

The Dow Jones was 3,300. Now it is over 10,000.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I think the Senator is making an important point, but I would like him to supplement it because I, too, have been startled in hearing Governor Bush explain they had their chance to enact a Patients' Bill of Rights. Indeed, it is my memory that on more occasions than I can remember the Clinton-Gore administration, with support of Democrats in this House, attempted to have a Patients' Bill of Rights.

I heard Governor Bush say on prescription drugs that we promised it and had not delivered it; we had our chance. Indeed, the Clinton-Gore administration supported prescription drugs and Democrats supported it in the Congress but failed.

Is my recollection of this correct, that we had our chance, we have attempted to do it but, ironically, the people who have stopped it are now the same people who constitute the Bush campaign?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. They had their chance. What about the issue of the Patients' Bill of Rights? We were blocked by the majority party.

What about campaign finance reform? We have tried, tried, and tried and were blocked by the majority party.

What about a prescription drug benefit for the Medicare program? We have tried and tried and were blocked by the majority party.

How about the issue of education and providing some help to reconstruct and renovate and provide for better schools and better classrooms?

Mr. TORRICELLI. If the Senator will yield, can we focus on that one as well because I heard in debates Governor Bush said on education Clinton-Gore had their chance. Indeed, the President proposed 100,000 new teachers repeatedly and has been fighting for it every year—got it enacted at one point—including right up to tonight on school reconstruction, which has not been supported, to my knowledge, by Governor Bush, certainly not supported by his party in Congress. So indeed they had their chance on education, and the Clinton-Gore administration led on education as they led on health care.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have had the longest economic expansion in American history. That did not happen by accident. Governor Bush says: Well, gosh, that's due to the American people. The American people worked hard in 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984. The American people had as much ingenuity, as much tenacity to work hard then. But you need public policies in place that help them as well.

The public policies that the Clinton-Gore administration and the Democrats in Congress put in place in 1993 said we were going to stop these Federal deficits. We had a new fiscal policy. We turned this country around.

The American people understand that when they have hope for the future, they do things that reflect that hope. They buy cars; they buy homes; and they take vacations. They do the things that represent their hope for the future.

There was not much hope for a long while because every year the deficit was getting worse and no one wanted to do much about it, but the Clinton-Gore administration came in and said: We have a new plan and it will be a little tough. It was hard to vote for—in fact, so hard that not one member of the majority party voted for it.

I see on the floor my friend from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, whom we have quoted many times. He said: If you pass this plan, this country is going to go into a tailspin. Those are not his exact words, but it is exactly what he meant.

Of course, he was wrong. This country passed a new economic plan and gave the American people confidence about the future. Guess what happened. The largest deficits in history turned into the largest surpluses in history. We have had the longest economic expansion on record—welfare rolls are down, home ownership is up, inflation is down. Almost every basic index in this country is better.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. DURBIN. When the Senator from Texas—Governor Bush's home State—voted against the Clinton-Gore plan in 1993, he said: "This program is going to make the economy weaker, hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their jobs as a result of this program."

Was the Senator from Texas correct as a result of the Clinton-Gore plan? Did hundreds of thousands of people lose their jobs?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois asked a question about job creation. This administration, during these 8 years, has seen 22 million new jobs created in this country. In the 4 years prior under President George Bush, 2.5 million new jobs were created. You will see this is one of the most robust periods of economic expansion in this country's history. Is it an accident? No. This administration had a new economic plan that said let's move away from growing and choking deficits and give the American people some confidence about the future. The result of it was that confidence manifested a growing economy that created new jobs and new opportunities. Every single feature of this economy has become better in the last 8 years, every single one. Unemployment, inflation, welfare, home ownership—in every sin-

gle instance, things are better in this country.

This morning, when I heard the Governor say, "Well, you have had your chance," I would say, yes, this administration had its chance and it inherited a weak and troubled economy and turned it into a strong, vibrant, growing economy, and good for them.

It did not happen because they took the easy road. This was not the easy thing to do. In 1993, when they had the vote on the new plan, it passed by only one vote in the House and the Senate. We did not get even one vote on the majority side. We took our licks for voting for it, but history shows that what we created was the strongest economy in this world, and I think Vice President GORE and President Clinton and those who voted for that new plan in this Congress can take some pride in what the result of that plan has been.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the distinguished Senator has expired.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received the continuing resolution. I ask that the previous order now commence, and the clerk report the joint resolution.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been considered read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from

Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would each vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Feingold	Murray
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Allard	Graham	Reed
Baucus	Gramm	Reid
Bayh	Grassley	Robb
Bennett	Gregg	Roberts
Biden	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Harkin	Santorum
Breaux	Hatch	Sarbanes
Bryan	Hutchinson	Schumer
Bunning	Hutchison	Sessions
Byrd	Inouye	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Miller	
Edwards	Moynihan	

NAYS—1

Stevens

NOT VOTING—32

Ashcroft	Frist	Lieberman
Bond	Gorton	Lugar
Boxer	Grams	Mack
Brownback	Helms	McCain
Burns	Hollings	McConnell
Campbell	Inhofe	Murkowski
Cleland	Jeffords	Roth
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Enzi	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feinstein	Leahy	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) was passed.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on October 10, 2000, the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) hosted an important luncheon discussion on the European Union's evolving European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). The guest speakers at that luncheon were Ambassador Christopher Meyer of Great Britain, Ambassador Juergen Chrobog of Germany, and Ambassador Francois Bujon de l'Estang of France. Senator LEVIN and I were privileged to sponsor this luncheon on Capitol Hill, in the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing room. Attendees at this luncheon included a prestigious group of former ambassadors and administration officials, representatives from industry, policy and research organizations, and senior congressional staff from both the House and Senate.

Since December 1999, when the European Union (EU) Heads of State announced at a summit meeting in Helsinki their "determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises," there has been a great deal of discussion and debate about the development of a common European defense identity. While I commend our European allies for their willingness to do more militarily, I have been concerned about the impact of an ESDP on the NATO Alliance.

My views on the development of the European Security and Defense Policy start with the basic premise that NATO has been the most successful military alliance in history. NATO won the cold war; it is now plying an instrumental role in keeping the peace in Europe. Whatever is done in the context of an ESDP, it must not weaken NATO.

There are a number of questions concerning the content of an ESDP—questions I, Senator LEVIN, and others raised at the October 10 luncheon. For example, Europeans are discussing increasing their military capabilities at a time of declining defense budgets, in a number of NATO partners. How is an added military capability possible with less money? Will ESDP developments—particularly the establishment of EU military structures—take valuable and scarce resources away from NATO military capabilities? How will the EU military force interact with NATO? Will NATO have the right of first refusal—or veto power—over an EU-led military operation?

These are important questions that should be answered. During the meeting on October 10, the Ambassadors provided valuable insight into the development of an ESDP. I commend their participation in today's forum. I ask unanimous consent that the opening statements of the three Ambassadors be printed in the RECORD.

I will continue to monitor these developments and keep the Senate informed.

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

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR CHRISTOPHER MEYER EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY (ESDP) AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND NATO

In October 1998 Tony Blair launched an initiative on European defense in a speech at Pörschach.

He had been dismayed by the inadequacy of European diplomatic and military performance in the Balkans. It undermined the credibility of the EU's common foreign and security policy. It corroded the Atlantic alliance by giving comfort to those in the U.S. who argue that the Europeans refuse to assume their share of the burden.

He saw that the Europeans lack military transportation over long distances; logistical support to sustain fighting forces for long periods away from home; and enough capabilities such as airborne surveillance, precision-guided munitions and command, control and communications. The Kosovo campaign in particular showed up these deficiencies.

Blair's aim was, and remains, three-fold: To strengthen the AEU's capacity to act internationally in a more effective manner; to deliver a step-change in Europe's ability to manage crises; and to strengthen the European Contribution to the Atlantic alliance, in particular through more robust European military capabilities.

In the British view this is overwhelmingly in the interests of the U.S., the alliance and of Europe.

Since Blair's speech, he and president Chirac have been the main drivers of this initiative. The British-French St. Malo declaration was the first land-mark. But, of course, over the last two years, the full memberships of the EU and NATO have become increasingly involved, notably Germany.

My colleagues will speak to you about the implications of this initiative for the U.S. and NATO; about the current state of play; and about next steps.

I want to make only two observations.

The first is that the initiative has made extraordinary progress in less than 2 years:

Last December, at Helsinki, the EU set itself a headline goal: to be able by 2003 to deploy 60,000 troops at 60 days' notice for operations lasting at least a year. By the end of this year we should have identified who will need to do what to make this goal reality; and we ought to have in place key element of EU/NATO arrangements, as well as necessary internal EU structures. My colleagues will say more about this.

My second observation is that behind the official statements of welcome for this initiative, there has been chronic suspicion and skepticism on this side of the Atlantic, especially on Capitol Hill. Why?

First, there is a long-standing schizophrenia at work. For decades you have been telling the Europeans to get their act together: one emergency phone number, please. But whenever we show signs of doing what you ask, you become suspicious and anxious that we are doing things behind your back. European defense initiative has been much afflicted by this schizophrenia. Damned if we do, damned if we don't.

Second, some of you don't actually believe we will ever put our money where our mouth is and increase European military effectiveness. But, Britain and, I'm sure, France and