

SEC. 502. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) GRANTS.—From the funds appropriated under section 505, the Secretary is authorized to award a grant in an amount of \$5,000,000 to the Robert T. Stafford Public Policy Institute.

(b) APPLICATION.—No grant payment may be made under this section except upon an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 503. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

Funds appropriated under this title may be used—

(1) to further the knowledge and understanding of students of all ages about education, the environment, and public service;

(2) to increase the awareness of the importance of public service, to foster among the youth of the United States greater recognition of the role of public service in the development of the United States, and to promote public service as a career choice;

(3) to provide or support scholarships;

(4) to conduct educational, archival, or preservation activities;

(5) to construct or renovate library and research facilities for the collection and compilation of research materials for use in carrying out programs of the Institute;

(6) to establish or increase an endowment fund for use in carrying out the programs of the Institute.

SEC. 504. ENDOWMENT FUND.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—An endowment fund created with funds authorized under this title shall be managed in accordance with the standard endowment policies established by the Institute.

(b) USE OF ENDOWMENT FUND INCOME.—Endowment fund income earned (on or after the date of enactment of this title) may be used to support the activities authorized under section 503.

SEC. 505. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$5,000,000. Funds appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

NOTICE OF HEARING**SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS**

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold hearings entitled "Private Banking and Money Laundering: A Case Study of Opportunities and Vulnerabilities." The upcoming hearings will examine the vulnerabilities of U.S. private banks to money laundering and the role of U.S. banks in the growing and competitive private banking industry, their services and clientele, and their anti-money laundering efforts. Witnesses will include private bank personnel, bank regulators, and banking and law enforcement experts.

The hearings will take place on Tuesday, November 9, 1999, at 9:30 a.m., and Wednesday, November 10, 1999, at 1:00 p.m., in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Linda Gustitus of the Subcommittee's Minority staff at 224-9505.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 2, 1999, to conduct a hearing on "The World Trade Organization, its Seattle Ministerial, and the Millennium Round."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 2, 1999 at 10:00 AM and at 2:00 PM to hold two Nomination Hearings.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet on Tuesday, November 2, 1999 at 10:00 a.m., in The President's Room, The Capitol, to conduct a mark-up.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet on Tuesday, November 2, 1999 at 10:30 a.m., in Dirksen Room 226, to conduct a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 2, 1999 at 3:00 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREST AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forest and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 2, for purposes of conducting a Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony on the recent announcement by President Clinton to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest lands for increased protection.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**THE PHONY BATTLE AGAINST 'ISOLATIONISM'**

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, Friday's Washington Post contained an excellent op-ed piece by columnist Charles Krathammer arguing that, contrary to claims now being made by senior Clinton Administration officials, the recent defeat of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is not evidence of an emerging isolationist trend in the Republican party. I ask that the column be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

THE PHONY BATTLE AGAINST 'ISOLATIONISM'

After seven years, the big foreign policy thinkers in the Clinton administration are convinced they have come up with a big idea. Having spent the better part of a decade meandering through the world without a hint of strategy—wading compassless in and out of swamps from Somalia to Haiti to Yugoslavia—they have finally found their theme.

National Security Adviser Sandy Berger unveiled it in a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations last week. In true Clintonian fashion, Berger turned personal pique over the rejection of the test ban treaty into a grand idea: The Democrats are internationalists, their opponents are isolationists.

First of all, it ill behooves Democrats to call anybody isolationists. This is the party that in 1972 committed itself to "Come home, America." That cut off funds to South Vietnam. That fought bitterly to cut off aid to the Nicaraguan contras and the pro-America government of El Salvador. That mindlessly called for a nuclear freeze. That voted against the Gulf War.

They prevailed in Vietnam but thankfully were defeated on everything else. The contras were kept alive, forcing the Sandinistas to agree to free elections. Nicaragua is now a democracy.

El Salvador was supported against communist guerrillas. It, too, is now a democracy.

President Reagan faced down the freeze and succeeded in getting Soviet withdrawal of their SS-20 nukes from Europe, the abolition of multiwarhead missiles, and the first nuclear arms reduction in history.

And the Gulf War was fought, preventing Saddam from becoming the nuclear-armed hegemon of the Persian Gulf.

"The internationalist consensus that prevailed in this country for more than 50 years," claimed Berger, "increasingly is being challenged by a new isolationism, heard and felt particularly in the Congress."

Internationalist consensus? For the last 20 years of the Cold War, after the Democrats lost their nerve over Vietnam, there was no internationalist consensus. Internationalism was the property of the Republican Party and of a few brave Democratic dissidents led by Sen. Henry Jackson—who were utterly shut out of power when the Democrats won the White House.

Berger's revisionism is not restricted to the Reagan and Bush years. He can't seem to remember the Clinton years either. He says of the Republicans, that "since the Cold War ended, the proponents of this [isolationist] vision have been nostalgic for the good old days when friends were friends and enemies were enemies."

Cold War nostalgia? It was Bill Clinton who early in his presidency said laughingly, "Gosh, I miss the Cold War." Then seriously, "We had an intellectually coherent thing.

The American people knew what the rules were."

What exactly is the vision that Berger has to offer? What does the Clinton foreign policy stand for?

Engagement. Hence the speech's title, "American Power—Hegemony, Isolation or Engagement." Or as he spelled it out: "To keep America engaged in a way that will benefit our people and all people."

Has there ever been a more mushy, meaningless choice of strategy? Engagement can mean anything. It can mean engagement as a supplicant, as a competitor, as an ally, as an adversary, as a neutral arbiter. Wake up on a Wednesday and pick your meaning.

The very emptiness of the term captures perfectly the essence of Clinton foreign policy. It is glorified ad hocism.

It lurches from one civil war to another with no coherent logic and with little regard for American national interest—finally proclaiming, while doing a victory jig over Kosovo, a Clinton Doctrine pledging America to stop ethnic cleansing anywhere.

It lurches from one multilateral treaty to another—from the Chemical Warfare Convention that even its proponents admit is unverifiable to a test ban treaty that is not just unverifiable but disarming—in the belief that American security can be founded on promises and paper.

If there is a thread connecting these meanderings, it is a woolly utopianism that turns a genuinely felt humanitarianism and a near-mystical belief in the power of parchment into the foreign policy of a superpower.

The choice of engagement as the motif of Clinton foreign policy is a self-confession of confusion. Of course we are engaged in the world. The question is: What kind of engagement?

Engagement that relies on the fictional "international community," the powerless United Nations or the recalcitrant Security Council (where governments hostile to our interests can veto us at will) to legitimize American action? Or engagement guided by American national interests and security needs?

Engagement that squanders American power and treasure on peacekeeping? Or engagement that concentrates our finite resources on potential warfighting in vital areas such as the Persian Gulf, the Korean peninsula and the Taiwan Strait?

Berger cannot seem to tell the difference between isolationism and realism. Which is the fundamental reason for the rudderless mess that is Clinton foreign policy.●

TRIBUTE TO HELEN WESTBROOK

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to recognize an outstanding individual who will soon be retiring from public service. Helen L. Westbrook currently works in the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In December, she will complete a career that has spanned many years of distinguished service to our country.

This is a special occasion for me and the Kennedy family, as Helen is truly one of our own. In 1955, as a Senator, my brother John F. Kennedy visited Chicopee, Massachusetts, and delivered an address about a recent visit he had made to Poland and Eastern Europe. Like many other young Americans of that time, Helen heard and heeded my brother's call to public service. She

moved to Washington, D.C., and in January 1956, she began work as a secretary in my brother's Senate office. Following the 1960 election, Jack asked Helen to join his White House Staff, and she served as a Secretarial Assistant in the Office of the President until January 1963.

Helen then decided she wanted to gain experience working overseas, and for the next year and a half, she served in our U.S. Embassy in Rome. She then returned to America, and at the request of Jackie Kennedy, she came back to work with our family. For the next few years, she served as an assistant to Jackie in New York City. She watched Caroline and John F. Kennedy, Jr. grow up, and went on to marry and raise a family of her own.

In 1992, Helen rejoined the Federal Government and started a career with NOAA. She has been a good friend to Massachusetts and has called for a balanced approach to fisheries management. She has been a skillful advocate for assistance to New England fishermen and coastal communities, and all of us who know her are proud of her achievements and her friendship.

Helen Westbrook is a kind, thoughtful person who truly cares about people. She has brought professionalism, wisdom and dedication to each position that she has held. She is a valued and loyal friend of the Kennedy family.

We don't have enough Helen Westbrooks in government and in the world. She is a shining example of the wonderful people who answered President Kennedy's call to serve their country. I'm proud of her contribution to public service, and I wish her well in her well-deserved retirement.●

CONFERENCE REPORT FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2000

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on October 20, 1999, the Senate passed the conference report for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. I thank the conferees for their hard work in putting forth this legislation which provides federal funding for fighting crime, enhancing drug enforcement, and responding to threats of terrorism. This bill also addresses the shortcomings of the immigration process, funds the operation of the judicial system, facilitates commerce throughout the United States, and fulfills the needs of the State Department and various other agencies.

For many years, I have tried to cut wasteful and unnecessary spending from the annual appropriations bills—with only limited success, I must admit. Nonetheless, I will continue my fight to curb wasteful pork-barrel spending, and I regret that I must again come forward this year to object

to the millions of unrequested, low-priority, wasteful spending in this conference report. This legislation includes \$535 million in pork-barrel spending. This is an unacceptable amount of money to spend on low-priority, unrequested, wasteful projects. Congress must curb its appetite for such unbridled spending.

Pork-barrel spending today not only robs well-deserving programs of much needed funds, it also jeopardizes social security reform, potential tax cuts, and our fiscal well-being into the next century.

The multitude of earmarks buried in this proposal will further burden the American taxpayers. While the amounts associated with each individual earmark may not seem extravagant, taken together, they represent a serious diversion of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to low priority programs at the expense of numerous programs that have undergone the appropriate merit-based selection process. Congress and the American public must be made aware of the magnitude of wasteful spending endorsed by this body.

For the Department of Commerce, there is \$400,000 for swordfish research. For the Department of Justice, there is \$1 million for the Nevada National Judicial College. For the Department of State, there is \$12.5 million for the East-West Center in Hawaii, and for the Small Business Administration, there is \$200,000 for Rural Enterprises, Inc., in Durant, Oklahoma. I have compiled a list on my Senate website of these examples and other numerous add-ons and earmarks in the report.

Mr. President, we must continue to work to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending so we can begin to pay down our debt and save billions in interest payments. We have an obligation to ensure that Congress spends taxpayers' hard-earned dollars prudently to protect our balanced budget and to protect the projected budget surpluses. The American public cannot understand why we continue to earmark these huge amounts of money to locality specific special interests at a time when we are trying to cut the cost of government and return more dollars to the people.

Mr. President, it is a sad commentary on the state of politics today that the Congress cannot curb its appetite to earmark funds for programs that are obviously wasteful, unnecessary, or unfair. Unfortunately, however, Members of Congress have demonstrated time and again their willingness to fund programs that serve their narrowly tailored interest at the expense of the national interest.●

DOWNRIVER GUIDANCE CLINIC TRIBUTE

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, It is my great pleasure to recognize and honor the Downriver Guidance Clinic as they celebrate their First Downriver Guidance Clinic Week November 7 through November 13, 1999.