

sources, the need for more data to develop cost estimates, and the extent to which the Federal Government contributes to water pollution.

Instead of pulling back, having found out this information, EPA is moving forward with the implementation of the program. States and impacted industries have complained to EPA through the Congress, through the committees, that EPA's plan places a financial burden and amounts to an unfunded mandate.

This could be reasonable, if they went through the process of involving people before putting the regulations in place. But when the regulations are put there by fiat, certainly that is not something we expect to happen and should not allow to happen in our system of government.

Even USDA wrote a letter, saying when they were doing these activities in the old Soil Conservation Service, they were much more efficient. When we questioned EPA about that, they got the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to change his mind and say: I really did not mean that at all.

Of course, 2 weeks ago I was in Wyoming for a week. Half of Wyoming belongs to the Federal Government. Much of our State is in public ownership. The use of those lands is vital to the economy. A multiple-use concept is what has made these lands useful, not only to preserve the environment, which can be done, but as well to be able to use them for hunting, recreation, grazing, mineral production—all the things that go together to make up an economy in the West.

Now we are faced with some other propositions. In this case, the Forest Service has declared by regulatory fiat that there would be 40 million acres dedicated to roadless areas. Of course, we have roadless areas in the public lands. We have wilderness that has been set aside by congressional action. By the way, when it was set aside in Wyoming, the statute also said there would be no more wilderness set aside unless Congress made that proposal.

It has been very difficult. We have had several hearings with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service to determine what "roadless" means, whether or not it is another way of having wilderness areas. The interesting part of it is, most of the lands that have been structured in this plan for roadless areas have roads on them; they are not roadless at all. But the Forest Service has done nothing to identify or solicit cooperating non-Federal agencies in the EIS.

Several of our States have asked to be cooperating agencies, which is what the Environmental Quality Group in the White House has said they are going to implement in all these kinds of programs, but the Forest Service has said: No, we are not going to have the

States; we are not going to have the counties; we are not going to have these non-Federal agencies participate.

Hearings were held. Actually, they were not hearings; they were information systems. People were invited to come, but there was no information there. They were asked to respond to something without knowing what was being done. So there was really not public involvement of that kind.

The other thing is that we already have forest plans in place. Each forest is required to have a forest plan. I have no objection to the idea of limited roads, but it ought to be done in a way in which people can participate, and it ought to be done in a way in which Congress can participate. We are finding more and more of that happening in this so-called land legacy that is being put forth by the administration.

Last week, the Secretary of the Interior announced there would be literally millions of acres of Bureau of Land Management lands that would be set aside simply for their scenic value. That is very important to western public land States, where much of that land is part of our economy. It can be preserved for the environment. However, we also have to have multiple use. Those things will go together.

The Antiquities Act is another. In 1996, we put into law the Congressional Review Act which requires regulations be submitted to the Congress. They are interpreted by OMB. Those that have over \$100 million of value or cost are submitted to the Congress, with an opportunity to take a look—oversight—to see if those regulations are carrying out the spirit of the legislation which authorized them or, indeed, to see if in some cases they are being put into place without any statutory or regulatory authority.

Unfortunately, it has not worked well. The idea was to have it come to the Congress. It has to go through OMB first to decide whether it has the \$100 million impact. Then it comes to the Congress, but the Congress has not had an opportunity to deal with it.

Unfortunately, from April 1 of 1996 until March 1 of 1999, Federal agencies issued, as I said before, 13,000 final rules. And 188 fell within this category of \$100 million. Unfortunately, not one has been changed by the Congress because this bill is not workable.

We have to make it work. We need to create a congressional regulatory analysis group that has the opportunity to look into these bills. Much like CBO, Congress needs an entity to take a look at them. Right now, unfortunately, it does not work. I think certainly we have to do something to keep this administration from running roughshod over my constituents' interests, the Presiding Officer's constituents' interests, and others. There needs to be this balance. I think the Congressional Review Act could be that balance, if it has some changes.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise to note two events, one historic today and one somewhat historic tomorrow—one looking a little bit back with some nostalgia and the other looking back with some degree of finality.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today, the 28th of February, is the 150th anniversary of the founding of the University of Utah. We look back with nostalgia but also look forward with great excitement at the future of that particular university.

It is a university to which I am attached both in personal life and by legacy. Both of my parents graduated from the University of Utah. My two brothers and two sisters attended the University of Utah. I graduated from the University of Utah. My wife attended the University of Utah. We are a Utah family.

The university started on the 28th of February, 1850. For those who understand Utah history, they will realize that the State, at least to the degree it is now, began on the 24th of July, 1847. So for those who founded the State, to focus on the creation of the University of Deseret, as they then called it, so quickly after they arrived in Salt Lake Valley is a testimony to their vision and their determination to make higher education a very key part of their lives.

At that time, there was no infrastructure in the community. There were barely farmhouses and farms that had been created. The first classes of the University of Deseret were held in private homes.

The university has come a long way since that time. It is now recognized as one of the premier universities in the United States in a number of areas. The one that they are perhaps best known for is in medicine. The University of Utah is the site of the first artificial heart. It has been the site of other medical breakthroughs. It is currently the home of the Huntsman Cancer Center—a \$100 million gift from the Huntsman family to fight cancer in the United States. The Huntsman family decided that the medical school at the University of Utah was sufficiently in the forefront that it would be the place they would have the Huntsman Cancer Center.

One other interesting thing that goes back to the founding of the University of Deseret that I think we need to recognize with respect to what the University of Utah is and can do in the future is its physical proximity to the genealogical records that are maintained by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

A few months ago, I had a medical researcher come into my office in Salt Lake City, a man who by virtue of his credentials could have gone virtually anywhere in the world, to tell me how excited he was to be at the University of Utah.

His specialty, an area of greatest medical concern, is dealing with the disease of diabetes. He went on to point out to me how diabetes many times is the disease that then causes other diseases. He said, statistically people may die from something other than diabetes but, in fact, it was the diabetes in the first instance that caused them to get whatever it was to which they were recorded as having succumbed. He said: The reason I am excited about being at the University of Utah is that the records available in the family history library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints make it possible for researchers at the University of Utah to trace the family history of people with this particular disease in a way no other body of data can. It is a unique experience to be here where you have that kind of link.

Of course, when the University of Deseret was founded, it was founded with the full support and, indeed, almost sole support of the leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. So it is appropriate even now, as the university has become a State institution, certainly separate from the church and any of its hierarchy, that there is still the kind of intellectual synergy that can come out of the proximity of the university and the work the church is doing in another area.

The University of Utah stands as the flagship research school in my State and, if I may be parochial a little, perhaps for a large part of the West. There are many things done at the University of Utah that radiate beyond our State borders, not only in medicine but in other fields as well. We have a first-class law school to go with the medical school. We give Ph.D. degrees in a wide variety of subjects. The University of Utah is proud to have been in this business for 150 years. I am proud, as a Utah man, to stand on the floor of the Senate and pay tribute to the university and to those farsighted individuals who founded it 150 years ago today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I would like to offer congratulations to the University of Utah on the 150th anniversary of its founding.

In 1850, just three years after the pioneers reached the dusty and desolate Salt Lake Valley, the General Assembly of the State of Deseret passed an ordinance to create the first university to be established west of the Missouri. Despite some stressful financial times, it persevered; and, in 1892, the territorial legislature changed its name to the University of Utah.

The Utah pioneers began an institution that would serve as the intellec-

tual and cultural cornerstone for the state of Utah and for the West. With its humble beginnings in a private home, the University of Utah has become the embodiment of the pioneering spirit that conceived it.

The University of Utah—the “U”—has led the way in a number of areas, including research, teaching, and public service.

Academically, the University makes significant contributions in the West and in the nation. The Honors Program is the third oldest in the nation. The graduate school of Architecture has the Intermountain West’s only program in historical preservation. The College of Humanities has the Intermountain West’s only joint master of public administration in Middle East studies.

Additionally, the University of Utah’s work in health sciences, where the first artificial heart was developed, in supercomputing and computer modeling, and in cosmic-ray research, where the U is home to the one-of-a-kind “Fly’s Eye,” has contributed significantly to the University’s growing reputation both nationally and internationally. The University of Utah currently ranks in the first tier of American research institutions according to the Carnegie Foundation.

Henry Eyring, a world renowned chemist and professor noted in 1946 that, “the stature of the university would rise through advancements of science and technology.” And so it has. The faculty and students representing all 50 states and 102 foreign countries have built the U into a premier research institution.

A pioneer in computer graphics, David Evans, after studying electrical engineering at the University, became chair in 1965 of the fledgling department of computer science. He oversaw the education of individuals who went on to groundbreaking careers in computing including, Alan Kay, vice president of Disney Imagineering; Jim Clark, founder of Silicon Graphics, Inc.; John Warnock, co-founder of Adobe Systems; and, Edwin Catmull: co-founder of Pixar.

The medical school, started in 1905, has made great strides in medicine that are recognized throughout the world. Dr. Philip Price, former chair of the Department of Surgery said, “The essence of the pioneer spirit as I see it, is the courage to tackle an un-ideal situation, trying hard with faith and intelligence to build something ideal out of it. That’s what I would like to see done, and have a part in.”

In 1946, the U.S. Public Health Service awarded its first grant to a medical school so that the University of Utah could study muscular dystrophy. The receipt of this first grant for medical research set the stage for the University’s subsequent success in medical research.

Dr. Willem Kolff began the division of Artificial Organs and the Institute for Biomedical Engineering in 1967. His pioneering work on both an artificial kidney and heart led to a number of medical breakthroughs, including the world’s first artificial heart transplanted into Dr. Barney Clark in 1982.

That was a great thrill for all of us from Utah.

More recently, there have been a number of major leaps taken in genetic research at the Eccles Institute of Human Genetics. Scientists have found dozens of genes for human diseases including cancer, heart disease, neurological conditions, birth defects, and blindness. And, the Huntsman Cancer Institute is becoming an international leader in the discovery of new ways to diagnose, treat, cure, and prevent cancer.

The University of Utah has also played a central role in the development of Utah in the arts and athletics. In 1948, the Utah Symphony was invited to make its home on the campus, establishing the University as home for various cultural events for the public. For the past decade, the Modern Dance Department ranks among the top three in North America along with the ballet program, which is the nation’s first college ballet degree program.

The University of Utah’s skiing and women’s gymnastics programs have each won ten national titles, and the Runnin’ Utes basketball team made it to the NCAA national championship finals in 1998. The football team has made numerous bowl game appearances.

Of course, to me, as an alumnus of BYU, the best thing to come out of the University of Utah was in 1875 when the University’s Provo branch was split off to become the Brigham Young Academy and eventually Brigham Young University. It would be impossible for any Utahn not to at least mention this historic rivalry.

It is difficult to do justice to the myriad of accomplishments of the University of Utah’s faculty and alumni in this brief statement.

Suffice it to say that, after 150 years, the University of Utah still draws on the courageous and adventurous spirit of Utah’s pioneers. The achievements and ideas of the faculty and graduates have multiplied across the geographic and academic frontiers of our country. The University’s proud heritage and traditions have established its values and lighted the path; but, without a doubt, the trail is still being blazed.

I might add that as a young boy living in Pittsburgh, PA, wanting to support anything from Utah, I can remember the great University of Utah championship basketball teams with Arnie Ferrin, Vern Gardner, Wat Misaka, and others who were terrific athletes who made the University of Utah a household name in basketball during those

years. Of course, they have been an inspiration to me ever since. In fact, it has been a thrill for me to meet some of those people, and especially become a friend of the great Arnie Ferrin who was the University of Utah's great All American during those years and later played professional basketball as well.

Again, my congratulations to the students, alumni, faculty, and administrators of the University of Utah on reaching this significant milestone. It is a great university. I support it very strongly, and I think everyone in Utah does as well. I am grateful to be able to make this statement on its behalf.

I yield the floor.

THE Y2K COMMITTEE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as I said, I have two items to commemorate. That is the first one, an item of some nostalgia looking forward. The second one actually is tomorrow, but I will take advantage of being here now to talk about something that comes to an end tomorrow.

The Presiding Officer was intimately involved, as he served as a member of the Senate's Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, a committee that officially goes out of existence tomorrow. There were many who said, when the committee was formed: There is nothing so permanent as a temporary government program. You will find an excuse somehow, some way, to keep this committee alive for years.

It is with some pride I point out that we are not doing that. The committee was organized to deal with the year 2000 technology problem. The committee dealt with the problem. The committee was scheduled to go out of existence on February 29, when presumably the problem would be behind us. The problem is behind us, and the committee will disband as of tomorrow.

I pay tribute to the vice chairman of the committee, CHRISTOPHER DODD, the Senator from Connecticut. As chairman of the committee, I could not ask for a better partner. I could not ask for a more cooperative or dedicated partner in working on this particular problem. We acknowledge the other members of the committee, starting with the distinguished occupant of the Chair, Senator KYL from Arizona; Senator MOYNIHAN from New York; Senator SMITH from Oregon; Senator EDWARDS from North Carolina, who was preceded on the committee by Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico; Senator LUGAR from Indiana, who was preceded on the committee by the junior Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS; and then, of course, the two ex officio members of the committee who attended committee hearings, paid attention to the committee activities, and contributed significantly to it, that is, the

chairman and ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD.

There are many people who say: Well, you really didn't have a problem, did you? You formed this committee, and then, look, nothing happened with respect to Y2K.

It reminds me a little of the story attributed to Bob Hope, who said: You know, I really don't appreciate the way the Army treats me when I go out on these USO tours over the holidays. At Christmas, I go all around the world to put on shows for the GIs. They tell me I am going into dangerous parts of the world, so they use me as a pin cushion; they fill me full of shots before I go. It is a complete waste of time because I have never gotten sick once in any of these places.

I think that can be said to a certain extent with respect to the Y2K problem. Many people are saying: Gee, you wasted all our time and money. Look, nothing happened.

The record is fairly clear that had we, as a Nation, not focused on this issue and dealt with it, we would have had very significant problems.

When the committee was formed, I set one goal, among others, which I believe we very much met and I feel very proud about having achieved. As we looked out over the Nation and, indeed, the world with respect to the Y2K problem, the one thing that was clear was that no one knew the extent of the problem. No one knew how it was going to play out, and there was no place one could go to get that information. So I challenged the staff as well as the members of the committee.

I said: If we do nothing else in this committee, we will become the repository of accurate information about Y2K. All over the world, people will know that if they want to find the best source of where things are with respect to Y2K, they will want to come to the Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem.

I believe we met that challenge. I believe by the last few months of Y2K, it was recognized virtually around the world that the Senate reports on Y2K were the most authoritative, the most complete, and ultimately the most dependable.

A lot of people don't realize we were saying in those last few months: There will not be a Y2K problem in the United States. I used to say that in speeches, and I would have people challenge me: How can you say that? Sometimes they would quote my own earlier speeches back to me because early on I was raising the alarm and predicting significant problems. I was predicting those problems on the basis of the information then available. But as the committee fulfilled its function and became the repository of accurate information, committee spokesmen and women would stand and say again and

again: We are probably not going to have any serious problems in the United States.

Then people said to us: Well, why did you miss it overseas? There weren't serious problems overseas?

I have two observations on that. First, we did not have the same degree of accurate information about situations overseas that we had in the United States. We were unable to reach the same level in dealing with information that came from outside the country as we did from information within the country. Second, we had more problems overseas than the press has reported. There were many people who were simply embarrassed about their Y2K problem and didn't talk about it. Indeed, we had some examples before the committee of problems that did exist and were later denied simply because of the embarrassment people would feel if they admitted they had had difficulties.

The ultimate question is: Was it worth it? Did we, in fact, make a contribution worth the amount of money we spent to staff this committee? I say without any hesitation, yes, it was very much worth it. We are seeing benefits over and above the contribution the committee made to alleviating the problem.

John Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense, has publicly stated: If it were not for the process we went through to deal with Y2K in the Defense Department, we would have had serious Y2K problems and we would not have the information we now have.

In responding to the pressure from Y2K, the Defense Department, for the first time in its history, now has an inventory of all of their computer systems together with a ranking as to which of those systems are mission critical and which are not. One might think in a straight management assignment the Defense Department would have that information anyway. They did not have it before we caused them, in an effort to respond to the inquiries from the committee, to go through the process of gathering it.

Alan Greenspan has been quoted as saying that in American industry at large, the effect of the Y2K remediation activity has caused American business men and women to understand their vulnerability and dependability on computers in a way they never understood before and that the investment of bringing everything up to the highest possible level is an investment that will pay significant financial dividends for the economy in the years ahead.

So as I look back on those activities and those accomplishments, I express satisfaction for the work of the committee, a degree of satisfaction for whatever contribution I may have been able to make as its chairman but ultimately enormous gratitude to the