Docket No. 98-128, RM-9308, RM-9385) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9946. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations, Las Vegas, Nevada" (MM Docket No. 99-252, RM-9648) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9947. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Sulphur Bluff, Texas" (MM Docket No. 99-287, RM-9712) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9948. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations, Reno Nevada" (MM Docket No. 99-291, RM-9665) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9949. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Tallulah, Louisiana)" (MM Docket No. 99-348; RM-9765) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9950. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Hemet, California)" (MM Docket No. 99-349; RM-9766) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9951. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Simmesport, Louisiana)" (MM Docket No. 99-350; RM-9769) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9952. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Holbrook, Arizona)" (MM Docket No. 99-351; RM-9785) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9953. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Mojave, California)" (MM Docket No. 99-353; RM-9787) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9954. A communication from the Associate Managing Director-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2000, Report and Order" (MD Docket No. 00-58, FCC 00-240) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9955. A communication from the Assistant Bureau Chief of Management, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Report and Order In the Matter of Redesignation of 17.7-19.7 GHz Frequency Band, Blanket Licensing of Satellite Earth Stations in 17.7-20.2 GHz and 27.5-30.0 GHz Frequency Bands, and Allocation of Additional Spectrum in 17.3-17.8 GHz and 24.75-25.25 GHz Frequency Bands for Broadcast Satellite-Service Use" (RIN IB Docket No. 98-172, FCC 00-212) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9956. A communication from the Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extending Wireless Telecommunications Services to Tribal Lands" (Wt Docket No. 99-266, FCC 00-209) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9957. A communication from the Associate Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, Narrowband PCS, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making." (GEN Doc. 90-314, ET Doc. 92-100, PP Doc. 93-253, FCC 00-159) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9958. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report regarding the incidental capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shipping Operations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9959. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification relative to the termi-

nation of danger pay for Eritrea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-9960. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of six rules entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama-Approval of Revisions to the Alabama State Implementation Plan; Transportation Conformity Interagency Memorandum of Agreement; Correction" [FRL #6735-6], "Azoxytobin or Methyl(E)-2-3-; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions" [FRL #6594-1], "Butyl Acrylate-Vinyl Acetate-Acrylic Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption" [FRL #6593-9], "Humic Acid, Sodium Salt, Exemption Tolerance" [FRL #6595-9], "Pendimethalin; Re-establishment of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions" [FRL #6596-5], "Tebuconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions" [FRL #6596-7] received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9961. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of five rules entitled "Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) or Superfund, Section 311(b)(9)(A), CERCLA Section 311(b)(3) "Announcement of Competition for EPA's Brownfields Job Training and Development Demonstration Pilots"" (FRL 6837-1), "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL 6838-5), "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revised 15% Plan for the Metropolitan Washington, DC Ozone Non-attainment Area" (FRL 6735-4), "Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL 6594-6), "Vinclozolin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL 65948) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9962. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Kern County Air Pollution Control District" received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9963. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas Permitting of New and Modified Sources in Nonattainment Areas," (FRL 6735-3) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9964. A communication from the General Counsel of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of the Inspector General, Department of Defense Inspector General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9965. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9966. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 13-379 entitled "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 236, S.O. 00-49, Act of 2000"

adopted by the Council on July 11, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9967. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the copies of D.C. Act 13-378 entitled "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 288, S.O. 98-163, Act of 2000" adopted by the Council on July 11, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9968. A communication from the Director of the Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Progress Payments for Foreign Military Sales Contracts" (DFARS Case 2000-D009) received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-9969. A communication from the Chief of Programs and Legislation Division, Office of the Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, a notice relative to a cost comparison to reduce the cost of the Supply and Transportation function over a sixty month period at Anderson Air Force Base, Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-9970. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, a notification relative to functions performed by military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-9971. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Tropical Botanical Garden Annual Audit Report for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-9972. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Program: Procedures for the Conduct of Referendum" (Docket Number: LS-99-14) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9973. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Research and Promotion Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order" (FV-99-701-FR) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9974. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Ruling 2000-33 Automatic Enrollment in Section 457(b) plans" (Rev. Rul. 2000-33) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

£

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 2101: A bill to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries (Rept. No. 106-354).

By Mr. GRAMM, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2266: A bill to provide for the minting of commemorative coins to support the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and the programs of the United States Olympic Committee (Rept. No. 106-355).

By Mr. GRAMM, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2453: A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-356).

S. 2459: A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation (Rept. No. 106-357).

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

S. 1474: A bill providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas (Rept. No. 106-358).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 2425: A bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the planning, design, and construction of the Bend Feed Canal Pipeline Project, Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-359).

£

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2908. A bill to authorize funding for successful reentry of criminal offenders into local communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 2909. A bill to permit landowners to assert otherwise-available state law defenses against property claims by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

£

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Res. 341. A resolution authorizing the printing of certain materials in honor of Paul Coverdell.

£

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2908. A bill to authorize funding for successful reentry of criminal offenders into local communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ACT OF 2000

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Offender Reentry and Community Safety Act of 2000. I am introducing this legislation because all too often we have short-term solutions for long-term problems. All too often we think about today, but not tomorrow. It's time that we start looking forward. It's time that we face the dire situation of prisoners re-entering our communities with insufficient monitoring, little or no job skills, inadequate drug treatment, insufficient housing and deficient basic life skills.

According to the Department of Justice, 1.25 million offenders are now liv-

ing in prisons and another 600,000 offenders are incarcerated in local jails. A record number of those inmates—approximately 585,400 will return to communities this year. Historically, two-thirds of returning prisoners have been rearrested for new crimes within three years.

The safety threat posed by this volume of prisoner returns has been exacerbated by the fact that states and communities can't possibly properly supervise all their returning offenders, parole systems have been abolished in thirteen states and policy shifts toward more determinate sentencing have reduced the courts' authority to impose supervisory conditions on offenders returning to their communities.

State systems have also reduced the numbers of transitional support programs aimed at facilitating the return to productive community life styles. Recent studies indicate that many returning prisoners receive no help in finding employment upon release and most offenders have low literacy and other basic educational skills that can impede successful reentry.

At least 55 percent of offenders are fathers of minor children, and therefore face a number of issues related to child support and other family responsibilities during incarceration and after release. Substance abuse and mental health problems also add to concerns over community safety. Approximately 70 percent of state prisoners and 57 percent of federal prisoners have a history of drug use or abuse. Research by Justice indicates that between 60 and 75 percent of inmates with heroin or cocaine problems return to drugs within three months when untreated. An estimated 187,000 state and federal prison inmates have self-reported mental health problems. Mentally ill inmates are more likely than other offenders to have committed a violent offense and be violent recidivists. Few states connect mental health treatment in prisons with treatment in the return community. Finally, offenders with contagious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis are released with no viable plan to continue their medical treatment so they present a significant danger to public health. And while the federal prison population and reentry system differs from the state prison population and reentry systems, there are nonetheless significant reentry challenges at the federal level.

We need to start thinking about what to do with these people. We need to start thinking in terms of helping these people make a transition to the community so that they don't go back to a life of crime and can be productive members of our society. We need to start thinking about the long-term impact of what we do after we send people to jail.

My legislation creates demonstration reentry programs for federal, state and local prisoners. The programs are designed to assist high-risk, high-need offenders who have served their prison

sentences, but who pose the greatest risk of reoffending upon release because they lack the education, job skills, stable family or living arrangements, and the substance abuse treatment and other mental and medical health services they need to successfully reintegrate into society.

Innovative strategies and emerging technologies present new opportunities to improve reentry systems. This legislation creates federal and state demonstration projects that utilize these strategies and technologies. The projects share many core components, including a more seamless reentry system, reentry officials who are more directly involved with the offender and who can swiftly impose intermediate sanctions if the offender does not follow the designated reentry plan, and the combination of enhanced service delivery and enhanced monitoring. The different projects are targeted at different prisoner populations and each has some unique features. The promise of the legislation is to establish the demonstration projects and then to rigorously evaluate them to determine which measures and strategies most successfully reintegrate prisoners into the community as well as which measures and strategies can be promoted nationally to address the growing national problem of released prisoners.

There are currently 17 unfunded state pilot projects, including one in Delaware, which are being supported with technical assistance by the Department of Justice. My legislation will fund these pilot projects and will encourage states, territories, and Indian tribes to partner with units of local government and other non-profit organizations to establish adult offender reentry demonstration projects. The grants may be expended for implementing graduated sanctions and incentives, monitoring released prisoners, and providing, as appropriate, drug and alcohol abuse testing and treatment, mental and medical health services, victim impact educational classes, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, and other social services. My legislation also encourages state agencies, municipalities, public agencies, nonprofit organizations and tribes to make agreements with courts to establish "reentry courts" to monitor returning offenders, establish graduated sanctions and incentives, test and treat returning offenders for drug and alcohol abuse, and provide reentering offenders with mental and medical health services, victim impact educational classes, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, and other social services.

This legislation also re-authorizes the drug court program created by Congress in the 1994 Crime Law as a cost-effective, innovative way to deal with non-violent offenders in need of drug treatment. This is the same language as the Drug Court Reauthorization and Improvement Act that I introduced with Senator SPECTER last year.

Rather than just churning people through the revolving door of the criminal justice system, drug courts help these folks to get their acts together so they won't be back. When they graduate from drug court programs they are clean and sober and more prepared to participate in society. In order to graduate, they are required to finish high school or obtain a GED, hold down a job, and keep up with financial obligations including drug court fees and child support payments. They are also required to have a sponsor who will keep them on track.

This program works. And that is not just my opinion. Columbia University's National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) found that these courts are effective at taking offenders with little previous treatment history and keeping them in treatment; that they provide closer supervision than other community programs to which the offenders could be assigned; that they reduce crime; and that they are cost-effective.

According to the Department of Justice, drug courts save at least \$5,000 per offender each year in prison costs alone. That says nothing of the cost savings associated with future crime prevention. Just as important, scarce prison beds are freed up for violent criminals.

I have saved what may be the most important statistic for last. Two-thirds of drug court participants are parents of young children. After getting sober through the coerced treatment mandated by the court, many of these individuals are able to be real parents again. More than 500 drug-free babies have been born to female drug court participants, a sizable victory for society and the budget alike.

This bill reauthorizes programs to provide for drug treatment in state and federal prisons. According to CASA, 80 percent of the men and women behind bars in the United States today are there because of alcohol or drugs. They were either drunk or high when they committed their crime, broke an alcohol or drug law, stole to support their habit, or have a history of drug or alcohol abuse. The need for drug and alcohol treatment in our nations prisons and jails is clear.

Providing treatment to criminal offenders is not "soft." It is a smart crime prevention policy. If we do not treat addicted offenders before they are released, they will be turned back onto our streets with the same addiction problem that got them in trouble in the first place and they will reoffend. Inmates who are addicted to drugs and alcohol are more likely to be incarcerated repeatedly than those without a substance abuse problem. This is not my opinion, it is fact. According to CASA, 81 percent of inmates with five or more prior convictions have been habitual drug users compared to 41 percent of first-time offenders. Reauthorizing prison-based treatment programs is a good investment and is an important crime prevention initiative.

This legislation is a first step. Someday, we will look back and wonder why we didn't think of this sooner. For now, we need to implement these pilot projects, help people make it in their communities and make our streets safer. I am certain that we will revel in the results.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2808

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 "Offender Reentry and Community Safety Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There are now nearly 1,900,000 individuals in our country's prisons and jails, including over 140,000 individuals under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

(2) Enforcement of offender violations of conditions of releases has sharply increased the number of offenders who return to prison—while revocations comprised 17 percent of State prison admissions in 1980, they rose to 36 percent in 1998.

(3) Although prisoners generally are serving longer sentences than they did a decade ago, most eventually reenter communities; for example, in 1999, approximately 538,000 State prisoners and over 50,000 Federal prisoners a record number were returned to American communities. Approximately 100,000 State offenders return to communities and received no supervision whatsoever.

(4) Historically, two-thirds of returning State prisoners have been rearrested for new crimes within three years, so these individuals pose a significant public safety risk and a continuing financial burden to society.

(5) A key element to effective post-incarceration supervision is an immediate, predetermined, and appropriate response to violations of the conditions of supervision.

(6) An estimated 187,000 State and Federal prison inmates have been diagnosed with mental health problems; about 70 percent of State prisoners and 57 percent of Federal prisoners have a history of drug use or abuse; and nearly 75 percent of released offenders with heroin or cocaine problems return to using drugs within three months if untreated; however, few States link prison mental health treatment programs with those in the return community.

(7) Between 1987 and 1997, the volume of juvenile adjudicated cases resulting in court-ordered residential placements rose 56 percent. In 1997 alone, there were a total of 163,200 juvenile court-ordered residential placements. The steady increase of youth exiting residential placement has strained the juvenile justice aftercare system, however, without adequate supervision and services, youth are likely to relapse, recidivate, and return to confinement at the public's expense.

(8) Emerging technologies and multidisciplinary community-based strategies present new opportunities to alleviate the public safety risk posed by released prisoners while helping offenders to reenter their communities successfully.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) establish demonstration projects in several Federal judicial districts, the District of

Columbia, and in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, using new strategies and emerging technologies that alleviate the public safety risk posed by released prisoners by promoting their successful reintegration into the community;

(2) establish court-based programs to monitor the return of offenders into communities, using court sanctions to promote positive behavior;

(3) establish offender reentry demonstration projects in the states using government and community partnerships to coordinate cost efficient strategies that ensure public safety and enhance the successful reentry into communities of offenders who have completed their prison sentences;

(4) establish intensive aftercare demonstration projects that address public safety and ensure the special reentry needs of juvenile offenders by coordinating the resources of juvenile correctional agencies, juvenile courts, juvenile parole agencies, law enforcement agencies, social service providers, and local Workforce Investment Boards; and

(5) rigorously evaluate these reentry programs to determine their effectiveness in reducing recidivism and promoting successful offender reintegration.

TITLE I—FEDERAL REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 101. FEDERAL REENTRY CENTER DEMONSTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall establish the Federal Reentry Center Demonstration project. The project shall involve appropriate prisoners from the Federal prison population and shall utilize community corrections facilities, home confinement, and a coordinated response by Federal agencies to assist participating prisoners, under close monitoring and more seamless supervision, in preparing for and adjusting to reentry into the community.

(b) **PROJECT ELEMENTS.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a Reentry Review Team for each prisoner, consisting of representatives from the Bureau of Prisons, the United States Probation System, and the relevant community corrections facility, who shall initially meet with the prisoner to develop a reentry plan tailored to the needs of the prisoner and incorporating victim impact information, and will thereafter meet regularly to monitor the prisoner's progress toward reentry and coordinate access to appropriate reentry measures and resources;

(2) regular drug testing, as appropriate;

(3) a system of graduated levels of supervision within the community corrections facility to promote community safety, provide incentives for prisoners to complete the reentry plan, including victim restitution, and provide a reasonable method for imposing immediate sanctions for a prisoner's minor or technical violation of the conditions of participation in the project;

(4) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed;

(5) to the extent practicable, the recruitment and utilization of local citizen volunteers, including volunteers from the faith-based and business communities, to serve as

advisers and mentors to prisoners being released into the community;

(6) a description of the methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program; and

(7) notification to victims on the status and nature of offenders' reentry plan.

(c) **PROBATION OFFICERS.**—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall assign one or more probation officers from each participating judicial district to the Reentry Demonstration project. Such officers shall be assigned to and stationed at the community corrections facility and shall serve on the Reentry Review Teams.

(d) **PROJECT DURATION.**—The Reentry Center Demonstration project shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Attorney General may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participant prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(e) **SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Reentry Center Demonstration project.

(f) **COORDINATION OF PROJECTS.**—The Attorney General, may, if appropriate, include in the Reentry Center Demonstration project offenders who participated in the Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration project established by section 105 of this Act.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL HIGH-RISK OFFENDER REENTRY DEMONSTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall establish the Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration project. The project shall involve Federal offenders under supervised release who have previously violated the terms of their release following a term of imprisonment and shall utilize, as appropriate and indicated, community corrections facilities, home confinement, appropriate monitoring technologies, and treatment and programming to promote more effective reentry into the community.

(b) **PROJECT ELEMENTS.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by Federal prisoners who have previously violated the terms of their release following a term of imprisonment;

(2) use of community corrections facilities and home confinement that, together with the technology referenced in paragraph (5), will be part of a system of graduated levels of supervision;

(3) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as appropriate;

(4) involvement of a victim advocate and the family of the prisoner, if it is safe for the victim(s), especially in domestic violence cases, to be involved;

(5) the use of monitoring technologies, as appropriate and indicated, to monitor and supervise participating offenders in the community;

(6) a description of the methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program; and

(7) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) **MANDATORY CONDITION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE.**—In each of the judicial districts in

which the demonstration project is in effect, appropriate offenders who are found to have violated a previously imposed term of supervised release and who will be subject to some additional term of supervised release, shall be designated to participate in the demonstration project. With respect to these offenders, the court shall impose additional mandatory conditions of supervised release that each offender shall, as directed by the probation officer, reside at a community corrections facility or participate in a program of home confinement, or both, and submit to appropriate monitoring, and otherwise participate in the project.

(d) **PROJECT DURATION.**—The Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration shall begin not later than six months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may extend the project for a period of up to six months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(e) **SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.**—The Judicial Conference of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration project.

SEC. 103. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTENSIVE SUPERVISION, TRACKING, AND REENTRY TRAINING (DC ISTART) DEMONSTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Trustee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712) shall establish the District of Columbia Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration (DC iSTART) project. The project shall involve high risk District of Columbia parolees who would otherwise be released into the community without a period of confinement in a community corrections facility and shall utilize intensive supervision, monitoring, and programming to promote such parolees' successful reentry into the community.

(b) **PROJECT ELEMENTS.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by appropriate high risk parolees;

(2) use of community corrections facilities and home confinement;

(3) a Reentry Review Team that includes a victim witness professional for each parolee which shall meet with the parolee—by video conference or other means as appropriate—before the parolee's release from the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to develop a reentry plan that incorporates victim impact information and is tailored to the needs of the parolee and which will thereafter meet regularly to monitor the parolee's progress toward reentry and coordinate access to appropriate reentry measures and resources;

(4) regular drug testing, as appropriate;

(5) a system of graduated levels of supervision within the community corrections facility to promote community safety, encourage victim restitution, provide incentives for prisoners to complete the reentry plan, and provide a reasonable method for immediately sanctioning a prisoner's minor or technical violation of the conditions of participation in the project;

(6) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer

intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed and indicated;

(7) the use of monitoring technologies, as appropriate;

(8) to the extent practicable, the recruitment and utilization of local citizen volunteers, including volunteers from the faith-based communities, to serve as advisers and mentors to prisoners being released into the community; and

(9) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) **MANDATORY CONDITION OF PAROLE.**—For those offenders eligible to participate in the demonstration project, the United States Parole Commission shall impose additional mandatory conditions of parole such that the offender when on parole shall, as directed by the community supervision officer, reside at a community corrections facility or participate in a program of home confinement, or both, submit to electronic and other remote monitoring, and otherwise participate in the project.

(d) **PROGRAM DURATION.**—The District of Columbia Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Trustee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL INTENSIVE SUPERVISION, TRACKING, AND REENTRY TRAINING (FED iSTART) DEMONSTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—From funds made available to carry out this section, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish the Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration (FED iSTART) project. The project shall involve appropriate high risk Federal offenders who are being released into the community without a period of confinement in a community corrections facility.

(b) **PROJECT ELEMENTS.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by appropriate high risk Federal offenders;

(2) significantly smaller caseloads for probation officers participating in the demonstration project;

(3) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed; and

(4) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) **PROGRAM DURATION.**—The Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may extend the project for a period of up to six months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(d) **SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.**—The Judicial Conference of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration project.

SEC. 105. FEDERAL ENHANCED IN-PRISON VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—From funds made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall establish the Federal Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration project in selected institutions. The project shall provide in-prison assessments of prisoners' vocational needs and aptitudes, enhanced work skills development, enhanced release readiness programming, and other components as appropriate to prepare Federal prisoners for release and reentry into the community.

(b) **PROGRAM DURATION.**—The Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration shall begin not later than six months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Attorney General may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

SEC. 106. RESEARCH AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) **ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act. Not later than 1 year after the end of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report shall address post-release outcomes and recidivism for a period of 3 years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.**—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act. Not later than 180 days after the end of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report should address post-release outcomes and recidivism for a period of 3 years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(c) **DC iSTART.**—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712) shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration project authorized by section 6 of this Act. Not later than 1 year after the end of the demonstration project authorized by section 103 of this Act, the Executive Director of the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712) shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry project authorized by section 103 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report shall address post-release

outcomes and recidivism for a period of three years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In the event that the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712) is not in operation 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Institute of Justice shall prepare and submit the reports required by this section and may do so from funds made available to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712) to carry out this Act.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) the term "appropriate prisoner" means a person who is considered by prison authorities—

(A) to pose a medium to high risk of committing a criminal act upon reentering the community; and

(B) to lack the skills and family support network that facilitate successful reintegration into the community; and

(2) the term "appropriate high risk parolees" means parolees considered by prison authorities—

(A) to pose a medium to high risk of committing a criminal act upon reentering the community; and

(B) to lack the skills and family support network that facilitate successful reintegration into the community.

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

To carry out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, the following amounts:

(1) To the Federal Bureau of Prisons—

- (A) \$1,375,000 for fiscal year 2001;
- (B) \$1,110,000 for fiscal year 2002;
- (C) \$1,130,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (D) \$1,155,000 for fiscal year 2004; and
- (E) \$1,230,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(2) To the Federal Judiciary—

- (A) \$3,380,000 for fiscal year 2001;
- (B) \$3,540,000 for fiscal year 2002;
- (C) \$3,720,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (D) \$3,910,000 for fiscal year 2004; and
- (E) \$4,100,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(3) To the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712)—

- (A) \$4,860,000 for fiscal year 2001;
- (B) \$4,510,000 for fiscal year 2002;
- (C) \$4,620,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (D) \$4,740,000 for fiscal year 2004; and
- (E) \$4,860,000 for fiscal year 2005.

TITLE II—STATE REENTRY GRANT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) as amended, is amended—

(1) by redesignating part Z as part AA;

(2) by redesignating section 2601 as section 2701; and

(3) by inserting after part Y the following new part:

"PART Z OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

"SEC. 2601. ADULT OFFENDER STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY PARTNERSHIPS.

"(a) **GRANT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to \$1,000,000

to States, Territories, and Indian tribes, in partnership with units of local government and nonprofit organizations, for the purpose of establishing adult offender reentry demonstration projects. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

“(1) oversight/monitoring of released offenders;

“(2) providing returning offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental health assessment and services;

“(3) convening community impact panels, victim impact panels or victim impact educational classes;

“(4) providing and coordinating the delivery of other community services to offenders such as housing assistance, education, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other social services as appropriate; and

“(5) establishing and implementing graduated sanctions and incentives.

“(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

“(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

“(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

“(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program, including existing community corrections and parole; and

“(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluating the program.

“(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2601(a)—

“(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2601(b); and

“(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

“(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

“(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

“(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

“(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002; and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

“(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

“SEC. 2602. STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY COURTS.

“(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to \$500,000 to State and local courts or state agencies, municipalities, public agencies, nonprofit organizations, and tribes that have agreements with courts to take the lead in establishing a reentry court. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

“(1) monitoring offenders returning to the community;

“(2) providing returning offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental and medical health assessment and services;

“(3) convening community impact panels, victim impact panels, or victim impact educational classes;

“(4) providing and coordinating the delivery of other community services to offenders, such as housing assistance, education, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other social services as appropriate; and

“(5) establishing and implementing graduated sanctions and incentives.

“(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

“(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

“(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

“(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies, including existing community corrections and parole, and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program;

“(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluation of the program.

“(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2602(a)—

“(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2602(b); and

“(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

“(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

“(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

“(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

“(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

“(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

“SEC. 2603. JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY PROGRAMS.

“(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to \$250,000 to States, in partnership with local units of governments or nonprofit organizations, for the purpose of establishing juvenile offender reentry programs. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

“(1) providing returning juvenile offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental and medical health assessment and services;

“(2) convening victim impact panels, restorative justice panels, or victim impact educational classes for juvenile offenders;

“(3) oversight/monitoring of released juvenile offenders; and

“(4) providing for the planning of reentry services when the youth is initially incarcerated and coordinating the delivery of community-based services, such as education, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, employment training and placement, efforts to identify suitable living arrangements, family involvement and support, and other services.

“(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

“(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

“(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

“(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies, including existing community corrections and parole, in the implementation of the program;

“(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluating the program.

“(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2603(a)—

“(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2603(b); and

“(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

“(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

“(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

“(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

“(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as are necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

“(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

“SEC. 2604. STATE REENTRY PROGRAM RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EVALUATION.

“(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants to conduct research on a range of issues pertinent to reentry programs, the development and testing of new reentry components and approaches, selected evaluation of projects authorized in the preceding sections, and dissemination of information to the field.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as are necessary to carry out this section in fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.), as amended, is amended by striking the matter relating to part Z and inserting the following:

“PART Z OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ACT

“Sec. 2601. Adult Offender State and Local Reentry Partnerships.

“Sec. 2602. State and Local Reentry Courts.

“Sec. 2603. Juvenile Offender State and Local Reentry Programs.

“Sec. 2604. State Reentry Program Research and Evaluation.

“PART AA—TRANSITION—EFFECTIVE DATE—REPEALER

“Sec. 2701. Continuation of rules, authorities, and proceedings.”

TITLE III—SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN FEDERAL PRISONS REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN FEDERAL PRISONS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 3621(e)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

“(E) \$31,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

“(F) \$38,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.”

TITLE IV—RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT FOR STATE PRISONS REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZATION.

Paragraph (17) of section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(17)) is amended to read as follows:

“(17) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part S \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 through 2006.”

SEC. 402. USE OF RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT GRANTS TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES DURING AND AFTER INCARCERATION.

Section 1901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.—States that demonstrate that they have existing in-prison drug treatment programs that are in compliance with Federal requirements may use funds awarded under this part for treatment and sanctions both during incarceration and after release.”

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 2909. A bill to permit landowners to assert otherwise-available state law

defenses against property claims by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LANDOWNERS DEFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY CLAIMS BY INDIAN TRIBES LEGISLATION

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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. 2909

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Subchapter 1 of Chapter 6 of Title 25 is amended by inserting as §210 the following:

SECTION 1. DEFENSES TO INDIAN CLAIMS.

Except as provided in Section 2, in any action, or claim by or on behalf of an Indian tribe to enforce a real-property right, or otherwise asserting a claim of Indian title or right, the defendant may assert any affirmative defense that would be available under state law to a defendant opposing an analogous action or claim that does not involve an Indian tribe.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FOR GOVERNMENTAL DEFENDANTS.

Section 1 shall not apply to any action or claim against a governmental entity with respect to land that is located within sovereign Indian country.

SEC. 3. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall be construed and applied without regard to the interpretive judicial canon that remaining ambiguities should be resolved in favor of the Indians when standard tools of statutory construction leave no indication as to the meaning of an Indian treaty or statute.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to judicial interpretation of an Indian treaty with respect to a determination of whether land was reserved or set aside by the federal government for the use of an Indian tribe as Indian land.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

(1) The term “Indian tribe,” as used in this Act, means any tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that is recognized by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. §479a).

(2) The term “sovereign Indian country” means land—

(A) that is rightfully owned by, or is held in trust by the federal government for, an Indian tribe;

(B) that was reserved or set aside for the use of the Indian tribe as Indian land by the federal government, and is either—

(i) outside the exterior geographical limits of any State; or

(ii) within the exterior geographical limits of a State that subsequently either—

(A) acknowledged Indian title to the land involved when the land was made a part of the State, if that State be one of the original 13 States to form the United States; or

(B) provided, either in the Act providing for the State’s admission to the United States or in the State’s first constitution, that all lands held by Indians within the State shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the United States, in accordance with Article I, Section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States, if that State were admitted to the United States after 1790; and

(C) for which the Indian title has not been extinguished or the jurisdiction reservation revoked.

SEC. 5. ATTORNEYS FEES.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), in any action or proceeding that is subject to

this Act, the court shall allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney’s fee with respect to a claim presented by the opposing party that was frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation, or that the opposing party continued to litigate after it clearly became so.

(1) A claim shall be deemed legally frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation only if it rests upon a legal theory that was clearly unavailable under existing case law.

(2) A claim shall be deemed factually frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation only if its proponent knew or should have known of those facts that would require judgment for the opposing party as a matter of law.

(b) EXCEPTION.—No attorney’s fee shall be assessed under subsection (a) against an Indian tribe seeking to enforce a right to an interest in land if the court determines that the land involved is located within sovereign Indian country.

SEC. 6. TIMING OF APPLICATION.

This Act shall apply to any action, claim, or right described in Section 1 that is pending, filed, or continuing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, other than a final money-damages judgment to which no one has a right to raise a challenge by any available procedure.

f

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to change the determination of the 50,000-barrel refinery limitation on oil depletion deduction from a daily basis to an annual average daily basis.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the tax on the social security benefits.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the

Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation water, and for other purposes.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of printed wiring board and printed wiring assembly equipment.

S. 1086

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account to the extent that the distribution is contributed for charitable purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide States with the option to allow legal immigrant pregnant women and children to be eligible for medical assistance under the medical program, and for other purposes.

S. 2078

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his outstanding athletic accomplishments and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2434

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2434, a bill to provide that amounts allotted to a State under section 2401 of the Social Security Act for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999 shall remain available through fiscal year 2002.

S. 2586

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2586, a bill to reduce the backlog in the processing of immigration benefit applications and to make improvements to infrastructure necessary for the effective provision of immigration services, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects, and to increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating chances for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and implementation of those Acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2686

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2686, a bill to amend chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, to modify rates relating to reduced rate mail matter, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to provide for the preservation of assisted housing for low income elderly persons, disabled persons, and other families.

S. 2739

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2739, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of a semipostal stamp in order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for the establishment of the World War II Memorial.

S. 2764

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, a bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for the programs carried out under such Acts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, supra.

S. 2787

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2787, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2806

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2806, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to terminate mortgage origination approval for poorly performing mortgagees.

S. 2828

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that the Secretary of Health and Human Services wage adjust the actual, rather than the estimated, proportion of a hospital's costs that are attributable to wages and wage-related costs.

S. 2841

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2841, a bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides

for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2843, a bill for the relief of Antonio Costa.

S. 2894

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2894, a bill to provide tax and regulatory relief for farmers and to improve the competitiveness of American agricultural commodities and products in global markets.

S. 2903

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the child tax credit.

S. CON. RES. 130

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 130, concurrent resolution establishing a special task force to recommend an appropriate recognition for the slave laborers who worked on the construction of the United States Capitol.

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 130, supra.

S.J. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 48, a joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

S.J. RES. 50

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 50, a joint resolution to disapprove a final rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency concerning water pollution.

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 294, a resolution designating the month of October 2000 as "Children's Internet Safety Month."

S. RES. 301

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator

from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 301, a resolution designating August 16, 2000, as "National Airborne Day."

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the presentation of such educational programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3987

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3987 proposed to H.R. 4461, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

f

SENATE RESOLUTION 341—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN HONOR OF PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 341

Resolved, That the eulogies and other related materials concerning the Honorable Paul Coverdell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, be printed as a Senate Document.

f

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 26, 2000, in SH-216 at 8:30 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review the Federal sugar program.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 27, 2000, in SH-216 at 9 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review proposals to establish an international school lunch program.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, August 10, 2000, at 10:30 a.m. in the Alaska Native Brotherhood Hall; 320 Willoughby Ave, Juneau, Alaska 99801.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony to assist in establishing the value of the Brady Glacier mineral deposit within Glacier Bay National Park; and to examine implications of National Park Service restrictions on commercial fishing in Glacier Bay.

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 (202) 224-6170

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the hearing to conduct oversight on the status of the Biological Opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the operations of the Federal hydropower system of the Columbia River regarding the National Marine Fisheries Service's draft Biological Opinion and its potential impact on the Columbia River operations, which had been previously scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC has been indefinitely postponed.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, staff assistant, or Colleen Deegan, counsel, at (202) 224-8115.

f

THE TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I came to the floor to tell my colleagues my disappointment that we are not able to move forward with the Treasury and general government bill. It is certainly not a perfect bill, but it is a darn good bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I can say that we worked very hard on that. I remind my friends that we only have about 28 working days left—not much to complete the whole appropriations process, which we are required to do by law. That gets us in trouble.

Two years ago, we didn't have the opportunity to complete the Treasury bill, and it ended up in what is commonly referred to as the omnibus bill. People in the Senate understand what

that is, but to the millions of Americans who watch these proceedings, the omnibus bill is, in one word, a mess. It is that bill where we stick everything in at the end that we didn't have time to finish. We end up with a bill a foot thick and weighs 30 pounds, with 3,000 to 5,000 pages. Nobody in this body can read it all because we don't have the time before we have to vote on it. That is how we get in trouble. We vote to pass it through as a last-minute emergency. When we go home, people say: Why did you vote to give money to that frivolous thing on page 2,403? And we don't even know why we voted for it, which is why it is so important to get the bills through one by one.

Let me mention a little bit about the Treasury and general government bill as it is going to come to the floor, if we can get an agreement. I don't think there is anybody in this body who doesn't know that we have a sieve, not a border, between the U.S. and Canada and the U.S. and Mexico. Our customs people are severely understaffed and underfunded. If you want to stop drugs at the border, the money to do that is in this bill. We need to do that. The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas we started about 8 years ago expanded to about 44 States and many cities. That is the agency that coordinates reduction of drug use and trafficking among our local law enforcement, State law enforcement, and Federal law enforcement.

If you want to reduce drug trafficking, the money is in this bill. We also have upkeep and maintenance for Federal buildings. A number of them nationwide are in disrepair, as everybody knows. We have to put money into making sure the buildings are sound, safe, and fireproof. We are not doing that very well. The money to do that is in this bill, too. If you want to reduce drug violence, the money to do that is in this bill. We know this is a very important year for the Secret Service. They are being asked to do more in an election year, with limited resources. The money to do that is also in this bill.

In fact, as all of us know, there are many, many requests by individual Senators in all of these bills. I was going through the list on our bill. We have 13 pages of requests by individual Senators for money in this bill. It is rather surprising to me that some of the Senators who are opposing bringing this bill to the floor are the ones who asked for money to be put in the bill in the first place. It is similar to when we consider the so-called pay raise and people demagog it, the thing passes, and they quietly pocket the money and leave. We have the same situation with this bill. A lot of people have very important programs in this bill. Again, there are 13 pages of things Senators want in this bill.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a program which I believe deserves the support of the Senate—the Gang Resist-

ance Education and Training or GREAT Program. GREAT is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in partnership with State and local law enforcement.

Unfortunately, gang activity has increased in our country in recent years. ATF has developed a program to give our children the tools they need to be able to resist the temptation to belong to a gang.

The GREAT program is eight years old, and has grown from a pilot program in Arizona to classrooms all over the United States—and in Puerto Rico, Canada, and overseas military bases. ATF estimates that about 2 million students have received GREAT training.

GREAT was designed to provide gang prevention and antiviolen- ce instruction to children in a classroom setting. ATF trains local law enforcement officers to teach these classes, and provides grants to their offices to help pay for their time.

This program is having a positive effect on student activities and behaviors, and is deterring them from involvement in gangs. A side benefit is that the graduates seem to be doing a better job of communicating with their parents and teachers, and getting better grades.

For the third year in a row, the Administration is requesting only 10 million dollars for grants for the GREAT program. For the last two years, Congress felt that wasn't enough to fund the many requests for help from State and local law enforcement and provided 13 million dollars for GREAT grants. 10 million dollars still isn't enough. I urge my colleagues to support the effort of the Committee to again provide 13 million dollars for grants to State and local law enforcement for this worthwhile and effective program.

I hope my colleagues will reach some consensus and allow us to move forward. It is an extremely important bill, and I certainly urge our leadership to try to get this to the floor.

With that, I yield the floor.

⚭

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SLAIN CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:40 having arrived, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in honor of Capitol Police Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were killed in the line of duty in the Capitol two years ago today.

[Moment of silence]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senate for honoring the two dedicated police officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I have one further comment. Both of these officers put their lives on the line, as all of our Capitol Police offi-

cers do and, indeed, officers in law enforcement across the country. J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson were personal friends to many of us. I used to be a policeman years ago, as some of my colleagues know. I collect shoulder patches, which are pretty easy to get. Most police organizations will send them to you if you like to collect them. John had a collection and we used to trade shoulder patches. If he had two of a patch I didn't have, or if I had two of one he didn't have, we would trade back and forth.

When you talk about the Capitol Police, they are not just uniforms; these are real people with real lives and real families.

Both of them left a wife and children, as the Presiding Officer knows. It has been 2 years, but they are still fresh in my mind—and that is a tragedy.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I understand we are in morning business; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there a limitation on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

⚭

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, we have recently witnessed another example of the indifference of Members of Congress to the needs of hard-working, low-wage American workers. While our minimum wage bill still languishes, Members of Congress are raising their own pay yet again. Congress has cut the taxes of the wealthiest Americans, but the Republican leadership still insists on doing nothing for those at the bottom of the economic ladder. It is an outrage that Congress would raise its own pay but not the minimum wage.

Over the past decade, in spite of the recent prosperity, the average inflation-adjusted income of the poorest fifth of Americans rose by only 1 percent, while the average inflation adjusted-income of the richest 5 percent rose by 27 percent.

The Republican Congress just passed an estate tax repeal that provides 100 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans and 91 percent

of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent. The Republican marriage tax penalty bill passed last week is also heavily tilted to benefit only the wealthy. Members of this Republican Congress are quick to find time to increase their own salaries and cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, but they cannot find the time to pass an increase in the minimum wage to benefit those hard-working, low-wage Americans.

These low-income working families deserve a raise. Their pay has been frozen for 3 years, and our Democratic proposal will increase the minimum wage by 50 cents this year and another 50 cents next year. The Republican leadership is doing all it can to prevent this fair increase, but this issue will not go away, and we will continue to offer our minimum wage amendment to bills on the floor again and again at every opportunity until we pass it and send it to the President for his signature.

In recent months, a bipartisan House voted by a solid majority to increase the minimum wage by \$1 over 2 years, and many of our Senate colleagues have also supported an increase: 50 cents now and 50 cents a year from now.

The American people agree that the minimum wage should be increased. The time is now to give America's hard-working families the raise they so desperately need and deserve. It is unconscionable for the Republican leadership to vote themselves a pay raise yet again, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and then deny workers at the bottom of the economic ladder a fair pay increase. Our Democratic proposal offers workers the minimum wage raise they need and deserve: No tricks, no poison pills, no tax breaks for the wealthy, and we have bipartisan support for this increase.

The issue is a priority. The Senate should act on a fair minimum wage bill, and we should act as soon as possible. It is wrong for the Senate to continue to block this long overdue act of simple justice for working families.

This chart shows the real value of the minimum wage. It is from 1968 up to the year 2001. If we were to take the real value and use constant dollars, the minimum wage would be \$7.66, if we were to have the same purchasing power as we had in 1968.

We have seen the minimum wage decline over these years, particularly in recent years. Without an increase, it will be valued at \$4.90. If we were to have the increase of 50 cents and 50 cents, the purchasing power would only be \$5.85, which is still below what it was for over 12 years. That is all we are asking: Let's bring it up by 50 cents this year and 50 cents next year. Even though that would be \$6.15, it represents \$5.85 of purchasing power in constant dollars.

What we are seeing is that it is almost \$2 lower than what the minimum wage was in 1968. This is against the situation, if one looks over this par-

ticular chart, that working families are living in poverty. If one looks at what has happened, again in constant dollars, of where the minimum wage has been going in recent years in adjusted inflation dollars, then one sees where the poverty line has been going in recent years.

We are finding out now that since 1988, minimum wage workers are working, in many instances, longer, harder, more jobs, and are sinking deeper and deeper into poverty.

This is against the background of the last 10 days where we gave over \$1.5 trillion—a huge amount in estate taxes, the majority of which goes to the highest income individuals, and \$300 billion to the wealthiest individuals in marriage tax penalty relief. Then last week, the House of Representatives voted themselves a \$3,800 pay increase. That represents what a minimum wage worker would make in 2 years. They voted themselves that in 1 year.

This is where we have seen America's poorest families are getting poorer. The bottom fifth of the families are right at the edge where they have been from 1979 to 1999, 20 years, working harder, working longer, and their benefit from the economic expansion is virtually nonexistent. The middle fifth has gone up 5 percent, and the top fifth of families has gone up 30 percent.

These are the men and women who are the backbone of the whole economic expansion. Yet they are the ones who are experiencing almost crumbs in advancing their quality of life and their lifestyle.

Last week, we saw all this happening in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives increased their pay by \$3,800 a year. As I mentioned, if our minimum wage amendment is passed, it works out to be less than \$2000.

Even if we give the increase in the minimum wage, minimum wage workers in 2 years will make half of what the pay increase will be for Members of Congress.

That is not bad enough, but Congressman DELAY was asked by a columnist, Mark Shields:

Can you and Dick Armev and others who voted for that pay raise or cost-of-living increase defend voting against an increase in the minimum wage?

Mr. DELAY said:

Well, Mark, we don't work for minimum wage. . . .

How dismissive can one be? Evidently, Members of Congress, their children, and their lives are more important than workers who are working hard as children's aides in the Head Start Program, or working in nursing homes taking care of seniors.

These are men and women who have a great sense of dignity and pride in their work, working, in many instances, two or three jobs.

Mr. DELAY says:

[W]e don't work for minimum wage. Members of Congress represent 250 million people. . . ."

How dismissive: We are more important.

I defy that. These are men and women who are working, and working hard, and who have a sense of dignity and a sense of pride in the work they do. They are teachers' aides. They are children's aides, working in child care programs. They work in nursing homes. They work in the buildings across this country in order to make the buildings clean for American industry.

This is basically a women's issue because the great majority of minimum wage workers are women. It is a children's issue because millions of the women who are working at the minimum wage have children, and their lives are all being affected by this. It is a civil rights issue because great numbers of the minimum wage workers are men and women of color. And most profoundly, it is a fairness issue, where we hear so many speeches here in the Senate saying: We honor work. We want Americans who want to work.

Here are men and women, who are working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, trying to make ends meet, trying to bring up children, trying to pay for rent because they don't have the income in order to purchase a house, trying to put food on the table, and trying to spend some time with their families.

It is an interesting fact, American workers now spend 22 hours less per week with their children. Why? Because they have to work at more jobs, and to work longer at their jobs. So it is a family issue.

Of all the times we listen to statements about family values and fairness in our society, we are crying crocodile tears, evidently, because we heard last week that people who have estates over \$100 million should not be taxed twice. Even if you scored \$100 million, we are still going to provide more tax breaks. We refuse to even permit a vote on an increase in the minimum wage here in the Senate, while we are going out and increasing our own salary, and doing it in a contemptuous way to these men and women. Shame on this body.

We are going to bring this up. We have heard a lot about: This is not relevant. Is it going to be fair to bring this up? We are going to be told that we do not set the agenda in the Senate.

I can just tell you, there are men and women who have struggled, and struggled mightily, and are struggling today. They deserve the increase. These arguments about inflation are out the window. Every economic indicator has demonstrated that the last two increases have had no impact in any way in terms of inflation. The idea that we are going to have lost jobs is absolutely preposterous. Every economic study has indicated the same. We have responded to those arguments.

This is a fairness issue. It is a decency issue. It is about our fellow citizens. It is about work. It is about families. It is about children. It is about

women. It is about fairness in civil rights. We are going to continue to pursue this item. We are going to pursue it this week and the 4 weeks when we return in September. We are going to continue to pursue it until we have justice for these workers.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

f

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN OUR NATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, on several occasions I have risen before this body to address the crisis associated with energy in our Nation today. We have all experienced the high price of gasoline. We have seen a slight reduction of late, but I want to assure my colleagues that that situation is temporary, at best.

The rationale for that is understandable if one considers the fact that we are currently consuming just about an amount equal to the productive capacity of our industry to supply gasoline. There are many good reasons for this. One is that we haven't built a new refinery in this country for almost 10 years now. We have closed about 37 refineries in the United States in the last decade and, as a consequence of our increased dependence on imported oil, we have lost a good deal of our leverage because currently about 56 percent of the oil we consume in this country is imported. Most of that comes from the Mideast. As a consequence, we have become more dependent on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The fastest-growing supply of oil now coming into the United States is from Iraq. That is rather curious. A lot of people forget that in 1991 we fought a war over there. We lost 147 lives. We had nearly 427 wounded. We had a number taken prisoner. Yet Saddam Hussein is the one we are looking toward now.

I think the American public should be aware that it is pretty difficult to define just what the energy policy of the Clinton-Gore administration has been. We have seen their policy with regard to the nuclear industry, which provides about 20 percent of the power generated in this country, and they have said no to storing high-level nuclear waste. We are one vote short of a veto override on that matter. We have not been able to generate that last vote. So it is clear that the administration has said no to the nuclear industry, as far as expanding its contribution to energy in this country.

As we look to hydroelectric, we have seen a policy which suggests that perhaps some of the dams out West should

be taken down, with no consideration for the realization that there is a tradeoff associated with that. If you take those dams down, you are taking the tonnage that is moved by barge and putting it on the highways. The implication of that is significant. It is estimated that as many as 700,000 trucks per year would have to go on the highways to replace the current cargo capacity of barges that would be lost.

If we take away nuclear and go to hydro, oil is certainly something we are looking toward other nations to provide, as opposed to developing the resources here in the continental United States, in the overthrust belt of Colorado, Wyoming, and other areas, and where there is oil in my State of Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, Texas, and other States. It is my understanding that the administration has withdrawn about 64 percent of the public land in the overthrust belt, which is in the Rocky Mountain areas, excluding them from the development of energy resources. The potential for coal, of course, is significant. There are no new coal plants being built in this country. The cost of permitting is such that we find they are uneconomical. The emphasis seems to be on natural gas. But if we look to the last 6 months, we have seen natural gas prices go from about \$2.16 to over \$4 for delivery later this winter.

The crisis associated with our energy policy, or lack of an energy policy, is real in every field of energy resources. Emphasis is placed by the administration to some extent on renewables. While we all support renewables, it is fair to say that renewables only constitute about 40 percent of our energy consumption, even though we have spent about \$70 billion in subsidies in this area. While they have a potential, surely they are not at the forefront nor are they capable at this time of relieving our dependence on conventional energy sources.

As we look at our policies today, I think there is confusion in the minds of Americans as they reflect on the statements of their political leaders and the policies they pursue. It is very easy to be confused.

I would like to share some examples with my colleagues.

If we go back to our Vice President, AL GORE, in his book "Earth in the Balance," AL GORE, the environmentalist, wrote that "higher taxes on fossil fuel . . . is one of the logical first steps in changing our policies in a manner consistent with a more responsible approach to the environment."

All of us are obviously concerned over the health of our environment. We want to have a responsible approach associated with the environment. Nevertheless, the idea that raising the price of gasoline is good for the American economy and good for the American people is pretty hard to sell to the American public at this time when gasoline prices, depending on where we are in the country, range anywhere from \$1.75 to \$1.95 or higher.

I think it is fair to say that perhaps the Vice President overlooks the reality that Americans live long distances from their jobs because they prefer to do so. We are a mobile society. As we are confronted with higher energy prices, obviously it not only affects our pocketbooks, but it affects inflation rates.

At about the same time that the Clinton/Gore administration was talking about conservation, the Vice President was casting a tie-breaking vote in the Senate to raise gasoline taxes—we all remember that—and the Environmental Protection Agency determined that more expensive "reformulated gasoline" needed to be sold in many areas of the country.

I am not arguing the merits of that—other than to report that before my committee on Energy and Natural Resources, one of the principals of the Environmental Protection Agency advised us that they are now required under the Clean Air Act to have nine different types of reformulated gasoline in this country.

That meant our refiners had to batch the gasoline additives, they had to transport it separately, they had to store it separately. Obviously, all of that has a significant cost for the taxpayer. According to a memorandum from the Department of Energy and the Congressional Research Service, EPA's gasoline requirements balkanized markets, strained supplies, and raised prices.

Since the policies of the administration were so effective in raising the prices, one might expect the Vice President to be pleased. But confronted with angry consumers on the campaign trail, the Vice President suggests that refiners and oil companies are to blame. A lot of finger-pointing is going on around here.

Let me refer to an article that appeared in the Washington Times of July 19. This is an editorial covering a memorandum that came from the Clinton Energy Department suggesting that the Department was indeed aware that the administration's own regulations pertaining to so-called "reformulated" gasoline, rather than the oil industry gouging, were primarily responsible for the increased price of motor fuels.

The reformulated gas—RFG—rule, which stipulated that refiners mix different types of gasoline for different localities, has made it impossible, or at least very difficult, to take advantage of the economies of scale in production and distribution that heretofore have helped keep U.S. energy prices stable and low.

Their memo, which was sent June 5—a full week before the administration began to blame the oil industry for raising fuel prices—states that the RFG reformulated gasoline rule was a major reason for the price spike, delaying claims made by the administration that they couldn't see any reason other than blind greed for the change in per-gallon gasoline prices.

I am not here to defend the industry, but I think it is fair to say that for the administration and the media to simply overlook what the cost of reformulated gasoline, applied regionally in this country with nine specific types of reformulated gasoline, has done to the price of gasoline speaks for itself.

It is kind of interesting. This article said something to the effect that the media and Dan Rather stated during the July 14 broadcast that, "Republicans today sided with the oil companies against the Clinton/Gore administration on the question of who and what is to blame for higher gasoline prices."

When you invoke this type of mandate on the first of June, you are certainly going to get a reaction from the American public when the price of reformulated gasoline goes up dramatically, particularly in the Midwest. That is what is known around here—and we are no strangers to it—as "dancing the sidestep."

Another example of the Clinton/Gore administration's attitude towards energy goes back a little further, when we needed Russia's support—or at least its acquiescence—in NATO's war in Kosovo. There is strong evidence that the administration sought to persuade OPEC to cut production and drive crude oil prices up some 18 months ago. It seems this was done to help Russia, an oil exporter generally badly in need of hard currency, in exchange for its acquiescence—which we got—in NATO's war in Kosovo.

Despite the fact that his own administration colluded with OPEC to manipulate prices, our Vice President has called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate oil companies and refiners—for colluding to manipulate prices. I don't know how long that is going to take, but I suspect it is going to take some time for that investigation to be completed. In any event, I find that highly ironic.

Here is another example.

We have all heard that our Vice President says he wants to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil in the volatile Middle East. But his stated policy is to curtail Federal oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf. We heard him make that statement in Louisiana, that, if elected, he would terminate leases and buy back others.

He would also defer any opening of public land in the Rocky Mountain Overthrust Belt in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. He also urged the President to veto a 1995 bill allowing a small sliver of the Alaska Coastal Plain to be opened for oil and gas exploration.

That area, I might add, in my State of Alaska, could have enough oil to replace imports of Saudi Arabian oil for the next 30 years. It is estimated the area might contain as much as 16 billion barrels. Of further note, the area known as ANWR has 19 million acres, most of which is already set aside in wilderness. The remaining acreage, 1.5 million acres, is left for Congress to

make a determination on. The industry says that out of that 1.5 million acres, oil is in abundance. With the advancement of technology we have in building icy roads in the wilderness, the footprint will be less than 2,000 acres. Clearly, the Clinton-Gore administration will not give us an opportunity to make a determination whether domestically we can reduce our dependence on imported oil and develop this very important resource in my State of Alaska.

Over the past 8 years, domestic production in this country has plummeted 17 percent as demand for foreign oil has risen 14 percent. We now depend on foreign oil to supply 56 percent of our needs. The averages of the last few weeks are as much as 64 and 65 percent. However, during the disastrous 1973 Arab oil embargo, we were only 35-percent dependent. Some of my colleagues remember we had gasoline lines around the block. The public was mad. They were upset and blamed the Government. Their rhetoric and policy just doesn't match up. We are now in the year 2000 and we are on average in excess of 56 percent dependent on foreign imports.

Our Vice President also says we must increase our use of cleaner-burning natural gas to replace "dirty coal." But his policy is to put the most promising areas for the discovery and production of natural gas off limits to exploration. I refer to another quote he made October 22 at a campaign appearance in Rye, NH. Our Vice President said: I will do everything in my power to make sure there is no new drilling, even in areas of the OCS already leased by previous administrations.

This is yet another example of what folks find confusing. Our Vice President, in his book, "Earth in the Balance," wrote: Mining influent must return to the Earth as pure as they came.

But did you know that the Vice President, with his family, certainly don't follow this practice, pocketing \$20,000 a year in mining royalties from the zinc mine on his Carthage, TN, property. He has pocketed \$500,000 over the past 25 years. Considering this zinc mine has contaminated the banks of the Caney Fork River with heavy metal—that is in this general area. This is the Caney Fork River. This is the area that is concentrated with pollutants from the leaching field. This is the actual area where the mines are. This is the leaching field. This is the Gore complex above. They have had violations of clean water standards from time to time. It is clear that the mine does not meet standards set forth in the Vice President's book. I am sure however, that the royalty checks got cashed.

This is a picture that appeared in the June 30 Wall Street Journal cover article of this particular mine and the activities associated with it. I ask unanimous consent the article from the Wall Street Journal of June 30 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 30, 2000]

AL GORE, ENVIRONMENTALIST AND ZINC MINER
(By Micah Morrison)

"The lakes and rivers sustain us; they flow through the veins of the earth and into our own. But we must take care to let them flow back out as pure as they came, not poison and waste them without thought for the future."—Al Gore, "Earth in the Balance."

"He taught me how to plow a steep hillside with a team of mules. He taught me how to clear three acres of heavily-wooded forest with a double-bladed axe. . . . He taught me how to stop gullies before they got started. He taught me how to drive, how to shoot a rifle, how to fish, how to swim. We loved to swim together in the Caney Fork River off a big flat rock on the back side of his farm."—Al Gore on his father, Sen. Albert Gore Sr., from alгоре2000.com.

CARTHAGE, TENN.—On his most recent tax return, as he has the past 25 years. Vice President Al Gore lists a \$20,000 mining royalty for the extraction of zinc from beneath his farm here in the bucolic hills of the Cumberland River Valley. In total, Mr. Gore has earned \$500,000 from zinc royalties. His late father, the senator, introduced him not only to the double-bladed ax but also to Armand Hammer, chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corp., which sold the zinc-rich land to the Gore family in 1973.

It also seems that zinc from Mr. Gore's property ends up in the cool waters of the Caney Fork River, an oft-celebrated site in Gore lore. A major shaft and tailings pond of the Pasmenco Zinc Mine sit practically in the backyard of the vice president's Tennessee homestead. Zinc and other metals from the Gore land move from underground tunnels through elaborate extraction processes. Waste material ends up in the tailings pond, from which water flows into adjacent Caney Fork, languidly rolling on to the great Cumberland.

MESSY BUSINESS

Mining is intrinsically a messy business, and Pasmenco Zinc generally has a good environmental record. But not one that would pass muster with "Earth in the Balance," Mr. Gore's best-selling environmental book. As recently as May 16, the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation issued a "Notice of Violation." It informed Pasmenco that it had infringed the Tennessee Water Quality Control act due to high levels of zinc in the river.

Those zinc levels exceeded standards established by the state and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. A "sample analysis found that total zinc was 1.480 mg/L [milligrams per liter], which is greater than the monthly average of .65 mg/L and the daily maximum of 1.30 mg/L." Pasmenco "may be subject to enforcement action pursuant to The Tennessee Water Quality Control Act of 1977 for the aforementioned violation," the notice stated.

This was not the first time Mr. Gore's mining benefactor had run afoul of environmental regulations. In 1996, the mine twice failed biomonitoring tests designed to protect water quality in the Caney Fork for fish and wildlife. Mine discharge "failed two acute tests for toxicity to *Ceriodaphnia dubia*," a species of water flea, according to a mine permit analysis by Tennessee environmental authorities. "The discharge of industrial wastewater from Outfall #001 [the Caney Fork effluent] contains toxic metals (copper and zinc)," the analysis stated. "The combined effect of these pollutants may be detrimental to fish and aquatic life."

Tests for The Wall Street Journal by two independent Tennessee laboratories, showed trace amounts of zinc and other metals in the Caney Fork that were in compliance with federal standards. But soil tests revealed what one lab called problematic "large quantities" of heavy metals in the riverbank soil downstream of the Caney Fork effluent. In both sets of tests, samples of water and soil were provided to the labs by the Journal.

Soil samples drawn from the mine effluent and downstream "contained large quantities of Barium, Iron, and Zinc, as well as smaller amounts of arsenic, Chromium and Lead," Warner Laboratories found in September. "The soil from each of these sites seems to have some problems according to our findings. The levels of Barium, Iron and Zinc far exceed any report limit [a detection threshold within the testing system] and it should be noted that these results are extremely high compared to typical soil found in a populated neighborhood."

Tests conducted in June by the Environmental Science Corp. found similar traces of heavy metals in the water and soil. The report found the soil samples to contain relatively high levels of "Barium, Iron, Zinc, and several of the other metals, including Aluminum, Calcium and Magnesium." The ESC report also noted traces of cyanide in some water and soil samples.

Pasminco is not required to test soil along the banks of the Caney Fork. Both labs, while noting anomalies in the soil, believe the results do not warrant concern as environmental hazards. The water and soil clearly are not, however, "as pure as they came," as Mr. Gore demands in "Earth in the Balance."

A 1998 study by the Environmental Working Group, a Washington-based organization, criticized the zinc-mining operation for purchasing a toxic waste that included sulfuric acid and reselling it as fertilizer. The mine buys acid waste from steel plants, uses it as purification agent in zinc processing, and then sells the waste to fertilizer companies, according to a report in the Tennesseean, a Nashville newspaper. Most soil scientists say the procedure is safe.

Tennessee environmentalists disagree. Clearly, when you spread those types of chemicals around on a farm or on the land, you're going to get a lot of runoff," Brian McGuire, executive director of Tennessee Citizens Action told the Tennesseean. "So it's going to get into the water. We're poisoning ourselves."

A Pasminco official noted that the mine has had few violations and works to uphold a "very strict standard" of environmental quality. The Gore campaign did not respond to requests for comment. But some Tennessee residents say Mr. Gore becomes testy when questioned about the zinc mine. Tom Gniewek, a retired chemical engineer from Camden, Tenn., has studied zinc mine for years and tried to question Mr. Gore about it at town-hall meetings. "He gets real angry," Mr. Gniewek says. "Instead of answering the question, he attacked my motives and accused people like me of vandalizing the earth."

Mr. Gore's original purchase of the zinc-rich land is of some interest as well, shedding light on his long relationship with Mr. Hammer, the former Occidental Petroleum chief. A controversial influence peddler who trafficked in politicians of all stripes and parties. Mr. Hammer pleaded guilty in 1975 to providing hush money in the Watergate scandal.

Mr. Hammer cut a wide swath across Washington from the 1930s until his death in 1990 at 92. His controversial career was marked by decades of profitable business

dealings with the Soviet Union, which were closely watched by the FBI. He leapt into the big time by acquiring Libyan oil rights for Occidental Petroleum through what biographer Edward Jay Epstein has characterized as a combination of shrewd business dealings and bribery. After his 1975 conviction, Mr. Hammer spent the rest of his life campaigning for a pardon, which President Bush granted in 1989.

Mr. Hammer cultivated close relationships with many politicians, but he was closest to Mr. Gore's father, a U.S. senator from 1953 until 1971. Mr. Hammer's Occidental Minerals snapped up the zinc-bearing property in 1972. The senior Mr. Gore's farm is on the opposite bank of the Caney Fork. Mr. Hammer paid \$160,000, double the only other offer, according to the Washington Post, which first disclosed details of the arrangement during the 1992 presidential campaign.

According to deed documents in Carthage, a year later Mr. Hammer sold the land to the senior Mr. Gore for \$160,000, adding the extremely generous \$20,000 per year mineral royalty. Ten minutes after that sale, the former senator executed a deed selling the property, including the mineral rights, to his son, the future vice president, for \$140,000. Albert Gore Sr. told the Post he kept the first \$20,000 royalty for himself, evening up the father-son transaction.

The purpose of the sale appears to have been transferring the annual \$20,000 payment from Mr. Hammer to the young Mr. Gore. The Post reported that the "\$20,000 a year amounts to \$227 an acre, much more than the \$30 an acre Occidental Minerals, part of Hammer's oil company, paid the senior Gore and some neighbors a few years before the 1973 arrangement."

In 1992 then-Sen. Gore told the Post that although he had been working for "slave wages" as a newspaper reporter, he quickly came up with a \$40,000 down payment from two previous real-estate investments. In 1974, the zinc mine began annual payments of \$20,000 to Mr. Gore, an important source of income to the young politician for many years.

After the senior Mr. Gore lost his 1970 Senate re-election bid, Mr. Hammer named him chairman of Island Creek Coal, an Occidental subsidiary, and appointed him to the board of directors of Occidental Petroleum. The late Mr. Gore's estate is conservatively valued at \$1.5 million, including a block of Occidental stock worth between \$250,000 and \$500,000. The vice president is executor and trustee of his father's estate, with "sole discretion" to manage a trust on his mother's behalf.

As Albert Gore Jr. rose through the political ranks, Mr. Hammer continued to assist him. The Hammer family and corporations made donations up to the legal maximum in all of Mr. Gore's campaigns, according to Mr. Hammer's former personal assistant, Neil Lyndon, writing in London's Daily Telegraph. Mr. Gore regularly dined with Mr. Hammer and Occidental lobbyists in Washington, Mr. Lyndon wrote. "Separately and together, the Gores sometimes used Hammer's luxurious private Boeing 727 for journeys and jaunts." The former Hammer aide noted that the "profound and prolonged involvement between Hammer and Gore has never been revealed or investigated."

Mr. Hammer was famous for his dealings with the Soviet Union, and received a humanitarian award in Moscow in 1987 from International Physicians Against Nuclear War. Mr. Gore, who had been elected to the Senate in 1984, delivered a speech to the same convention, saying conventional arms should be cut along with nuclear weapons. As vice president, Mr. Gore became the Clinton administration point man on relations with Russia.

MORE HYPOCRISY

Mr. Gore would be well served to get the facts out about his relationship with Mr. Hammer, beginning with the zinc bounty. The issue is bigger than whether there is a pollution problem in Tennessee. When Mr. Gore's zinc riches are at stake, he appears unwilling to live by the standards he sets out for others in "Earth in the Balance."

His record of uncompromising environmental rhetoric seems another instance of the kind of hypocrisy that has dogged his campaign for months. He's been accused of being a slumlord for providing substandard housing to a tenant on a rental unit adjoining his farm. A well-remembered 1996 speech to the Democratic National Convention, invoking his sister's death by lung cancer and attacking the tobacco industry, also contributed to his reputation for slippery sanctimony when his close ties to Tennessee tobacco were revealed. And of course Mr. Gore has been sharply criticized for posturing on campaign finance reform while under investigation for possible fund-raising crimes in the 1996 campaign.

No mention of the zinc mine appears in "Earth in the Balance," on Mr. Gore's campaign Web site or in his speeches. At this point the story of the Tennessee farm, the zinc mine, the politician and the influence peddler is largely one of cant and hypocrisy. This is not a hanging crime in the political world, but the vice president, among others, might note that Bill Clinton's problems also began with a murky land deal and a shady financier.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Again, it is not my desire to criticize somebody because they own a mine or have a resource interest, but there is a certain criticism when one recognizes the reality that this mine is hardly a model for anyone, based on the number of violations that have been filed in Tennessee over an extended period of time on this particular mine.

We know the Vice President has been critical of some; namely George W. Bush, for his close ties to big oil. In fact, the Vice President's family has close historical ties to Occidental Petroleum and shares in that company which, in its public disclosure, is valued between \$500,000 to \$1 million. Occidental Petroleum plans to drill in the ancestral lands of over 5,000 U'wa Indians in the Colombia rain forest. They threatened suicide if Occidental goes forward with its plans.

I ask unanimous consent an article from the June 26 Washington Times that substantiates that allegation be printed in the RECORD.

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

OCCIDENTAL DEAL BENEFITS GORES—SALE OF FEDERAL OIL FIELD BOOSTS FAMILY FORTUNE (By Bill Sammon)

Vice President Al Gore's push to privatize a federal oil field added tens of thousands of dollars to the value of oil stock owned by the Gore family, which has been further enriched by skyrocketing gasoline prices.

Shares of Occidental Petroleum jumped 10 percent after the company purchased the Elk Hills oil field in California from the federal government in 1998. Mr. Gore, whose family owns at least \$500,000 in Occidental stock, recommended the sale as part of his "reinvesting government" reform package.

The sale, which constituted the largest privatization of federal land in U.S. history,

transformed Occidental from a lackluster financial performer into a dynamic profit-spewing, oil giant. Having instantly tripled its U.S. oil reserves, the company began pumping out vast sums of crude at low cost.

As the months went by, Occidental was able to sell the oil, which ends up at gasoline retail outlets like Union 76, for more profit. Rising oil prices have significantly improved Occidental's bottom line, said analyst Christopher Stavros of Paine Webber.

This year, the company posted first quarter revenues of \$2.5 billion, or 87 percent higher than a year earlier. That's a bigger increase than at nine of 10 other oil companies listed in a survey that Mr. Gore cited last week as evidence of price gouging.

The rise in Occidental oil prices, coupled with the acquisition of the Elk Hills field, has paid handsome dividends for the Gore family.

The vice president recently updated his financial disclosure form to put the value of this family's Occidental stock at between \$500,000 and \$1 million. Prior to the Elk Hills sale and gasoline price spike, Mr. Gore had listed the value of the stock at between \$250,000 and \$500,000.

Gore aides insist the vice president's push to sell Elk Hills does not constitute a conflict of interest. They point out the family's Occidental shares were originally owned by Mr. Gore's father, who died in 1998, leaving the stock in an estate for which the vice president serves as executor.

Although Mr. Gore continues to list the stock on his financial disclosure forms, aides said the shares are in a trust for the vice president's mother, Pauline.

"He doesn't own stock because he's trying to avoid conflicts of interest," said Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway. "He's the executor of the estate, but he's not the trustee of the trust. It's a separate thing."

Still, Mr. Gore's recommendation to privatize Elk Hills ended up enriching his mother, who is expected to eventually bequeath the stock to the vice president, her sole heir.

Last week, Mr. Gore began a concerted effort to blame skyrocketing gasoline prices not only on "big oil" but also on Texas Gov. George W. Bush. Gore aides have emphasized that Mr. Bush once ran several oil-exploration firms and has accepted more campaign contributions from oil companies than the vice president.

The Texas governor has dismissed the attacks as an attempt to divert attention away from Mr. Gore's energy and environmental policies, which have driven up gasoline prices. Political analysts say the spiraling gas prices could imperil Mr. Gore's presidential bid because they are highest in the Midwest, which he must carry in order to win the White House.

The political and financial fortunes of the Gore family were established largely with oil money from Occidental's founder, Armand Hammer. Part capitalist and part communist, Mr. Hammer became the elder Gore's patron more than half a century ago, showering him with riches and nurturing his political career through the House and Senate.

The elder Gore enthusiastically returned the favors. In the early 1960s, Sen. Gore took to the Senate floor to defend Mr. Hammer against FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who wanted to investigate Mr. Hammer's Soviet ties.

In 1965, the elder Gore helped Mr. Hammer obtain a visa to Libya, where he opened oil fields that turned Occidental into a multinational powerhouse.

When the elder Mr. Gore lost his re-election bid in 1970, Mr. Hammer installed him as head of an Occidental subsidiary and gave him a \$500,000 annual salary. The man who

had begun his career as a struggling school-teacher in rural Tennessee ended it as a millionaire oil tycoon.

The younger Gore also benefited from Mr. Hammer's generosity. He was paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual payments of \$20,000 for mineral rights to a parcel of land near the family's homestead in Tennessee that Occidental never bothered mining.

When the younger Gore first ran for president in 1988, Mr. Hammer promised former Sen. Paul Simon "any Cabinet spot I wanted" if he would withdraw from the primary, according to a 1989 book by the Illinois Democrat.

Mr. Gore and his wife, Tipper, once flew in Mr. Hammer's private jet across the Atlantic Ocean. They hosted Mr. Hammer, at several presidential inaugurations and remained close to the oilman until his death in 1990.

In 1992, when Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton was considering Mr. Gore as his running mate, the elder Gore wrote a memo describing his son's ties to Mr. Hammer. The document was designed to provide Mr. Clinton with answers to possible questions from reporters.

Mr. Hammer's successor at Occidental, Ray Irani, has continued to funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars into the campaigns of Mr. Gore and the Democratic Party. For example, two days after spending the night in the Lincoln Bedroom in 1996, he cut a check for \$100,000 to the Democratic Party.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have heard that the Vice President and the administration tried to stop drilling in Alaska with expressions of concern for the G'wichin Indians, some of which reside in Alaska, and others which reside in Canada.

But has he spoken out for the U'was in Colombia? Is there an inconsistency here? On the one hand, he allows, and evidently ignores, the drilling in the Colombia rain forest on leases owned by Occidental Petroleum, and he seems to have no objection. But in an area the G'wichin Indians in Alaska depend on for subsistence, a significant area which is in the purview of the Senate to make decisions for opening, he does not support oil and gas exploration. My point is, there is an inconsistency here.

The weight of their policy as it twists and reinvents itself is a mystery to me as I try to summon a clear vision of their intent. His beliefs are a confusing world of images and contradictions. I suspect it might be difficult for others, as well.

§

PROJECTS ON GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am also going to take the opportunity to address an issue that some time ago my Committee on Energy and Natural Resources asked the General Accounting Office to provide a detailee to conduct a preliminary inquiry into payments made by the Project On Government Oversight to two Federal officials. The Project On Government Oversight is known as "POGO." This report was received by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It was prepared by Paul Thompson, the detailee from the General Accounting Office. It is dated July 2000.

There is no question in my mind after reviewing this that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior should be required to review this report and respond to our Committee. I think it is fitting that the Attorney General, Janet Reno, address and resolve some of the questions that are raised by the inquiry.

Let me share some of them. I read as follows from the report of the POGO on July 2000.

CONCLUSIONS

It appears that POGO paid the two Federal officials in connection with their activities to influence the Department toward taking actions and adopting policies that, among other things, (a) directly and indirectly assisted POGO in a project involving matters in which these two individuals were substantially involved as Federal employees and that led to POGO's filing of a lawsuit through which it and the two officials received substantial sums of money and stand to receive potentially millions of dollars more, and (b) benefited the professional and business interests of POGO's chairman and a client of his law firm. The circumstances associated with the payments raised the possibility that the Department of the Interior's development of the policy underlying the new oil royalty regulations may have been improperly influenced by expectations or understandings of the officials that they could personally benefit from using their positions as Federal employees to assist POGO and two of its principals. The officials were substantially involved in key stages of the Department's policy development process in ways that served the interests of the POGO's chairman and its executive director. Whether the payments and circumstances under which they were made could serve to erode confidence in the Department's administration of the royalty management program is a well grounded concern.

Madam President, the entire transcript of the committee report on POGO, prepared for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, is available from the committee's website at <http://www.energy.senate.gov>.

§

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO H.R. 4461

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following technical corrections to the Agriculture appropriations bill be adopted.

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

The corrections are as follows:

Change the instruction on amendment #3970 to read: "On page 76, after line 5, insert:".

Change the instruction on amendment #3068 to read: "On page 76, after line 5, insert:".

Change the instruction on amendment #3457 to read: "On page 85, after line 8, insert:".

Change the instruction on amendment #3958 to read: "On page 100, after line 12, insert:".

Change the instruction on amendment #3985 to read: "On page 95, after line 22, insert:".

On page 55, line 22, strike "\$1,216,796,000" and insert "\$1,210,796,000".

In amendment #4003, on page 2, line 9, insert "90".

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 25,
2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 25. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee, 9:30 to 10 a.m.; Senator THOMAS or his designee, 10 to 10:30 a.m.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, when the Senate convenes at 9:30 a.m., the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m. As a reminder to all Senators, cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and on the motion to proceed to the intelligence authorization bill earlier today. Therefore, under the rule, those votes will occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Wednesday.

‡

ORDER FOR STATEMENTS IN
MEMORY OF SENATOR COVERDELL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Further, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, the time from 9:30 a.m. until 11 a.m. be designated for Senators to make state-

ments in memory of our dear friend, the late Senator Paul Coverdell.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Under the provisions of S. Res. 341, statements made on Thursday or prior to Thursday in regard to our colleague's death will be bound and given to Mrs. Coverdell.

‡

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:14 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.