

the administration. We are hoping that we can add some bills that should have been included in the package that passed the House by an overwhelming margin. Certainly some of those that were knocked out should have been included, and there is no justification for them not being there. We are trying to identify those and get an understanding as to how we will handle it in the Senate and the House and with the administration.

As developments occur and as we clear bills, we will be back to the floor to deal with those.

Mr. President, I have no further need of time, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

THE OMNIBUS PARKS BILL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will not take a full 10 minutes, but I would like to speak briefly about this so-called parks bill or Presidio package which is being considered here in the Senate this week and urge my colleagues who are engaged in negotiations on this to come to some resolution so that we can move ahead with this important piece of legislation.

My home State of New Mexico will be greatly benefited if this package of legislation becomes law. There are many provisions in it that I believe would be important to many constituencies around the country.

I notice in the October 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the RECORD that we received on our desks today, there is a list on page—let us see—it is H12197, a listing of the various titles which are included in the bill. I can honestly say there is probably something in here for every State in the Union. This is a catch-all piece of legislation which is intended to make necessary boundary adjustments and to make necessary provisions for the protection of our public lands in a great many areas. These are noncontroversial provisions.

This is a summary I refer to here, a summary of the legislation that has already passed the House of Representatives. I wish, Mr. President, we could call this legislation up and pass it in the Senate. Today would be a good time to do that while we still have

enough Senators here to get a quorum. I could go through and will indicate the various titles.

The first title relates to the Presidio of San Francisco which, of course, has been the reason that the package was designated the Presidio package. The second title is on boundary adjustments and conveyances. The next title is on rivers and trails and exchanges of lands, then historic areas, and it goes on to describe the various administrative and management provisions including the National Coal Heritage Area, the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area, the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area, Steel Industry Heritage Project, Essex Heritage Area, South Carolina National Heritage Corridor, America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership, the Ohio and Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor, the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area.

Mr. President, to my knowledge, all of these are meritorious provisions and ones which we should enact before we leave town. I think it would be a great shame if we were not able to do that. This is of particular interest in my home State for several provisions, but particularly there has been a longstanding problem of great concern to the Taos Pueblo which we are proposing to resolve in this legislation.

The Taos Pueblo land transfer provision would transfer 764 acres in northern New Mexico which is now located in the Wheeler Peak Wilderness of the Carson National Forest to the Taos Pueblo, adjacent to the Taos Pueblo.

The area has spiritual significance to the people in the Taos Pueblo. The bottleneck area continues to be used by the Taos Pueblo Indians for religious pilgrimages. The sacred Path of Life Trail, connecting the Pueblo with Blue Lake, runs through this bottleneck. The Blue Lake Wilderness has been a source of spiritual strength to the Taos Pueblo for over 1,000 years. The bill pending before the Senate today is intended to complete the full transfer of the Blue Lake territory to the Taos Pueblo, a transfer that Senator Anderson pursued diligently while he was here representing our State. The bottleneck tract will be returned to its rightful owners under this legislation.

I would hate to see the legislation fail to pass because of a disagreement over some totally unrelated provisions. Again, I urge my colleagues to allow this land transfer in my home State and the many other important provisions in the Presidio package to become law. It is the right thing to do for the people of Taos Pueblo. I hope very much we can take that responsible action before we adjourn this session for this year.

I yield the floor.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, as the 104th Congress draws to a close, I want to spend a few moments discussing what I believe are some important

initiatives which are not going to make it into the statute books this year. Although I am deeply disappointed that the many months—and years—which have gone into these efforts have not borne fruit, I am confident that they have taken enough root that they will rise once again in the 105th Congress.

Unfortunately, the list of proposals falling into this category is much longer than I might wish. I will not go through the entire litany, but I do want to set out what I was attempting to accomplish with respect to the Food and Drug Administration [FDA], the National Institutes of Health [NIH], and our Nation's job training programs.

Legislation to reform the Food and Drug Administration, S. 1477, was reported by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with strong bipartisan support. Members on both sides of the aisle spent long hours in negotiations, and I want particularly to commend the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] for her unflagging efforts on behalf of reform. Unfortunately, these negotiations failed to produce an agreement which would not be filibustered, and it was therefore not possible to bring S. 1477 before the full Senate.

This legislation was designed to enhance the professionalism, stature, and effectiveness of the FDA. In developing the measure, I was motivated by a desire to assure that our Nation does not lose its leadership in new product development and by a desire to respond to the plight of countless individuals who have suffered needless delays in obtaining new therapies.

Through hearings, meetings, and other reviews of the issue, I concluded that the performance of the FDA could be substantially improved without sacrificing consumer confidence in the safety and efficacy of the products they purchase.

I would like to outline briefly the major principles underlying this legislation, because I believe they are important and should serve as the foundation for any FDA reform measure considered in the future:

First, as I stated, the major purpose of S. 1477 was to enhance the professionalism of the agency, and it attempted to do so by providing a clear statement of the agency's mission and by emphasizing performance standards and accountability.

Second, it attempted to improve the speed and efficiency of the product testing, review, and approval process by encouraging cooperation between the agency and the manufacturer from the very beginning. Too often, all the focus is placed on the back end of the process—FDA approval—without giving sufficient attention to steps which could be taken to improve the process during the many years leading up to that point.

Mr. President, as you know, it can take sometimes as many as 12 years or more before final approval is achieved.

We felt strongly in the committee that process could be enhanced without hurting in any way safety, efficiency, and efficacy in order to bring that time span down.

There have been instances where the agency has implemented this type of cooperative approach—for example, with respect to the testing and review of AIDS drugs—and this measure attempted to encompass those practices which have been successful.

Finally, the measure put forward some new options, such as the contracting of review of certain medical devices. The point was not to take FDA out of the picture. The bill maintained the role of the FDA as the final arbiter of safety and efficacy. At the same time, it took steps to assure that, at the appropriate point, the agency does come to a decision.

Scientific methods and technology have changed dramatically over the past two decades, while our regulatory structures have barely budged. An incentive is growing for U.S. companies to move research, development, and production abroad, threatening our Nation's continued world leadership in new product development—costing American jobs and further delaying the public's access to important new products. We can address these issues through sound reform legislation, and we should.

Another important health care matter which deserves priority in the 105th Congress is the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health. Last week, the Senate approved a reauthorization bill (S. 1897), and I had hoped the House of Representatives would take it up as well. Unfortunately, that will not happen.

As a consequence, we have lost—for the moment—an opportunity to reaffirm the importance of the biomedical research mission of the NIH and to enhance the effectiveness of the agency in performing that mission.

All Americans can take great pride in the exceptional contributions that the NIH has made. It has compiled an astonishing record of biomedical research advances which have transformed all of our lives. Vaccines against conditions which once crippled and killed are now routine, and drugs hailed as miracles at their inception are as well known as aspirin. These past successes against seemingly insurmountable odds have inspired confidence and offered hope to those who have nowhere else to turn.

In addition to reauthorizing the important work of the two largest institutes—the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute—the reauthorization bill approved by the Senate attempted to strengthen the ability of the NIH to respond to emerging issues in the biomedical research arena and in the larger health care environment in which it operates.

Among other things, this legislation authorized the creation of the National

Human Genome Research Institute, in recognition that one of the biggest future frontiers is that of the human genetic code. The elevation of the National Center for Genome Research to institute status would serve to better focus NIH resources for this important work.

It recognized the need to invest in the education and training of the next generation of clinical researchers by providing for greater support for expert training of young biomedical scientists who have elected the difficult, and frequently less well-compensated, careers in scientific inquiry.

The bill streamlined the excess and often duplicative infrastructure that has grown up over time in the NIH. Every dollar saved from unnecessary administrative burdens is another dollar freed up for support of biomedical research.

It established a framework under which additional sources of funding could be tapped by creating a biomedical research trust fund within the Treasury.

This legislation included a significant initiative in the area of Parkinson's disease research. Based on separate legislation with broad bipartisan support in both the Senate and House, this initiative would establish up to 10 Morris K. Udall Centers for Research on Parkinson's Disease and provide for awards to neuroscientists and clinicians to support innovative research.

Turning to other issues before the labor committee this year, I think perhaps my greatest disappointment is the demise of the Work Force and Career Development Act. I say it is the greatest disappointment not only because its failure is a lost opportunity to bring about significant reform in an area where reform is sorely needed, but also because we came so close to achieving it.

This is not a bill which died in committee. It was not killed on the Senate floor; in fact, just about a year ago it was adopted by a vote of 95 to 2. It did not die in the House, where its companion measure was adopted with overwhelming bipartisan support.

This initiative, which has its roots in legislation I introduced with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], in the 103d Congress, moved step by step through the legislative process. Yet, the conference report, which was filed on July 25, has been sitting gathering dust due to the threats of dilatory action should it be called up.

I have addressed the Senate on many occasions regarding the need for fundamental reform of our Nation's job training programs. I think reform is absolutely essential if we are to provide the skilled job training which can best address the needs of the people in each of our States, because what might be necessary in Kansas might be very different in Alabama or in South Carolina. As I have mentioned before, the roughly \$5 billion which the Federal Government invests in job training and

related programs is small potatoes in our annual trillion-dollar-plus budget. Most probably feel, I think, that this is a boring subject and ask why should we focus our attention on this. It doesn't grab headlines. But if we wish to make welfare reform work, if we wish to provide a work force for the next century that is going to meet the challenging demands of developing new technology, we have to be more flexible in letting States design good job-training programs. I just worry, Mr. President, that by maintaining the status quo, we are saying that we are willing to live with inadequate programs and that we are not willing to step forward with the innovative ideas that I think are important, and that I believe the American people think are important. These are ideas that will help assure that Government spends money more effectively and wisely.

I contend that it is a travesty to continue to allow these billions of dollars to be thrown away on programs where good intentions are not sufficient to produce good results. We don't even have the data to know what works and what doesn't work.

That is what the Work Force and Career Development Act is all about. It would consolidate narrowly focused Federal categorical programs into a comprehensive statewide system—offering States the flexibility they need to focus resources where the need is greatest. It would encourage the development of true partnerships among educators, trainers, and the business community. And it would focus on getting results.

Many forces in our society are raising the stakes for the effective performance of job training programs. Technology has transformed the marketplace and the skills which employers seek from their employees. The recently enacted welfare reform legislation places a premium on job placement and retention.

My biggest regret at the failure to bring about job training reform is the fact that those Americans most in need of quality programs which have to continue to muddle their way through the current morass, will have to continue to be shuttled from one program to the next, our not knowing for sure what will work and where they will be able to find the answers they seek. I think it is a disappointment and a shame, our not being able to address the conference report before this Congress closes.

There are other reform efforts as well which I believe could have made Government programs work better. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and I developed legislation to reform the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] in an effort to place greater emphasis on improving safety education and less on imposing fines for trivial violations. I worked with Representative J.C. Watts on the Youth Development Community

Block Grant Act, an effort to consolidate scattered youth development programs into a locally controlled system of positive prevention activities.

A recent edition of Roll Call mentioned the interest of the majority leader in spending more time overseeing existing programs, rather than creating new ones. I wholeheartedly agree. We do a disservice to the American taxpayer to add to Federal obligations while ignoring the performance of those we have already made.

The process of oversight and reform is a long one. It does not happen overnight or even over the 2-year course of a Congress. I would like to think that the work which has gone into the initiatives I have mentioned today will make a contribution to efforts to be undertaken next year and the year after that. Although I will not be here to shepherd these initiatives through their next phases, I have confidence that they will flourish under the care of those who follow.

Mr. President, this is the last speech I will give on the Senate floor. I would just like to say it has been a great honor to represent the State of Kansas. I want to say a special thanks to my colleague from the State of Alabama, Mr. HEFLIN, who will be retiring in this Congress. It has been an honor to serve with him. I thank my colleagues and my staff and the support personnel. It has been a pleasure to serve with them for 18 years.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as America heads into the next century and millennium, it is crucial that a serious reevaluation of our role in the world occur. Our role in the world will largely be dictated, at least for the foreseeable future, by the fact that our Nation is the sole remaining superpower. This role carries with it added responsibilities with regard to international and even more localized foreign disputes.

In reevaluating our role as the sole superpower, there are some restraining factors that must be part of the equation.

The lessons of Vietnam, Korea, and Beirut, as they relate to public support, cannot be dismissed. We have to consider the attitudes of the population in this country if we are to pursue action in places like Bosnia. A key question is how many human casualties the public will tolerate. Will the public support the mission and to what degree will it be supported? The media is a key element, since it has a tremendous capacity for creating sentiment for or against a particular policy. Our role might increasingly be ad hoc in nature. Public attitudes are a potential internal threat that can't be dismissed. There is a strong feeling that America cannot be the world's policeman. There

is a vocal sentiment of limited quasi-isolationism among many that can't be dismissed, and it has the potential to grow. The question of how best to manage this sentiment is important to the conduct of our foreign policy and in assessing our role in the world.

Scarce and limited resources on the part of our national government will also be a major determinant of our foreign policy. We are living in a world of shrinking government action. Both major political parties acknowledge this reality. It is a reality based upon budgetary constraints and a desire for less government, and dictated to some degree by the competition between domestic and foreign policy needs.

We have already seen over the last few years a tendency on the part of our allies to look to us for leadership and to put out fires. Our leadership of the NATO operations in Bosnia is a stark example. In this war-torn region, we have seen not only armed battles, but rape, torture, murder, and genocide. As a society which stands against such evils, we will be called upon to intervene. Budgetary constraints will continue to require a reevaluation of our role as a world policeman and as the rewarding arbiter of international disputes in places like the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and other areas.

A key part of the reevaluation of our role as a solver of conflicts will also be the reevaluation of our role in world disarmament as well as an arms merchant. As we rightfully pursue disarmament and restraints on the sale of arms, we must strive to retain a sensible balance and not go too far. A root cause analysis will serve us well; it is obvious that not much serious fighting takes place between two parties if there are no arms. Our own security, in the light of more ambiguous threats and potential terrorism, will continue to be paramount. Military technology and the feasibility and need of such programs as SDI will continue to demand attention. These questions will not recede just because the direct threat from a competing superpower has receded.

We must not only look at our role in securing human rights around the world, but also to the commercial and business opportunities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, as well as in the former Warsaw Pact nations. Our international trade policies are important components of such development.

As far as our trade policy and how it affects our own citizens, we must carefully look at our trade deficits and how they will affect America's jobs if not reduced. There should be little doubt that many of our traditional jobs are going overseas or across borders. While new service jobs are being created, there is the increasing danger of a growing gap between the wealthy and, on the other hand, the economically disadvantaged and poor and a narrowing of the middle class. There is no question that Japan has emerged as a world economic power because of its

successful trade policies. It is no secret that one learns from the successful. So far, we have not learned from Japan or come close to duplicating their success. What can be learned from them in making our own policies more beneficial to our national interests is an important question. One key component of their successful policy is that the corporate sector does not view the government as the enemy.

Another challenge will be the role of NATO in European security and outside Europe. It is currently being seriously reevaluated. The alliance's expansion by the end of the century appears to be a foregone conclusion. What will the exact mission of an expanded NATO be in the next century? In order to avoid some of the problems experienced by the United Nations, particularly in the "peacekeeping" realm, its mission will have to be reevaluated meticulously, defined precisely, and articulated forcefully. The Pacific Rim, a rapidly expanding area of trade, development, and expansion, is also one of potential security threats. The lessons of China's influence in the Korean and Vietnam conflicts must not be forgotten. Possible East Asian alliances, as well as our understanding of East Asian motivations, are puzzling and wrought with dangers. Considerable thought, patience, and insight must be given to security threats and trade relationships. The issue of whether NATO could or should be used outside Europe—even if the consent of the member nations were obtained—will be paramount. The role of the United Nations is a major component of this issue, particularly in view of China's veto in the U.N. Security Council. We know the future will continue to yield technological advances that we have not even thought of today. This is true both in terms of domestic and international policy. A renewed commitment to research and development will be crucial in keeping pace with the rest of the world. Think about the Internet and how it has already changed the ways in which we receive, transmit, and exchange news and information. This will only increase in the next century. Our space program has yielded some of the greatest benefits our nation has ever realized. Its bi-products have helped lead to advances in health care techniques. We must commit ourselves anew to NASA and its mission. We must help citizens see the direct links between advanced science and research and their relevance to their daily lives. How many unforeseen research triumphs are waiting to be realized in the next century?

Here at home, the delivery of health care is still a great concern to many of our citizens. As the National Institutes of Health and other government and private entities continue to increase the average life span of our population, the demand for health care services will only increase. The costs will rise. Access will continue to be an issue. We must evaluate these strains on the system and whether or not we will be able