

State, Treasury, Defense, and Justice—and that all the others be folded into four new departments with very broad jurisdiction—Natural Resources, Human Resources, Economic Development, and Community Development. In 1991, then-Congressman Leon Panetta proposed that the executive branch be reorganized into just six departments—State, Defense, Justice, Human Services, Natural Resources, and Economic Policy. And just last month the Heritage Foundation proposed that there be only five cabinet departments—State, Defense, Justice, Treasury, and Health and Human Services.

But before launching into a full-scale examination of Federal departments, agencies, and programs—to see what should be eliminated, consolidated, or reorganized—I think we need a better understanding of how to approach this task.

This is why I intend first to begin with an overview hearing. The purpose will be to get a better understanding of the principles and criteria that Congress should apply as it looks to specific aspects of governmental organization and operation. For example, is it best to centralize responsibility into fewer departments, so as to focus accountability and enhance policy coordination? Or is it best to decentralize responsibility, in order to eliminate layers of bureaucracy and improve responsiveness? Are there innovative ways to achieve the advantages to both approaches—such as through semi-independent agencies located within larger departments?

If the Federal Government is going to retain a certain programmatic responsibility—even after reorganization and streamlining—are there better ways of doing so? When, for example, should a program be part of an independent agency? When should it be part of a cabinet department? And when is it best to use some sort of autonomous government corporation?

We will also ask about privatization. What does it mean, when should it be used, and how should it be implemented? Are there alternative forms that might be appropriate, sometimes referred to as commercialization or marketization. And what about contracting out?

As I have stated, I intend that the hearing on the following day, May 18, will address specific proposals for agency consolidation and elimination, and program privatization. I would invite Members of Congress who have offered such proposals to contact the committee if they would like to testify on their ideas.

I should add that I also intend to have the Governmental Affairs Committee begin an examination of governmental operational issues. We need to improve the performance of government, as we reduce its size and complexity. This means a serious effort at civil service reform, as well as looking at budget system reform, program performance measurement, and financial

accountability. We also need to ask which responsibilities might most appropriately be devolved to the State and local governments.

I strongly agree with the demands for cutting the size and costs of the Federal Government by eliminating obsolete and ineffective programs and agencies. I think the right way to do this is to approach the task thoughtfully and carefully—but with a clear intention to develop a plan that is both bold and comprehensive.

Of course, another way to do this would be to appoint a commission—modeled on the Military Base Closing Commission—to develop the plan, and require Congress to approve or disapprove the plan. I have in past congresses introduced legislation that would create just such a commission, and I am still willing to consider it as an alternative approach.

But regardless of what mechanism we use to develop it, we need a blueprint for the organization of the Federal Government that reflects today's priorities and fiscal realities, and that prepares us for the 21st century. The Governmental Affairs Committee will soon begin work on this task.

#### IN MEMORY OF SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to comment on the life and career of our departed colleague and my good friend, Senator John C. Stennis, whose long and full life ended on Sunday, April 23, at the age of 93.

When Senator Stennis retired in January 1989, he had been in the Senate 41 years, 1 month, and 29 days. This made his service in the Senate longer than all but one other person in history.

When I came to the U.S. Senate in November 1972, Senator Stennis had been a Member of this body for nearly 25 years, and I had the great honor and privilege of serving with Senator Stennis for 16 years—until he retired at the close of the 100th Congress in 1989. So it is with sadness that I pay tribute to the memory of this departed colleague today.

John Stennis was a man who anyone coming to know him well would love and admire. I came to know him early on my arrival in the Senate. He was from my neighboring State, and I learned to follow his advice and leadership in certain areas of our service together.

It was also my privilege to serve with John Stennis on the Appropriations Committee beginning in 1975. We had nearly identical subcommittee assignments on the committee. He was chairman of the then Public Works Subcommittee, now the Energy and Water Subcommittee, when I came aboard and I succeeded him as chairman of that subcommittee when he became chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in 1978. We worked together on many matters of mutual

interest, especially the Mississippi River and tributaries flood control works, and other infrastructure improvements throughout the country. He requested my assistance on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project and I was pleased to help floor manage the successful completion of that massive project which opened in 1985. The New York Times called the Tenn-Tom Senator Stennis' "pyramid," and I am pleased to have had a role with Senator Stennis on this impressive project.

Mr. President, in our committee assignments and work together, I was blessed as much as a fellow Senator could be blessed by association, counsel, and advice from our departed friend.

As I mentioned earlier, it has been my honor and privilege to be closely associated with Senator Stennis for over 16 years of service together. As chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Stennis designated and commissioned me to floor manage and handle various appropriations measures including supplemental bills and continuing resolutions. He was my chairman, and I was always happy and enthusiastic to carry out his wishes on these matters.

Mr. President, John Stennis was unqualifiedly and unreservedly a gentleman in the finest American tradition. He was a man whose word was as good as his bond. He had an almost reverent sense of discretion and personal taste in his relations to the greatest affairs of the Nation as in his relations to individuals. He was indeed a giant in the Senate.

John Stennis was a Senator's Senator. He was gentle and courteous in conduct, but tough and strong in conviction and character. He personified the highest ideals of honor and integrity within the Senate.

John Stennis also possessed an extraordinary, and indomitable, fortitude, spirit, and fearless courage. I think of the several personal adversities he confronted with such wonderful dignity and demeanor. In 1973, he was shot by robbers in front of his house and left for dead. In 1983, his beloved wife of 52 years, he called her Miss Coy, passed away. In 1984, he lost a leg to cancer and was confined thereafter to a wheelchair but, Senator Stennis bore these adversities with such great strength and courage that he served as a great inspiration to us all.

We are thankful for his character, for his modesty and selflessness, for his devotion to the Senate and his family, for his outgoing good will to his friends, for his high honor as a man.

Mr. President, I traveled with a number of my colleagues to the burial services for Senator Stennis on Wednesday, April 26, at the Pinecrest Cemetery in DeKalb, MS. He was born in DeKalb County in the red clay hills of eastern Mississippi and his mortal remains were buried there in the family plot next to his beloved "Miss Coy" and near his parents. Many of the Stennises

buried there were known as professional people—doctors, lawyers, teacher, and legislators. I was deeply impressed with the tribute given Senator Stennis by his son, John Hampton Stennis. He stated Senator Stennis' campaign pledge and creed when Senator Stennis ran for the Senate in 1947, after having served as a circuit court judge for 10 years. That political creed was "I want to plow a straight furrow right down until the end of my row." Obviously, Senator Stennis succeeded with that campaign pledge. And that philosophy seems to have guided his entire political career and his life. With those words John Hampton captured the spirit and philosophy of John C. Stennis.

Senator Stennis taught through example. He has left both a challenge and a pattern of conduct for citizenship, as well as public life.

What can our citizens today find in John C. Stennis to emulate? A course of conduct that inspires confidence; absolute personal dedication; noble purposes always foremost as a motive and objective; standards in public and private life unexcelled; a willingness to serve; a willingness to lead and endlessly carry the penalty of leadership, and above all else, the attainment of being an honorable man.

I believe we find here a man and a record that fully live up to the everlasting call of the poet, Gilbert Holland, who said:

God, give us men! A time like this demands  
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and  
ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;

Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;

Men who possess opinions and a will;

Men who have honor; men who will not lie;

Strong men, who live above the fog

In public duty and in private thinking.

Mary and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to the family of Senator Stennis—his daughter, Mrs. Margaret Jane Womble, and son, John Hampton Stennis, and to his grandchildren of whom he was so proud.

#### CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE MCKIM BUILDING OF THE BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of one of the most beautiful buildings in America, the McKim Building of the Boston Public Library.

Founded by an act of the Massachusetts Legislature on April 3, 1848, the Boston Public Library was the first free and publicly supported municipal library in the world. By 1880, its original 10,000 volumes had grown to 357,440, and the legislature empowered the city of Boston to take as much land within its limits as it needed to build a new library. The trustees envisioned the new library to be a "palace for the people, and as such \* \* \* a monumental building, worthy of the city of Boston." They hired architect Charles Follen McKim, a senior partner in the New

York firm of McKim, Mead & White, to design this new edifice.

McKim wanted to create a building which would fit with its architecturally distinguished neighbors—H.H. Richardson's Romanesque Trinity Church and the Italian Gothic of the New Old South Church. He modeled the building on Henri Labrouste's Bibliotheque Ste. Genevieve and recruited such outstanding artists as American sculptors Louis and Augustus Saint-Gaudens, French muralist Puvis de Chavannes, and American painters John Singer Sargent and Edwin Austin Abbey.

Since its opening in 1895, the collection has become one of the most outstanding research libraries in the nation, including papers of many Colonia Americans and New England Abolitionists such as William Lloyd Garrison; the Sacco and Vanzetti papers, and the manuscripts and personal libraries of such figures as the famous conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra Serge Koussevitzky and American composer Walter Piston.

It is also a wonderfully user-friendly library, providing many services for the community. It was the first to have a formal system of branch libraries throughout the city. In addition, there are programs for seniors, for children, and for young adults and a structured lecture series which provides college-level humanities courses free to library patrons. The new Johnson addition to the McKim Building is also where I vote.

The McKim Building has recently undergone an extensive restoration. I invite by colleagues to visit its marble lions, view the mural depicting Sir Gawain's quest for the Holy Grail, and enjoy the courtyard. The statue of "The Baccahante," originally designed to be the centerpiece of the fountain in the courtyard, was deemed too scantily clad to display in public. She was hidden away in a dark, unlit recess on the third floor, unseen and unadmired, but now she is being installed in her intended home.

Joshua Bates, for whom the Great Reading Hall is named, wrote to the mayor of Boston,

While I am sure that, in a liberal and wealthy community like that of Boston, there will be no want of funds to carry out the recommendation of the Trustees, it may accelerate its accomplishment and establish the library at once, on a scale to do credit to the City, if I am allowed to pay for the books required, which I am quite willing to do. The only condition that I ask is, that the building shall be such as to be an ornament to the City.

Mr. Bates, your wish has been amply fulfilled.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S PLAN TO SELL STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Energy to the

President of the Senate that transmits administration-proposed legislation. The primary purpose of this legislation is to sell strategic petroleum reserve [SPR] oil to fund the decommissioning of the Weeks Island SPR storage facility. I am having the proposed legislation printed in the RECORD instead of introducing it because I disagree with the policy of selling SPR oil to raise money. Let me explain.

The administration's legislation proposes three things. First, it authorizes the sale of up to 7 million barrels of crude oil from the SPR. Second, it earmarks the moneys from that sale for the decommissioning of the Weeks Island storage facility, and for other unspecified activities related to the SPR. Third, the administration's legislation allows the sale of the SPR oil to not count adversely under the budget rules. I will not speak to the asset sale issue because it is not central to my concerns.

The key policy issue raised by this legislation isn't whether the Weeks Island SPR storage facility should be drained of oil and decommissioned; that must occur. Instead, the question facing the Senate is whether we should authorize the sale of SPR oil to fund this activity and a host of other unspecified SPR activities simply because the administration is unwilling to ask for the necessary money as a part of DOE's regular budget. In a nutshell the issue is: Should SPR oil be sold to make up for a budget shortfall, or should SPR oil be kept on hand in case of an energy emergency? Before I explain my concerns about the administration's proposal to sell SPR oil, let me first describe why the Weeks Island SPR storage facility must be emptied and decommissioned.

Weeks Island is one of the five SPR crude oil storage facilities. Located in Louisiana, it holds 73 million of the total 592 million barrels of oil stored in the SPR. Weeks Island is unique among the SPR oil storage facilities. It was a commercial salt mine before being purchased by the Department of Energy and converted to an oil storage facility. The other four SPR facilities were created specifically to store oil.

In May 1992, a sinkhole was discovered on the ground directly above Weeks Island. The cause of the sinkhole was determined to be a fracture in the salt formation. Over time, the fracture has enlarged as a result of water leaking through it and into the Weeks Island storage cavern. In February 1995, a second sinkhole was discovered over Weeks Island, but it has not yet been determined if this indicates a second leak.

The water leaking into Weeks Island is accumulating at the bottom of the oil storage chamber and it is pushing the oil up. Although the leak is slow, water intrusion creates a risk of path enlargement and increased water inflow. This could ultimately result in a catastrophic water inflow, which would completely displace the oil stored in