

this treaty. Over half of the nuclear-capable nations in the world have ratified this treaty. We have the least to lose and the most to gain if this treaty goes into force. This nation must do its part and help rid the world of these terrible nuclear explosions. I urge my colleagues to support a reexamination of these issues and a reconsideration of the Senate's regrettable course of action.

S CORPORATION ESOPS

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, in 1996 and 1997, I supported the creation of S corporation ESOPs, which—while they may sound a bit obscure to some—are an innovative way of giving employees an ownership stake in their companies and providing for their retirement.

The design of these programs was quite deliberate, and intended to accomplish very specific policy objectives. We sought to create not only an administrable structure for these plans, but also a program that encouraged private businesses to give their workers a “piece of the rock” and help them save for their retirement. The law therefore allows some deferral of tax liability on current-year revenues of a participating S corporation, but of course only for that portion of the company's revenues that are put into the ESOP accounts of employees. That is to say, the deferral only exists so long as the monies are not realized by employee-owners; when they withdraw the funds for their retirement benefit, they also pay a tax, and in this case, at a much higher rate than standard capital gains.

Recently, some have questioned whether this incentive should be eliminated. I am delighted that a strong bipartisan majority of the members of the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee have indicated they want to preserve the fundamental attributes of S corporation ESOPs. We have carefully scrutinized this matter in recent months, particularly in the context of the tax extenders legislation. We have determined that Treasury's proposal to eliminate the deferral aspect of S corporation ESOPs is a serious threat to the vitality of S corporation ESOPs. In rejecting this proposal, Congress has affirmed that—at a time when national savings rates are abysmally low, when Americans worry how they will fund their retirement, and when we in Congress worry about the future of Social Security—we cannot afford to undo such important programs.

In response to Treasury's concerns with possible abuse of the system, we included a revenue raising provision in the extenders package to strengthen the 1996 law. However, the Treasury Department objected to the provision and it was dropped during the last minute negotiations on the bill. Secretary Summers has agreed to work with me over the coming months on a provision to strengthen and preserve

broad-based employee ownership of S corporations through ESOPs in the future.

Today, there are 100,000 or more workers in America who are using and benefiting from the S corporation ESOP rules that we designed. We have reason to be proud of this accomplishment, and to point to it as an example of how we are helping Americans build wealth for their futures and their families through private ownership. I believe more workers stand to benefit from this great opportunity, which is working as Congress intended. I believe, along with a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues, that we must do all we can to sustain and promote S corporation ESOPs. I appreciate the strong support of Chairman ROTH and other members of the Finance Committee in particular to achieve this objective, and look forward to working with them on an ongoing basis for this very important cause.

FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

Mr. GRAMS. At the Brandenburg Gate, West Berlin, on June 12, 1987, President Reagan issued a stunning challenge: “General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!” And less than three years later, the wall crumbled, along with the threat of communism as a viable, universalist alternative to democracy.

I remember reporting on the fall of the Berlin Wall as a newscaster. I remember those first tentative attempts to climb over it, and the rush of revellers that followed when no shots were fired. Remember, the wall was built to keep people in, and freedom out. The guard posts in the East were facing eastward, not toward West Berlin. It is incredible that the tenth anniversary of this seminal event passed almost without comment. For it marked the end of the Soviet Empire, and foreshadowed the end of the Soviet Union itself. The global correlation of forces, as the Soviets used to say, aligned with freedom, not oppression.

The Wall crumbled because President Reagan was committed to achieving peace through strength. The Reagan Doctrine asserted the need to confront and rollback communism by aiding national liberation movements in Afghanistan, Angola, Grenada, Cambodia, and Nicaragua. He proved that once countries were in the Soviet camp, they need not remain there forever. He realized that our national prestige is reinforced and enhanced when we operate with a coherent, concise, and understandable foreign policy. And by doing so, he succeeded in inspiring and supporting dissidents behind the Iron Curtain who eroded the mortar of that Wall.

In contrast, the Clinton Administration has reacted to foreign policy cri-

ses, but has failed to develop a foreign policy. The Administration has lurched from managing one crisis to another, but never articulated the national interest in accordance with a core philosophy. Instead of consistently safeguarding and promoting our values abroad, it has acted on an ad hoc basis according to the needs of the moment, confusing our allies and emboldening rogue nations. Serbia was emboldened to conduct ethnic cleansing in Kosovo; North Korea was emboldened to develop nuclear weapons; Saddam Hussein was emboldened to strengthen his position in northern Iraq.

What is the Clinton Doctrine? We have been told about a “do-ability doctrine” whereby the United States acts “in the places where our addition of action will, in fact, be the critical difference.” However, that alone cannot be the criteria for U.S. intervention. Under that formulation we could be expected to intervene anywhere in the world. And as Secretary Albright stated as our Ambassador to the U.N. “we are not the world's policeman, nor are we running a charity or a fire department.”

However, as a practical matter, the combination of a “do-ability doctrine” with so-called “assertive multilateralism”—places the United States in the very position which Secretary Albright derided. It has resulted in both the abdication of our responsibilities and the misguided projection of our power. Instead of applying the Reagan Doctrine by equipping and training the Bosnian forces over our allies' objections, the Administration subcontracted our role of arming the Bosnians to a terrorist regime in Iran, unnecessarily endangering the lives of U.S. troops. Instead of arming the Bosnians, we supported our allies standing by in U.N. blue helmets, watching unarmed civilians be massacred in Srebrenica. In contrast, the attempt at nation building in Somalia, and the refusal to provide equipment requested on the ground because it would send the wrong signal, sacrificed the lives of 18 brave soldiers without regard to whether such action advanced our vital concerns. When this Administration acts according to the exigencies of the moment instead of according to an underlying philosophy, the country lurches from paralysis to “mission creep” without regard to the national interest.

Recently, there has been discussion of the possibility of reworking our entire military force structure—which is presently based on the capacity to fight two simultaneous major regional conflicts—in order to enable us to commit US troops to an ever-growing number of multilateral “peacekeeping” missions. I am concerned that we may sacrifice our vital national security interests in order to be able to participate in peripheral endeavors. We should not be shortsighted. We should not lose sight of what we must do in

order to accomplish what we can do. Our military should be used to protect our national security interests, not provide peacekeeping in areas without strategic significance.

That kind of distinction will never happen under the Clinton Administration. President Clinton does not have the clarity of purpose of Ronald Reagan. No walls will be torn down. There is no Clinton Doctrine. There is only a half-hearted attempt to justify random acts under an artificial rubric and a series of slogans. And our country is the worse for it. We should note the fall of the Berlin Wall symbolizes more than just a victory of liberty over totalitarianism. It shows that armed with a core philosophy, a coherent doctrine, and a lot of courage, there is no limit to what we can accomplish.

ROMANIAN CHAIRMANSHIP OF OSCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we attempt to conclude our business for this session of Congress, I wanted to mention an important decision that has just occurred in Istanbul. Mr. President, as you know, Turkey is hosting the annual summit of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Our President was in attendance, and from reports, this summit has been a robust forum for debate.

Given recent history, it is impossible to overstate the importance that the OSCE might play in maintaining Europe's peace and stability. It is the only forum available where all the nations of Europe meet to discuss European concerns. Clearly, the status of European Security is more fluid at this time than at any other in the last 40 years. Therefore, one of the very important decisions that the OSCE must make at the Istanbul Summit, is who will chair the OSCE in 2001.

I am very pleased to announce that the OSCE has chosen the nation of Romania to undertake this important leadership role. The United States and several leading European nations had advanced Romania's candidacy, and I believe that the OSCE has made a very wise choice. Romania's value as OSCE chair derives from a number of factors. First, Romania's geostrategic position places it in the heart of the region where stability is needed most. Despite lying at the crossroads of the Balkans, the Caucasus, and European Russia, Romania has managed to maintain excellent relations with all the parties. The OSCE desperately needs leadership that understands the problems of this region, while having no vested interest in any particular outcome. That is the sort of leadership that only Romania can bring to the table. Second, Romania is a role model for other Balkan nations. The economic and political reforms that Romania has undertaken, have not come easy—but that is part of her attraction to the other nations of the region. Romania's experience dem-

onstrates that if willing to make the necessary sacrifices, democracy and a liberalized economy are within reach. Finally, Romania has a strong tradition of cooperation with this nation. Our friendship has been formalized through the 1997 Strategic Partnership, as well as Romania's vigorous participation in the Partnership for Peace.

Mr. President, Romanian chairmanship is a very positive harbinger for the future of Europe, and for the future of the Balkan Region. I congratulate the OSCE for their excellent choice. I wish Romania's leadership the very best wishes upon assuming this very weighty responsibility. We look forward to another session of productive dialogue and meaningful diplomacy upon their accession to the chairmanship.

THE 1999 STATE PARKS GOLD MEDAL

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today, I rise with my colleague Senator MACK to take a moment to recognize our Florida state park system, which recently received the prestigious 1999 National State Parks Gold Medal from the National Sports Foundation, Inc., a part of the 25,000-member National Sporting Goods Association. The State Parks Gold Medal is awarded every other year to the state park system considered America's best. We are proud and honored that Florida's state park system, which includes 151 diverse state parks throughout the state covering more than one-half million acres, received this recognition in October at the National Recreation and Park Association Annual Congress in Nashville, Tennessee.

Congratulations to Governor Jeb Bush, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Secretary David Struhs, and the Department's Division of Recreation and Parks Director, Fran Mainella, on this achievement.

This nation's state parks play a key role in our society—they provide much needed recreational opportunities to Americans while protecting key resources. These parks create the link between our national parks, dedicated specifically to protection of the resources for which the park was created, and our local parks, dedicated specifically to recreation. Without a strong state park system, the resources in our national parks will become stressed as people seek to fill unmet recreational needs. We are proud that the state of Florida recognizes this connection, and works to maintain a strong state park system.

In honor of "Florida's State Parks—Voted America's Best," Governor Bush and the Florida Cabinet have designated Saturday, November 20 as a "free day" when admission charges to Florida state parks will be waived for all visitors. We invite all of our colleagues to a free day in one or more of America's best state parks that day.

Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to recognize these out-

standing natural areas, preserved forever for the enjoyment of this and future generations.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, the Senate confirmed Governor Joseph E. Brennan as a commissioner on the Federal Maritime Commission, and this week Governor Brennan was sworn in for a term to expire in 2003.

Governor Brennan, who formerly served as a Member of Congress for four years, where he was a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and Governor of Maine for eight years prior to that, is eminently qualified to confront the challenges facing the maritime community. With his broad experience at both the state and federal level, Governor Brennan is an outstanding choice to serve as a Commissioner on the FMC.

His service in Congress gave him first-hand knowledge of federal maritime issues as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that will be invaluable on the Maritime Commission.

Established in 1961, the Federal Maritime Commission—FMC—is an independent regulatory agency charged with administering laws relating to shipping and the waterborne domestic and offshore commerce of the U.S.

The FMC's jurisdiction encompasses many facets of the maritime industry. The Chairman and four Commissioners of the FMC are responsible for protecting shippers, carriers and others engaged in foreign commerce from restrictive rules and regulations of foreign governments and from the practices of foreign-flag carriers that have an adverse effect on shipping in U.S. trades. The FMC also reviews and monitors agreements under shipping law, reviews and approves or rejects tariff filings, issues licenses for ocean freight activities, administers passenger indemnity laws, reviews alleged or suspected violations of shipping statutes, and promulgates rules and regulations on shipping laws.

The maritime sector is vitally important to our economy, and the FMC's responsibilities are fundamental to sustaining U.S. competitiveness in this area.

As a Senator from Maine, a state with a rich maritime heritage, I am keenly aware that our nation has always been dependent upon the sea and has thus enjoyed a rich maritime tradition. To this day, our merchant marine remains an integral part of our culture and our economy.

Today, one out of every six jobs in the United States is marine related. America's ports support more than 95 percent of all our overseas foreign trade, and within the U.S., more than one billion tons of commercial cargo is transported by ship each year. We must