

with us about this very important matter of getting the people's business done, getting a safety net here so we can lower the anxiousness of what gridlock will produce in our country at this time.

As I said a little earlier, we are now speculating about whether the last gridlock that occurred in the country was an actual political plan. I am made uncomfortable when the White House Chief of Staff admits that some Democrats would like to force Republicans to stay in Washington longer. This article, which appears in the *National Journal Congressional Daily*, says:

Some Democrats, Thursday, warned that finishing the funding bills may not be as easy as Republican members are saying. Senate minority leader Daschle warned there may be pitfalls in trying to pass the bill.

Well, what we are hearing is that you are laying a political strategy because it is thought to be politically useful to have the Congress appear to be tied up in knots. But I would like to step back from that and just remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that, currently, because of decisions that the President of the United States has made, there are 15,000 American soldiers, men and women, in Bosnia. There are 1,500 of them in Croatia.

There are 29,500 American armed services men and women in the gulf. There are 200,000 U.S. troops on duty abroad. There are 54,000 involved in 13 operations around the globe while 146,000 are stationed at permanent bases abroad. We have literally—quick math—over 50,000 in harm's way today. And the prospect of this kind of posturing is completely out of place. It leaves everyone of the families here at home in support of these troops wondering, and it increases their worry.

I remember in 1990 my good friend and colleague, former President Bush, confronted with a Congress that was exacting and demanding tax increases, and priorities that were not his but he had 1.5 million of America's men and women in the gulf, and simply would not accept allowing our Government to come to a gridlock. He would not accept it. It may have been the decision that ultimately lead to his failed election. But he was not going to leave those American men and women overseas at risk. He was not going to do it. So he accepted the Congress—that was controlled by the other side of the aisle—he accepted it, and he paid an enormous price for it because people thought that he had reneged on a pledge. But he first and foremost stood behind those men and women in uniform in harm's way. We do not have as many, fortunately, in harm's way today. But we have 50,000. I think it is just as incumbent upon this Congress and this President to get that safety net under these men and women, and remove the anxiety and get the politics out of here. Get it done. Let them feel secure and move on.

I could read a long litany as we move from troops. We often hear the Fami-

lies First agenda about children as if they were the only legislators that were concerned about children. I would like to remind them that in the legislation that we are calling upon to get settled we have 20,000 families in crisis who would not know where to turn for help for temporary child care, for crisis nurses that serve thousands of families with children who have disabilities, or serious illnesses. And the families that are under stress—including families affected by HIV, homelessness, violence, and family crisis in drugs and alcohol—over 20,000 families were served in the last 2 years alone. For these families are we going to put them first, as they are asking, or last, to fulfill a political objective?

Will you shut down 2,000 school districts who benefit from impact aid, or put in question the financing of all of those systems? Impact aid provides financial assistance to school districts for the cost of educating children when enrollments and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by the presence of Federal activity. That means military impact by and large across our country.

Mr. President, the list goes on. You could cite the issues and problems that will be compounded ad infinitum as you go through this huge appropriations process that we are saying we should just announce to the entire country is going to be settled; lower the stress; our troops don't have to worry; the systems are going to stay intact and we are going to take politics out of the Halls of Congress, and we are going to put them in the election where they properly belong.

Mr. President, I have been quoting this *National Journal* rather extensively. It is interesting reading. I notice that my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD, who is chairman of the Democratic National Committee, suggested that our party wants to go home because they realize—we realize—that this Congress, the 104th Congress, is a "disaster." I just could not leave that unchallenged. I remind my good friend from Connecticut that in the last Congress, the 103d Congress, it was dominated by two massive events:

First, the passage by one vote in the House and the Senate, at their encouragement and by the President's demand, of the largest tax increase in American history;

Second, by the suggestion that we should grow Government to the largest level it had ever been, and that we should put in place for America a Government-run health system, which would have meant for the first time that over 50 percent of the U.S. economy would be run by the Government and not by our private sector and citizens.

Those are the two most singular marking events of the last Congress.

Now we come to this Congress that the Senator from Connecticut characterizes as a "disaster." We have had no

tax increase. We have had not expanded the Government. As a matter of fact, we have saved the American taxpayers in this Congress \$53 billion in the last 2 years, marking the first time in 25 years that Congress has reversed the trend to increase discretionary spending; in other words, the first time we have responded to the American people's request that we get spending under control.

We adopted a tax—an adoption tax credit. We secured tax relief for small business. We passed the line-item veto after a 200-year debate. We made Congress—you and I—live under the same laws as the rest of America. We passed legislation that would stop unfunded Federal mandates. We passed, after years of debate, welfare reform. We passed tax deductions for long-term care expenses. We passed targeted health care reform, lobbying reform, food safety, safe drinking water and Everglades restoration.

And the list really is much longer.

More importantly, we secured at least an interim transition in our President, Mr. President, because in his State of the Union he said that the era of big Government is over. I would call that a rather substantive success.

The agenda in this city has been changed. The era of big Government is over. Welfare reform is in place. Health care reform is in place. We are not raising taxes. We are saving taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I think this is exactly the kind of change that America has been asking for.

I am going to conclude, Mr. President, by simply saying that I think it is incumbent upon all of us—both sides of the aisle, given the nature of this political season, and the intensity of it, to come to terms—to get a safety net under our troops, our families that are victims of disaster, our children, and our seniors. Take the elections and our differences out of these halls and into the elections themselves.

With that, I yield back any time remaining under my designation.

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

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

THE CLINTON RECORD

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to share a few moments with my colleagues on actions taken by the Clinton administration this week. We have had discussions concerning the appropriateness of the President withdrawing about 1.8 million acres in Utah under the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906.

I ask the Chair and my colleagues, is this really the creation of a national

monument, or is it simply a reelection ploy? The administration justifies the action based on some historical withdrawals of Federal land, referring back to Teddy Roosevelt's time. I would ask for a quick reflection on the oversight of the various land management agencies and laws as they have been developed over the years—the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the management of our refuge systems—and suggest that there is, indeed, enough oversight in the process to ensure extremes are not taken on the utilization of public land.

I think a number of people are asking, in the wake of President Clinton's surprise announcement Wednesday of the 1.8-million-acre national monument withdrawal in southern Utah, just what the President and the administration have in mind. One looked at some of the media and saw the expanse of the Grand Canyon with the President standing—I should say sitting—at a desk overlooking the brink of the Grand Canyon with the Vice President standing behind him.

This withdrawal was a last-minute withdrawal, it was a secretive withdrawal, it was an unconventional withdrawal. The way they attempted to create the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, could cause one to quickly conclude the administration was primarily concerned about the photo opportunities and climbing the staircase to reelection. The details of this withdrawal were left undecided. The potential harms of this hasty decision, in my opinion, suggest the President is in an irresponsible rush to get on the evening news.

I have a question for the White House and the President. It is specific. It is: Why was the public not involved in this decision? We have NEPA, FLPMA, and Federal land use planning laws, all of which stress public involvement in species protection. The administration insists on strict adherence to these laws. Adherence to these laws occurs, of course, before the action, not after it.

These laws were followed in the California desert wilderness debate. It was extensive. We all participated in it. It did not turn out the way we all wanted it, but a democratic process occurred, hearings were held, there was give and take, the State of California was consulted, individuals in this body took a stand, they voted on it and they were held accountable for their vote. Why was that procedure not followed in the State of Utah?

My constituency, of course, is the State of Alaska. We have already experienced a little activity in the 1970's, under President Carter, with the Antiquities Act, whereby some 56 million acres or thereabouts were withdrawn.

Wilderness in Alaska is very sacred to us. The mistake that was made in our State, when we were establishing land patterns, is we did not do a resource inventory. We almost did. We could have met the wilderness demands and we could have identified those

areas of high resource potential, but, unfortunately, the technology and the commitment were not quite there at that time. So we are in constant conflict with Federal refuge areas and the potential development and access through these areas. So we do have a long memory with regard to the application of the Antiquities Act and other laws.

But, in this case, the President, in this day—not in 1970 or 1975 or 1978, but in 1996—did not run the idea by the State of Utah, its elected officials, its legislature, its Governor. He did it over the objection of the Utah delegation. They could have helped prevent some pitfalls that are going to occur.

Instead, they read about it in the newspapers. You can also assume the administration simply has written off Utah, their electoral votes—six, I think—written them off. They have probably written off Alaska.

I know my colleague from Idaho is introducing legislation to ensure, as far as Idaho is concerned, the application of the Antiquities Act. Wyoming, after the experience with the Antiquities Act, had a provision in the final settlement that suggested that the Antiquities Act would be no longer applicable in that State. In our State of Alaska, we have a no more clause. The Federal Government simply cannot take land under a land grab and designate it without a congressional process occurring.

The President included 200,000 acres of school trust lands in Utah which potentially could produce \$1.5 billion to fund Utah's public schools. Why did the President not choose to work with Governor Leavitt about that and the other \$6.6 billion the State potentially would lose? Does the President realize that locking up 62 billion tons of recoverable low-sulfur coal will lead to greater air pollution when utilities are forced to burn dirtier coal?

Like it or not, coal provides about half the Nation's electricity.

It is my understanding this particular coal deposit would be about 40 acres out of the 1.8 million acres—a pretty small footprint.

Does the President know that 350,000 acres of what he is declaring a monument will be opened up to buses, tourists, and other development, and that it would have been protected as wilderness under the plan written by the State of Utah and Utahns? In fact, Utah had indicated a willingness for further review of its roadless areas for wilderness status.

What about the huge liability the Federal Government assumes in wiping out private property claims in this area? Where are we going to find the money to reimburse Americans whose property is, obviously, taken at the cost of billions of dollars? What about the people who are going to lose their jobs? The President says the monument will add jobs.

Let's look at Utah. The people of Kanab, UT, an area surrounded by five

national parks, had their families' incomes drop from \$23,000 in 1990 to \$18,000 in 1995. That does not sound like a lot of new jobs to me.

These questions bring a bigger question to mind: Why was our President in such a hurry? We went through this process. We were going to take it up again in the 105th Congress. He was pressed by the Utah delegation not to make the designation until such questions were answered. The administration and the President offered vague promises saying details would be worked out later. Even Utah's Democratic Congressmen begged him not to ignore the details. I have even heard that Dick Morris made the recommendation. Maybe he is still calling the shots for the President and the administration.

So let me be blunt. Our President appears to be a young man in a hurry. It is becoming more and more clear he doesn't seem to be very concerned about where he is going, as long as it leads to his reelection. As a result, we have great TV news stories, a lot of action and some major policy blunders, in my opinion. We seem to be seeing the influence from the extreme national environmental groups who have the ear of the administration and the President, and these groups have put fear into the American people; fear that we cannot develop resources on public lands. This issue is true not just about coal mining. It is true about grazing, it is true about timbering, it is true about oil and gas exploration—virtually all development on public land.

The environmental community is instilling this degree of fear in the American electorate. It bears no responsibility, no accountability. They simply sell American technology short and, by this fear tactic and the ability of the media to expound on it and add to it, they are generating membership, they are generating dollars, and we are becoming more and more dependent on imports, something I am going to talk a little bit about later.

As we reduce our own self-sustaining resource base, we become more dependent on imports. Those imports are coming in from nations that do not have the same environmental sensitivity that we do. We have the ingenuity, we have the technology, we have the American know-how to preserve these jobs at home, develop our resources, and do it safely.

The President's designation of the 1.7-million-acre monument was an arrogant act. It was in violation of the intent of the Federal environmental laws and procedures the President's own administration has so ardently enforce on everyone else.

Mr. President, I intend, before this session is over, to introduce legislation to close this dangerous loophole in our environmental laws. It is going to be applicable, obviously, to those States with public lands, which are the Western States, to eliminate the necessity and the authority of the President to

continue these land grabs without any congressional evaluation.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 has a narrow, specific purpose. It was never intended to be used in this manner. As I indicated, Alaska and Wyoming have been exempt from the act, but other public land States should know it could only be a matter of time before they are attacked for withdrawals similar to what occurred in Utah.

The question is not should we have a national monument in Utah. The Utah delegation said it would work with the administration on that. The question is, should a President ram through such a big Federal land change at the last minute without public participation and congressional involvement?

Clearly, we know the answer. The democratic process is being circumvented. It is no wonder some people are referring to this action as President Clinton's Federal land grab and calling it reelection national monument. He says he is merely doing what Teddy Roosevelt did by using the Antiquities Act of 1906. But, again, there are many important differences. President Roosevelt thought first and acted later. Roosevelt acted nearly 100 years ago, before this Nation developed environmental laws and procedures for proper and detailed land use decision-making. I am sorry, President Clinton, you are no Teddy Roosevelt.

(Mr. HATFIELD assumed the Chair.)

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in conjunction with that, I think it is noteworthy to recognize President Clinton's themes this week. He continues to push the themes that, one, he is the environmental President, and, two, he is the export President. Let's examine that for a minute. I just shared with you my views on why his decision to lock up Utah's vast energy resources was a mistake, but I also want to discuss why his rhetoric about exports covers up what is really going on with the trade deficit.

The most recent statistics on the trade deficit were absolutely horrible. In July, imports increased to \$78.9 billion from \$77.9 billion in June. The largest increases were in industrial supplies and materials, primarily the cost of crude petroleum.

Our exports decreased to \$67.2 billion from \$69.7 billion in June. The trade deficit in goods for the first 6 months of this year amounted to \$89.6 billion, and this is expected to grow to \$170 billion by year's end, second only to last year's record \$175 billion.

China and Japan continue as the countries with the largest trade imbalance, but focusing only on China and Japan ignores one of the major contributors to our trade deficit, and that is our dependence on foreign oil. Right now, America is importing 51 percent of its daily oil needs. That percentage is expected to rise to two-thirds by the year 2000.

Here is a chart, Mr. President, of the current account balances of our top three creditors from 1994 to 1995. Petro-

leum payments in 1994, 27 percent, or \$44.2 billion; petroleum payments in 1995, 33.2 percent, or \$57.9 billion. Then there is China, Japan, and others.

That is what we are looking at when we look at the trade deficit. As this chart illustrates, foreign oil dependency translates into one-third of the total trade deficit. The Department of Energy predicts that by the years 2000 and 2002, we will be two-thirds dependent on imported oil. Instead of 51 percent, it will be 66 percent.

What is America doing about its continuing dependency? I think we are following counterproductive policies. We are not reducing our oil dependency. As I said earlier, the President just locked up huge reserves of coal in Utah. This is clean coal. Earlier, he vetoed legislation which would have opened up the Arctic oil reserve. That passed both the House and the Senate for the first time. That is the best chance to find significant stable American sources of oil domestically, in the United States.

I remind my colleagues that Prudhoe Bay has been supplying this Nation with nearly 25 percent of its total crude oil utilization for the last 18 years. It is in decline. Yet this administration will not let us use American technology to go into the areas that are most likely to have a major discovery. And with that technology, the footprint would be very small, no larger than the Dulles International Airport complex, which is about 12,500 acres out of the 19 million acres in the area associated with the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve.

So the President's actions are certainly disturbing. But I guess they are hardly surprising, because if you really look at our energy area—and as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, that is my area of responsibility—he is equally unwilling to address and promote nuclear power, coal power, hydroelectric power. He strongly supports the consumption of natural gas, but is not equally supportive of domestic production. He does not want to see additional offshore and on-shore Federal lands opened up. In short, he is doing virtually nothing to reduce our dependence on imported oil and, thereby, address our trade deficit.

During President Clinton's 4 years in office, the United States will have accumulated the largest trade deficit in the history of our Nation. That is astonishing, when you consider the exchange rate records set during the same period. I think this is a part of the Clinton record that Americans should understand and consider and reflect on a little closer.

There is another inconsistency relative to energy. As we recognize our dependence on nuclear power for about 30 percent of our power-generating capability, we have accumulated high-level nuclear waste. The President refuses to support the plan in Congress to establish in Nevada a temporary repository until a permanent repository can be determined at Yucca Mountain.

As far as low-level waste, the President refuses to support a congressional proposal giving the ability to the State of California at Ward Valley to put in a facility to store the waste even though we have given the States the authority. The disturbing thing is, while the President, in this election mode, opposes these proposals—responsible proposals, proposals that have been supported by State Governors, State legislatures, and proposals that have been supported by a majority of the U.S. Senate—he and his administration refuse to come up with responsible alternatives.

I have sent letters saying, if you do not like this, what will you support? He absolutely ignores the responsibility associated with addressing and correcting these exposures.

Lastly, Mr. President, another part of the Clinton record that should not go without remark is the inept and naive approach the administration has taken in dealing with some of our foreign adversaries. Let me just touch on two recent examples.

The Clinton administration, some time ago, embarked on a policy towards North Korea that can only be called, in my opinion, "appeasement," and put the United States in a position of being a party, almost, to a bribe. Under the so-called negotiated framework deal, the Clinton administration was going to provide North Korea with \$500 million worth of oil—500,000 tons a year—and, along with South Korea and Japan, two light-water nuclear reactors worth \$4 to \$5 billion.

What have we received in return for this so-called deal? Have the North Koreans acted in good faith? No. The North Koreans held us hostage. They said they would stop their own graphite reactor construction if they could have this new technology, and only then could we go in and examine their storage sites, once the new light-water reactors were on line.

Under the deal we negotiated, the Clinton administration was going to provide these light-water reactors worth \$4 to \$5 billion. We saw what North Korea did with regard to acting in good faith just yesterday and the day before in their relationships with South Korea and the rest of the world.

A North Korean submarine, filled with 26 commandos—I met with the Korean Ambassador last evening—tried to infiltrate the south. Some of the commandos carried South Korean uniforms with them. They were armed. And they had a mission, Mr. President, a mission to infiltrate South Korea. But we will hear more about that later.

Nineteen of the commandos have already been killed. A manhunt continues for the remaining infiltrators. But these commandos came from a North Korean submarine that beached in the south. The United Nations command attempted to deliver a formal protest to the North Korean military official in the face of clear evidence of the North Korean infiltration. The North

Korean Government refused to even accept the protest of South Korea.

So there we have, I think, an extraordinary example of our foreign policy, perhaps well-meaning, but indeed to a high degree naive in relation to shoring up a deteriorating regime of totalitarianism in North Korea, one that, if left to its own weight, in the opinion of the Senator from Alaska, would very soon flounder. There is no other area in the world as isolated as North Korea. Having visited there a few years ago, I can tell you that they cannot feed themselves as a nation. They have no energy. They have no capital reserves. They have an extraordinary government whose longevity is extremely short, in this Senator's opinion.

So, Mr. President, what has the Clinton administration done? Well, have they decided to reconsider the energy bribery deal they have negotiated with the north? No. No. They are not reconsidering it. Are they so naive they believe the North Korean Government bargains in good faith? I wonder. The American people have to wonder when it comes down to this administration and President Clinton negotiating with foreign adversaries.

What of the Clinton administration's spin-doctoring claim of "success" after last week's cruise missile attack in Iraq? The coalition that President George Bush put together in 1990 is crumbling. Saddam Hussein has no fear of crushing the Kurds because he knows that U.S. leadership is lacking under this President and this administration.

Just this week we learned that nearly 200 people disappeared. They have been murdered, Mr. President. These are people who were providing our Government with intelligence. Why didn't we get those people out of the country before Saddam and his murderous troops crushed the Kurds?

Yesterday, CIA chief John Deutch told Congress that Saddam is politically stronger today than he was before he sent his troops into northern Iraq. Somebody asked the question, well, is Saddam better off today than he was 2 weeks ago? The answer is clearly, yes. We have lost a good deal of credibility.

So, Mr. President, it is a very dangerous world we live in. It is easy to criticize. But it is important to point out the gross inconsistencies associated with these items that I have touched on today.

I think the administration is naive. I think they are gullible. I do not think they are equipped, based on their record, to deal with the dangers that confront us today and in the immediate future. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURKOWSKI). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ON PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in the last days of this session, as I reflect on the past 30 years in which I have been privileged to serve here in the U.S. Senate, my thoughts turn time and again to the many, many individuals who not only have enriched my experience here but have been exemplars of public service. I cannot possibly name them all or thank them all. There are two gentlemen, however, who have been integral to the work of the Appropriations Committee in my time as chairman and ranking minority member these past 15 years, and I want to take a few minutes today to thank them, particularly, today.

Bill Hoagland has served as the staff director of the Senate Budget Committee for 11 years. In that time, he has grappled with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, played a significant role in the 1987, 1990, and 1995 "budget summit" negotiations, and fought daily battles with virtually every committee in the Senate and the House of Representatives to nurture an effective congressional budget process and keep the fiscal policy of our Government on a sound foundation. The legislative process during his tenure in the Senate has been nearly consumed with budget legislation of one sort or another, and he has been in the midst of it all.

Bill Hoagland has epitomized the qualities and character of an outstanding public servant and Senate staffer. He has been unfailingly honest. He has considered opposing views of issues dispassionately. He has been a staunch defender of the budget process, and a loyal advisor to his chairman, Senator PETE DOMENICI. Like his chairman, he has been courageous in holding his convictions despite harsh criticism from certain quarters. The Senate is fortunate to have his able assistance, and I salute him.

A sound relationship with the Office of Management and Budget is very important to the work of the Appropriations Committee, and in the past 10 years that relationship has been enhanced by the work of Chuck Kieffer, a career employee of OMB. Chuck started at OMB when Mr. David Stockman was named Director, and he has served under every Director since, through Republican and Democratic administrations alike. He has been the principal OMB liaison with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under Republican and Democratic majorities.

By virtue of that experience, Chuck Kieffer has become the single person in OMB most knowledgeable about the appropriations process. He is the institutional memory of the Executive Office of the President on what we have done, and what we have left undone, in appropriations acts. More important, he is the honest broker between the Con-

gress and the administration, faithfully characterizing the differences between us, and providing accurate information to bridge those differences. He works impossibly long hours keeping track of myriad issues, and does so with a degree of professionalism that meets the highest standard. For that, he has earned the respect and appreciation of the committee members and staff in both Houses on both sides of the aisle, and I want thank him for his service.

Mr. President, there are many other people throughout our Government, at all levels, who perform demanding jobs under difficult circumstances. They do so with integrity and diligence to duty. Those of us who serve here, in the House of Representatives, and in the highest levels of the executive departments, could not do without them. All of the citizens of this Nation owe them more than we ever effectively express. By expressing my appreciation to Bill Hoagland and Chuck Kieffer, I mean to convey that appreciation to all those other public servants as well, who perform day after day these many duties staffing our committees and our personal offices.

(The remarks of Mr. HATFIELD pertaining to the introduction of S. 2100 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, September 19, the Federal debt stood at \$5,190,460,235,894.57.

One year ago, September 19, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,965,955,000,000.

Five years ago, September 19, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,625,828,000,000.

Ten years ago, September 19, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,108,205,000,000. This reflects an increase of more than \$3 trillion, \$3,010,255,235,894.57, during the 10 years from 1986 to 1996.

HONORING LOWELL MOHLER, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE MISSOURI FARM BUREAU

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, in 1794 George Washington said, "I know