

Senators ALLARD and KERRY for holding hearings on the legislation in October. I am hopeful that with the help of the interested parties, we can make this important bill even better. I look forward to a continued dialogue on this issue and for the Senate to take up this issue early in the new year.

TRIBUTE TO DAISY GASTON
BATES OF ARKANSAS

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American and an honored daughter of Arkansas. Daisy Gaston Bates was an author, a newspaper publisher, a public servant, a community leader. And some would say most importantly, a civil rights activist. Mrs. Bates passed away last Thursday and we in the great state of Arkansas are celebrating the life of one of our greatest citizens.

Mrs. Bates believed in justice and equality for all of us. No doubt it was that love of freedom and equality that compelled her crusade in 1957 for the rights of nine African-American children to attend Little Rock's all-white Central High School. Daisy Bates played a central role, as Arkansas president of the National Association of Colored People, in the litigation that lead up to that confrontation on the school steps. This was a defining moment in the history of the civil rights movement.

According to her own accounts and those of the Little Rock Nine, the students would gather each night at the Bates' home to receive guidance and strength. It was through the encouragement of Daisy Bates and her husband that these young men and women were able to face the vicious and hateful taunts of those so passionately opposed to their attendance at Central High.

Mrs. Bates and her husband, L.C., also published a newspaper, the Arkansas State Press, which courageously published accounts of police brutality against African-Americans in the 1940's and took a stance for civil rights. Eventually, Central High was integrated and Daisy and her husband were forced to close their newspaper because of their civil rights stance. Advertisers withdrew their business and the paper suffered financial hardships from which it could not recover. She and L.C. were threatened with bombs and guns. They were hanged in effigy by segregationists.

But Daisy Bates persevered. She did all this, withstood these challenges, because she loved children and she loved her country. She had an internal fire, instilled in her during a childhood spent in Huttig, Arkansas. And this strong character shone through as she willingly took a leadership role to battle the legal and political inequities of segregation in our state and the nation.

Mrs. Bates continued to work tirelessly in anti-poverty programs, community development and neighborhood improvement. She published a book, for which another remarkable woman, Eleanor Roosevelt, wrote the introduction. Daisy also spent time working for the Democratic National Committee and for President Johnson's administration.

Many people honored Daisy Bates during her lifetime. In 1997, Mrs. Bates received for her courage and character, the Margaret Chase Smith Award, named after the second woman ever elected to the U.S. Senate. Daisy Bates carried the Olympic torch from a wheelchair during the 1996 Atlanta games. Many more, I am sure, will honor her after her death. I am proud to honor her today in the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. Bates will lie in state on Monday at the State Capitol Rotunda in Little Rock. Ironically, this is only blocks away from the school where that famous confrontation occurred in 1957. And in another twist of fate, the Little Rock Nine are scheduled to receive Congressional Gold Medals in a White House ceremony with President Bill Clinton this Tuesday, the very same day Daisy Bates will be laid to rest.

This great woman leaves a legacy to our children, our state and our nation; a love of justice, freedom and the right to be educated. A matriarch of the civil rights movement has passed on but I'm encouraged by the words of her niece, Sharon Gaston, who said, "Just don't let her work be in vain. There's plenty of work for us to do."

Mr. President, there is still much work to be done to bring complete civil rights and equality to our nation. Today, as we pause to remember Daisy Gaston Bates, I hope we will be renewed and refreshed in our efforts.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
ESTIMATES OF S. 977

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on November 2, 1999, I filed Report 206 to accompany S. 977, that had been ordered favorably reported on October 20, 1999. At the time the report was filed, the estimates by Congressional Budget Office were not available. The estimate is now available and concludes that enactment of S. 977 would "result in no significant costs to the federal government." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the CBO estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 2, 1999.
Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost

estimate for S. 977, the Miwaleta Park Expansion Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state and local governments), who can be reached at 225-3220.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

Enclosure.

S. 977—Miwaleta Park Expansion Act

S. 977 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey, without compensation, Miwaleta Park and certain adjacent land to Douglas County, Oregon. The bill stipulates that the county must use this land for recreational purposes. Currently, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) allows the county to use the land for a park at no cost to the county. Because BLM does not plan to sell the land or otherwise generate receipts from it, CBO estimates that implementing S. 977 would result in no significant costs to the federal government. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, so pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

S. 977 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. Douglas County might incur some costs as a result of the bill's enactment, but any such costs would be voluntary. The county also would benefit, however, because it would receive land at a negligible cost. The bill would have no significant impact on the budgets of other state, local, or tribal governments.

On October 29, 1999, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1725, the Miwaleta Park Expansion Act, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on October 20, 1999. The two bills are very similar and the cost estimates are identical.

The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state and local governments), who can be reached at 225-3220. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED
STATES JOINT FORCES COMMAND

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hugh Shelton, the Commander in Chief Joint Forces Command Admiral Hal Gehman, and the Army Chief of Staff, General Eric Shinseki for their commitment to transforming our current military force to one which will assure our military superiority well into the twenty first century.

Secretary Cohen and General Shelton have taken strong and direct action to establish transformation as the guiding policy for the Department of Defense. Their leadership responds to what are now broadly accepted conclusions about the security environment we will face and the challenges and opportunities resulting from the Revolution in Military Affairs. Many, both inside and outside the Pentagon, have concluded

that these changes are of such magnitude that they require that our military in the twenty first century be fundamentally different than today's military. This view was compellingly articulated by the National Defense Panel, which was created by this body. And it was given the force of policy by Secretary Cohen in the Quadrennial Defense Review.

But how are we to know what this very different military should look like? Secretary Cohen and General Shelton, encouraged and supported by legislation we passed last year, established a process to answer that question. On the first of October, 1998, they charged the Commander in Chief of the United States Atlantic Command, Admiral Harold Gehman, to put in place a joint experimentation process to objectively determine which new technologies, organizations, and concepts of operation will most likely to future military superiority. Since that time Admiral Theman has done a superb job of establishing a process and beginning experiments toward that end. In June, 1999, Admiral Gehman began experiments to address how the U.S. military should be equipped and organized to effectively find and strike critical mobile enemy targets, such as ballistic missiles. Other experiments to address near, mid, and far term strategic and operational problems will follow. On the first of October of this year the Secretary and the Chairman increased the priority of the policy of transformation by redesignating the United States Atlantic Command as the United States Joint Forces Command. This change is more than simply a change in name. It underlines the increasing importance of increased jointness in meeting the security challenges of the twenty first century, increases the priority assigned to experimentation, and reflects the expanded role that the United States Joint Forces Command assumes in order to achieve that goal. I applaud Secretary Cohen and General Shelton for their commitment to transformation of the U.S. military and their courage to make the tough changes needed to get it done.

I am also pleased to see that their leadership is having a positive effect on our military Services' plans to transform themselves to meet the coming challenges. The U.S. Air Force has begun to reorganize its units into Air Expeditionary Forces to be more responsive to the need for air power by the warfighting commanders. And I note with great admiration that on October 12, 1999 General Eric Shinseki, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, announced his intention to begin to transform the U.S. Army from a heavy force designed largely for the Cold War to one that will be more effective against the threats that most now see as most likely and most dangerous.

The goal is to make the U.S. Army more strategically relevant by making it lighter, more deployable, more lethal, and more sustainable. General Shinseki plans to find technological solutions to these problems, and intends to create this year an experimentation process at Fort Lewis Washington in order to begin to construct this new force. He has said that he wants to eliminate the distinction between different types of Army units, and perhaps in time go to an all-wheeled fleet of combat vehicles, eliminating the tank as we have known it for almost a century. These are historic and very positive steps. But there is much progress that must still be made. For example, the Army and the Air Force must now implement their plans in concert with the other services, and with the Joint Forces Command.

Fundamental change is very difficult to effect, especially in organizations, like the Department of Defense, that are large and successful. Frankly, I am a little surprised that we have been able to achieve these changes in so short time. But organizations that don't change ultimately fail, and that is not an outcome we can accept. So we should not only applaud these moves, but support them, and encourage faster and more direct action. An excellent report by the Defense Science Board in August, 1999 suggests some things we can do to provide this support. The most important are encouraging the development of a DOD-wide strategy for transformation activities, and insisting on the establishment of processes to turn the results of experiments into real capabilities for our forces. And we must ensure that this effort is not hobbled by lack of resources. Perhaps most importantly, we must insist that no Service plan nor program be agreed to or resourced unless we are assured that it has passed through a rigorous joint assessment and is consistent with the joint warfighting needs of our military commanders.

I urge my colleagues to join me in complementing our senior leaders and to support their efforts to move to the next level of jointness as they grapple with the difficult task of building the most effective American military possible for the 21st century.

THE FREEDOM TO TRAVEL TO CUBA ACT OF 1999

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, any American who wants to travel to Iran, to North Korea, to Syria, to Serbia, to Vietnam, to just about anywhere, can do so, as long as that country gives them a visa. As far as the United States Government is concerned, they can travel there at their own risk.

Cuba, on the other hand, a country 90 miles away that poses about as much threat to the United States as a flea does to a buffalo, is off limits unless

you are a journalist, government official, or member of some other special group. If not, you can only get there by breaking the law, which an estimated 10-15,000 Americans did last year.

Of all the ridiculous, anachronistic, and self-defeating policies, this has got to be near the top of the list.

For forty years, administration after administration, and Congress after Congress, has stuck by this failed policy. Yet Fidel Castro is as firmly in control today as he was in 1959, and the Cuban people are no better for it.

This legislation attempts to put some sense into our policy toward Cuba. It would also protect one of the most fundamental rights that most Americans take for granted, the right to travel freely. I commend the senior Senator From Connecticut, Senator DODD, who has been such a strong and persistent advocate on this issue. I am proud to join him in cosponsoring this legislation, which is virtually identical to an amendment he and I sponsored earlier this year. That amendment came within 7 votes of passage.

Mr. President, in March of this year I traveled to Cuba with Senator JACK REED. We were able to go there because we are Members of Congress.

I came face to face with the absurdity of the current policy because I wanted my wife Marcelle to accompany me as she does on most foreign trips. A few days before we were to leave, I got a call from the State Department saying that they were not sure they could approve her travel to Cuba.

I cannot speak for other Senators, but I suspect that like me, they would also not react too kindly to a policy that gives the State Department the authority to prevent their wife, or their children, from traveling with them to a country with which we are not at war and which, according to the Defense Department and the vast majority of the American public, poses no threat to our security.

I wonder how many Senators realize that if they wanted to take a family member with them to Cuba, they would probably be prevented from doing so by United States law.

Actually, because the authors of the law knew that a blanket prohibition on travel by American citizens would be unconstitutional, they came up with a clever way of avoiding that problem but accomplishing the same result. Americans can travel to Cuba, they just cannot spend any money there.

Almost a decade has passed since the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Eight years have passed since the Russians cut their \$3 billion subsidy to Cuba. We now give hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to Russia.

Americans can travel to North Korea. There are no restrictions on the right of Americans to travel there, or to spend money there. Which country poses a greater threat to the United States? Obviously North Korea.