

As the season began, few seers in the sports world could have foretold the indelible mark this team would leave behind. The adversity these young men faced would have folded a team of lesser character. Their stalwart manager Joe Torre began the year in a hospital room rather than in the dugout as he battled prostate cancer. Teammates Paul O'Neill, Luis Sojo, and Scott Brosius all lost their fathers during the past season. In addition, the Yankee family was struck by the passing of baseball legends, Joe DiMaggio and Jim "Catfish" Hunter. Yet this team endured and reached its goal, giving New York an unfathomable 25th World Championship.

For the past two seasons—and three of the last four—we have seen the Yankees go to the World Series. They emerged victorious after the minimum of four straight wins on both occasions. Starting pitchers David Cone, Orlando Hernandez, and Roger Clemens held the Braves to a meager six hits and two runs in 21½ innings. Reliever Mariano Rivera had saves in Games One and Two and won Game Three on his way to becoming the Series Most Valuable Player. Offensively, the team had Derek Jeter and Chuck Knoblauch getting on base, and Chad Curtis came off the bench to hit two home runs in Game Three, with the second coming in the bottom of the 10th, sealing the victory for the Bronx Bombers.

All in all, this team put forth admirable effort coupled with unmatched talent. This victory is a truly epochal moment that brings joy to the hearts of Yankee fans everywhere. An editorial appearing in today's New York Times puts it best, "We are all fans now." In closing I would like to offer a possible slogan for next year's team: Thrice would be nice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 29, 1999]

THE YANKEES WIN

Maturity in sports has many looks, but right now it looks like the New York Yankees, who won their 25th World Series last night against the Atlanta Braves. Clearly, the Yankees were able to dominate the Braves, whom they swept, but just as clearly they were able to dominate themselves and their own fortunes. Patience is a word that has been much used around the Yankees dugout this season, and what it means is a privileged manner of looking at baseball. What this team seems to see is not a game where one event cascades into another as the innings slip by, the past steadily commanding the present. To this team baseball looks like a game of constant renewal, with each pitch, each batter, each defensive out.

Baseball is, if anything, too rich in the grand themes, especially during a World Series. You expect television to turn grandeur into grandiosity, and it does. But a kind of triumphalism thrives at Yankee Stadium too, where the World Series pregame soundtrack included the theme from "Star Wars" and the "1812 Overture." But that mood is

meant for the fans, not the players. There is a difference between destiny and opportunity, and the 1999 Yankees know it. They will take opportunity every time, and in this Series, take it they have.

It is easy, in the high-wattage glare of a Series game, to lose sight of the fact that baseball, even at Yankee Stadium, can still have a pleasantly smalltown feel to it. Kofi Annan, mayor of the world if not the city, throws out the first pitch in New York, which bounces halfway to the plate. Marching bands from South Jersey assemble on the warning track—the outfield grass remaining inviolate—and play "Gimme Some Lovin'" and "Louie, Louie." The notes of all the instruments, except the base drums, gust away into the evening, just as they would at a local homecoming game. Hand-lettered signs rise in the stands—"Dripping Springs, Texas, Loves the Yankees"—and the stadium sparkles with camera flashes going off, snapshots of a vortex where a batter steps up to the plate.

The fans roar with emphatic, if imprecise, knowledge. They call balls and strikes from a mile away. The air is barbed with advice, with schoolyard taunts, and then with the exultation of the moment. The emotion so latent in the players, so overt in the fans, gives way at the final out, and at last, in the rejoicing, there is no distinction between players and fans. We are all fans now.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, a lack of leadership from the administration is responsible for the present difficulty in reaching an agreement on the foreign operations appropriations bill. The President says he vetoed the bill over low levels of foreign assistance in general and a lack of funding for the Wye Accord specifically. The Administration did not exert the leadership needed to secure the Wye funding, however, and did not work with Congress to find a way to provide this critical assistance to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians without raiding the Social Security surplus. I am a strong supporter of funding the Wye Accord if the money can be found without using Social Security surplus funds. The President should make Wye funding the priority it should be and find the money somewhere in the budget.

The lack of leadership from the administration in providing for our allies and interests in the Middle East already has had real costs, however. The President's veto of the foreign operation appropriations bill on October 18, 1999 sends a disturbing signal that our foreign policy is being held hostage to the domestic budget politics of the administration. While the President's veto was the wrong step for U.S. foreign policy around the world, the administration's rejection of the bill is particularly troubling for U.S. policy in the Middle East and strategic allies such as Israel.

The foreign operations bill passed by Congress contains \$960 million in economic assistance and \$1.9 billion in military assistance for Israel. The for-

ign operations bill also contains over \$2 billion in assistance to Egypt and \$225 million in aid to Jordan, both important countries in the peace process. The provision of such assistance to Israel is critically important at this juncture of the peace process, and it troubles me that the administration did not lay the groundwork for an acceptable foreign assistance package. The government of Prime Minister Ehud Barak has stated its intention to complete final status negotiations within one year. Many difficult issues must be resolved for a final settlement to be reached. Jerusalem, refugees, and water rights are just several of the monumental issues that will be topic of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

It is my hope that the administration will support Israel more forcefully during these negotiations, including a clear statement of U.S. policy that Jerusalem is and should remain Israel's undivided capital. As final status negotiations proceed, the United States should defend Israel against diplomatic ambushes in international fora such as the United Nations. An unequivocal U.S. position in support of Israel in the coming months will be essential to achieve a sustainable peace settlement.

Also at stake is a potential peace settlement with Syria. I trust that Prime Minister Barak will not make territorial concessions in the Golan Heights that will jeopardize Israel's security. As a former military chief of staff, Prime Minister Barak is well aware of the security implications associated with relinquishing territory in the Golan. Any Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights should be met with the most reliable assurances from Syria that its hostility toward Israel and support for terrorism will cease. For the peace to be sustainable, however, and Israel-Syrian settlement will have to be based on more than words. Israel will have to be able to defend itself, and continued provision of annual U.S. military assistance is an integral part of that process.

With all that is at stake right now in the peace process, it is difficult for me to understand why the administration has not worked closely with Congress to ensure that vital assistance is provided to Israel in a timely fashion. Mr. President, it is my hope that the administration will demonstrate better leadership in supporting Israel as the peace process enters this critical year.

HIGH SPEED RAIL INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me begin by congratulating Senator LAUTENBERG for developing this important piece of legislation that recognizes the importance of rail in our overall transportation system as we approach the 21st century.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the High Speed Rail Investment Act, which will provide Amtrak with

much needed resources to pay for high speed rail corridors across the country. This legislation is crucial for the country, and for my home State of Massachusetts, and I am hopeful we can move it quickly through Congress.

This bill will give Amtrak the authority to sell \$10 billion in bonds over the next 10 years to finance high speed rail. Instead of interest payments, the Federal Government would provide tax credits to bondholders. Amtrak would repay the principal on the bonds after 10 years, however, the payments would come primarily from required state matching funds. I know many states will gladly participate in this matching program, as their Governors and State legislatures are eager to promote high speed rail. Amtrak would be authorized to invest this money solely for upgrading existing lines to high speed rail, constructing new high speed rail lines, purchasing high speed rail equipment, eliminating or improving grade crossings, and for capital upgrades to existing high speed rail corridors.

Let there be no mistake, this country needs to develop a comprehensive national transportation policy for the 21st century. So far, Congress has failed to address this vital issue. What we have is an ad hoc, disjointed policy that focuses on roads and air to the detriment of rail. We need to look at all of these modes of transportation to alleviate congestion and delays on the ground and in the sky and to move people across this country efficiently. Failing to do this will hamper economic growth and harm the environment.

Despite rail's proven safety, efficiency and reliability in Europe and Japan, and also in the Northeast corridor here in the United States, passenger rail is severely underfunded. We need to include rail into the transportation mix. We need more transportation choices and this bill helps to provide them.

In the Northeast corridor, Amtrak is well on its way to implementing high speed rail service. The high speed Acela service should start running in January. This will be extremely helpful in my home State of Massachusetts, where airport and highway congestion often reach frustrating levels. The more miles that are traveled on Amtrak, the fewer trips taken on crowded highways and skyways.

But new service in the Northeast corridor is only the beginning. We need to establish rail as a primary mode of transportation along with air and highways. This bill will help us achieve that goal across the country and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of such an important piece of legislation.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in observance of "National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week" to highlight the problem of

childhood lead poisoning and the deficiencies within the current system of detection and prevention.

Lead poisoning is the number one environmental health hazard to our children, despite a ban on the manufacture of lead paint and efforts to remove lead from gasoline and dietary sources. It is estimated that 800,000 children today suffer from elevated lead levels. Lead poisoning attacks a child's nervous system, impairing physical, mental, and behavioral development. Extreme exposure can cause seizures, brain damage, comas, and even death. And, inadequate diet and exposure to environmental hazards such as old housing make the threat greatest for those who possess the fewest resources to confront it—our nation's poor children.

This is why in 1992 Congress required states to test every Medicaid recipient under age two for lead poisoning. Mandatory screening would enable the highest-risk children to be tested and treated before lead poisoning impairs their development. However, many Medicaid providers are not conducting the required screening. A recent GAO study found that two-thirds of the children on Medicaid have never been screened for lead. In New Jersey, only 39% of children covered by Medicaid are tested.

A report issued this past summer from the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning and the National Center for Lead-Safe Housing provides new information regarding the extent of this problem. This report, a state-by-state analysis of follow-up care provided to lead-poisoned children, found that only 29 states have standards for how to care for lead-poisoned children. The report also found that only 35 states have developed specific strategies for investigating lead hazards in poisoned children's homes. And, 22 states reported that they lack the necessary funding to make a home safe for a lead-poisoned child.

This report presents compelling evidence in support of legislation, S.1120, the Children's Lead SAFE Act of 1999, introduced by Senator REED and myself to strengthen lead screening policy. This legislation would ensure that every federal program which serves at risk kids is involved in the lead screening process. Our bill would require WIC and Head Start centers to determine if a child has been tested and ensure testing for those children who have not. As 75% of at-risk children are enrolled in federal health care programs, this would ensure that no child is overlooked.

Secondly, the Children's Lead SAFE Act of 1999 would guarantee that Medicaid contracts explicitly require health care providers to adhere to federal rules for screening and treatment. Currently, many states are having Medicaid services provided by health maintenance organizations (HMO's). These HMO's, however, either are not conducting the required lead screening tests or are only conducting one of two

required tests. This legislation would effectively stop this corner cutting. Our bill would also ensure that states and federal agencies have the resources and incentives to complete mandatory screening by requiring Medicaid to reimburse WIC and Head Start for screening costs. We must create a bonus program that rewards states who screen more than 65% of their Medicaid population.

But additional testing is only a first step. Our legislation would also focus on prevention by reducing the sources of poisoning and provide for follow-up care for those children identified as at-risk. This includes expanding Medicaid coverage to include treatment for lead poisoning and for environmental investigations to determine its sources.

I am extremely pleased to tell my colleagues that in response to the efforts of the Senator from Rhode Island and myself, the Department of Health and Human Services has initiated some important steps to address the problem. Their efforts include ensuring that state Medicaid agencies comply with existing Medicaid policies requiring lead screening and requiring states to report the number of children under age six screened for lead poisoning. These measures will help us to better understand the problem and how to respond to it.

However, enhancing screening and identifying children exposed to lead is only the first step. Identification must be followed with treatment and abatement, including controlling the source of lead poisoning. For example, my own state of New Jersey has made great efforts in the area of abatement. Specifically, New Jersey requires the renovation and maintenance of older housing as well as mandating landlords to periodically test for lead. New Jersey has also initiated statewide programs to educate families on how to find and eliminate lead sources from their homes.

Similarly, on the federal level, the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides grants to states and local governments to reduce lead hazards in housing. Yet, for every application, there are nine that go unfunded. This year, the House tried to cut funding for this program by \$10 million. Although conferees ultimately restored funding equal to the President's request, this attempt demonstrates the need to provide greater awareness of the need for lead prevention efforts.

As the Alliance report suggests, there is more every state must do and there is clearly more the federal government can do to protect lead-poisoned children. I encourage my colleagues to examine the Alliance report and learn about what can be done in your states to improve lead poisoning treatment and prevention efforts. Finally, I would encourage Senator ROTH and Senator JEFFORDS to begin hearings not only on our legislation but also on this issue. In 1992, Congress