

	Fiscal years—						Average
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	
Proj. Contributions (millions)	795	1,198	1,027	1,049	1,066	1,087	1,037
Proj. Obligation Auth. (at 90% guarantee)	715	1,078	924	944	951	976	931

So, the average return to Michigan under a bill that provides a true guarantee of 90 percent of contributions would be about \$931 million. That is about \$230 million more annually than the committee's estimate. What's the explanation? It is not yet clear.

I would like to support a Transportation authorization bill that treats States fairly. Unfortunately, there is insufficient information available right now to make that assessment. I am concerned about what I have learned about the bill. I strongly encourage the committee or the Department to provide Senators, as soon as possible, with charts showing the likely apportionments and allocations that each State can expect for each year for the life of the bill, including information on the actual average return that each State can expect in terms of total obligation authority, assuming USDOT's gas tax receipts projections and the balanced budget agreement levels for transportation.

Mr. President, though I am generally pleased that the committee is proposing to modernize the factors in the basic allocation formula to do away with postal routes and other obsolete factors, I was dismayed to learn that S. 1173 would add a convoluted and highly suspect payment to States that seem to receive special treatment. I am referring to the ISTEAs transition payments. I strongly urge the committee members to strike this unnecessary and unfair provision during markup.

There are many questions that need to be answered about that provision. For instance, are these ISTEAs transition payments subject to an obligation limitation? Can they grow over time? Shouldn't they phase out if they are truly transition payments? Shouldn't the fiscal year 1997 basis used in calculating these transition payments be the authorized amount and not as amended in a supplemental appropriations bill?

Mr. President, I would like to support a fair bill to reauthorize our Nation's transportation systems. This bill holds some promise, but there are too many unanswered questions at this point to make a final conclusion.●

TRIBUTE TO THE PROCTOR MAPLE RESEARCH CENTER

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Proctor Maple Research Center in Underhill Center, VT on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. It is the oldest maple research facility in the country with a mission that embraces research, demonstration, and education.

The center employs basic, as well as, applied research in studying various aspects of the sugar maple tree, its

products and methods to improve syrup production. In addition, the facility monitors long-term meteorological as well as air pollution data in close cooperation with a number of State and Federal agencies. Operations on site demonstrate the latest technologies from which the public and industry can learn the best methods available for manufacturing. The center's state-of-the-art laboratory promotes crucial communication among researchers.

Over the years, research conducted at the center has provided new techniques for efficient sap collection and evaporation systems. It has, and will continue to play an integral role in the success of our region's maple sugar industry so very critical to the local economy.

I am sure that the impact of work completed at the center is realized not only in New England, but across the country, as many have had the pleasure of tasting the fruits of their labor. As a Vermonter and one of millions of Americans that enjoys maple sugar products each year, I would like to extend my best wishes to the Proctor Maple Research Center for many more years of continued success.●

FAREWELL TO HIS EXCELLENCY RAUL ENRIQUE GRANILLO OCAMPO, DEPARTING ARGENTINE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in order to pay a special tribute to Ambassador Raul E. Granillo Ocampo, until recently the Government of Argentina's Ambassador to the United States. Ambassador Ocampo left Washington last month to return to Buenos Aires and another challenging assignment from President Menem.

During his nearly 4 years in Washington, Ambassador Ocampo did a superb job representing his country's interests. He understood well what it takes to be an effective diplomat in Washington. Not only did he develop close working relationships with the State Department and the White House on matters of mutual concern to the United States and Argentina, he also made a special effort to establish close ties with the United States Congress.

The United States-Argentine relationship has never been better. I believe that Ambassador Ocampo can take a good deal of the credit for this. Certainly issues between our two countries would arise from time to time. That is only natural. But, thanks to Ambassador Ocampo's diplomatic skills, such issues were never allowed to undermine our fundamental friendship and mutual respect.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing Ambassador Ocampo, quickly

recognized and appreciated his special talents. So too did President Menem. Hence, it came as no real surprise when in July, President Menem announced the appointment of Ambassador Ocampo to the post of Minister of Justice—a very important position in his Cabinet. That is why Ambassador Ocampo has returned to Argentina.

Knowing something about Ambassador Ocampo's background, it makes perfect sense to me that he would be selected to become Minister of Justice. Not only does he have a law degree from the National University of La Plata, a master's degree in Comparative International Law from Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX; and a doctorate in law from the National University of Buenos Aires. He has also practiced law extensively, served as a judge on the Superior Court of the Province of La Rioja, and as the president, or chief judge, for that court for 2 years.

I for one am only grateful that I had the opportunity to get to know Ambassador Ocampo personally during his tenure in Washington. Thanks to him, I have a much better understanding and appreciation of the complexities of the relations between our two countries and of importance of working to maintain those close ties.

Before the August recess, I was able to personally bid farewell to Ambassador Ocampo and his charming wife, Chini. However, I also wanted to say a more formal farewell to him as well. I particularly wanted him to know that we in the U.S. Senate have been enriched by his presence in Washington over these last number of years.

Finally, Mr. President, it is only fitting that as we say goodbye to an old friend, we also prepare to welcome a new one. President Menem has chosen as Ambassador Ocampo's replacement, His Excellency Diego Ramiro Guelar, who just recently presented his credentials to President Clinton.

Although I have not yet had the opportunity to meet Ambassador Guelar, I understand that he is both an experienced diplomat and an experienced politician—he has held a number of ambassadorial posts and has been a Representative in the Argentine Congress. I look forward to meeting Ambassador Guelar in the very near future, and to working with him as I did with his predecessor.●

INTEL

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Intel is the epitome of a good corporate citizen. During the August recess I was able to view the exceptional good deed performed by Intel. Intel has a large semiconductor manufacturing plant located in Rio Rancho, NM. It is a big

employer and it provides good paying jobs. Rio Rancho didn't have a high school so Intel decided to build the community one. Some 1,900 students will attend this beautiful new 30 million-dollar facility. This is exciting for the community because the high schoolers will no longer have to leave Rio Rancho to attend high school. It is a special kind of home coming.

New Mexico is lucky to have Intel as a member of its community. Rio Rancho would have eventually built a high school, but Intel made it happen sooner.

Also of significance is what will be going on inside this high school. Intel has been very active in working with voc-ed programs so that students are trained for the jobs available at Intel. It starts in the high schools and continues in the technical schools, community colleges, and universities. As job requirements change at Intel, the company has a rigorous job training program that makes a prime example of what lifelong learning is all about.●

GROWING SUPPORT FOR AN OUTSIDE AUTHORITY TO HANDLE Y2K

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, there appears to be some movement on my idea to appoint a commission—which will act more like a special task force—to oversee the Federal Government's handling of the year 2000 problem. In this morning's Federal Page of the Washington Post, a story entitled “‘Year 2000’ Report Flunks 3 Agencies” reports that “three house Republicans called on President Clinton to appoint a special aide to tackle the computer problem.” In July 1996, I wrote the President and proposed the creation of just such a “Y2K czar.” But the administration is still confident that the Office of Management and Budget can handle the job. Like my House counterparts, I fear OMB may not have the time or the resources to handle this issue.

In 1997, fearing the private sector's lagging awareness, I realized that perhaps a task force could increase awareness in the private sector while ensuring compliance in the public sector.

Thus I introduced a first day bill, S. 22, to address this matter through a special task force. S. 22 is cosponsored by 16 Senators and has been endorsed by the New York Stock Exchange [NYSE]. The enormity of this problem demands a task force of experts to ensure compliance. I hope my colleagues agree.

I ask that “‘Year 2000’ Report Flunks 3 Agencies” from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1997]

“YEAR 2000” REPORT FLUNKS 3 AGENCIES—
LAWMAKERS URGE SPECIAL AIDE TO HANDLE
LOOMING COMPUTER PROBLEM

(By Stephen Barr)

A congressional report card flunked three federal agencies and faulted several others

yesterday for moving too slowly on fixing potential “year 2000” computer glitches.

Rep. Stephen Horn (R-Calif.), who oversees information technology issues in the House, issued the report card at a news briefing, where he was joined by Reps. Thomas M. Davis III (R-Va.) and Constance A. Morella (R-Md.). The three House Republicans called on President Clinton to appoint a special aide to tackle the computer problem.

“Most agencies are behind schedule,” Horn said. “The problem, of course, is that we do not know which programs will fail, what problems their failures will create, an how disastrous will be the consequences.”

Most large computer systems use a two-digit dating system that assumes 1 and 9 are the first two digits of the year. Without specialized reprogramming, the system will think the year 2000—or 00—is 1900, a glitch that could cause most to go haywire.

If government systems are not fixed, malfunctions could jeopardize the tax-processing system, payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities, student loan repayments and perhaps even air traffic control.

Horn issued his grades on the same day the Office of Management and Budget delivered to report to Congress that reflected a more aggressive stance by OMB is dealing with the problem. The OMB report said agencies estimate they will spend \$3.8 billion fixing the year 2000 problem.

OMB put four agencies on notice that they will not be allowed to buy new computer and other information technology systems in fiscal 1999 until they have fixed critical computer systems. The funding restriction, however, will be lifted if agencies can justify the need for new equipment or show sufficient progress on the year 2000 problem.

“I have a high degree of confidence there will not be adverse economic consequences flowing from this decision,” said Sally Katzen, OMB's administrator for information and regulatory affairs. But, she added, OMB's increased scrutiny will “reestablish priorities for these agencies.”

The agencies on OMB's troubled list are the departments of Agriculture, Transportation and Education and the Agency for International Development. On his report card, Horn flunked Education, Transportation and AID and gave Agriculture a D-minus.

Agency officials expressed confidence yesterday that they would make their year 2000 fixes before the Jan. 1, 2000, deadline. The pointed out that the OMB report and Horn's grades represented an August snapshot that does not reflect recent decisions to repair or replace computers.

At the Agriculture Department, Secretary Dan Glickman has issued a five-point plan to address year 2000 problems, officials said. An AID official said the agency has narrowed its problem to 28 date fields in a software system that can be “readily resolved.” An Education spokesman said the department “hopes to have most if not all the problems resolved in the coming year.” And at Transportation, a spokesman said DOT plans to make many of its fixes by early 1999.

Yesterday, Horn, Davis and Morella urged Clinton to designate a White House official to lead the government effort to fix year 2000 computer bugs. Horn and Davis praised OMB Director Franklin D. Raines but said pressing budget issues rob him of the necessary time to oversee the computer situation. Morella said Katzen, who oversees regulatory affairs across the government, has done a “good job” on year 2000 policy but contended “they need someone for whom this is a full-time job.”

Katzen said she “very respectfully disagreed that a new bureaucracy is the way to go. . . . This is an issue in which the agen-

cies themselves have to do the work and it is to them that we must look to be responsible and accountable.”

REPORT CARD

(Federal agencies were graded on their progress toward addressing year 2000 computer problems—and given a place to have the report cards signed)

Agency	Grade
Social Security Administration	A—
General Services Administration	B
National Science Foundation	B
Small Business Administration	B
Department of Health and Human Services	B—
Environmental Protection Agency	C
Federal Emergency Management Agency	C
Department of Housing and Urban Development	C
Department of Interior	C
Department of Labor	C
Department of State	C
Department of Veterans Affairs	C
Department of Defense	C—
Department of Commerce	D
Department of Energy	D
Department of Justice	D
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	D
Office of Personnel Management	D
Department of Agriculture	D—
Department of Treasury	D—
NASA	D—
Agency for International Development	F
Department of Education	F
Department of Transportation	F

Source: House subcommittee on government management, information and technology.●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2016

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:45 a.m. on Wednesday, the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2016, the military construction appropriations. I further ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived and there be 5 minutes of debate each for Senators BURNS, MURRAY, and MCCAIN and, following the conclusion of that debate, the Senate proceed to a vote on the adoption of the conference report, with no intervening action or debate.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the following bills, en bloc: Calendar No. 146, S. 308; Calendar No. 150, S. 931; Calendar No. 151, S. 965; Calendar No. 152, H.R. 63; that any committee amendments be agreed to; that the bills be read the third time, and passed, any amendments to the titles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, statements relating to the bills appear at this point in the RECORD with the above occurring, en bloc.

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

GRAZING USE STUDY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 308) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study concerning grazing use of certain land within and adjacent to Grand Teton National Park, WY, and to extend temporarily certain grazing privileges,